

Council Meeting Agenda & Reports

7 April 2025

Our Vision

*A City which values its heritage, cultural diversity,
sense of place and natural environment.*

*A progressive City which is prosperous, sustainable
and socially cohesive, with a strong community spirit.*

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4555
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au
Socials  /cityofnpsp  @cityofnpsp



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

3 April 2025

To all Members of the Council

NOTICE OF MEETING

I wish to advise that pursuant to Sections 83 and 87 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the next Ordinary Meeting of the Norwood Payneham & St Peters Council, will be held in the Council Chambers, Norwood Town Hall, 175 The Parade, Norwood, on:

Monday 7 April 2025, commencing at 7.00pm.

Please advise Tina Zullo on 8366 4545 or email tzullo@npsp.sa.gov.au, if you are unable to attend this meeting or will be late.

Yours faithfully



Mario Barone
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4555
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au
Socials  /cityofnpsp  @cityofnpsp



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

1.	KAURNA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
2.	OPENING PRAYER.....	1
3.	CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 3 MARCH 2025	1
4.	MAYOR'S COMMUNICATION.....	1
5.	DELEGATES COMMUNICATION.....	1
6.	ELECTED MEMBER DECLARATION OF INTEREST.....	1
7.	ADJOURNED ITEMS.....	1
8.	QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.....	1
9.	QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE	1
9.1	QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE - CONDITION OF LOCAL ROADS IN STEPNEY AREA - SUBMITTED BY CR SCOTT SIMS	2
10.	DEPUTATIONS	3
10.1	DEPUTATION – STOBIE POLE ARTWORK APPROVAL PROCESSES	4
11.	PETITIONS.....	5
11.1	PETITION – BIRRELL STREET, NORWOOD – ON-STREET PARKING RESTRICTIONS	6
	<i>Attachments – Item 11.1.....</i>	7
12.	WRITTEN NOTICES OF MOTION.....	8
12.1	WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION – 2025 AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (ALGA) NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY – SUBMITTED BY CR CONNIE GRANOZIO	9
12.2	WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION – TREES TO BE PLANTED IN COUNCIL OWNED/MANAGED OPEN SPACE – SUBMITTED BY CR HUGH HOLFELD	10
12.3	WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION - TRAFFIC EFFICIENCY REVIEW - BUS MOVEMENTS - INTERSECTION OF SIXTH AVE AND STEPHEN TERRACE, ST PETERS – SUBMITTED BY CR KESTER MOORHOUSE	11
12.4	WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION – PUBLIC LIGHTING – SUBMITTED BY CR KESTER MOORHOUSE	12
13.	STAFF REPORTS	13
	Section 1 – Strategy & Policy.....	14
13.1	REVIEW OF E-SCOOTER PERMITS.....	15
13.2	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BUILT HERITAGE STRATEGY 2022-2027	19
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.2.....</i>	24
13.3	REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S ON-STREET PARKING POLICY	25
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.3.....</i>	38
13.4	2022-2025 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY – FINAL PROGRESS REPORT & DRAFT 2025-2027 YOUTH ACTION PLAN	39
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.4.....</i>	45
	Section 2 – Corporate & Finance.....	46
13.5	2024-2025 THIRD BUDGET REVIEW.....	47
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.5.....</i>	54
13.6	DRAFT ANNUAL BUSINESS PLAN & DRAFT 2025-2026 BUDGET	55
13.7	SHORT-TERM RENTAL PROPERTIES RECLASSIFICATION FOR RATING PURPOSES	75
	Section 3 – Governance & General.....	80
13.8	COUNCIL OWNED LEASED PROPERTIES	81
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.8.....</i>	84
13.9	VESTING OF PUBLIC ROAD - HEANES LANE, KENSINGTON	85
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.9.....</i>	92
13.10	CHURCH AVENUE, NORWOOD - ROAD PROCESS.....	93
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.10.....</i>	96
13.11	ERA WATER – REQUEST TO INSTALL A BOOSTER PUMP.....	97
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.11.....</i>	100
13.12	PROPOSED BY-LAWS	101
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.12.....</i>	105
13.13	REPRESENTATION REVIEW – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION & FINAL REPORT	106
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.13.....</i>	110
13.14	REVIEW OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS.....	111
	<i>Attachments – Item 13.14.....</i>	113
14.	ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	114
15.	OTHER BUSINESS	114
16.	CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS.....	114
16.1	REVIEW OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS – EXTENSION OF CONFIDENTIALITY ORDER.....	115
16.2	STAFF RELATED MATTER	116
17.	CLOSURE	117

VENUE Council Chambers, Norwood Town Hall

HOUR

PRESENT

Council Members

Staff

APOLOGIES

LEAVE OF ABSENCE Cr Claire Clutterham

ABSENT

1. **KAURNA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**
2. **OPENING PRAYER**
3. **CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 3 MARCH 2025**
4. **MAYOR'S COMMUNICATION**
5. **DELEGATES COMMUNICATION**
6. **ELECTED MEMBER DECLARATION OF INTEREST**
7. **ADJOURNED ITEMS**
Nil
8. **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**
9. **QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE**

**9.1 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE - CONDITION OF LOCAL ROADS IN STEPNEY AREA -
SUBMITTED BY CR SCOTT SIMS**

QUESTION WITH NOTICE: Condition of Local Roads in Stepney Area
SUBMITTED BY: Cr Scott Sims
FILE REFERENCE: qA1040
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

BACKGROUND

Cr Sims has submitted the following Questions with Notice:

Could staff please:

1. advise on the reasons for the prolonged delay in repairing Laura, Henry and Phillis Streets, Stepney?
2. detail the planned actions to resolve these issues and provide a detailed timeline for repair?

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF QUESTIONS

As a representative for the Maylands/Trinity Gardens area since November 2018, the community has consistently raised issues regarding the condition of our local roads, many of which still require attention.

Roads such as Laura Street, Henry Street and Phillis Street in Stepney are in particularly poor condition, highlighting broader infrastructure concerns.

Residents have shared their frustrations at the continued delays and need for action.

**RESPONSE TO QUESTION
PREPARED BY ACTING GENERAL MANAGER, INFRASTRUCTURE & MAJOR PROJECTS**

As Elected Members will recall, in 2020 it was anticipated that stormwater drainage upgrade works would be undertaken in Henry Street and Laura Street as part of the Trinity Valley Drainage Upgrade Stage 1 Project. Therefore, it was decided at that time, to align the timing of road surface renewal works with the Trinity Valley Drainage Upgrade Stage 1 Project to ensure an efficient and economical outcome.

The concept design for Trinity Valley Drainage Upgrade Stage 1 Project was updated in 2024 and at its meeting on 5 August 2024, the Council resolved that *“the detailed design for the Trinity Valley Stormwater Drainage Upgrade Project Stage 1 be based on stormwater detention along Clifton Street, Maylands, with the upgrade of stormwater drainage capacity along Henry Street and Nelson Street removed.”* As a result, the road surface renewal works for Henry Street and Laura Street have been included in the draft 2025-2026 Capital Works Program and will be prioritised to be completed early in the new financial year.

The Trinity Valley Drainage Upgrade Stage 1 Project works are also scheduled to be undertaken during the 2025-2026 financial year. In addition to Clifton Street, intersecting streets (e.g. Phillis Street) may have minor stormwater upgrade works or be used as a route for construction traffic.

Once the detailed design is completed, the timing of road resurfacing for Phillis Street will be reconsidered. Road resurfacing may be undertaken to align with the Trinity Valley Drainage Upgrade Stage 1 Project works or as part of the 2026-2027 Capital Works Program, depending on which option is the most pragmatic.

10. DEPUTATIONS

10.1 DEPUTATION – STOBIE POLE ARTWORK APPROVAL PROCESSES

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4568
FILE REFERENCE: qA1041
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

SPEAKER/S

Mr Travis Cox

ORGANISATION/GROUP REPRESENTED BY SPEAKER/S

Not Applicable.

COMMENTS

Mr Travis Cox has written to the Council requesting that he be permitted to address the Council in relation to stobie pole artwork approval processes.

In accordance with the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, Mr Travis Cox has been given approval to address the Council.

11. PETITIONS

11.1 PETITION – BIRRELL STREET, NORWOOD – ON-STREET PARKING RESTRICTIONS

REPORT AUTHOR: Governance Officer
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4533
FILE REFERENCE: qA173560
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to table a petition which has been received by the Council regarding concerns with a request to implement time limited on street parking restrictions in Birrell Street, Norwood.

BACKGROUND

The Petitioners are requesting that the Council does not implement 2 hour time limited parking restrictions in Birrell Street, Norwood.

A copy of the Petition is contained in **Attachment A**.

The Petition has been signed by a total of 16 citizens, which includes 1 signatory who resides outside of Birrell Street.

In accordance with the Council's *Privacy Policy*, the personal information of the petitioners, (i.e. the street addresses) have been redacted from the petition. The names of the signatories and the suburb which have been included on the petition have not been redacted from the petition.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Goals contained in *CityPlan 2030* are:

Outcome 1: Social Equity

Objective 1.2: A people friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network.

Strategy:

1.2.4 Provide appropriate traffic management to enhance residential amenity.

DISCUSSION

A resident of Birrell Street, Norwood has requested that the Council implements 2 hour time limited parking restrictions in Birrell Street, Norwood.

On the basis of this request, other residents have signed the petition and are requesting that the on-street parking arrangements in Birrell Street remain unchanged and that the time limited parking restrictions not be implemented.

The request to implement on street parking restrictions in Birrell Street is being considered by Council staff in accordance with the Council's *On-Street Parking Policy* (the Policy).

It is therefore recommended that the Council refers the petition to staff for consideration as part of the assessment of the request in accordance with the Policy.

RECOMMENDATION


That the Convenor of the petition be advised that this matter will be referred to Council staff for consideration as part of the assessment of the parking arrangements in Birrell Street, Norwood in accordance with the Council's *On-Street Parking Policy*.

Attachments – Item 11.1

Attachment A

**Petition
Birrell Street, Norwood
On Street Parking Restrictions**





Save our street from 2-hour parking restrictions.

Birrell Street, Norwood says please NO to 2-hour parking.

Through Covid and through the Coles build, we managed agreeable street parking in Birrell St.

It is a small back street where many classic old houses have narrow shared lanes and no rear access. Street parking has been the way of life and everyone has managed without conflict until now.

A newcomer has applied to Council for 2-hour parking which will force hapless residents (and their guests, carers or cleaners) to keep clock-watching and stressing and moving their cars all day - or face punishing parking fines.

Please help us to petition the council asking to let us stay the way we are:

.....
SANDRO DECICCIA.
.....

.....
JUDE HARRINGTON.....
.....

.....
Shelley O'Hara
.....

.....
MAURIE BRIDGWOOD.....
.....

.....
LORRY BRIDGWOOD.....
.....


.....
Annette Cooney.....
.....

.....
THOMAS SMITH.....
.....

.....
ELLEN RANOUA
.....

.....
Helen Ferguson
.....

.....
DAVID FERGUSON
.....





Save our street from 2-hour parking restrictions.

Birrell Street, Norwood says please NO to 2-hour parking.

Through Covid and through the Coles build, we managed agreeable street parking in Birrell St.

It is a small back street where many classic old houses have narrow shared lanes and no rear access. Street parking has been the way of life and everyone has managed without conflict until now.



A newcomer has applied to Council for 2-hour parking which will force hapless residents (and their guests, carers or cleaners) to keep clock-watching and stressing and moving their cars all day - or face punishing parking fines.

Please help us to petition the council asking to let us stay the way we are:

Name

Address

Bruce Blackwell



.....
~~Samuel Harris~~



Roger Wiseman

Natalie Jones

Rev. Rob WPK Phrusu

Prof. Susan Luchman

.....

.....

12. WRITTEN NOTICES OF MOTION

12.1 WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION – 2025 AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (ALGA) NATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY – SUBMITTED BY CR CONNIE GRANIZIO

NOTICE OF MOTION: 2025 Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) National General Assembly
SUBMITTED BY: Cr Connie Granozio
FILE REFERENCE: qA1039
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

Pursuant to Regulation 12(1) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, the following Notice of Motion has been submitted by Cr Connie Granozio.

NOTICE OF MOTION

That the Council approves the attendance of Cr Victoria McFarlane and Cr Scott Sims at the 2025 Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) National General Assembly in Canberra from 24-27 June 2025.

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

At the Council Meeting held on 3 March 2025 the Council approved the attendance of Cr Moorhouse at the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) National General Assembly (NGA).

Both Cr McFarlane and Cr Sims also expressed an interest in attending.

At the time the Council was advised that there was adequate funding as part of the budget for all three (3) Elected Members to attend.

The ALGA is the national body for Local Government and the NGA provides both a learning and networking opportunity and attendance at the NGA is relevant to all Elected Members.

STAFF COMMENT

Nil

12.2 WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION – TREES TO BE PLANTED IN COUNCIL OWNED/MANAGED OPEN SPACE – SUBMITTED BY CR HUGH HOLFELD

NOTICE OF MOTION: Trees to be Planted in Council Owned/Managed Open Space
SUBMITTED BY: Cr Hugh Holfeld
FILE REFERENCE: qA1039
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

Pursuant to Regulation 12(1) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, the following Notice of Motion has been submitted by Cr Hugh Holfeld.

NOTICE OF MOTION

That, starting from the 2026 tree planting season, all trees to be planted in Council owned or managed open space, including Linear Park, where Council staff deem it reasonable and/or appropriate to do so, should be:

- (a) native species based on Table 6 - Street Tree Palette (pp 50-53) of the *2022-2027 Tree Strategy*; and
- (b) locally (Adelaide Plains) native species.

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Trees are the cornerstone of our parks and reserves and to have the best outcomes for community wellbeing and the flora and fauna that call our Council home, all trees planted within should be native trees. Locally native trees provide several benefits as compared to species introduced to the Adelaide Plains. They are better adapted to our climate and conditions, provide food and habitat for local wildlife and they have a better cooling ability, compared to introduced species that lose all their leaves during winter dormancy. Street, verge, and median strip trees have a wider range of factors that must be taken into account in their selection, as identified in the *2022-2027 Tree Strategy*.

STAFF COMMENT

Nil

12.3 WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION - TRAFFIC EFFICIENCY REVIEW - BUS MOVEMENTS - INTERSECTION OF SIXTH AVE AND STEPHEN TERRACE, ST PETERS – SUBMITTED BY CR KESTER MOORHOUSE

NOTICE OF MOTION: Traffic Efficiency Review - Bus Movements - Intersection of Sixth Ave and Stephen Terrace, St Peters
SUBMITTED BY: Cr Kester Moorhouse
FILE REFERENCE: qA1039
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

Pursuant to Regulation 12(1) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, the following Notice of Motion has been submitted by Cr Kester Moorhouse.

NOTICE OF MOTION

That staff write a letter to the Department of Infrastructure and Transport advocating for a traffic efficiency review for bus movements at the intersection of Sixth Avenue and Stephen Terrace to improve efficiency and road safety.

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Adelaide Metro buses taking the W90 and W91 bus routes must cross through heavy Stephen Terrace traffic to get from one side of Sixth Avenue to the other, often having to wait a long time for a gap in traffic. The intersection is a known trouble spot, a nightmare during peak hour and poses an ever present safety risk for buses, cars and pedestrians alike. It is unreasonable for buses to be expected to cross Stephen Terrace during peak hours. Doing so creates unnecessary stress for drivers and poses a significant safety risk to all road users. A traffic efficiency review for the Sixth Avenue/ Stephen Terrace intersection would explore options to improve its traffic flows and road safety. Possible measures to consider could include bus priority traffic light signalling, or making minor changes to the bus route.

STAFF COMMENT

Nil

12.4 WRITTEN NOTICE OF MOTION – PUBLIC LIGHTING – SUBMITTED BY CR KESTER MOORHOUSE

NOTICE OF MOTION: Public Lighting Policy
SUBMITTED BY: Cr Kester Moorhouse
FILE REFERENCE: qA1039
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

Pursuant to Regulation 12(1) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, the following Notice of Motion has been submitted by Cr Kester Moorhouse.

NOTICE OF MOTION

1. That a report be presented to the Council to provide information regarding the framework for the management of public lighting within our City.
2. That as part of the report, consideration be given to the development of a policy which would provide guidance to the Council in respect to the Council's role and to inform decision making in respect to public lighting matters within the City.

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

By illuminating roads and footpaths during the nighttime, street lights make it easier for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers to see where they are going and to be seen by others. Well lit areas have fewer car crashes, less crime and can engender a greater sense of security. Yet our Council area does still have some dark areas, particularly our laneways. Unlike many of our neighbouring councils, at present Norwood, Payneham and St Peters does not have a Public Lighting Policy to guide our approach to public lighting. As such, we risk our roll out of public lighting being seen as inconsistent and on-the-fly.

A Public Lighting Policy Would inform decision making around the installation of new public lighting and upgrades to existing public lighting in the Council's streets, laneways, parks and reserves, as well as the management of public lighting with a focus on providing a safe and vibrant public realm. The Policy could also consider architectural feature lighting (e.g. heritage facades) and the appropriate type of lighting for the Council's buildings for visual comfort, light spillage minimisation and energy efficiency. As some members of our City feel unsafe walking our streets at night, a report to Council on street lighting, followed by the adoption of a Public Lighting Policy would be necessary initial steps in demonstrating that we take their safety concerns seriously.

**STAFF COMMENT
PREPARED BY ACTING GENERAL MANAGER, INFRASTRUCTURE & MAJOR PROJECTS**

A report, as requested in the Motion, can be provided to the Council.

13. STAFF REPORTS

Section 1 – Strategy & Policy

Reports

13.1 REVIEW OF E-SCOOTER PERMITS

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Urban Planning & Sustainability
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4532
FILE REFERENCE: qA72872
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to consider the future operation of e-scooters in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 4 November 2024, the Council resolved the following:

1. *That an extension of the e-scooter permits to Beam and Neuron until 30 April 2025, be endorsed for the purposes of aligning with the permit period of the City of Adelaide, noting that Council staff will work with the City of Adelaide during this period and a report will be provided to Council on the long-term future for the operation of a shared e-scooter scheme.*
2. *That the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to write to the Minister for Infrastructure & Transport, advising of the outcomes of this report and seeking further authorisation through exemption of e-scooters under the Road Traffic Act 1961 until 30 April 2025, or until such time as the proposed PMD legislation is enacted, removing the need for this authorisation.*

The Council has been involved in the current e-scooter trial since 14 May 2021, with a number of extensions being granted over that period. The current permits that have been issued to the two (2) commercial operators (Beam and Neuron) will expire on 30 April 2025.

This report considers an interim position as a date for the commencement of the new legislation for such devices has not been announced by the State Government]. Once enacted, the *Statutes Amendments (Personal Mobility Devices) Bill 2024* will allow privately-owned e-scooters and other personal mobility devices to be ridden on roads and other public areas.

The Government proposes to take a broad access approach, permitting use on footpaths and pedestrian infrastructure, as well as in bike lanes and on roads where the default speed limit is a maximum of 50km/h. It is proposed that a speed limit of 25km/h will apply on roads, bike lanes and separated paths and a lower speed limit of no more than 15km/h on footpaths and shared paths with pedestrians. Riders will be required to use a helmet at all times and must be aged 16 or older to ride PMD's unsupervised.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Outcomes and Objectives contained in the Council's Strategic Plan, *CityPlan 2030*, are set out below:

Outcome 1 Social Equity

An inclusive, connected, accessible and friendly community

Objective:

1.2: A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network.

Outcome 3 Economic Prosperity

A dynamic and thriving centre for business and services

Objective:

3.1: A diverse range of businesses and services.

Outcome 4: Environmental Sustainability

A leader in environmental sustainability

Objective:

4.4. Mitigating and adapting to the impacts of a changing climate.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The permits that have been issued to operators incorporate a fee that generates a combined income to the Council of \$6,300 per annum, which covers the costs incurred in the management and administration of the scheme, including the Ride Share mobility management platform.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

The transport and parking convenience offered by shared mobility devices, combined with the City's close proximity to the Adelaide CBD, means that the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is attractive for shared mobility device operators and users.

Increased local accessibility for citizens and visitors through micro-mobility devices can also increase the level of patronage and expenditure for local businesses and events in the Council area.

E-scooter use increases significantly during major events, such as the AFL Gather Round and the Adelaide Fringe.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Shared mobility device schemes offer a convenient and affordable mode of transport to people who may not have the capacity or desire to travel by private car, ride share or taxi. This in turn can contribute to a healthier, more connected and more active community.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Shared mobility devices, such as e-scooters are known to replace car journeys and therefore reduce carbon emissions and air pollution and congestion. Additionally, shared mobility device schemes provide a link for passengers to public transport, by offering a low-cost faster option of travelling to and from public transport stops (first and last mile transport).

RESOURCE ISSUES

The responsibility for managing e-scooters lies with the Sustainability Unit, with some additional support from Regulatory Services in management of public complaints about footpath obstruction or public safety concerns.

RISK MANAGEMENT

In the past, the Council has responded to areas of possible risk by adjusting the operational requirements through Permit conditions and requests to the operators (such as new No Parking Zones).

If the Council continues to play a role in providing permits for e-scooter hire schemes, additional resources will need to be applied to better manage the needs of users versus the need to safe pedestrian and traffic movement and orderly management of the e-scooters in the public realm.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

The Council last considered this matter at its meeting held on 4 November 2024.

- **Community**

Not Applicable.

- **Staff**

General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment

- **Other Agencies**

Not Applicable

DISCUSSION

There is a need to consider whether an extension of the e-scooter permits to Beam and Neuron beyond 30 April 2025, is to be approved.

Data from the previous period, reported to the Council at its meeting held on 4 November 2024 showed an overall downward trend in device usage each year since 2021. The average trip per e-scooter per day was approximately 0.3 trips.

In the previous report to Council, it was reported that there had been a decline in the number of complaints to the Council regarding the shared e-scooter scheme. This remains the case, with only isolated complaints being received by Council staff. Since November 2024 the Council is not aware of any safety incidents or reports in the intervening four (4) month period.

The State Government legislation will allow private use of personal mobility devices and incorporates notable changes such as allowing the use of these devices on roads with speed limits under 50km/h and permitting travel speeds for on road use of up to 25km/h.

Demand for e-scooters has gradually reduced over the four-year period. It is difficult to predict what impact there will be following the commencement of the PMD legislation allowing private use of e-scooters and other PMDs, now advised as likely to occur in mid-2025. However, there is a possibility that the legislation may undermine the viability of Beam and Neuron's operations.

OPTIONS

Option 1: Short-term extension of e-scooter trial permits

This option would enable the e-scooter trial to continue operation for a further period, nominally for an additional eight (8) months, until 31 December 2025. A further Ministerial exemption would need to be sought and obtained, prior to offering permits to the current operators beyond 30 April 2025.

This option is put forward to extend the current arrangements and enable reassessment following the expected State Government commencement of the legislation enabling private use of PMDs.

This is the recommended option.

Option 2: Long-term extension of e-scooter trial permits

This option provides a longer-term commitment to a shared e-scooter trial. Once the legislation is in effect, there is no need for Ministerial exemption, and this effectively would no longer be part of a "trial". Rather, it would be an ongoing permit arrangement.

Adopting this option would not enable a broader review of the commercial operation of e-scooters in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters and is not recommended.

Option 3: Discontinue shared e-scooter operations

The Council could choose not to extend the shared e-scooter scheme due to public perceptions relating to public nuisance and safety concerns.

The ongoing operation and viability of a shared e-scooter scheme is most likely to be dependent on the commitment of the City of Adelaide. The permits in the City of Adelaide for the two operators terminate on the same date (30 April 2025) and it is not possible to pre-empt the outcome of that decision.

Due to the imminent legislation commencement and the uncertainty of the City of Adelaide's position this option is not recommended at this time.

CONCLUSION

As an interim position, it is considered reasonable to continue the current Permit arrangements for Neuron and Beam for a further eight (8) months. Once a date is announced for legislative commencement, the Council can reconsider its position for operating ongoing e-scooter availability.

COMMENTS

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That should the operators wish to continue in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, an extension of the e-scooter permits be granted to Beam and Neuron until 31 December 2025, noting that should the City of Adelaide not extend the current permits operating in the City, then the permit to operate in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters will be cancelled.
2. That subject to the above, the Council notes that the Chief Executive Officer will write to the Minister for Infrastructure & Transport, seeking authorisation through exemption of e-scooters under the *Road Traffic Act 1961* until 31 December 2025, or until such time as the proposed PMD legislation is enacted, removing the need for this authorisation.

13.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BUILT HERITAGE STRATEGY 2022-2027

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Urban Planning & Sustainability
GENERAL MANAGER: Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4561
FILE REFERENCE: qA88791
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report presents the second annual report on implementation of the Council's *Built Heritage Strategy 2022-2027*.

There are a number of strategy documents that sit underneath the Council's Strategic Management Plan, *CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future*. These documents set out a range of actions to implement the Council's objectives and strategies. It is important to regularly report on the implementation of these strategies to track progress and to identify any gaps or barriers to implementation.

BACKGROUND

The Council endorsed the *2022-2027 Built Heritage Strategy* at its meeting held on 5 September 2022. The Strategy contained a commitment to report the *progress and outcomes of the initiatives annually to the Council*.

A report on implementation of the Strategy was considered at the October 2023 meeting. This report updates the actions taken to progress the Strategy. This implementation update is contained in **Attachment A**.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Outcomes and Objectives contained in the Council's Strategic Plan, *CityPlan 2030*, are set out below:

Outcome 2: Cultural Vitality

A culturally rich and diverse city, with a strong identity, history and sense of place

Objective

2.2 *A community embracing and celebrating its cultural diversity and heritage*

2.3 *A City which values and promotes built heritage*

2.4 *Pleasant, well designed, and sustainable neighbourhoods*

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

No direct budget implications arise from reporting on the progress of the implementation of the Strategy. The actual implementation tasks rely on utilisation of planning policy staff resources or a budget allocation.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Nil

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

The Council's role in supporting the retention of buildings and places of heritage value strongly aligns with one of the key objectives of the Council, which is to protect and enhance the City's valued built form and character.

Cultural heritage also encompasses items in places such as museums and the Cultural Heritage Centre, intangible cultural heritage, indigenous heritage, and natural heritage.

While the focus of this Strategy is on built heritage, there are synergies and future opportunities for collaboration with the Council's *Arts and Culture Plan*.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Strategy has been undertaken within existing staff resources.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no legislative risks associated with this issue. The potential reputational risk that Council is not progressing with its strategic directions for heritage, is being managed through the actions being taken to implement this Strategy, as outlined in this report.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

The Council considered the *Built Heritage Strategy* at its meetings held on 7 February 2022, 4 July 2022, 5 September 2022 and 3 October 2023.

- **Community**

Not applicable.

- **Staff**

General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
Manager, Arts, Culture & Community Connections

- **Other Agencies**

Nil

DISCUSSION

Reporting Framework

The *2022-27 Built Heritage Strategy*, provides an overarching strategic document which outlines the Council's approach to protecting, managing and promoting built heritage.

The Strategy contains fourteen (14) Objectives and twenty (20) Initiatives, which are categorised under the following four themes:

- *Celebrate, Promote and Support* - celebrating and promoting the value of built heritage and supporting owners of heritage properties;
- *Protect* - maintaining and strengthening heritage protections;
- *Advise, Influence and Advocate* - advocating and influencing good heritage outcomes in legislation and policy, and providing information and advice to the community; and
- *Lead by Example* - protecting and promoting heritage buildings and historic public realm features which are under the care and control of the Council.

The Initiatives and Actions are varied, including actions that reflect existing services or initiatives which are already offered by the Council, as well as new initiatives involving the Council and other partners. Ongoing communication was considered valuable for the community.

A successful outcome in June 2024, was the Minister for Planning awarding the Council grant funding of up to \$47,600 to match the Council's costs in undertaking its three (3) concurrent heritage and historic area related Code Amendments. The grant is being used to match the Council's costs for eligible activities and will maximise the outcomes for heritage and historic area protections.

The following discussion summaries the progress that has been made in the period October 2023 to February 2025. The reporting follows the themes set out in the Strategy and is further detailed in the summary table in **Attachment A**.

Celebrate, Promote and Support

Initiatives that have been progressed during this time include the commencement of the Heritage Plaque Scheme, the continuation of detailed property history searches through the Cultural Heritage Centre and a focus for planning staff in assessing development applications based on heritage referral advice from the Council's consulting Heritage Architect.

The free Heritage Advisory Service offered to residents and applicants continued to be well received and highly utilised with 139 booked appointments or phone consultations over the reporting period (October 2023 – February 2025).

The Council measures utilisation and satisfaction with Council services through the biennial Community Survey. The survey's measurement of Council services over time showed that survey respondents that had accessed "built cultural heritage services/ advice" had significantly increased during the reporting period. The latest survey (November 2023) recorded a 18% usage rating, a significant rise from 12% usage recorded at the previous Community Survey. See Figure 1 below.




FIGURE 1: Source: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters Community Survey Report 2023

The Council's planning staff continue to undertake an important role in engaging with applicants to achieve good design and flexible land use outcomes that complement the heritage or historic values.

Presentations and information sessions were held to assist community groups and property owners in understanding the work the Council is progressing to protect heritage places and areas of historic value.

Protect

Significant work has been undertaken on the program of Code Amendments, implementing better planning policy outcomes for identified heritage places and areas of historic character meeting the threshold for protection.

The *Interwar Housing Heritage Code Amendment* was approved by the Minister for early commencement and consultation approval. The Code Amendment includes protection for 20 new Local Heritage Places, a new Historic Area Overlay and identification of 12 new Representative Buildings in Heathpool. Public consultation was undertaken from 24 October 2024 until 20 December 2024 and a consultant has been engaged and is currently reviewing submissions to provide independent advice on the objections that have been lodged in respect to the proposed listings of buildings.

Area Statements under the *Planning and Design Code* play a key role in guiding planning assessment for new development in these locations. In the transition to the Code from the Development Plan, the Council was required to sacrifice considerable policy detail to meet the Code scope. Following this process, the State Planning Commission has recognised the need to further enhance the Area Statements and is supporting Council's to undertake this work to assist owners, applicants and Development Assessment staff in better understanding the historic and character area attributes, which form the basis of the policy protections under the Overlays, the *Historic and Character Area Statement Review Code Amendment*. This has involved the preparation of investigations, drafting the Proposal to Initiate and undertaking a review of the 32 Area Statements for these precincts. A Heritage Consultant has been engaged and is currently finalising a revised set of Area Statements, ready for public consultation in the second half of 2025.

One of the actions relates to better describing the descriptions of Local Heritage Places in the *Planning and Design Code*. This work has not commenced and requires further implementation by the State Government towards an integrated heritage framework.

In June 2024, the Environment, Resources and Development Court handed down its judgement affecting a prominent Local Heritage Place, upholding a Council Assessment Panel decision to refuse an application which adversely impacted on heritage value of the building. The Court's reasoning reinforced the importance of preserving the streetscape character and retaining the building's heritage setting.

Advise, Influence and Advocate

The Council continued an advocacy role in putting forward comments and suggestions relating to heritage, through a number of submissions, including on the draft Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, Assessment Improvements Code Amendment and the Accommodation Diversity Code Amendment.

The Council participated in the Local Council Survey conducted by Heritage South Australia, to help inform better advocacy and support for Councils in delivering heritage outcomes.

Lead by Example

Council owned heritage buildings remain available for the community to visit and hire.

Supporting the Strategy's initiative of promoting community access to Council owned heritage buildings, accessibility reviews were conducted for Norwood Swimming Centre, Norwood Oval Grandstand and St Peters Library. New guard rails were installed at Norwood Oval and new accessible toilets built at St Peters Library.

There were a number of improvements made to Council owned heritage assets including repair and refurbishment to the Benson Fountain (Kensington), Norwood Memorial Gardens Fountain and Sir Edwin Thomas Smith Fountain (Kent Town).

As in previous years, bluestone kerbing has been conserved in streets where maintenance work has been performed.

OPTIONS

Not Applicable.

CONCLUSION

The development of the *2022-2027 Built Heritage Strategy* with an annual reporting mechanism, provides for a greater level of transparency and communicates the Council's priorities and initiatives regarding built heritage.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That the Built Heritage Strategy report on implementation, as contained in Attachment A, be noted.

Attachments – Item 13.2

Attachment A

Implementation of the Built Heritage Strategy 2022-2027



TABLE 1: BUILT HERITAGE STRATEGY 2022-2027 - IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS – OCTOBER 2023 to FEBRUARY 2025

Celebrate, Promote, Support					
Objective	Initiative	How will we do this	Timeframe	Responsible Department	Status
1.1 Support owners of heritage places and buildings in historic areas	1.1.1 Heritage Advisory Service	Provide owners of Local Heritage Place buildings, buildings in an Historic Area Overlay and applicants proposing new dwellings in an Historic Area Overlay, access to free specialist in-house heritage architectural services and advice	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	The Heritage Advisor participated in 139 meetings or phone consultations with people seeking advice regarding development of Local Heritage Places or buildings in the Historic Area Overlay (from October 2023 to end of February 2025, a 17-month period). \$120,000 was spent on the Heritage Advisory Service over this period. See <i>Table 2 below</i> .
1.1 Support owners of heritage places and buildings in historic areas	1.1.2 Heritage information sessions	Host Heritage information sessions for owners of heritage and historic buildings on specialist conservation topics such as roofing, stonework, fencing and verandahs	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	No heritage information session was held during this period.
1.1 Support owners of heritage places and buildings in historic areas	1.1.3 Historic information available through the Council's Cultural Heritage Centre	Provide information and archival records through the Council's Cultural Heritage Staff to property owners and community members seeking information on the history of a property	Ongoing	Chief Executive's Office	Cultural Heritage Services staff responded to 191 requests for information about residential property history (164) or suburb history (27) over the 17-month period October 2023 to February 2025 (<i>note data is incomplete for 6 months of this reporting period</i>).
1.1 Support owners of heritage places and buildings in historic areas	1.1.4 Facilitate appropriate and sensitive building improvements and adaptive reuse	Planning staff collaborating and engaging with applicants to achieve good design and flexible land use outcomes that complement the heritage or historic value of the building or the broader locality, within the confines of South Australia's development assessment system. Also recognising and encouraging the environmental benefits of the retention and re-use of buildings, where appropriate	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	<p>Development Assessment staff were involved in the assessment and successful negotiation of good design outcomes for Development Applications (DAs) in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 68 DAs for Local Heritage Places 177 DAs in Historic Area Overlay <p>The Council's Heritage Advisor provided reports on 183 Development Applications which were referred for heritage and design advice during the reporting period.</p> <p>Council staff made representations advocating for good heritage outcomes for a number of State Commission Assessment Panel assessed development applications and private Code Amendments.</p>
1.2 Celebrate and promote the value of heritage conservation	1.2.1 SA History Festival	Run activities to increase public awareness and appreciation of building heritage such as: information sessions / talks, practical workshops, and guided tours	Annually in May	Community Development	Council offered the Art of Glass Festival as part of the 2024 SA History Festival. This showcased an exploration of the history and artistry of stained glass, including workshops and exhibitions in three historic churches.
1.2 Celebrate and promote the value of heritage conservation	1.2.2 Heritage Plaques	Through the Heritage Plaques Program the Council will progressively install recognition plaques to Local Heritage Places to provide information and historical context of the Place (Minimum of 6 plaques to be installed in each financial year)	Commenced 2022	Urban Planning & Environment	<p>The plaque scheme has been progressed with the development of a standard template, preparation of inscription, liaison with the property owner and installation of the first plaque.</p> <p>Following the pilot of the first plaque installment, refinements to the process are being made with a new standard procedure and revision of the plaque design. Letters will be sent in April 2025 to targeted heritage place owners offering plaques.</p>
1.2 Celebrate and promote the value of heritage conservation	1.2.3 Council membership of the International League of Historic Cities	Maintain membership of the League of Historical Cities (member since 2007)	Ongoing	Chief Executive's Office	Membership has been maintained.

1.3 Educate and raise awareness of heritage within the planning framework	1.3.1 Provide educational opportunities to the community	Council staff to take up opportunities for presentations, information sessions and provide educational material for community groups and students	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	<p>Staff presented to the Norwood Residents Association in August 2024 on the topic of “<i>Heritage, Historic Character and Streetscapes</i>”. This session included information on Heritage Places, Historic and Character Areas, past heritage surveys, the <i>Built Heritage Strategy</i> and current program of changes for Heritage/ Historic Area policy changes to the <i>Planning and Design Code</i>.</p> <p>Two additional community information sessions were held to inform the community about the heritage listing process.</p>
1.3 Educate and raise awareness of heritage within the planning framework	1.3.1 Provide educational opportunities to the community	Information articles in the Council's quarterly publication, Look East and other publications such as website and digital media platforms, where practical	Ongoing	Governance & Civic Affairs	<p>A Fact Sheet – <i>Heritage and Historic Area Protection in the Planning and Design Code</i> was prepared, published on the Council’s website and distributed to properties affected by the Inter War Heritage Housing Code Amendment.</p> <p>An article was featured in Look East about St Peters Soldiers Memorial, a Local Heritage Place.</p> <p>The updated Built Heritage Strategy was published on the Council’s website.</p>

TABLE 1: BUILT HERITAGE STRATEGY 2022-2027 - IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

Protect					
Objective	Initiative	How will we do this	Timeframe	Responsible Department	Status
2.1 Protect key examples of Interwar heritage	2.1.1 Expand the protection of buildings constructed between WW1 and WW2	Identify additional Interwar era buildings that may be worthy of heritage listing or additional protection. Engage and work collaboratively with the State Government to explore amendments to the Planning and Design Code to facilitate policy change that will enhance the protection of Interwar heritage buildings.	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	The Interwar Housing Heritage Code Amendment was approved by the Minister for early commencement and consultation approval. The Code Amendment includes protection for 20 new Local Heritage Places, a new Historic Area Overlay and identification of 12 new Representative Buildings in Heathpool. Public consultation has now been conducted and a consultant is currently engaged to review submissions and provide independent advice on the objected listings.
2.2 Protect Historic Areas	2.2.1 Expand application of Planning and Design Code Overlays	<p>Investigate areas containing vulnerable, at-risk buildings that have historic value but do not currently have any demolition protection that may warrant additional protections under the Planning and Design Code.</p> <p>Work collaboratively with the State Government to explore amendments to the Planning and Design Code to facilitate policy change to further protect historic areas.</p>	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	<p>In June 2024, the Council was successful in securing grant funding (up to \$47,600) from the Minister for Planning to match the Council's costs in undertaking its three (3) concurrent heritage and historic area related Code Amendments.</p> <p>Staff have undertaken on the ground surveys, prepared mapping and documentation and undertaken discussions with Plan SA representatives regarding the identification of areas worthy of historic area protection. Following formal approval to proceed through a Proposal to Initiate process, a consultant is currently engaged to provide independent advice to confirm the recommended extent of Historic Area Overlay and Character Area Overlay. The culmination of this work (currently confidential) is likely to be released for public consultation in mid 2025.</p> <p>Ongoing discussion is occurring with the State Government about improvements to the Planning and Design Code framework.</p>
2.3 Clarify extent of Local Heritage Place listings	2.3.1 Progressively review descriptions of Local Heritage Places contained in the Planning and Design Code	<p>Work collaboratively with PlanSA to amend current descriptions and mapping for Local Heritage Places contained in the Planning and Design Code to provide clarity on the extent of the listings and what aspects are considered to be of heritage value, in turn, providing greater clarity for planners, owners and applicants</p> <p><i>This is contingent on securing State Government directions.</i></p>	Following State Government heritage reform	Urban Planning & Environment	Awaiting State Government's progress of an integrated heritage listing system and audit of heritage places.
2.4 Appropriate and sensitive development outcomes	2.4.1 Development assessment decisions and policy development which seek to conserve heritage places and areas	<p>Working within the Planning and Design Code policy framework, Council's Planning Staff collaborate with the Council's Heritage Advisor to ensure original historic building fabric is retained where possible and demolition is pursued as a last resort, and to ensure new development does not detrimentally affect surrounding heritage places and historic streetscapes.</p> <p>The Council will also, where practicable, ensure that planning policies reflect the importance of maintaining a substantial curtilage and sense of open space around heritage buildings, so as to preserve the visual amenity and context of the protected building.</p>	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	<p>A Proposal to Initiate the <i>Historic and Character Area Statements Review Code Amendment</i> was prepared and submitted to the State Planning Commission. This received approval in May 2024. Staff have prepared revised Area Statements and Consultants have been engaged to review the draft Statements.</p> <p>In mid 2024, the Council successfully defended an appeal against a Council Assessment Panel decision affecting a prominent Local Heritage Place. The Environment, Resources and Development Court upheld the Council's refusal of the application, on the grounds of streetscape character and heritage setting.</p>

2.5 Recognise new State Heritage Places	2.5.1 Nominate, or support nominations for buildings worthy of State Heritage Protection	Where buildings are identified (by the Council or by others) as being worthy of State Heritage Place criteria, prepare or support nominations of these buildings to the South Australian Heritage Council	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	The Council has a representative on the South Australian Heritage Council, actively engaged in the assessment and support of nominated State Heritage Places which meet the criteria for listing under the <i>Heritage Places Act 1993</i> .
---	--	---	---------	------------------------------	--



TABLE 1: BUILT HERITAGE STRATEGY 2022-2027 - IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

Advise, Influence and Advocate					
Objective	Initiative	How will we do this	Timeframe	Responsible Department	Status
3.1 Inform owners and prospective owners of heritage listed or historic properties	3.1.1 Provide advice on impacts of heritage and planning policy and legislation	Provide advice to property owners, prospective purchasers and applicants on the potential implications of heritage and historic area policy and legislation. <i>For any substantial changes proposed either by the Council or other parties affecting owners, an engagement plan will need to be adopted and implemented.</i>	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	Detailed advice was provided in response to 139 customer inquiries over the period over the 17-month period October 2023 to February 2025. An Engagement Plan was prepared and executed for the Interwar Housing Heritage Code Amendment including letters, fact sheets, posters, website, drop in sessions and a telephone helpline.
3.2 Advocate and influence good legislation and planning policy	3.2.1 Advocate to the State Government, for a strong, consistent and transparent legislative framework for State and Local Heritage Places	As part of State Government Heritage Reform program, identify opportunities for improvement in heritage protection legislation, advocate in writing and present information.	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	Participation and provision of feedback as opportunities arise.
3.2 Advocate and influence good legislation and planning policy	3.2.1 Advocate to the State Government, for a strong, consistent and transparent legislative framework for State and Local Heritage Places	Participate in consultation on draft changes to legislation and advocate for appropriate changes when legislation is being amended.	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	Ongoing discussion is occurring with the State Government about improvements to the Planning and Design Code framework.
3.2 Advocate and influence good legislation and planning policy	3.2.2 Advocate to the State Government, Members of Parliament and the Local Government Association (SA) for good policy outcomes with respect to heritage places and historic areas	Proactively identify opportunities for improvement in the planning framework, advocate and present information to the State Government.	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	In February 2025 the Council participated in the Local Council Survey conducted by Heritage South Australia, to help inform better advocacy and support for Councils in delivering heritage outcomes.
3.2 Advocate and influence good legislation and planning policy	3.2.2 Advocate to the State Government, Members of Parliament and the Local Government Association (SA) for good policy outcomes with respect to heritage places and historic areas	Participate in consultation on strategic documents, policy amendments and discussion papers.	Ongoing	Urban Planning & Environment	The Council prepared a Draft Greater Adelaide Regional Plan submission (November 2024) which included advocacy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the GARP expressly supporting the protection, and where appropriate the expansion, of historic areas (which was considered insufficient in the draft) not introducing Urban Corridor zoning to portions of Flinders Street where it would impinge on buildings of historic character and heritage value a review of policies affecting the interface between Urban Corridors and historic areas the Affordable Housing Overlay <i>not</i> applying to historic areas, as proposed in the draft, due to likely policy conflicts and poor development outcomes The Council prepared a submission on the Draft Assessment Improvements Code Amendment (March 2025) which included advocacy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> amendments to allow decisions of the SA Heritage Council to be reflected in updated Code mapping and Overlay application in an efficient and appropriate manner

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consideration be given to whether proposed changes could result in development adjacent to a State Heritage Place detrimentally affecting the context of the Heritage Place • improvements to Local Heritage Place demolition policy <p>The Council prepared a submission on the draft Accommodation Diversity Code Amendment (February 2025) which included advocacy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoiding policy conflicts between proposed Significant Retirement Facilities and Supported Accommodation Overlay and Historic Area and Heritage Place Overlays, and potential for undesirable development outcomes in those areas
<p>3.3 Collaboration with special interest groups</p>	<p>3.3.1 Work with interest groups and other organisations to support, encourage and advocate for heritage protection</p>	<p>Liaise and work with groups such as community organisations where the Council's strategic outcomes align with the advocacy aims of these groups</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Urban Planning & Environment</p>	<p>Meet with planners in other Councils on an ongoing basis to discuss opportunities and challenges in progressing heritage and historic area issues.</p>

**TABLE 1: BUILT HERITAGE STRATEGY 2022-2027 - IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS**

Lead by Example					
Objective	Initiative	How will we do this	Timeframe	Responsible Department	Status
4.1 Retain and enhance historic features of the public realm	4.1.1 The Council proactively conserves and enhances historic features of the public realm under its care and control	The Council will ensure that any public works seek to conserve and restore historic features such as bluestone kerbing, bridges and parapets (when old bluestone kerbing is removed, the Council retains the bluestone for future use wherever possible). Historic areas are enhanced, where possible, by appropriately designed features such as street lighting.	Ongoing	Infrastructure & Major Projects	<p>The Benson Fountain at the corner of High Street and Portrush Road, Kensington was repaired and painted.</p> <p>The Norwood Memorial Gardens Fountain was refurbished.</p> <p>The Sir Edwin Thomas Smith Fountain is in the process of refurbishment and will be reinstalled at the corner of Rundle Street and Fullarton Road, Kent Town in 2025.</p> <p>Bluestone kerbing is always conserved and repaired where necessary in various street works.</p>
4.2 Council owned heritage buildings are conserved and celebrated	4.2.1 The Council proactively conserves and celebrates its heritage buildings	The Council will ensure the heritage buildings under its care and control are appropriately conserved through ongoing maintenance and restoration and adaptive reuse of buildings is supported wherever possible.	Ongoing	Infrastructure & Major Projects	Minor building renewal works are being planned and undertaken at the Norwood Town Hall and Norwood Concert Hall. All designs consider heritage advice and receive development approval prior to implementation.
4.2 Council owned heritage buildings are conserved and celebrated	4.2.1 The Council proactively conserves and celebrates its heritage buildings	Feature lighting to highlight heritage buildings installed as part of The Parade Masterplan	Long term	Infrastructure & Major Projects	The George Street Upgrade proposes to provide feature lighting for the Norwood Concert Hall building façade. Additional heritage buildings will receive feature lighting as the implementation of The Parade Masterplan progresses in future financial years.
4.3 Council owned heritage buildings are accessible to the community	4.3.1 Council owned buildings are open and accessible to the community wherever possible	Where appropriate, the Council's heritage buildings will be available for hire and to visit to ensure heritage buildings are accessible and enjoyed by all	Ongoing	Governance & Civic Affairs	<p>Accessibility reviews were conducted for Norwood Swimming Centre, Norwood Oval Grandstand and St Peters Library. New guard rails installed at Norwood Oval and new accessible toilets built at St Peters Library.</p> <p>Council owned heritage buildings remain available for the community to visit and hire.</p>

TABLE 2: HERITAGE ADVISORY SERVICE CONSULTATIONS – OCTOBER 2023 TO FEBRUARY 2025

Month	No. of Meetings/Calls	SHPs *	LHPs *	HAO *	CAO *	Other	Comments	Monthly Invoice Amount
October 2023	8			2		3		\$5,346.00
November 2023	12		4	1		3		\$7,128.00
December 2023	6		2	3			Includes design advice for Norwood Oval - Proposed new toilets sketch design	\$8,668.00
January 2024	4	1					Includes Norwood Oval design advice	\$15,642.00
February 2024	10		3			4	Environment Resources and Development Court appeal and Norwood Swimming Centre – concept design	\$14,058.00
March 2024	2		1				Includes Norwood Oval - Transformer advice	\$9,801.00
April 2024	7		2			2		\$7,187.40
May 2024	13	1	4			4		\$5,544.00
June 2024	11		1	5		2		\$4,950.00
July 2024	5		1	1		1		\$3,762.00
August 2024	7		1		1	3		\$6,930.00
September 2024	10		3	4		1		\$4,682.70
October 2024	10		2	2		1		\$6,534.00
November 2024	7		1	1		2		\$5,940.00
December 2024	1		1					\$1,980.00
January 2025	11		3	1		1		\$4,950.00
February 2025	15		4	3		1		\$6,165.50
Total	139	2	33	23	1	28		\$119,268.60

*SHP = State Heritage Place;

*LHP = Local Heritage Place;

*HAO = Property in Historic Area Overlay (not heritage place);

*CAO = Property in Character Area Overlay (not heritage place)

TABLE 3: CULTURAL HERITAGE ENQUIRIES – OCTOBER 2023 TO FEBRUARY 2025

Month	Total Enquiries	Enquiry Type						
		Residential Property History	Biography / Family History	Business/Group History	Commercial Redevelopment Info	Indigenous History	Suburb History	Other
October 2023	48	19	8	-	12	-	-	9
November 2023	49	18	4	-	7	-	1	19
December 2023	32	11	5	-	8	-	3	5
January 2024	35	18	22	-	-	-	6	7
February 2024	62	20	1	-	4	-	6	10
March 2024	49	22	14	2	7	1	-	16
April 2024	80	6	-	8	5	-	3	44
May 2024	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
June 2024	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
July 2024	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
August 2024	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
September 2024	22	7	11	-	-	1	-	3
October 2024	32	17	1	-	1	-	7	6
November 2024	29	12	11	-	-	-	1	5
December 2024	29	14	4	5	-	-	0	5
January 2025	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
February 2025	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL	467	164	85	15	45	2	27	129

* Data unavailable

13.3 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S ON-STREET PARKING POLICY

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4501
FILE REFERENCE: qA64322
ATTACHMENTS: A - C

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present to the Council the submissions, that have been received in response to the draft *On-Street Parking Policy* and to present the draft Policy for consideration and final endorsement.

BACKGROUND

The Council considered a report on the draft *On-Street Parking Policy* at its meeting held on 2 April 2024 and resolved the following:

1. *That the draft On-Street Parking Policy, as contained in Attachment B, be endorsed, as suitable for release for public consultation, for a minimum period of six (6) weeks.*
2. *The Council notes that a further report will be presented to the Council following consideration of submissions that are received during the consultation period.*

A copy of the report that was previously considered by the Council and the draft Policy that was released for community consultation, is contained in **Attachment A**.

Subsequent to the Council's decision, the draft *On-Street Parking Policy* was released for community consultation between 3 June 2024 and 8 July 2024. All existing Permit Holders and relevant property owners were advised in writing of the consultation process and the draft Policy.

At the conclusion of the consultation period, 122 submissions on the draft Policy were received.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant sections of the Council's Strategic Management Plan, *City Plan 2030*, are set out below.

Outcome 1 - Social Equity

Objective 1.2

A people friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network.

Strategy 1.2.4 is relevant as it notes that the Council will provide appropriate traffic and parking management, to enhance residential amenity and support business.

Outcome 3 – Economic Prosperity, Objective 3.2 is relevant to the extent that the Council's objective is to have cosmopolitan business precincts which contribute to the prosperity of the City and promote the City as a visitor destination.

Objective 5 of the Council's Smart City Plan is relevant to on-street parking as it encourages the exploration of opportunities to improve parking in the City with smart technology.

The Council's Access and Inclusion Strategy is also of relevance as it promotes equitable access to services available in the City.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

There are no proposed changes to the fee structure for *On-Street Parking Permits* as part of this review of the current Policy. However, it is proposed to offer Permits on an annual and biennial basis, to make the Permit process more convenient for long-term residents who regularly renew their On-Street Parking Permits year after year. If a high proportion of Permit holders take up the opportunity to renew their permits on a biennial (two yearly) basis, then the administration associated with the processing of Permit Applications will, over time, become more efficient and cost-effective.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

The availability of on-street parking impacts on the economic development of a City. In respect to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, its retail and commercial base is essentially focussed on main streets such as The Parade, Magill Road, Kensington Road and Payneham Road. As these main streets have developed over time, together with changes to on-site car parking requirements through changes to planning policies (now almost exclusively controlled by the State Government), there has been a gradual loss of on-site car parking, thereby making the availability and management of on-street parking critical to the sustainability of these precincts. This situation, together with less restrictive parking policies which have been introduced by the State Government, has resulted in significant competition for on-street parking as some land uses do not accommodate sufficient on-site car parking to meet the demand that is generated by the land use. This situation is heightened in precincts such as The Parade and Magill Road, where both commercial and residential land uses are required to co-exist and compete for limited on-street parking. Achieving a balance is therefore critical, but challenging and complex.

SOCIAL ISSUES

The City's residential areas and its residents rely on the provision of on-street car parking. In suburbs such as Felixstow, the competition for on-street car parking spaces is not as high as in residential areas adjacent to The Parade, Magill Road and Payneham Road and indeed, many of the suburbs west of Portrush Road. Tipping the balance totally in favour of residential land uses and residents will impact negatively on the City's main streets. Similarly, tipping the balance in favour of the business sector will impact negatively on residents. As such, a balance needs to be achieved.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Australian cities are still very much "car-centric". There are numerous reasons for this continuing reliance on vehicles.

From a cultural perspective, this dependency translates to the expectation that on-street car parking must be provided to each user, irrespective of priority and need. Similarly, there is a growing expectation that individual needs are more important than collective needs and that priorities should be based on the needs of the individual.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The draft Policy sets out the Council's objectives with respect to the use of Smart Technology to assist in the management and enforcement of parking areas and parking controls. The draft Policy lists the Council's objective of providing up to sixteen (16) EV Charging Stations across the City over the next fifteen (15) years, subject to community demand.

Three (3) submissions were received suggesting that the Council should be more ambitious with its EV Charging Station targets.

The Council has entered into commercial agreements with EV Charging Station providers to provide the infrastructure in a staged manner, noting that the providers will only install additional infrastructure as the need and demand arises. In addition, the electric vehicle market is dynamic and technology continues to evolve at a rapid pace. As such, it is prudent for the Council to invest cautiously in EV Infrastructure in the public realm in the short-term, as today's needs may not be relevant or as relevant in ten or fifteen years time.

It is also worth noting that the provision of EV Charging Infrastructure is not solely the responsibility of the Local Government sector and as such, as demand rises for the EV Charging Stations, the private sector will play its part and provide most of the required infrastructure, as is the case with petrol stations.

No change is recommended to the Council's EV Charging Station targets as part of this review of the *On-Street Parking Policy*.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Nil.

RISK MANAGEMENT

If the Council endorses changes to the existing Policy, there is a risk that the changes will be met with resistance from some citizens. In addition, if a Policy review is handled poorly, it can damage the Council's reputation. These risks can be appropriately managed by ensuring that the reasons for changing the Policy are well explained to the community, as part of the implementation process.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

Nil.

- **Community**

Community consultation comprised:

- writing to each Permit Holder and relevant property owners and local Resident's Associations, advising of the review of the Policy and inviting feedback; and
- uploading the draft Policy and a "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQ) document on the Council's website.

Consultation was undertaken between 3 June 2024 and 8 July 2024.

- **Staff**

Chief Executive Officer;
General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs;
Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport;
Manager, Development & Regulatory Services;
Team Leader, Regulatory Services; and
Traffic Engineer.

- **Other Agencies**

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

A wide range of issues have been identified with the current Policy, since its adoption in 2021. Those issues have been addressed in the draft Policy that was released for public consultation in June 2024. Some of the issues relate to gaps in the existing Policy and some relate to anomalies or ambiguities that have been identified in the wording contained in the Policy.

A total of 122 submissions have been received in relation to the draft Policy that was released for public consultation. A summary of the key issues raised in the submissions and discussion of the implications for the draft Policy is set out below. Aspects of the draft Policy that were not raised during the consultation period have not been discussed below. Matters raised in the submissions that were deemed to relate to specific streets or properties are not discussed below as they will be considered as part of the implementation of the Policy on a 'precinct by precinct' basis.

The structure below generally lists the relevant section of the draft Policy (if applicable), discussion of the issues that may require resolution or at least consideration and a recommendation.

Parking Precincts and Priority of Use

The *Land Use and Competing Demands* section of the draft Policy (Pg 4), sets out considerations for determining who should have priority to a specific area of on-street parking. In three submissions, it was suggested that the draft Policy does not give sufficient emphasis to the priority of residential parking, with specific reference to the Mixed Use Residential (MUR) Precinct. All three submissions suggest the inclusion of additional text that discourages all day 'non-residential' parking.

The MUR Precinct has been established for areas across the City where schools are located within relatively low-density residential areas. As such, the draft Policy encourages priority for residential and long-term employment parking for school employees, where inadequate off-street parking is available. This approach acknowledges that higher rates of occupancy for on-street parking may be acceptable in the MUR Precinct because of the mix of residential properties and schools prevalent in those precincts.

If the Council determines to increase the priority of on-street parking to serve residential properties in the MUR Precinct, long-term employment parking for school employees would be displaced and potentially 'shift' long-term employment parking to adjacent Residential Precincts, which would be undesirable.

More broadly, the priority for Residential Parking is clearly articulated in the Parking Precincts and Priority of Use section of the draft Policy (Pg. 5), which was adopted by the council in 2021, following a careful analysis of the different land uses that exist within the different precincts.

Two submissions questioned why Henry Street, Norwood is included in the Commercial Activity District (CAD), given that the street does not include commercial properties. The CAD precinct has been established in the areas adjacent to The Parade, recognising that parking demand is influenced by the commercial activity on The Parade. The focus in the CAD is to support the business and economic development activities on The Parade, while acknowledging the competing demands for residential parking. In this context, notwithstanding the concerns raised in the submission, given the close proximity of Henry Street to The Parade, it is considered reasonable that on-street parking priority should not be strongly skewed in favour of residential properties.

Visitors to The Parade cannot always find a convenient car parking at or near the commercial premises they are visiting and therefore, providing some opportunities for parking in side streets near The Parade strikes a reasonable balance of supporting on-street parking needs of local residents and commercial operators on The Parade.

Recommendation

No change to the draft Policy is recommended.

When Intervention is needed & Occupancy Rates

Investigations

The draft Policy includes a recommendation that the current wording in the Policy be supplemented to allow for minor changes to existing on-street parking controls to be implemented, where, in the opinion of the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, the proposed changes will not cause adverse on-street parking issues in the broader locality and provided that regard is given to the Policy objectives and that consultation on the proposed changes is undertaken with (and limited to) persons deemed to be directly impacted by the proposed changes.

No submissions were received in relation to this proposal. However, since the draft Policy was released for consultation, a re-structure within the Urban Planning & Environment Department has resulted in the primary responsibility for implementing on-street parking control changes being transferred from the Regulatory Services Unit to the Traffic & Integrated Transport Unit. As such, it is recommended that the draft Policy include reference to both the Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport and the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services being able to implement minor changes to existing on-street parking controls.

Recommendation

Change the draft Policy wording in relation to the implementation of minor changes to existing on-street parking controls to include reference to the Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport.

Residential Parking Permits - Multi-Dwelling Developments

Three (3) submissions were received in support of the proposed changes to the eligibility criteria for occupants of multi-dwelling units to access Residential Permits.

In the draft Policy, it is recommended that the eligibility criteria for Residential Parking Permits be amended to state that permits will not be issued to residents or owners of dwellings within multi-dwelling developments that are provided with off-street car parking facilities and were constructed and completed for occupation after 1 November 2021. This date has been chosen because it is the date on which the *On-Street Parking Policy* was first adopted. Residents living in these developments are expected to make adequate arrangements for parking within the premises and not rely on the limited resource of on-street parking.

Recommendation

Retain the proposed changes to the eligibility criteria for residents of multi-dwelling units for Residential Parking Permits.

Residential Parking Permits – Other Eligibility Criteria

Types of vehicles eligible for Residential Permits

The draft Policy includes a statement that permits only be available for registered/roadworthy motor vehicles and not be available for buses, trucks, motorcycles, scooters, motor homes, boats, trailers, caravans or the like.

One (1) submission suggests that the proposed restrictions on motorcycles, scooters and trailers is unreasonable and without basis and that all vehicles that can be registered for road use have a legal right to be parked in the street. The submission suggests that if the Council believes that there is a valid argument to exclude certain types of vehicles, then such an exclusion should be implemented on the basis of a particular characteristic, such as limiting the size of the item or vehicle.

The Council's current *On-Street Parking Policy*, which was adopted in 2021, states that "*permits are only available for 'registered/roadworthy motor vehicles and are not available for trailers, caravans etc.'*" The suggested wording in the draft Policy seeks to provide greater clarity for what types of vehicles and items are not eligible. However, having regard to the submission, it is considered that some further amendments to the wording are warranted.

The proposal to exclude motorcycles and motor scooters in the draft Policy was included on the basis that smaller motor vehicles such as motorcycles and motor scooters can typically be housed on private properties and therefore, the storage of such smaller motor vehicles on the street would unnecessarily take up available on-street parking spaces for cars. However, it is acknowledged that it is not always possible to house motorcycles and scooters off-street. In this context, it is considered reasonable that the owner of a motorcycle or scooter should be eligible to receive a Residential Parking Permit, provided that all other eligibility requirements are met.

The specific exclusion of items and vehicles that are primarily used for work and or recreational purposes or because of their large size, including motor homes, trucks, trailers, caravans, boats and the like, is an intentional Policy inclusion. One submission suggests that the exclusion of motorhomes from the eligibility criteria for Residential Parking Permits is discriminatory.

The objective of providing Residential Parking Permits is to provide residents with limited or no off-street parking, with an opportunity to access on-street parking spaces in areas where there is a high demand for parking spaces and high occupancy rates in those spaces. As the availability of on-street parking spaces is finite, the Council must be judicious in setting its eligibility criteria for Residential Parking Permits, to ensure equitable (fair and reasonable) access to the limited number of on-street parking spaces that are available. There is nothing discriminatory with eligibility criteria that aims to provide equitable access to a finite number of on-street parking spaces.

In this context, it is considered fair and reasonable that the eligibility criteria be restricted to include only cars, motorcycles and scooters. Larger vehicles and or recreational items such as trucks, trailers, small recreational scooters, caravans, motorhomes, boats and the like, are typically used for work and or recreational purposes and as such, are not considered to warrant priority access for Residential Parking Permits.

Recommendation

Retain the proposed changes to the eligibility criteria for the type of vehicles and items that are eligible for Residential Parking Permits, but include motorcycles and scooters (vespa type scooters, not recreational scooters intended for use on footpaths).

Residential Parking Permits – Time Limit for Vehicles

The conditions of use for Residential Permits do not currently include any requirements for permit holders to move their vehicles on a regular basis. Whilst the vast majority of permit holders move their vehicles regularly, there are some examples across the City where registered vehicles have remained in the same on-street parking space for several months. In some cases, permit holders have multiple vehicles parked in on-street parking bays for extended periods of time. Occasionally, the Council receives complaints about such vehicles, due to their poor visual condition and negative aesthetic impacts on streetscapes and to a lesser extent, their impact on traffic safety.

Some Councils that issue Residential Permits, impose time limits for the movement of vehicles. For example, the City of Adelaide, City of Charles Sturt and the Town of Walkerville, require Residential Permit holders to move their vehicles every twenty-four (24) hours, although it is unknown to what extent this provision is enforced.

In the draft Policy, it is suggested that vehicles not be permitted to remain stationary in the same position for a period of more than seven (7) days and that vehicles must be moved a minimum distance of four on-street parking spaces if the vehicle is to be parked in the same time restricted parking area for concurrent seven (7) day periods.

Four (4) of the submissions that have been received are opposed to the imposition of a time limit, citing that such a restriction is likely to cause problems for Permit holders who travel for extended periods for various reasons.

Notwithstanding the validity or otherwise of the four submissions, the suggested imposition of a time limit restriction is considered to strike a reasonable balance between retaining convenience for the vast majority of permit holders who may, from time to time, need to leave vehicles parked in the same on-street location for reasons such as illness, employment or travel, whilst at the same time, empowering staff to take enforcement action and revoke permits or issue expiations to citizens who ignore repeated requests to regularly move their vehicles.

Recommendation

Retain the suggested change in the draft Policy that states that *“vehicles not be permitted to remain stationary in the same position for a period of more than seven (7) days and that vehicles must be moved a minimum distance of four on-street parking spaces if the vehicle is to be parked in the same time restricted parking area for concurrent seven (7) day periods.”*

If the suggested change is endorsed, it should be noted that enforcement of the time limits to move vehicles through revocation of permits would only be undertaken as a last resort of enforcement, with application of this approach limited to cases where citizens are blatantly ignoring repeated requests to move their vehicles and to address repeat offenders.

Visitor Parking Permits

The current Policy, which was adopted by the Council in 2021, restricts the use of Visitor Permits to four hours and states that residents can purchase books of Visitor Permits as needed, but that the number of Visitor Permits may be limited, without stating what that limit is.

To provide clarity for all affected parties, in the consultation draft of the Policy, it was recommended that the existing Policy be amended to state that the maximum number of Visitor Permits that the Council will provide annually to each household will be limited to fifty (50) and that one additional book containing another fifty (50) Visitor Permits may be provided annually, on request, provided that the resident provides evidence that the first book of Visitor Permits has already been used. It was also recommended that a maximum of two Visitor Permit vouchers per household be used at any one time.

Visitor Permits have historically been issued as transferable permits and whilst the four-hour time limit was introduced in 2021, the time limit has not been actively enforced to date. As such, some residents have historically used Visitor Permits as 'de-facto' Residential Permits and from time to time – and frequently in some cases – some residents park their vehicles on the street all day in time limited parking areas or Resident Only Parking Zones, using a Visitor Permit.

Enforcement of the four-hour time limit would provide more equitable accessibility to on-street parking for all permit holders as it would ensure that the Visitor Permits are used for their intended purpose, for occasional, short-term use, which in turn should assist to increase turn-over of on-street parking spaces in time limited parking areas and Resident Only Parking Zones. However, the Council must also be mindful that the implementation of visitor permit booklets and the enforcement of four-hour time limits will cause significant inconvenience for existing permit holders.

Eighty-eight (88) submissions have been received requesting the retention of the current Visitor Parking Permit system. Of these, the majority state that radical reform is not needed, that there is no undue pressure for visitor parking on their respective streets and that the proposed Visitor Parking Permit system, including the use of the Permit Booklets and or the enforcement of the four-hour time limit is impractical and unworkable. Other key reasons cited for the retention of the current Visitor Parking Permit system include:

- the use of a Visitor Permit booklet system is cumbersome, antiquated and unacceptable;
- the proposed restrictions do not cater for ageing in place and the regular needs of older people who require regular medical care or other regular needs that are provided by visitors;
- the use of Visitor Permit booklets unnecessarily introduces a wasteful paper-based system;
- better policing by the Council will resolve current issues;
- there is no point imposing a time limit restriction on Visitor Parking Permits if the Council has insufficient resources to enforce the Policy;
- the number of proposed Visitor Permit vouchers is insufficient;
- reducing the flexibility of the current Visitor Parking Permit system favours parking for non-residential land uses over the needs of local residents;
- reducing the flexibility of the current Visitor Parking Permit system will negatively impact owners of short-term rental properties; and
- having to walk long distances from parking spaces to residential properties causes inconvenience and safety concerns.

Six (6) submissions have indicated a preference for the retention of the existing Visitor Parking Permit system but requested that in the event that the Council implements a significant change to the current system, that at least one (1) Visitor Parking Permit per eligible properties be made available.

Five (5) submissions were received in support of the proposed enforcement of time limits for Visitor Parking Permits, noting that effective policing of the current Policy would address current 'abuse' of the system. Two (2) submissions were received in support of the introduction of the Visitor Permit booklets.

The Visitor Parking Permit system is a vexed one. On the one hand, the Council receives complaints from time to time from Permit holders advising that they have experienced difficulties in accessing available parking bays in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Parking Zones and complaints that visitor parking permits are being 'abused' because they are being used for extended periods of time, well beyond the four-hour time limit stipulated in the Council's *On-Street Parking Policy*. On the other hand, a significant number of submissions that have been received during the consultation period on the draft Policy suggests that a significant proportion of Permit holders believe that there are no major issues with the current system and that radical reform is not required.

The objective of providing Visitor Permits is to provide eligible residents with permits for occasional use, where additional time may be needed for visitations, for example, to facilitate convenient parking for friends, family, carers and tradespersons. Visitor Permits are not intended to be used for longer term parking needs or to supplement a shortage of on-site parking.

The current system will not meet the above objectives if the four-hour time limit is not enforced. However, the four-hour time limit is considered too restrictive by many Permit holders. The concerns that have been raised in the submissions that suggest that the four-hour time limit does not adequately cater for many visitation requirements, are considered valid. In addition, the proposed implementation of a paper-based Visitor Permit booklet system has been widely criticised in the submissions.

As the availability of on-street parking spaces is finite, the Council must be judicious in setting its eligibility criteria for Visitor Parking Permits, to ensure equitable (fair and reasonable) access to the limited number of on-street parking spaces that are available.

On balance, having had regard to the submissions that have been received, it is considered that some reform of the current system is warranted but that radical reform is not required.

Visitor Permit Booklet System

The proposed implementation of a paper-based Visitor Permit booklet system is problematic. A paper-based system is considered antiquated, unworkable and impractical for users and it is not an effective way to manage visitor permit parking. It is recommended that this aspect of the current Policy be rescinded and that the Council retain its current process of issuing a re-usable Visitor Permit that is required to be displayed on the vehicle dashboard in the relevant year that the Permit issued.

Maintaining the provision of the current re-usable Visitor Permit, will ensure that it is available for use all-year-round, whereas the use of Visitor Parking Permit booklets would cap the number of permits to 100 vouchers per residential property per year, though additional booklets could be obtained in exceptional circumstances.

Recommendation

That the Council not proceed with the implementation of the Visitor Parking Permit booklet system.

Enforcement of Visitor Permit Time Limits

To ensure compliance with the existing Policy objective for the provision of Visitor Parking Permits, which is to provide eligible residents with permits for occasional use, where additional time may be required for visitations, it is recommended that that Council enforce Visitor Permit time limits. However, having had regard to the submissions that have been received, it is considered that there is a warrant for the current time limit to be extended from four to six hours to provide a more practical approach for Visitor Permit users. This approach will provide greater flexibility for eligible residents, whilst ensuring more turn-over of available spaces for Permit holders and more accessibility for all visitors in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Permit Zones. Enforcement of a six-hour time limit will also minimise the risk of misuse of Visitor Parking Permits by some Permit holders, who have historically used the Visitor Permits to cater for their long-term parking needs, rather than for occasional use, an approach which has restricted the turn-over of available on-street parking spaces which should otherwise be available for all visitors.

Recommendation

Extend the time limit for Visitor Permits from four (4) hours to six (6) hours and commence enforcement of the time limits.

Visitor Parking Permit Eligibility Criteria

The current eligibility criteria for Visitor Parking Permits enables eligible residents to obtain two Visitor Permits per residential property. In the 2024-2025 financial year, the Council issued 647 Visitor Permits to 500 households. Of these, 144 households were issued with two Visitor Parking Permits. To ensure equitable (fair and reasonable) access to the limited number of on-street parking spaces that are available, the Council could, in combination with enforcing time limits on Visitor Parking Permits, consider reducing the number of Visitor Parking Permits to one (1) Visitor Permit per eligible residential household. This would significantly increase the availability of on-street parking spaces throughout the day in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Permit Zones, for all visitors. However, the change may also inconvenience some existing Visitor Parking Permit holders, who have recently and/or historically relied on the use of two Visitor Parking Permits to meet their visitation needs.

The current system provides maximum flexibility in the sense that the unfettered use of Visitor Parking Permits (arising from the historic non-enforcement of the four-hour time limit) caters for broad visitation needs of households ranging from, for example, medical needs, ageing in place, to large families. However, the Council must balance this flexibility and potential inconvenience together with the need to ensure fair and reasonable access to on-street parking spaces for all visitors. The Council receives complaints from time to time that it is difficult to find on-street parking in time restricted parking areas, however, it is difficult to quantify the extent of the issue.

One possible approach that could be considered to ensure a reasonable degree of flexibility is maintained for Visitor Permit holders is to allow residents to access a second Visitor Permit to cater for exceptional circumstances that are out of their control and have a significant impact on their lives, such as a proven significant medical condition that requires regular visitation by multiple parties to the residential premises on a regular basis. This approach would cater for those residents who have pressing visitation needs that have arisen from circumstances outside of their control but would also make management of the Permit Authorisation process more complex and resource-intensive because staff would need to consider each request for a second Visitor Permit on its merits.

On balance, it is recommended that the Council reduce the number of Visitor Parking Permits that are made available to one (1) per residential household, in addition to enforcing a six (6) hour time limit. This approach would keep the system simple, consistent and equitable to all eligible residents, significantly increase turnover of spaces in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Parking Zones and ensure that Visitor Permits are being used for their intended short-term, occasional purpose.

The combination of recommended amendments to the consultation draft of the Policy, including the increase of the four (4) hour time limit to six (6) hours and scrapping the proposed use of a paper-based Visitor Permit voucher system and the associated cap of 100 Visitor Permit vouchers, addresses several of the key issues of concern raised in the submissions. However, if the Council is of the view that there is no significant issue with the availability of on-street parking where time restricted parking controls apply, then it is open to the Council to retain the current Visitor Parking Permit parameters in place, which allows for up to two Visitor Permits per residential household.

In weighing up its position, the Council should note that the consultation draft of the Policy includes a new Permit category, that being a third Residential Permit, which is transferrable. The introduction of this new category will enable eligible residents to access a third Residential Permit, were exceptional circumstances apply, such as a where a resident is suffering a significant medical condition that requires regular, rather than occasional visitation by multiple parties to the residential premises on a regular basis. In such cases, the additional Residential Permit, will be issued at the discretion of Council staff, but will only be issued in circumstances where there is a proven need outside of the person's control. The provision of a third Residential Permit in exceptional circumstances will assist to offset the loss of receiving a second Visitor Permit for some residents.

Recommendation

That the Council reduce the number of Visitor Parking Permits to one (1) per residential household.

Temporary Parking Permits

The proposed inclusion of Temporary Parking Permits for tradespeople in limited circumstances, is aimed at providing convenience for the delivery of materials to residential construction sites and for tradespeople to have faster convenient access to their vehicle to access tools and materials. The current Policy makes no provision to facilitate this type of activity despite that fact that there are several hundred residential developments undertaken across the City in any given year and many of these occur in parts of the City where there are time restricted parking controls in place and high demand for on-street parking spaces, which makes it difficult for tradespeople to do their job efficiently and effectively. The proposal includes a suggested cap on the number of permits that will be issued, sets a minimum value of development and includes a forty-two-day time limit for this type of permit, to ensure that other Residential Permit holders will still have reasonable access to on-street parking spaces adjacent their properties.

Five submissions opposed the proposed cap of one (1) Temporary Parking Permit per residential property to allow a tradesperson's vehicle to park in time restricted parking areas or Resident Only Parking Zones for a maximum period of forty-two days. The submissions raise concern that the provision of a Permit for one tradesperson would be insufficient to cater for the number of tradespersons that are usually required on development sites. One submission raised concern that setting a \$50,000 minimum value of development cap is detrimental to the rights of the less affluent.

The proposal to issue Temporary Parking Permits for tradespeople in limited circumstances cannot practically cater for the parking requirements associated with large scale developments, without significantly restricting access to on-street parking bays in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Parking Zones. In addition, if there is no minimum value of development cap, then the demand for Temporary Parking Permits for tradespeople associated with low value developments and home maintenance works, would likely be very high, which would, in turn, restrict access to on-street parking bays in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Parking Zones for regular Permit holders.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Council adopt the recommended eligibility criteria for Temporary Parking Permits for tradespeople in the consultation draft of the Policy, as these parameters will ensure that the issuing of Temporary Parking Permits for tradespeople does not undermine the objective of providing fair and reasonable access to on-street parking to all residents and visitors.

Narrow Streets

The Council frequently receives complaints about narrow streets, typically about there being inadequate space to pass parked vehicles, blocking of driveways, lack of space to present bins for waste collection and accessibility difficulties for waste collection trucks and emergency services vehicles.

The current Policy recommends the restriction of on-street parking to one side of the street in narrow streets with widths under 7.2 metres. However, in the consultation draft of the Policy, it was proposed to apply a staged approach to intervention from the Council. For example, if accessibility for waste collection vehicles is problematic in a narrow street, parking restrictions could be implemented or trialed for one or two parking spaces on waste collection days to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection. The initial intervention could be supplemented with a staged approach of educating local residents, which may include the deployment of educational signage about parking requirements or restrictions, followed by a second phase of enforcing non-compliance if education fails and lastly introducing on-street parking controls such as the removal or staggering of existing on-street parking spaces if the first two measures fail.

Addressing parking and traffic issues through a staged approach of education followed by enforcement and finally the imposition of on-street parking controls if the first two are ineffective is consistent with the approach used by the City of Unley for streets with widths of between 5.0 metres and 7.0 metres and is considered to be a more realistic, equitable, collaborative and balanced approach to addressing on-street parking issues in narrow streets.

Two (2) submissions were received in support of the proposal for managing on-street parking in narrow streets and two (2) submissions were opposed to the proposal.

Recommendation

Given the relatively low number of submissions received in relation to the proposal to manage on-street parking in narrow street and the even split of support and opposition to the proposed approach, no changes are recommended to the approach included in the consultation draft of the Policy.

Revenue

Four (4) submissions were received suggesting that the proposed amendments to the Council's draft *On-Street Parking Policy* represent a "revenue raising" exercise.

The rationale for these submissions is unclear. The intent of the proposed amendments is clearly not to raise revenue. Rather, the amendments have been proposed to address long-standing issues and concerns raised by the community.

Recommendation

No changes to the Policy are recommended in relation to revenue raised from on-street parking Permits.

Other Issues

Land Uses & Competing Demands

Council staff have identified that the current Policy does not articulate the circumstances in which on-street parking may be removed by the Council. There are some situations where the Council may determine to reallocate space within the public realm for reasons such as the implementation of landscaping, traffic control devices, protected cycle lanes, or improved crossings for active transport modes etc. In addition, the of removal of on-street parking spaces may be necessary for traffic management or road safety purposes—e.g., removing parking on the approach or departure side of intersections, or along bends where safe sight distance cannot be achieved. While these changes would typically be subject to site specific community consultation, it is considered prudent to articulate this approach in the Policy.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the following information be included in the *Land Uses & Competing Demands* section on Page 4 the draft Policy.

There are some situations where the Council may determine to reallocate space within the public realm for reasons such as the implementation of landscaping, traffic control devices, protected cycle lanes, or improved crossings for active transport modes etc. In addition, the of removal of on-street parking spaces may be necessary for traffic management or road safety purposes—e.g., removing parking on the approach or departure side of intersections, or along bends where safe sight distance cannot be achieved. In such cases, the proposed changes would typically be subject to site specific community consultation.

Some other minor changes to the wording of the draft Policy have been included to address typographical errors and to improve the flow of the document. None of these changes have significant impact on the implementation of the Policy.

A copy of the submissions is contained in **Attachment B**. The address of the citizens who made submissions has been redacted for privacy reasons.

A copy of the final version of the draft Policy, for which endorsement is requested from the Council, is contained in **Attachment C**.

OPTIONS

There are many different approaches which could be taken to the various issues which are addressed in the draft *On-Street Parking Policy*, including those which have been proposed and those which have been carried over from the current Policy that was adopted by the Council in 2021. The draft Policy has been developed having regard to experience of Council staff in the management of on-street parking, as well as benchmarking against other Councils that experience similar parking related issues and having had regard to the submissions received during the community consultation period.

The draft Policy is considered to provide appropriate flexibility and practicality, noting that the Policy cannot create on-street parking spaces. Rather, it is seeking to manage the use of the available spaces as fairly and as equitably as possible. This means that some compromises are necessary.

The Council has the option of not endorsing the draft Policy or any aspects of it, should it wish any matters to be further investigated. However, the Council must be mindful of the need to implement the *On-Street Parking Policy* a timely and appropriate manner to address outstanding parking concerns that have been raised by citizens.

CONCLUSION

The draft *On-Street Parking Policy* has been revised to address some shortcomings raised as a result of the consultation process as well as shortcomings that have been identified by Council staff, who are responsible for administering the management of on-street parking.

It is difficult and complex to find the right balance of Policy provisions to satisfy the needs of all road users, businesses and residents with respect to the management of on-street parking and no matter what position the Council takes, there is likely to be some citizens who will not be satisfied with the outcome. The management of on-street parking, by its very nature will always be controversial as there are many competing demands, expectations and entitlements for a finite number of spaces.

The most prominent issue raised during the community consultation period related to the management of Visitor Parking Permits. The submissions clearly articulated that the proposed implementation of a Visitor Parking Voucher Booklet would be impractical and unworkable, that the proposed enforcement of a four-hour time limit for Visitor Permits would be problematic and that radical reform of the current system is not required.

The proposed removal of the Visitor Parking Voucher Booklet and the associated cap of 100 vouchers, combined with the proposed extension of the Visitor Parking time limit to six (6) hours and the implementation of a third Residential Parking Permit that can be obtained in exceptional circumstances, is considered to address a high proportion of the submissions received. However, the proposal to reduce the number of Visitor Parking Permits issued to a maximum of one (1) per residential household, is aimed at significantly increasing turn-over of spaces in time restricted parking areas and ensure that Visitor Permits are being used for their intended short-term, occasional purpose. The effect of this change is that 144 households will no longer be eligible for a second Visitor Parking Permit and therefore, the Council must weigh up the benefits of the proposed change against the retention of the existing system.

If the Council is of the view that there is no significant issue with the availability of on-street parking where time restricted parking controls apply, then it is open to the Council to retain the current Visitor Parking Permit parameters in place, which allows for up to two Visitor Permits per residential household. However, in weighing up the proposed changes to the Policy, it is also worth noting that if the proposed changes to Visitor Parking Permits are adopted, each eligible residential household can still access up to two Residential Parking Permits, plus a third Residential Parking Permit in exceptional circumstances, such as a significant medical need, in addition to a Visitor Parking Permit, as well as a temporary permit to accommodate a tradesperson, as those needs arise.

If the Council determines to retain two Visitor Parking Permits per eligible household, then it is recommended that the proposed third Residential Permit be removed from the draft Policy.

The overall number of parking permits that residential households can access is considered to be a reasonable, given that the number of available on-street parking spaces in affected areas is finite.

COMMENTS

Household occupancy and circumstances change over time and what may be suitable requirements for one household today may not be relevant or sufficient at a later time. As such, the Council must be judicious with respect to the manner in which it administers Parking Permits. The more generous that the Council is with respect to the number of Permits it is prepared to issue, the more competition there will be for the finite number of on-street parking spaces that are available and may result in a lower turn-over rate of cars parked in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Permit Zones.

The *On-Street Parking Policy* is a strategic level document that sets an overall framework for the management of on-street parking and is not intended to meet the individual needs of all property owners. However, through the implementation of the Policy over time, the unique circumstances that apply to each street, including, but not limited to parking occupancy rates, width of the relevant street, traffic volumes, mix of land uses etc. may influence what types of parking controls are most appropriate to meet the needs of the affected citizens and they will have an opportunity to provide input into parking control changes, through street specific community consultation that will be undertaken as part of implementing the Policy on a "precinct by precinct" basis.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the draft *On-Street Parking Policy* contained in Attachment C, be endorsed.
2. That all persons who lodged a submission on the draft *On-Street Parking Policy* be advised in writing of the Council's decision and thanked for their submission.
3. That the next scheduled review of the *On-Street Parking Policy* be undertaken in April 2028.
4. That the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to make further minor changes to the document, that are deemed necessary to ensure that it is suitable for publication, provided that the changes do not affect the intent of the document.

Attachments – Item 13.3

Attachment A

Review of the Council's On Street Parking Policy



11.1 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S ON-STREET PARKING POLICY

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4501
FILE REFERENCE: qA64322
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present the outcome of a review that has been undertaken of the Council's *On-Street Parking Policy*, which was first adopted in November 2021.

BACKGROUND

The *On-Street Parking Policy* was developed to manage (insofar as is reasonably practical) current and future on-street parking needs and requirements and aims to balance and cater for the role of on-street car parking in influencing urban form, transport patterns, investment (both public and private) and its impact on liveability.

Parking plays an instrumental role in supporting broader transport strategies and its demand and supply is a strong driver of choices which are made by both residents and people wishing to conduct business, shop, visit and work within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

It is both a challenging and complex undertaking to establish and implement parking controls and a parking permit framework that is 'fit-for-purpose' to meet current needs, but also cater to the needs of the future, in terms of promoting, achieving and maintaining liveability, equity, economic prosperity and sustainability. In this context, given that three years have passed since the Policy was first endorsed, it is considered timely for the Policy to be reviewed.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

There are no specific strategies contained in *CityPlan 2030* relating to on-street parking. However, Outcome 1 - Social Equity, Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 are relevant to the extent that the objectives relate to attaining a people friendly, integrated, sustainable and active transport and pedestrian network and maximising access to services and facilities.

Outcome 3 – Economic Prosperity, Objective 3.2 is also relevant to the extent that the Council's objective is to have cosmopolitan business precincts which contribute to the prosperity of the City and promote the City as a visitor destination.

Objective 5 of the Council's *Smart City Plan* is relevant to on-street parking as it encourages the exploration of opportunities to improve parking in the City with smart technology.

The Council's Access and Inclusion Strategy is also of relevance as it promotes equitable access to services available in the City.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

If the extent of the changes that are proposed is endorsed by the Council, the draft revised Policy will need to be released for community consultation. The scope of the community consultation is yet to be finalised but will likely include some actions that will incur costs, such as a targeted mail out to all existing parking permit holders informing of the community consultation process and the distribution of information flyers to relevant interest groups and other stakeholders. It is guesstimated that \$3,000 will be required to undertake comprehensive community consultation.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

The availability of on-street parking impacts on the economic development of a City. In respect to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, its retail base is essentially focussed on main streets such as The Parade, Magill Road, Kensington Road and Payneham Road. As these main streets have developed over time, together with changes to on-site car parking requirements through changes to planning policies (now almost exclusively controlled by the State Government), there has been a gradual loss of on-site car parking, thereby making the availability and management of on-street parking critical to the sustainability of these precincts. This situation, together with less restrictive parking policies which have been introduced by the State Government, has resulted in and continues to result in, significant competition for on-street parking as some land uses do not accommodate sufficient on-site car parking to meet the demand that is generated by the land use. This situation is heightened in precincts such as The Parade and Magill Road, where both commercial and residential land uses are required to co-exist and compete for limited on-street parking. Achieving a balance is therefore critical, but challenging and complex.

SOCIAL ISSUES

The City's residential areas and its residents also rely on the provision of on-street car parking. In suburbs such as Felixstow, St Peters, etc., the competition for on-street car parking is not as high as in residential areas adjacent to The Parade, Magill Road and Payneham Road and indeed, many of the suburbs west of Portrush Road. As with main streets, tipping the balance totally in favour of residential land uses and residents will impact negatively on the City's main streets. Similarly, tipping the balance in favour of the business sector will impact negatively on residents. As such, a balance needs to be achieved.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Australian cities are still very much "car-centric". There are numerous reasons for this continuing reliance on vehicles.

From a cultural perspective, this dependency translates to the expectation that on-street car parking must be provided to each user, irrespective of priority and need. Similarly, there is a growing expectation that individual needs are more important than collective needs and that priorities should be based on the needs of the individual.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Nil.

RISK MANAGEMENT

See the Discussion section of this report.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
Nil.
- **Community**
If the draft revised Policy is endorsed by the Council, broad community consultation will be undertaken.
- **Staff**
 - Chief Executive Officer;
 - General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs;
 - Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport;
 - Manager, Development & Regulatory Services;
 - Team Leader, Regulatory Services; and
 - Traffic Engineer.
- **Other Agencies**
Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

This report sets out the range of issues that have been identified with the Policy, since its adoption in 2021. Some of the issues that are addressed below relate to gaps in the existing Policy and some relate to anomalies or ambiguities that have been identified in the wording contained in the Policy. The recommendations that have been proposed that aim to provide greater clarity to assist in the application and interpretation of the Policy and some recommendations address unforeseen consequences that would arise if aspects of the current Policy are strictly implemented and enforced.

The structure below generally lists the relevant section of the Policy (if applicable), the recommended change and discussion of the issues that may require resolution or at least consideration.

Parking Precincts and Priority of Use

The existing Parking Precinct Map contained on Page 6 of the Policy, shows the respective parking precinct areas across the City and serves as a guide to inform the priority of parking within each precinct. In addition, the existing map shows buffer zones for some, but not all, Arterial Roads within in the City. The buffer zones provide guidance for when specific on-street parking controls may be needed on local streets that abut Arterial Roads to supplement Clearway and Bike Lane parking controls that are often applied on Arterial Roads and regulated by SAPOL. The introduction or alteration of on-street parking controls within the buffer zones seeks to ensure that some on-street parking remains available in close proximity to service retail and commercial land uses located on Arterial Roads.

It is recommended that new buffer zones be included in the Parking Precinct Map for O.G. Road, Dequetteville Terrace, Nelson Street, Stephen Terrace and Fullarton Road, to ensure a more consistent approach for the application of parking controls in buffer zones adjacent to all Arterial Roads within in the City. In addition, it is recommended that the current 50 metre Arterial Road buffer zone distance be increased to 100 metres to enable the provision of more time restricted parking adjacent to Arterial Roads to meet retail and commercial land use requirements.

The proposed changes do not necessarily mean that all on-street parking located within 100 metres of Arterial Roads will be exclusively time restricted to service non-residential land use requirements. Rather, it seeks to provide greater flexibility for Council staff to take a more tailored approach to the implementation of parking controls adjacent to Arterial Roads to more accurately address local conditions.

The proposed changes are considered to strike a better balance of meeting the competing needs of residential and non-residential land uses.

When Intervention is needed & Occupancy Rates

Investigations

The current wording in the Policy infers that intervention (ie. the introduction of new or altered on-street parking controls) should be considered after the following steps are carried out for each investigation:

- defining the precinct boundary;
- identifying the hierarchy of parking uses that should apply to the precinct;
- undertaking parking surveys;
- preparing an inventory of the current parking supply;
- summarising public transport options/cycling facilities in close proximity;
- summarising the perceived issues for the precinct;
- comparing the issues at hand with the actual parking demand recorded in the survey and identifying areas of deficiencies or surplus; and
- recommending what measures are required to rebalance parking to ensure adequacy for visitors and other stakeholders in the precinct.

The extent of investigations that are currently required are workable for addressing precinct wide on-street parking issues but are considered excessive and too resource intensive to address a relatively minor local on-street parking issue. It is therefore recommended that the current wording in the Policy be supplemented to allow for minor changes to existing on-street parking controls to be implemented, where, in the opinion of the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, the proposed changes will not cause adverse on-street parking issues in the broader locality and provided that regard is given to the Policy objectives and that consultation on the proposed changes is undertaken with (and limited to) persons deemed to be directly impacted by the proposed changes.

The suggested change will streamline investigations into parking issues of a relatively minor nature and will negate the need for staff to undertake unnecessarily detailed investigations such as parking occupancy surveys, which may otherwise be relevant considerations required to address precinct wide on-street parking issues.

Minor interventions will still need to be justified and align with the priorities for the relevant respective precincts. Notwithstanding this, the proposed change will enable staff to address on-street parking issues of a relatively minor nature in a more timely manner.

Occupancy Rates & Intervention

The current Policy includes information about optimum on-street parking occupancy ranges for commercial activity areas and guidance in respect to when intervention (ie. the implementation of on-street parking controls) may be required. However, the Policy is silent with respect to what should be considered as optimum parking occupancy ranges within residential areas to guide initial or additional intervention. Having had regard to academic transportation and parking theory and the advice of the Council's traffic engineering staff, it is recommended that the following content be included in the Policy.

Occupancy Rates

*The Council considers that the ideal maximum occupancy rate for on-street parking is 85% before intervention should be considered, meaning that approximately one in every eight (8) on-street parking spaces should be vacant at any given time. In a practical sense, this approach should enable drivers to find an on-street parking space within reasonably close proximity to their destination, without excessive searching**.*

** Shoup, D. (2007) *Cruising for Parking*. *Transport Policy* 13(6), 479-486.[2].

Introducing or Altering Parking Controls

Parking occupancy surveys will be undertaken during business hours and/or outside of business hours on a weekday or on a weekend depending on the relevant issues that need to be addressed. This will establish on-street parking demand and availability throughout the day. The type of survey may include parking space occupancy, duration of stay, permit holder parking and compliance with the existing controls, depending on the issues being investigated.

Generally, at least three (3) surveys will be conducted throughout the day or on more than one day, to identify the relevant issues and to assist in determining what type of intervention may be required. Where parking occupancy rates are below 85% on average, intervention such as the implementation of additional parking restrictions, will generally not be considered. However, the Council may consider education initiatives, additional signage and enforcement of existing parking controls as alternative types of intervention, where such a requirement is identified.

Intervention where maximum occupancy rates are below 85%, may also be considered, when local conditions and other relevant factors are taken into account. This may also include the implementation of parking controls in areas adjacent to the area where new or altered parking controls are proposed to mitigate against the new parking controls shifting the parking problem to the next street or area.

If there are existing parking controls in a street where surveys identify that there is less than 65% occupancy, the alternation or removal of the controls will be considered.

Where on-street parking occupancy surveys are undertaken, average occupancy rates and other considerations, such as walkability, will be considered. For this, occupancy rates for on-street parking areas will be generally considered in grouped areas of up to 150 metres, which is considered a reasonable maximum distance that a motorist should have to walk to their vehicle within a suburban residential setting – all things being equal. This may mean that parking occupancy rates are high at one end of the street compared to another end of the street that may be separated by a significant distance.

The need or otherwise for the parking controls will take into account, the average parking occupancy rates separately for both ends of the street, rather than grouping them together as this may skew the occupancy survey results.

Where intervention through new, altered or removed parking controls is deemed necessary, the Council will consult over a minimum period of two weeks, with the affected citizens and businesses. The Council will carefully consider all responses that are received on proposed parking controls and use an evidence-based approach in determining and implementing parking management actions.

Residential Parking Permits - Multi-Dwelling Developments

Prior to the introduction of planning controls in South Australia in 1972, many multi-dwelling developments were constructed with minimal, insufficient or no off-street parking.

In more recent decades, multi-dwelling developments have been required to include adequate off-street parking facilities to cater for the likely parking demand generated by occupants and visitors. This approach has minimised the demand for Residential Parking Permits from residents of contemporary multi-dwelling developments. However, as the Council's Assessment Panel or Assessment Manager are not always the relevant planning authority to determine applications for multi-dwelling developments in this City, there is a risk that external planning authorities may approve multi-dwelling developments with insufficient off-street parking facilities.

In such cases, unless the supply of available off-street parking spaces is well managed by the relevant Strata Corporation and property owners, there is a risk that the demand for off-street parking spaces will be greater than the supply within the development site and this will, in turn, increase demand for on-street parking spaces in the locality adjacent to such developments.

To manage this risk, it is recommended that the eligibility criteria for Residential Parking Permits be amended to state that permits will not be issued to residents or owners of dwellings within multi-dwelling developments that are provided with off-street car parking facilities and were constructed and completed for occupation after 1 November 2021. This date has been chosen because it is the date on which the *On-Street Parking Policy* was first adopted. Residents living in these developments are expected to make adequate arrangements for parking within the premises.

The proposed change is less restrictive than the current eligibility criteria, which does not allow owners and occupants of any multi-dwelling developments to access Residential Permits, irrespective of when the multi-dwelling development was constructed.

If the current wording of the Policy is strictly enforced, this would unreasonably leave some existing residents without access to on-street parking spaces and no access to Residential Parking Permit, meaning that the value and liveability of those dwellings would be significantly reduced and compromised. For example, the residents who would no longer be eligible for permits that they have historically been provided would either have to park a significant distance from their dwelling, typically outside of a time-restricted parking area (assuming they can even find a parking space within walking distance to their dwelling), occupy the dwelling without a vehicle or consider moving to more suitable residential accommodation.

The unforeseen impact that would arise if the current wording contained in the Policy is strictly enforced, would lead to unintended and inequitable consequences. For these reasons, this aspect of the Policy has not been actively enforced since its adoption in 2021. The recommended change will not penalise existing residents who reside in multi-dwelling developments that were constructed prior to 1 November 2021 and who have historically been eligible to be provided with Residential Parking Permits. The recommended change is therefore considered to strike a more pragmatic balance between maintaining the status quo for the majority of existing permit holders, whilst at the same time 'future-proofing' the Council area to ensure that the demand for on-street parking spaces is not substantially exacerbated by new multi-dwelling developments.

The On-Street Parking Policy should, as far as is practicable, be a forward-facing document rather than retrospective and any attempts to address historical anomalies should be minimised to ensure that existing residents are not unreasonably disadvantaged.

Residential Parking Permits – Time Limited Parking Areas

The current wording in the Policy states that Residential Permits cannot be used in time limited parking areas of less than two-hour duration, whereas historically, Residential Permits have been used by eligible residents to park in one-hour time limited parking areas.

If staff strictly enforce the above-mentioned change to the Policy that was introduced in 2021, this would have a significant and unforeseen impact on many existing residents. The location of existing one-hour time limited parking areas has been cross-referenced with Residential Permits issued in those locations and this analysis has revealed that ninety-six (96) residents would no longer be eligible to receive a Residential Parking Permit if the current wording of the Policy is strictly enforced. This would primarily affect residents in College Road, Rundle and King William Street, Kent Town; Botanic Street, Hackney; Margaret and Charles Street, Norwood as well as various streets in Payneham, Stepney and Marden.

It should also be noted that the above-mentioned provision of the Policy has not been enforced by staff to date, due to the significant unintended and negative impact it would have, noting that residents using Residential Permits to park in one-hour time limited parking areas has not caused any significant issues in the affected parts of the City.

An alternative approach would be to consider removing or changing time-limited parking areas in the above-mentioned parts of the City. However, this would be problematic given that the parking restrictions are in place to minimise the impacts of all-day parkers and to provide on-street parking opportunities for residents who live in premises that have no or limited off-street parking facilities. In this context, it is recommended that the Residential Permit eligibility criteria be changed to allow residents to park in Resident Only Parking Zones and in time limited parking areas of no less than one hour, which reverts back to arrangements that were in place prior to the adoption of the current Policy in 2021.

If the current wording in the Policy is strictly enforced and the eligibility criteria remains unchanged, ninety-six (96) residents would no longer be issued with Residential Permits and those residents would need to park outside of the time limited parking areas, in areas where there is already significant demand and competition for untimed on-street parking spaces. This unforeseen impact would unreasonably disadvantage a significant proportion of residents who currently use Residential Permits and park in one-hour time limited parking areas.

The suggested change to the Policy to allow Residential Permit holders to continue to park in time limited parking areas of no less than one-hour duration and would overwhelmingly retain the status quo, with eligibility impacts limited to permit holders associated with six (6) properties, which are located adjacent to thirty (30) minute time limited parking zones.

Residential Parking Permits – Other Eligibility Criteria

Proposed changes are recommended with respect to the eligibility criteria for Residential Permits to provide greater clarity on the type of vehicles and objects for which Residential Permits can be used, where vehicle parking is permitted and restricted, how permits should be used, the circumstances for when revocation of permits may be considered and allowing households to access a third Residential Permit where extenuating circumstances apply.

More specifically, the suggested changes to the eligibility criteria for Residential Parking Permits include:

- *allowing eligible residents to access an additional and transferable Residential Permit on application, where extenuating circumstances apply, such as a proven significant medical need.*

The current eligibility criteria does not cater for extenuating circumstances that may arise from time to time. The proposed change will provide an opportunity for residents to access an additional permit when the need arises. For the avoidance of doubt and to limit the number of residents who can access an additional permit, it is recommended that 'extenuating circumstances' be defined in the Policy to include and be limited to situations that are out of a person's control, that has a significant impact and where the timing of the circumstance is relevant to the claimed impact. It is also recommended that where an additional Residential Permit is issued to address an extenuating circumstance, that such permits be transferable to provide greater flexibility for its use by the beneficiaries.

- *permits are only available for registered/roadworthy motor vehicles and are not available for buses, trucks, motorcycles, scooters, motor homes, boats, trailers, caravans or the like.*

The proposed change provides greater clarity as to the type of vehicles or items that are allowed and prohibited with respect to using Residential Permits.

- *permit/s will not be issued if parking spaces could reasonably be provided on the property. This includes, for example, where a garage, carport or other space that could reasonably be used as an off-street parking space has been converted to an alternative use or used for storage of any kind including, but not limited to, items such as boats, jet skis, trailers, caravans, scooters, motorbikes.*

The proposed change provides greater clarity to assist staff in their assessment of the extent of available parking contained within residential properties when assessing Residential Permit applications.

- *permits cannot be used to park a vehicle on The Parade, Norwood.*

The proposed change will ensure that parking opportunities on The Parade are provided and maintained primarily for shoppers and visitors, as well as for public transport and emergency services vehicles.

- *permits may be revoked where they have been misappropriated.*

The proposed change introduces new criteria for revocation should a person use a Permit dishonestly. It is envisaged that this provision will only be rarely used, however it is proposed as a safeguard, particularly if transferrable and temporary permits are issued, which can more easily be misappropriated than Residential Permits.

Residential Parking Permits – Time Limit for Vehicles

The conditions of use for Residential Permits do not currently include any requirements for permit holders to move their vehicles on a regular basis. Whilst the vast majority of permit holders do move their vehicles regularly, there are some examples across the City where registered vehicles have remained in the same on-street parking space for extended periods of time. In some cases, permit holders have multiple vehicles parked on-street for extended periods of time. Occasionally, the Council receives complaints about these vehicles, due to their poor visual condition and negative aesthetic impacts on streetscapes and to a lesser extent, their impact on traffic safety. Often cars parked for extended periods collect dust, rust and cobwebs, the paint fades etc. which can negatively impact on residential amenity.

If a vehicle is legally registered and the vehicle owner has an entitlement to a Residential Permit or multiple permits (maximum of 2 permits), Council staff currently have no powers to require the vehicles to be moved or to revoke permits.

Some Councils that issue Residential Permits impose time limits for the movement of vehicles. For example, the City of Adelaide, City of Charles Sturt and Town of Walkerville require Residential Permit holders to move their vehicles every twenty-four (24) hours, although it is unknown to what extent this provision is enforced. The introduction of a condition requiring vehicles that are parked under the guise of a Residential Parking Permit to be regularly moved is considered appropriate for this Council, however, a more generous timeframe than twenty-four (24) hours to move a vehicle is considered appropriate within a suburban setting.

Whilst there is no accurate way of determining what a reasonable timeframe would be, it is suggested that vehicles not be permitted to remain stationary in the same position for a period of more than seven (7) days and that vehicles must be moved a minimum distance of four on-street parking spaces if the vehicle is to be parked in the same time restricted parking area for concurrent seven (7) day periods.

The suggested imposition of a time limit restriction is considered to strike a reasonable balance between retaining convenience for the vast majority of permit holders who may, from time to time, need to leave vehicles parked in the same on-street location for reasons such as illness, employment or travel, whilst at the same time empowering staff to take enforcement action and revoke permits or issue expiations to citizens who ignore repeated requests to regularly move their vehicles.

The suggested change would not necessarily address concerns with registered vehicles being parked on-street for extended periods, as legitimate permit holders could choose to move their vehicle every seven (7) days, but it will at least ensure that the location of all vehicles parking on-street changes regularly and it may create a level of inconvenience for some permit holders that may encourage them to move cars that have been parked on-street for extended periods of time to off-street facilities.

If the suggested change is endorsed, it should be noted that enforcement of the time limits to move vehicles through revocation of permits would only be pursued as a last resort of enforcement, with application of this approach limited to cases where citizens are blatantly ignoring repeated requests to move their vehicles and repeat offenders.

Visitor Parking Permits – Eligibility Criteria

Under the current Policy, Visitor Parking Permits cannot be used in parking zones of less than two-hour duration. However, it is recommended that the use of Visitor Permits be allowed in resident only parking areas and time limited parking areas of no less than one (1) hour duration. This will ensure that residents of ninety-six (96) affected properties, which are located adjacent to one-hour time limited parking areas across the City, will retain their eligibility to use Visitor Permits from time to time to meet their domestic needs.

The current Policy restricts the use of Visitor Permits to four hours and states that residents can purchase books of Visitor Permits as needed, but that the number of Visitor Permits may be limited, without stating what that limit is.

To ensure clarity for all affected parties, it is recommended that the Policy be amended to state that the maximum number of Visitor Permits that the Council will provide annually to each household will be limited to fifty (50) and that one additional book containing another fifty (50) Visitor Permits may be provided annually, on request, provided that the resident provides evidence that the first book of Visitor Permits has already been used. It is also recommended that a maximum of two Visitor Permits per household be used at any one time.

The suggested amendments to the Policy will align with information that has been advised to all Residential Permit holders as part of the foreshadowed roll out of Visitor Permit booklets, which will occur for the first time in the 2024/2025 financial year.

Visitor Permits have historically been issued as transferable permits and whilst the four-hour time limit was introduced in 2021, the time limit has not yet been enforced. As such, some residents have historically used Visitor Permits as 'defacto' Residential Permits and from time to time – and frequently in some cases – some residents park their vehicles on the street all day in time limited parking areas using a Visitor Permit.

The roll out of Visitor Permit booklets from July 2024, will include enforcement of the four-hour time limits and this will ensure that the Visitor Permits are used for their intended purpose, which in turn should assist to increase turn-over of on-street parking spaces in time limited parking areas. Enforcement of this aspect of the Policy will provide more equitable accessibility to on-street parking for all permit holders. However, it should be noted that the proposed enforcement will raise the ire of some residents who have historically used Visitor Permits as 'defacto' Residential Permits and this will need to be carefully managed.

Limiting the use of Visitor Permits to a maximum of two (2) at any one time will ensure that all permit holders will have reasonable access to on-street parking spaces in time-restricted parking areas. If a limit on the number of Visitor Permits that can be used concurrently is not included, there is a risk that a Residential Permit holder could, from time to time, park two vehicles and have several visitors park in resident only parking areas or time limited parking areas and this would be inequitable to other users.

Temporary Parking Permits

The current Policy is silent with respect to the provision of temporary permits to address accessibility issues for local residents during major events and is silent with respect to the issuing of temporary permits for tradespeople.

Notwithstanding these omissions from the current Policy, the suggested inclusion of temporary permits for events reflects the Council's current practice of managing on-street parking impacts that arise from time to time from the staging of significant events or activities in or adjacent to this City, such as the Adelaide 500 Super Car event and the WomAdelaide Arts Festival.

The inclusion of a new section allowing for the issue of temporary permits for tradespeople in limited circumstances, is aimed at providing convenience for the delivery of materials to residential construction sites and for tradespeople to have faster convenient access to their vehicle to access tools and materials. The current Policy makes no provision to facilitate this type of activity despite that fact that there are several hundred residential developments undertaken across the City in any given year and many of these occur in parts of the City where there are time restricted parking controls in place and high demand for on-street parking spaces, which makes it difficult for tradespeople to do their job efficiently and effectively. Including a maximum number and time for this type of permit will ensure that other Residential Permit holders will still have reasonable access to on-street parking spaces adjacent their properties.

The imposition of a daily fee for this type of permit is not recommended at this time, but could be a consideration for the Council now or at a later time. At the very least, provision should be made for the option of charging a fee in the Policy.

The following new section is recommended for inclusion in the Policy:

Events & Significant Activities

The Council, at its absolute discretion, may provide Temporary Parking permits to occupiers of residential and commercial premises located in parts of the City in which temporary parking controls are implemented from time to time to address accessibility issues for on-street parking arising from the staging of an event or the undertaking of a significant activity.

The aim of the temporary parking controls and permits of this kind, is to enable local residents and businesses to conduct their day-to-day business and activities and maintain reasonable access to on-street parking during the course of a significant event or activity.

The Temporary Parking Permit is transferable between vehicles and will only be issued in relation to significant or major events or activities, as determined by the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, at his or her absolute discretion.

A Temporary Parking Permit related to significant or major events or activities will only be valid on the days where temporary parking controls are in place in the affected streets.

Parking for Tradespeople

The Council may, at its absolute discretion, provide a maximum of one (1) Temporary Parking Permit per residential property to occupiers or owners of residential properties to allow a tradesperson to park in a time restricted parking area or Resident Only Parking Zone, whilst the property is being renovated or new residential development is being constructed.

Such permits will generally only be issued where a major renovation or construction of residential development valued over \$50,000 is being undertaken and will not be issued in relation to maintenance works of any kind. The permits will only be valid for tradespeople vehicles that are no larger than a sedan, van, ute or SUV and where the total length of the vehicle including any overhanging materials or trailers or the like do not take up more than two on-street parking spaces at any one time.

Temporary Parking Permits issued in relation to tradespeople vehicles will be subject to a daily fee, must be displayed on the Tradesperson's vehicle and may be issued for a minimum of one (1) day up to a maximum of forty-two (42) days.


Events & Significant Activities

Narrow Streets

The Council frequently receives complaints about narrow streets, typically about there being inadequate space to pass parked vehicles, blocking of driveways, lack of space to present bins for waste collection and accessibility difficulties for waste collection trucks and emergency services vehicles.

Under the Australian Road Rules, when a vehicle is parked on-street, it must be positioned so that there is at least three (3) metres of the road alongside the vehicle, enabling other vehicles to pass. This is depicted in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1: Australian Road Rule 208 (7) – Minimum carriageway clearance space required between parked vehicles



The current Policy recommends the restriction of on-street parking to one side of the street in narrow streets with widths under 7.2 metres. However, it is recommended that the definition of narrow streets in the Policy be changed from 7.2 metres to 7.0 metres, to be consistent with the definition of a 'Narrow Street', under Australian Standard 'ASNZ 28.90.5 2020 Parking Facilities – On Street Parking'. This Standard was updated in 2020 and resulted in the minimum parallel parking space width changing from 2.1 to 2.0 metres. Therefore, the minimum road width can be 7.0 metres, rather than 7.2 metres to allow a 3.0 metre space between two parked cars.

When intervention is deemed necessary following investigations, the approach contained in the current Policy requires that parking is banned on one side of the narrow street or that on-street parking be staggered to provide safe passing opportunities for vehicles. This approach works in theory but does not recognise that in many parts of the City, the demand for on-street parking spaces in narrow streets is very high and that removing or staggering on-street parking spaces would substantially reduce parking space supply, creating a significant level of inconvenience for local residents and possibly creating a new parking problem by exacerbating demand for off-street parking in adjacent and nearby streets.

An alternative approach could be to apply a staged approach to intervention. For example, if accessibility for waste collection vehicles is problematic in a narrow street, parking restrictions could be implemented or trialed for one or two parking spaces on waste collection days to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection. The initial intervention could be supplemented with a staged approach of educating local residents, which may include the deployment of educational signage about parking requirements or restrictions, followed by a second phase of enforcing non-compliance if education fails and lastly introducing on-street parking controls such as the removal or staggering of existing on-street parking spaces if the first two measures fail.

This alternative approach to addressing parking and traffic issues through a staged approach of education followed by enforcement and finally the imposition of on-street parking controls if the first two are ineffective is consistent with the approach used by the City of Unley for streets with widths of between 5.0 metres and 7.0 metres and is considered to be a more realistic, equitable and balanced approach to addressing on-street parking issues in narrow streets. The alternative approach is recommended.

Parking Controls and Management – Construction

The inclusion of additional information in the Policy is recommended to better outline the Council's information requirements and expectations for parking controls, as they relate to proposed construction sites for major developments.

Parking Restrictions – Waste Collection

It is suggested that the following new information be included in the Policy, regarding the need for short-term parking restrictions to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection.

Demand for on-street parking spaces is high across much of the Council area, particularly in areas located adjacent to the City of Adelaide Central Business District as well as suburbs such as Norwood, where there is a significant mix of traffic generating land uses and Kensington, which contains an historic pattern of development with limited space for the provision of off-street parking facilities and relatively narrow streets.

These conditions result in high demand for on-street parking spaces across the City which, combined with the substantial number of narrow streets in the City, and historic housing stock that has limited or no off-street parking available, creates a conflict from time to time for the safe and convenient collection of waste.

The Council's waste collection service is provided by East Waste, which provides citizens with the following bins and services:

- *red lidded bin (140 litre) for general waste;*
- *yellow lidded bin (240 litre) for recycling;*
- *green lidded bin (240 litre) for food/kitchen organics; and*
- *at call hard waste collection service.*

General waste is collected weekly and alternate fortnightly pick-ups are scheduled for recycling and green organics. East Waste vehicles generally collect waste using a robotic arm that lifts bins into the truck's receptacle. However, from time to time, the waste collection trucks have trouble accessing narrow streets and or struggle to collect bins using robotic arms due to vehicles obstructing the location of the bins. To overcome this issue, many residents place their bins in driveway cross-overs or adjacent to neighbouring properties where access to the bins is more convenient.

In general, these ad-hoc arrangements work reasonably well, however, in some rarer cases, there are very limited opportunities to present bins in suitable and convenient locations for collection and this either results in the affected residents having to present bins a long distance from their property or in some cases, bins not being emptied which causes re-work for East Waste.

This can also cause frustration for the affected residents.

To address this issue, the Council may implement short-term parking controls to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection.

This type of intervention will only be considered where:

- there is high and regular demand for on-street parking spaces and high occupancy rates, including, but not limited to narrow streets and high density residential areas;*
- East Waste has verified that the waste collection process has been regularly impeded by vehicles blocking access to bins presented for collection; and*
- there are not reasonable alternatives available for the affected residents to present their bins for collection.*

If parking controls are required, the restrictions will only apply to the relevant day of collection and will be generally limited to between 7.00am and 5.00pm or other such times as may be required by East Waste or the Council.

The Council does not generally endorse or support the use of stickers on bins to provide visual cues to motorists to avoid parking adjacent the bins on bin collection day. It is acknowledged that this approach is simple and likely to be effective in some cases, however, it placed the burden of addressing the issue on residents rather than the Council, has the potential to lead to confrontation between residents and motorists, has no legal effect and if they are used 'en-masse' and heeded by motorists, this would displace many vehicles that would otherwise park in these areas, potentially shifting demand for on-street parking to adjacent streets.

The suggested approach of implementing parking controls to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection has been implemented in other metropolitan Council areas including the City of Charles Sturt and the City of Unley.

Accessible Parking

It is suggested that the following additional information be included in the Policy, regarding accessible parking in the City.

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is committed to making parking accessible and convenient for persons with a disability. Accessible parking bays are available across the City and are provided adjacent to most community facilities, open space and commercial precincts.

When the Council upgrades its assets and community facilities, accessibility to the facilities, including the availability of accessible parking spaces, is given careful consideration to evaluate compliance with current accessibility standards.

Accessible parking spaces are sign-posted or have the accessibility symbol painted on the road surface or signs cover the space. When parking in a designated accessible parking space, the time limit on the sign applies (ie. no extra time is allowed).

The Disability Parking Permit that is issued by the South Australian Government, must be clearly displayed to be eligible for the extended time limit described above, either hanging from the rear-view mirror or on the passenger side of the dashboard of the vehicle.

A vehicle correctly and legally displaying a Disability Parking Permit, may be parked in a time limited parking space and be entitled to additional time beyond the signed time limit restriction as follows:

- *for time restricted parking areas less than 30 minutes, the time for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be 30 minutes;*
- *for time restricted parking areas between 30 minutes and one hour, the time for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be two hours; and*
- *for time restricted parking areas where the time limit is more than one hour, the time limit for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be twice the period indicated on the sign.*

When the Council upgrades its assets and community facilities, accessibility to the facilities, including the availability of accessible parking spaces, is given careful consideration to evaluate compliance with current accessibility standards.

Smart Parking & Technology

It is suggested that the following additional information be included in the Policy regarding Smart Parking initiatives and the use of technology to assist in monitoring and enforcing parking restrictions across the City.

The use of smart technology to assist in the management and enforcement of parking areas and parking restrictions is rapidly expanding across Australia.

Smart Parking comes in many forms and has many benefits. Where a need is identified, the council will consider the use of smart parking technology to assist with the management and enforcement of parking controls or to enhance wayfinding and other directional signage as well as experiences for the convenience of citizens.

Case Study - Webbe Street Car Park, Norwood

In 2024, the Council will be installing in-ground sensors for each parking bay located within the ground floor of the Webbe street car park, Norwood.

The Council's overall objectives for monitoring and enforcing time limited car parking spaces in the car park with the use of smart technology include:

- *increasing turn-over of available parking spaces to benefit local traders;*
- *issuing or facilitating the issuing of expiation notices in an effective and efficient manner;*
- *improving the standard of proof of evidence for issuing expiations, using data obtained from technology such as in-ground-sensors;*
- *reducing the time the Council's Parking Compliance Officers need to patrol the car parking, in turn enabling them to perform more duties elsewhere; and*
- *monitoring of the car park usage rates, including during peak times and during community or significant events, to inform timing and delivery of council projects and initiatives such as capital works and other infrastructure upgrades.*

Vehicle overstays will trigger an electronic notification that will be sent to hand-held devices used by the Council's Parking Compliance Officers, who will then attend the car park to address the parking issue.

This efficient use of technology will reduce the need for the traditional and time consuming foot patrolling of the car park and 'chalking' of tyres as the presence of the Parking Compliance Officers will only be needed when a vehicle overstay is identified by the in-ground sensor technology.

This contemporary approach to monitoring parking controls will ensure that the Parking Compliance Officers use their time more effectively and efficiently to monitor other parts of the City and respond to parking overstays in the Webbe Street car park, only when the smart technology has identified a need.

Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

There are six publicly accessible electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, provided by JOLT and Evie in operation across the Council area.

EV charging station locations include:

- *Webbe Street car park, Norwood;*
- *Osmond Terrace, Norwood (on street parking bay near the Republic Hotel);*
- *Dunstone Grove/Linde Reserve car park;*
- *Borthwick Reserve, Portrush/Payneham Road;*
- *Payneham Community Centre; and*
- *Glynde Corner car park.*

In collaboration with JOLT and Evie, the Council aims to provide up to 16 EV charging stations in the City over the next fifteen (15) years, subject to demand.

A map showing the location of the charging stations is available on the Council's website.

The Council may take enforcement action and expiate owners of non-electric vehicles that park in designated electric vehicle parking spaces.

Consideration has also been given to public safety and accessibility concerns associated with the charging of electric vehicles, caravans, motorhomes etc. in on-street parking spaces.

As the popularity of electric vehicles continues to grow, some residents who have no off-street parking facilities or limited space on their residential property have been charging their vehicles whilst the vehicle is located within an on-street parking space, using an electrical cable (extension cord), that runs from the residential property across the adjacent footpath and verge, either in a protected state with a cover over the cable or in an unprotected state. This practice also occurs from time to time with respect to the electrical charging of items contained within caravans, motorhomes etc., which are parked in on-street parking spaces.

The practice is considered very dangerous as it essentially runs live electricity currents across footpaths, creating accessibility issues for passing pedestrians and cyclists, including visually impaired persons and creates an unacceptable risk of electrocution for anyone who comes into contact with a damaged or faulty electrical cable. Even if the cable is protected within a casing, some sections of the cable adjacent to the property and or vehicle are likely to remain exposed and as such, the unacceptable risk of electrocution would remain.

The Council has also recently received some enquiries from residents who have no off-street parking facilities or limited space on their residential property, about its position in respect to approving the installation of permanent underground electrical charging facilities in the public realm, which would allow privately owned electric vehicles parked within on-street parking spaces to be charged, using electricity that runs from the citizen's residential property into an electric vehicle charging outlet installed in the adjacent verge.

Whilst it is possible to safely install permanent underground electrical charging facilities in the public realm to facilitate the charging of privately owned electric vehicles parked within on-street parking spaces using electricity from the citizen's residential property, this practice raises broader questions about equity. This is because the installation of a permanent underground electrical charging facility in the public realm to charge privately owned electric vehicles is highly likely to lead to an expectation of semi-permanent or exclusive rights of use for the on-street parking space, which would be at the detriment of other users. This outcome would be inequitable to other citizens and would lead to the partial privatisation of the public realm, which is 'slippery slope'. Additionally, the management of such infrastructure will present ongoing liability issues for the Council.

On this basis, it is recommended that the Policy include a statement to the effect that the charging of privately owned electric vehicles, caravans, motor homes etc. located within an on-street parking space, that is not designated as a publicly accessible electric vehicle charging station location, using permanent or temporary charging facilities is prohibited.

Other Considerations

Issuing of Residential Permits

Residential Permits are currently issued annually and the process of issuing permits is very resource intensive. Given that more than ninety (90) percent of existing Residential Permits issued are renewed annually, it is recommended that Residential Permits be issued biennially (ie. once every two-years) to lessen the administrative burden on staff and to increase the convenience for citizens. In time, the permit renewal process will also be digitised to make it easier and quicker for citizens to renew their permits via the council's website.

Transferable Residential Parking Permits

Consideration has been given to introducing transferable Residential Permits, which some Councils provide. For example, the City of Burnside provides fully transferable Residential Permits whilst the City of Unley provides transferable Residential Permits in limited circumstances.

The provision of fully transferable residential parking permits would provide households that use Residential Permits with greater flexibility to meet their on-street parking needs. For example, a transferable permit would make it more convenient for citizens in circumstances where, for example, a resident is using a different car for a period of time due to an accident or vehicle servicing or where a house sitter is minding a residential property or where occupants swap vehicles between multiple residential properties or where children reach driving age. Conversely, the use of transferable permits can create an administrative burden as they need to be displayed on vehicle and this does not always occur, as is the case with the current Visitor Permit system used in this City.

When a permit is not correctly displayed, an expiation is issued. In such circumstances, where the person who did not display the permit is eligible for the permit, they will usually appeal the expiation which in turn triggers the need for a review of the expiation, all of which creates an additional administrative burden. This administrative burden would significantly increase if the Residential Permits are changed to transferable permits. In addition, issuing transferable Residential Permits may create the risk of occasional misuse where, for example, a resident could lend or sell their transferable permits to others, including employees of local businesses and this would undermine their intended purpose.

In any event, the Council receives very few requests to change Residential Parking Permits to transferable permits and requests for amended Permits to accommodate vehicle changes where someone's circumstances have changed, are already accommodated.

Having had regard to the pros and cons of issuing transferable Residential Parking Permits, no change to the current fixed nature of the Permits is recommended, other than in respect to the provision of an additional transferable Residential Permit per household, where extenuating circumstances apply, for the reasons set out earlier in this report.

Residential Permit Eligibility Criteria - Demographic Considerations

Consideration was given to expanding the eligibility criteria for Residential Permits to provide greater flexibility for households, based on demographic need, when their circumstances change. For instance, should a household be provided with more than two permits if their circumstances change, such as children living in the household reaching driving age and driving additional vehicle/s.

Domestic and individual life circumstances can change slowly over time or rapidly for many reasons such as illness, extended travel and changes in marital status. Citizens therefore make housing choices to meet their changing needs. Whilst one person or family may be happy to stay in a house with no off-street parking or not enough spaces to service all drivers in the household and or share bedrooms or minimal private open space, another person or family may choose to change their living environment and find larger accommodation that can accommodate their needs or shift to an area where there is less demands for on-street parking. Others will prefer to age in place and others may by choice or due to circumstances out of their control make changes to accommodate illness or disabilities.

Using demographic reasons to support an equity argument only works from the person's perspective that benefits from those arguments. For example, in a street with time restricted parking spaces, if there happens to be eight properties using two Residential Permits at any one time, but for demographic reasons three of those eight households qualify for a third permit using expanded eligibility criteria and use them, then that adds three more drivers vying for the limited supply of time limited on-street parking spaces in that street.

In this example, the demand for those on-street parking spaces could be substantially increased for substantial periods of time by the households who have been provided with additional Residential Permits to meet their changing demographic requirements. In such a scenario, the outcome may be considered equitable from the perspective of the three households who can reap the benefit of parking three additional cars on the street, whereas an occupant of one of the other five households, who may struggle to access an on-street space because of the additional demand for the finite parking spaces would not consider the policy equitable as they would be adversely affected by the flexibility of the policy to accommodate demographic needs.

On balance, it is considered that expanding the Residential Permit eligibility criteria to cater for the changing demographic needs of households does not necessarily result in more equitable outcomes, as is evidenced by the above-mentioned example and no change to accommodate this issue is recommended, other than to allow for the provision of an additional Residential Permit to cater for extenuating circumstances, such as a proven regular medical need. This change is considered to make the policy more flexible without being likely to have a significant impact on on-street parking demand.

Verge Parking

Consideration has been given to allowing verge parking, as this is allowed by some Councils and could in some cases, ease traffic flow, particularly in narrow streets. However, on balance, it is considered that allowing motor vehicles to park on verges would be at odds with Council's accessibility objectives and would in many cases force pedestrians, cyclists and people with mobility issues to walk on the carriageway, which is undesirable. As such, allowing vehicles to be parked on verges is not recommended.

Area-wide Parking Controls

Consideration was given to introducing area-wide parking controls. Such an approach would create consistency in approach and make legibility and application of parking controls easier for all parties to understand and follow in the affected suburb or precinct. However, the downside of introducing area-wide parking controls is that every street within a suburb or precinct has its own unique character and context and demand for on-street parking and the need for parking controls can differ significantly from one street to the next. As such, it is considered that a tailored approach to the management of parking controls be retained.

OPTIONS

The Council can either endorse the proposed changes to the On-street Parking Policy to enable public consultation on the draft document with or without amendments or it can choose not to adopt any of the proposed changes.

CONCLUSION

As indicated throughout this report, the objective of the review and the draft revised Policy, is to achieve a balanced approach to the management of on-street car parking and to address anomalies, ambiguities and unintended consequences in the interpretation and application of the current Policy. As such, the draft Policy has taken a practical approach to these issues as it is most unlikely that the Council (or indeed any Council) can reduce the demand for on-street car parking availability through parking controls and strict application of some aspects of the current Policy would result in unfair, inequitable and unnecessary changes for existing parking permit holders.

The practical role for the Council is to manage the situation and balance the many competing interests – noting that achieving a balance at all times and acceding to everyone's requests and expectations, may not be possible.

If the draft revised Policy is adopted for the purposes of undertaking community consultation, the document will be released for public consultation for six weeks. After the consultation period concludes, the submissions will be reviewed and a further report will then be presented to the Council seeking endorsement of the final version of the revised Policy.

A copy of the current On-Street Parking Policy is contained in Attachment A and a copy of the revised draft On-Street Parking Policy, reflecting the suggested changes discussed in the body of this report, is contained in **Attachment B**.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the draft On-Street Parking Policy, as contained in Attachment B, be endorsed, as suitable for release for public consultation, for a minimum period of six (6) weeks.
 2. The Council notes that a further report will be presented to the Council following consideration of submissions that are received during the consultation period.
-

Cr Sims left the meeting at 7.33pm.
Cr Sims returned to the meeting at 7.35pm.

Cr Mex moved:

1. *That the draft On-Street Parking Policy, as contained in Attachment B, be endorsed, as suitable for release for public consultation, for a minimum period of six (6) weeks.*
2. *The Council notes that a further report will be presented to the Council following consideration of submissions that are received during the consultation period.*

Seconded by Cr Duke and carried unanimously.



On-Street Parking Policy

Draft June 2024



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters





Contents

Introduction	2
<i>Context</i>	2
<i>Key Objectives</i>	3
<i>Principles</i>	3
How will On-Street Parking be Managed	4
<i>Not all Parkers are the Same</i>	4
<i>Land Uses and Competing Demands</i>	4
<i>Parking Precincts and Priority of Use</i>	5
<i>When is Intervention Needed?</i>	8
Parking Permits	11
<i>Residential Permits</i>	11
<i>Visitor Permits</i>	13
<i>Temporary Permits</i>	13
Narrow Streets Policy	14
Driveways	15
Construction Zones	16
Waste Collection	17
Accessible Parking	18
Smart Parking Technology	19
Appendix A - Application of Parking Zones	20



Introduction

Context

Like many inner urban Councils, the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters experiences parking pressures from a wide range of users including local residents, business and commercial activity and people who park within our City but work elsewhere (e.g. long term parkers walking/ riding into the Adelaide CBD).

Parking is an 'end game': the result of people wanting to drive cars to and from their destinations, including their home. Over time, the Council will influence travel choice to reduce the demand for on-street parking. This will be reflected in a range of integrated land use and transport strategies.

However, in the short term, the Council has an immediate role in managing overall parking supply. This includes parking on-street as well as the supply of additional off-street parking.

This Policy specifically deals with how on-street parking will be managed throughout the City. On-street parking is a limited resource with competing user requirements and demands. Managing these competing demands can be difficult and there is no one best solution for all situations.

The Council will also continue to monitor the need for additional off-street car parking in high demand areas.

Diagram 1.

Framework for Community Well-being Quadruple Bottom Line

The Council exists to improve the Well-being of their citizens and our community, through:

Social Equity

Cultural Vitality

Economic Prosperity

Environmental Sustainability



CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future

The Council has adopted a strategic plan—*CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future*. Ultimately, the provision and management of parking has a direct relationship to the Council's four pillars in *CityPlan 2030*.

Social Equity

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is a growing and culturally diverse community. Managing on-street parking needs to accommodate a changing social structure including age demographics, housing stocks, socio-economic profile, increases in the number of people working and studying from home, smaller allotment sizes, and alternative transport choices including sustainable and active transport.

Cultural Vitality

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has a strong 'sense of place' that is built upon the unique features of the built environment and streetscapes. The Council continues to encourage activities that involve community participation. The built form is a unique built heritage, featuring Adelaide's best concentration of early, mid and late Victorian residential development, ranging from small settler cottages to large villas and mansions. How parking is managed in these areas, and whether kerbside space is allocated to activities other than parking is an important consideration.

Economic Prosperity

The Council has taken both a precinct and sector approach to business and economic development. Maintaining access to local businesses, services and amenities with convenient parking provides fundamental support to the range of business activities and economic growth of our City.

Environmental Sustainability

The impacts of climate change will underpin the Council's operations. The vision for our City includes less cars on the road, improved air quality, attractive local streets which provide shade, with more people choosing sustainable transport choices like walking and cycling. The provision of unfettered parking will simply continue to support car usage, which cannot be sustained in the future.

Key Objectives

The Council will manage on-street parking on the following basis:

- 1 To provide a fair and equitable process in assessing and meeting the parking needs of all road users within our City;
- 2 To optimise the use of available on-street parking in a manner that best meets the needs of the precinct, taking into account the availability of off-street parking; and
- 3 Provide a clear and transparent basis, for the Council and the community on how on-street parking will be managed.

Principles

Parking will be managed on a precinct basis acknowledging that decisions made in one street can affect parking demand and availability in other nearby streets.

On-street parking will be available in a safe convenient and appropriate manner that supports the highest needs of the precinct (reflected by the range of activities and land uses).

On-street parking will not be allocated through the means of the exclusive use of a single space or spaces by any individual or group.

Where necessary and based on available evidence, on-street parking will be managed through the implementation of time limit controls in order to provide adequate turnover of parking vehicles to actively encourage use by all road users.

How will On-Street Parking be Managed

The allocation of parking will never satisfy all stakeholders and will be managed on the basis of a hierarchy of needs of the different precincts.

This approach acknowledges that there will be different demands throughout the City and that one approach will not be appropriate for all conditions. Ultimately, on-street parking will be managed in a manner that best meets the needs of the precinct taking into account the availability and limited supplies of off-street parking.

Not all Parkers are the Same

The Council strives to accommodate a wide range of different users throughout the City. These include:

- Residents;
- Cyclists;
- Disability permit holders;
- Pick-up and drop-off (private users);
- Shoppers;
- Loading (commercial);
- Long stay/employee parking – people who work in the Council area;
- Long stay/employee parking – people who work outside of the Council area;
- Motorcycle and scooter parking;
- School parking (employees as well as drop-off and pick-up times);
- Public transport (bus stops etc);
- Visitors;
- Trades and services;
- Taxis; and
- Ride share.

Land Uses and Competing Demands

In considering who has priority to a specific section of on-street space, the Council must consider the nature of the surrounding land use and the function that the particular road plays in the overall transport network. This allows for different priorities within the same precinct depending on the adjacent generators of on-street demand. These are:

- in some areas, this will favour visitors, shopping and traders to support the economic prosperity of our City; and
- in other areas, controls might be needed to discourage all-day parking and encourage alternative and sustainable transport choices.

Parking Precincts and Priority of Use

Parking Precincts

Seven general precincts have been established based on known parking demand, land uses and overarching transport objectives. The precinct boundaries are not absolute and there will be areas that overlap in functionality and parking pressures.

Commercial Activity District (CAD) (Norwood Central)

This focuses on The Parade and side roads immediately abutting the Parade (generally within 50–100m of The Parade).

On-street parking will support the business and economic activities along the Parade. Parking will also be managed to support alternative sustainable transport modes. Parking controls will include short to medium term parking zones to manage vehicle turnover.

CAD Fringe

This includes roads beyond 50–100m from The Parade but with parking demand influenced by the commercial activity.

The focus of on-street parking will be to support the business and economic activities along The Parade, while acknowledging the competing demands for residential parking. Parking will also be managed to support alternative sustainable transport modes.

Residential

Properties in these precincts are residential with only a few other traffic and parking demands from other developments.

The Council will support parking for residents and discourage undue parking pressures from other demands. Some longer term commuter parking can be accommodated to support alternative transport modes, where it does not unduly reduce parking supply for residents and their visitors.

Mixed Use Residential

These areas include a mix of lower intensity developments including schools within mostly residential areas.

Parking will be managed to support the peak demands of the various activities. Higher levels of parking occupancy can be accepted to support the overall parking pressures. Longer term parking will be managed to support the longer term employment car parking, where inadequate off street parking is available.

Mixed Use Higher Density

There is ongoing development of higher density residential living throughout the Council—most notably in Kent Town where there is also pressure from surrounding business and commuters who work in commercial/light industrial.

These are predominantly employment areas that require a mix of short term customer car parking and longer term employment parking. The Council will not look to support surplus residential parking on-street for higher density developments.

Arterial Roads and Fringes

Roads adjacent to arterial roads require specific parking controls to supplement Clearway and Bike Lane conditions that are often applied and regulated by the State Government. Time limit controls will be used to manage turn over in business and commercial strips.

Local streets that have parking demands from business activity along the main roads, generally within 100m of the arterial roads.

Some longer term employee parking will be permitted as will parking to support public transport usage, to the point that it does not adversely compromise the availability of residential parking.

Commercial / Light Industrial

These areas that include a mix of commercial and light industrial land uses.


These areas predominantly employment areas that require a mix of short term customer car parking and longer term employment parking.

Parking Precincts Map

This map shows the parking precincts areas and the different parking pressures that apply throughout the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

The precinct boundaries are not absolute and there will be areas that overlap in functionality and parking pressures.

The map is intended as a guide to inform the priority of parking within each precinct.



Legend

- Arterial Roads
- Arterial Road Buffer 50-100m
- Commercial Activity District (CAD)
- Commercial Activity District Fringe (CAD-F)
- Commercial and Light Industrial (CLI)
- Mixed Use Residential (MUR)
- Mixed Use Higher Density (MUHD)
- Residential

Prioritisation Of Users

The following table provides general guidance on how the Council will assess the prioritisation of parking users in different precincts.

The table addresses the peak demands when there are conflicting requirements and demands for the parking spaces.

At other times (eg after business hours) parking will be managed on the needs at those times.

Prioritisation of Parking Users	Precinct						
	Commercial Activity District	CAD 'Fringe'	Residential	Mixed Use Residential	Mixed Use Higher Density	Commercial / Light Industrial	Arterial Roads and Fringes
Residential includes parking for residents and visitors	Low	Medium	High	High	Medium	Low	Medium
Disability permits	High	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
Short Term Shopping < 2 hours	High	High	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Loading Zones	High	High	Low	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Long term commuter / public transport working outside of the immediate area or the Council area	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Long Term Employee working within the precinct and generally staying within Council	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High	High
School Parking parking for employees and short term drop-off and pick-up activities	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
Ride Share including shared hire vehicle schemes	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	High	Low	Low
Taxi includes other short term commercial drop-off and pick-up areas	High	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low

When is intervention needed?

Overview of process

The Council will manage on-street parking based on evidence that demonstrates a need for parking controls. This evidence-based approach provides a framework for consistent and transparent decision-making to promote the efficient, fair and equitable use of available on-street parking.

Analysis of parking needs is best completed on a precinct basis so that parking demands are not moved to the next street following the introduction of change. This is especially true for shopping and commercial areas.

The following process provides an overview of the investigations the Council may undertake depending on the specific situation. It will allow the Council to respond to on-street parking needs on a strategic basis, rather than in reaction to a vested interest suggested resolution of a parking problem:

1. Define the precinct boundary. This will depend on the location and specific concern. The precinct should include any streets that might be affected by any changes.
2. Identify the hierarchy of parking uses that should apply to the precinct based on this section.
3. Undertake parking surveys during daytime on a weekday or weekend. This will establish parking demand and availability during the critical periods. The type of survey could include parking occupancy, turn over and compliance with the existing controls, depending on the issue being investigated.
4. Prepare an inventory of the current total parking supply (including on and off-street) in the precinct, including the current restrictions that apply at each.
5. Summarise public transport facilities, pedestrian and cyclist facilities within and in close proximity to the precinct and any other relevant data available from other State agencies and Local Government authorities.
6. Summarise the perceived issues for the precinct. Consider any inputs from the results of the parking surveys and stakeholder input.
7. Compare these issues with actual parking demand recorded by the parking surveys and identify areas of deficiency/surplus.

Recommendations should establish what measures are required to rebalance parking so that adequate provision exists for visitors and stakeholders in the precinct. An outline of the different application of parking zones is addressed in Appendix A (and further information in the Austroads guidelines).

Where the issues at hand are of a relatively minor nature, undertaking some of the investigation steps set out in this Policy will not necessarily be required or undertaken.

Implementation of minor changes to existing on-street parking controls to address local parking issues that will, in the opinion of the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, not cause adverse on-street parking issues in the broader locality, will be determined by Council staff, having regard to the factors set out in this Policy that provide guidance in respect to when intervention may be needed and any other factors deemed relevant. Where it is deemed necessary to consult on any proposed changes of a minor nature, the consultation will be limited to persons who are deemed to be directly impacted by the proposed changes.

Other Factors

The following factors will also be considered by the Council when deciding the best way to manage parking in a certain precinct:

- safety;
- road type/function;
- road location;
- key land uses in the precinct;
- traffic flows within the precinct;
- public transport and bike requirements;
- availability of off street parking in the precinct; and
- service vehicles, emergency access.

Occupancy Rates

Parking occupancy describes the percentage of spaces occupied at any given time. Parking occupancy rates, also called utilisation, reflect the relationship between parking supply and demand.

Occupancy of on-street parking spaces should be high enough to ensure they are occupied at a level that justifies the supply, but not so high that it is unreasonably difficult to find a space.

Industry standards generally acknowledge that parking is considered at capacity when available spaces are 85% occupied at times of peak demand'. This equates to approximately 1 in 7–8 spaces being available.

The optimum occupancy range is regarded as 65%–85%. Occupancy below 65% or above 85% suggests that parking management intervention may be required.

When the average parking occupancy is regularly above 85%, a change to the parking management approach may be necessary to encourage turn-over of the spaces. Equally, if parking occupancy rates are consistently below 65% it

indicates there are many spaces that are empty or unused.

While this may be convenient for some drivers, lower occupancy rates can also mean that an oversupply of parking or inappropriate parking prices exist in the area. By contrast, an area with a very high level of occupancy could mean the available parking is limited and needs management to accommodate a certain level of demand.

The competing needs for on-street parking need to be balanced to ensure, where possible, that there is sufficient on-street parking spaces available for residents, visitors and businesses.

The Council considers that the ideal maximum occupancy rate for on-street parking is 85% before intervention should be considered, meaning that approximately one in every eight (8) on-street parking spaces should be vacant at any given time. In a practical sense, this approach should enable drivers to find an on-street parking space within reasonably close proximity to their destination, without excessive searching**.

Diagram 2.

Optimum occupancy range



Under 65% occupancy

Under 65% occupancy indicates additional parking controls could be relaxed.

In residential areas, low occupancy rates suggest that no further changes are needed.

Over 85% occupancy

Over 85% occupancy indicates additional parking controls may be needed to encourage turn over.

It may also indicate an overall shortfall in parking spaces that can only be addressed through additional (off-street) parking supply.

In residential areas, additional parking controls or permits may be warranted.

'Austroads Part 11, Parking "Generally, parking is considered 'at capacity' when available spaces are 85% occupied at times of peak demand" (Shoup 2005).

*** Shoup, D. (2007) Cruising for Parking. Transport Policy 13(6), 479-486.[2].*

Introducing or Altering Parking Controls

Parking occupancy surveys will be undertaken during business hours and/or outside of business hours on a weekday or on a weekend depending on the relevant issues that need to be addressed. This will establish on-street parking demand and availability throughout the day. The type of survey may include parking space occupancy, duration of stay, permit holder parking and compliance with the existing controls, depending on the issues being investigated.

Generally, at least three (3) surveys will be conducted throughout the day or on more than one day, to identify the relevant issues and to assist in determining what type of intervention may be required. Where parking occupancy rates are below 85% on average, intervention such as the implementation of additional parking restrictions, will generally not be considered. However, the Council may consider education initiatives, additional signage and enforcement of existing parking controls as alternative types of intervention, where such a requirement is identified.

Intervention where maximum occupancy rates are below 85%, may also be considered, when local conditions and other relevant factors are taken into account. This may also include the implementation of parking controls in areas adjacent to the area where new or altered parking controls are proposed to mitigate against the new parking controls shifting the parking problem to the next street or area.

If there are existing parking controls in a street where surveys identify that there is less than 65% occupancy, the alternation or removal of the controls will be considered.

Where on-street parking occupancy surveys are undertaken, average occupancy rates and other considerations, such as walkability, will be considered. For this, occupancy rates for on-street parking areas will be generally considered in grouped areas of up to 150 metres, which is considered a reasonable maximum distance that a motorist should have to walk to their vehicle within a suburban residential setting – all things being equal.

This may mean that is parking occupancy rates are high at one end of the street compared to another end of the street that may be separated by a significant distance. The need or otherwise for the parking controls will take into account, the average parking occupancy rates separately for both ends of the street, rather than grouping them together as this may skew the occupancy survey results.

Where intervention through new, altered or removed parking controls is deemed necessary, the Council will consult over a minimum period of two weeks, with the affected citizens and businesses.

The Council will carefully consider all responses that are received on proposed parking controls and use an evidence-based approach in determining and implementing parking management actions.

Parking Permits

Residential Permits

Residential Parking Permits may be provided for residential properties that do not have off-street (on-property) car parking and are in a street with time-limited controls or Residential Only Permit Zones.

Residential Parking Permits are also available for residential properties in precincts where the following conditions apply:

- there is limited available on-street parking;
- there are time limited parking controls applied to the street; and
- there is demonstrated competing demands between drivers due to other land uses in the precinct.

Residential Permits will not be issued to residents or owners of dwellings within multi-dwelling developments that have provision of off-street car parking facilities, constructed and completed for occupation after 1 November 2021. Residents living in these developments are expected to make adequate arrangements for on-site parking within their premises.

For the avoidance of doubt, multi-dwelling developments refer to single and multi-storey developments that include three or more dwellings and mixed-use developments that comprise a mix of residential and non-residential land uses and three or more dwellings.

Residential Permits do not guarantee an available on-street parking space. The permits can only be used in the street/s for which they are issued, which exempts the specified vehicle from any time limit restrictions that may be applicable.

Residential Permits will be provided on the following basis:

- maximum of two permits per residential property. An additional (transferable) permit, may be issued on application, where extenuating circumstances apply, such as a proven significant medical need. Such applications will be determined by the Council's Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, at his or her absolute discretion. For the avoidance of doubt, extenuating circumstances relates to a situation that is out of a person's control, that has a significant impact and where the timing of the circumstance is relevant to the claimed impact;

- permits will only be issued to residents and not business owners, operators, employees, landlords, tradespersons or property maintenance personnel;
- permits will be allocated to specific vehicles and are non-transferable (except for additional Residential Permits that are issued where proven extenuating circumstances apply);
- permits are only available for registered/roadworthy motor vehicles and are not available for buses, trucks, boats, motorcycles, scooters, motor homes, trailers or caravans;
- permit/s will not be issued if parking spaces could reasonably be provided on the property. This includes, for example, where a garage, carport or other parking space has been converted to an alternative use or used for storage of any kind, including, but not limited to, items such as boats, jet skis, trailers, caravans, scooters or motorbikes;
- permits cannot be used to park a vehicle on The Parade, Norwood;
- permits may only be used in the street/s for which they are issued and only in Resident Only Parking Zones or time restricted parking spaces located adjacent to the relevant property. For the avoidance of doubt, this allows the permit holder, subject to meeting other eligibility requirements, to park in any Resident Only Parking Zone or time restricted parking areas located in a continuous arrangement within a street or section of a street, located adjacent to their property, including on the opposite side of the street.
- Residents who live in properties where time restricted parking areas or Resident Only Parking Zones are not located immediately in front of their property or on the opposite side of the street are not eligible for a Residential Permit;
- Residential Permits can only be used in parking permitted areas, cannot be used in parking zones of less than one-hour duration, and cannot be used in Loading Zones, No Parking Zones, Bus Zones etc; and
- Vehicles must not remain stationary in the same position when parked on-street within a Residential Only Parking Zone or time restricted parking area for more than seven (7) consecutive days. Vehicles must be moved a minimum distance equivalent to four (4) on-street parking spaces after this time if the vehicle is to remain parked in the same street.

The Council may, by notice in writing, revoke permit/s where:

- the holder of a permit ceases to reside in the dwelling in respect of which the permit was issued; and/or
- in the opinion of the Council's Chief Executive Officer, it is no longer appropriate that the resident/s of a particular street be issued with permits or the permit has been misused or misappropriated.

The Council will issue Residential Permits (other than visitor permits) for a maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, or part thereof, and permits will be subject to a fee as determined by the Council from time to time.

Table 1 sets out the Residential Permit eligibility for residents in streets with Resident Only Permit Zones and/or Time Limited Parking Areas. Eligibility for Residential Permits set out in Table 1 must be read in conjunction with all other Applicable eligibility criteria and limitations set out in this Policy.

Table 1. Residential Permit Eligibility

Number of off-street car parking spaces on the property	Number of vehicles registered at the property	Maximum number and type of Residential Permit
0	0	No Permit
0	1	1 non-transferable [#]
0	2 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
1	0 or 1	No Permit
1	2	1 non-transferable [#]
1	3 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
2	0, 1 or 2	No Permit
2	3	1 non-transferable [#]
2	4 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
3	0, 1, 2 or 3	No Permit
3	4	1 non-transferable [#]
3	5 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
4 or greater	Number of registered vehicles exceeds the available spaces on the residential property by one vehicle	1 non-transferable [#]
4 or greater	Number of registered vehicles exceeds the available spaces on the residential property by two or more vehicles	2 non-transferable [#]

[#]Residents eligible for one or two Residential Permits may also be eligible for an additional (transferable) Residential Permit, where extenuating circumstances apply. See other Residential Permit eligibility criteria for more details.

Visitor Permits

Visitor Permits are intended for occasional use where additional time may be needed for visitations, for example friends, family or trades people/workers. The holder of a visitor permit is not guaranteed a parking space in the street for which the permit is issued.

Like the Residential Permits, Visitor Permits are only available in precincts where the following conditions apply:

- there is limited available on-street parking;
- there are time limited parking controls applied to the street; and
- there is demonstrated competing demands between parking users due to other land uses in the precinct.

Visitor Permits are not intended to be used for longer term parking needs or to supplement a shortage of on-site parking.

The permit allows parking up to a maximum of four hours.

Visitor Permits can only be used in time restricted parking areas or Resident Only Parking Zones, cannot be used in parking zones of less than one-hour duration and cannot be used in Loading Zones, No Parking Zone, Bus Zones or Taxi Zones etc.

Residents can purchase books of Visitor Permits. The total number of permits issued by the Council to each residential property will be generally limited to fifty (50) each year and will be subject to the following conditions:

- permits can only be used in the street/s for which they are allocated;
- only provide a maximum of four hours parking;
- location, date and time of parking to be recorded on the permit along with vehicle registration details;
- each permit is only valid for a single one off use;
- a maximum of two (2) visitor permits per property can be used at any one time; and
- Additional visitor permits may be issued annually, on request, provided the first book of visitor permits has already been used by the eligible resident.

All Permits must be displayed in the bottom passenger-side corner of the motor vehicle windscreen at all times when the vehicle is parked in the Resident Only Parking Zone or relevant time restricted parking area. Failure to display the permit will leave the vehicle owner liable for an expiation and or prosecution for illegal parking.

Temporary Permits

Events & Significant Activities

The Council, at its absolute discretion, may provide Temporary Parking permits to occupiers of residential and commercial premises located in parts of the City in which temporary parking controls are implemented from time to time to address accessibility issues for on-street parking arising from the staging of an event or the undertaking of a significant activity.

The aim of the temporary parking controls and permits of this kind, is to enable local residents and businesses to conduct their day-to-day business and activities and maintain reasonable access to on-street parking during the course of a significant event or activity.

The Temporary Parking Permit is transferable between vehicles and will only be issued in relation to significant or major events or activities, as determined by the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, at his or her absolute discretion.

A Temporary Parking Permit related to significant or major events or activities will only be valid on the days where temporary parking controls are in places in the affected streets.

Parking for Tradespeople

The Council may, at its absolute discretion, provide a maximum of one (1) Temporary Parking Permit per residential property to occupiers or owners of residential properties to allow a tradesperson to park in a time restricted parking area or Resident Only Parking Zone, whilst the property is being renovated or new residential development is being constructed.

Such permits will generally only be issued where a major renovation or construction of residential development valued over \$50,000 is being undertaken and will not be issued in relation to maintenance works of any kind. The permits will only be valid for tradespeople vehicles that are no larger than a sedan, van, ute or SUV and where the total length of the vehicle including any overhanging materials or trailers or the like do not take up more than two on-street parking spaces at any one time.

Temporary Parking Permits issued in relation to tradespeople vehicles will be subject to a daily fee, must be displayed on the Tradesperson's vehicle and may be issued for a minimum of one (1) day up to a maximum of forty-two (42) days.

Narrow Streets Policy

There are many historic laneways and narrow streets throughout our City that significantly limit on-street parking. In these areas, the Council will manage parking through consultation with the local affected residents, and in accordance with the Australian Road Rules (ARRs).

Under the ARRs, drivers must leave a 3 metre clear width between parked vehicles or the continuous centre line along the road (if one is marked). This requirement allows for emergency access.

This requirement affects all roads less than 7.0m wide (allowing 2.0m for each parked car and 3m for vehicle access). On these roads, it is not legally possible to park a car on each side of the road as there will be less than 3m left for vehicle access. On very narrow roads less than 5.0m, it may not be possible to allow any parking at all.

In managing parking controls in narrow streets, the Council will take a staged approach focusing on education about local conditions as the first stage, enforcing existing controls if education fails and implementing new or altered parking controls as the third stage.

This approach is underpinned by the idea that managing parking controls in narrow streets is very difficult and requires a collaborative approach with all affected parties.

The Council will engage with residents and businesses directly affected by any changes/decisions on the following basis:

- notification of the parking and access issues;
- education of the ARR requirements. This may include actions such as the installation of advisory signs along the street to highlight the narrowness and discourage parking opposite other vehicles and/or the distribution of educative material to local residents;
- enforcement of the ARR requirements. This may include actions such as proactive and regular enforcement of illegal parking;
- Restricting parking opportunities. If education and enforcement are ineffective, there may be need to implement new or alter existing parking controls to improve accessibility. Where such interventions are proposed, the Council will consult with directly affected parties to determine how parking restrictions might be applied (e.g. which side of the road); and
- ongoing monitoring and communication as may be required.

The Council's policy for managing parking in narrow streets is as follows:

Road Width (between kerbs)	Treatment
Less than 5.0m	No Parking allowed.
5.1m – 7.0m	Parking on one side only or staggered parking may be considered. This will be negotiated with the local residents and could include implementing actions such as staggered parking along the road and parking controls to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection.
7.1m or more	Parking can be allowed on both sides of the road subject to other considerations such as driveway access.

Driveways

The Council has endorsed the following framework for the discretionary use of yellow line marking over property driveways.

Under the Australian Road Rules (ARRs), there is no requirement for a Council to install road markings or signage to indicate that it is illegal to park in a manner that obstructs a driveway. This is on the basis that the existence of the driveway should be sufficient notification to motorists not to obstruct or restrict access to and from the property.

However, there is a level of expectation from the community that the Council should provide some form of road marking to assist in reducing the number of instances whereby vehicles are found to be obstructing/impeding access to driveways. This is exacerbated in areas where there is a combination of urban infill and business precinct areas.

The Council will mark a continuous yellow (No Stopping) edge line 500mm from the edge of the driveway in the following areas:

- all driveways located within areas of high on-street parking demand, around schools as identified in the City-Wide Schools Traffic, Parking and Safety Review report;
- all driveways located within a designated zone, bounded by Portrush Road, Payneham Road/ North Terrace, Dequetteville Terrace and Kensington Road and the whole of the suburb of Hackney (as this area has been identified as having consistently high demands); and
- all other streets which are located outside the designated zone be assessed on a case-by-case basis and the following considerations be satisfied prior to the installation of driveway line marking:
 - consistent high demand for parking (typically exceeding 85% occupancy rates); and
 - regular disregard by drivers parking over driveway.

The isolated use of yellow marking over individual driveways along a street will not be considered as this creates an inconsistent use of the marking for drivers. Where applied, line marking will be applied to a whole street or precinct.

Diagram 3

Line marking shown in the following diagram extending 500mm either side of the driveway.



Construction Zones

The Council will request developers of major and/or medium to high-rise development to prepare a traffic management and on-street parking plan in consultation with Council staff, with a view to identifying the most appropriate suite of controls during the construction period to minimise impacts on local residents and traffic management.



Construction works, Third Creek

The Council requires developers of major and medium to high-density developments to prepare traffic management and on-street parking plans in consultation with Council staff, to identify the most appropriate suite of controls during the construction phase of developments to minimise traffic and parking related impacts. Traffic Management Plans may also be required for small-scale developments that, in the Council's opinion, are likely to have impacts on the public realm, including on-street parking.

Traffic Management and On-street Parking Plans should include at a minimum, information about the following aspects of the development construction which specifically relate to how traffic and parking impacts are proposed to be managed:

- requirements for temporary work zones in the public realm;
- hoardings;
- loading and unloading of building materials and supplies;

- traffic management;
- impacts on on-street parking arrangements;
- management of parking by tradespeople;
- traffic and parking signage requirements;
- proposals for required temporary parking controls, temporary signage; and
- how the local community will be informed about the management of on-street parking during the construction period and who they can contact on the developer's behalf to address concerns.

For further information or to discuss construction related requirements, contact the Council's Public Realm Compliance Officer on 8366 4530.

Waste Collection

There are many historic laneways and narrow streets throughout our City that significantly limit on-street parking. In these areas, the Council will manage parking through consultation with the local affected residents, and in accordance with the Australian Road Rules (ARRs).

Demand for on-street parking spaces is high across much of the Council area, particularly in areas located adjacent to the City of Adelaide Central Business District as well as suburbs such as Norwood, where there is a significant mix of traffic generating land uses and Kensington, which contains an historic pattern of development with limited space for the provision of offstreet parking facilities and relatively narrow streets.

These conditions result in high demand for on-street parking spaces across the City which, combined with the substantial number of narrow streets in the City, and historic housing stock that has limited or no off-street parking available, creates a conflict from time to time for the safe and convenient collection of waste.

The Council's waste collection service is provided by East Waste, which generally provides citizens with the following

bins and services:

- red lidded bin (140 litre) for general waste;
- yellow lidded bin (240 litre) for recycling;
- green lidded bin (240 litre) for food/kitchen organics; and;
- at call hard waste collection service.

General waste is collected weekly and alternate fortnightly pick-ups are scheduled for recycling and green organics. East Waste vehicles generally collect waste using a robotic arm that lifts bins into the truck's receptacle. However, from time to time, the waste collection trucks have trouble accessing narrow streets and or struggle to collect bins using robotic arms due to vehicles obstructing the location of the bins. To overcome this issue, many residents place their bins in driveway cross-overs or adjacent to neighbouring properties where access to the bins is more convenient.

In general, these ad-hoc arrangements work reasonably well, however, in some rarer cases, there are very limited opportunities to present bins in suitable and convenient locations for collection and this either results in the affected residents having to present bins a long distance from their property or in some cases, bins not being emptied which causes re-work for East Waste.

This can also cause frustration for the affected residents. To address this issue, the Council may implement shortterm parking controls to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection.

This type of intervention will only be considered where:

- there is high and regular demand for on-street parking spaces and high occupancy rates, including, but not limited to narrow streets and high density residential areas;
- East Waste has verified that the waste collection process has been regularly impeded by vehicles blocking access to bins presented for collection; and
- there are not reasonable alternatives available for the affected residents to present their bins for collection.

If parking controls are required, the restrictions will only apply to the relevant day of collection and will be generally limited to between 7.00am and 5.00pm or other such times as may be required by East Waste or the Council.

The Council does not generally endorse or support the use of stickers on bins to provide visual cues to motorists to avoid parking adjacent the bins on bin collection day. It is acknowledged that this approach is simple and likely to be effective in some cases, however, it places the burden of addressing the issue on residents rather than the Council, has the potential to lead to confrontation between residents and motorists, has no legal effect and if they are used 'en-masse' and heeded by motorists, this would displace many vehicles that would otherwise park in these areas, potentially shifting demand for on-street parking to adjacent streets.

Accessible Parking

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is committed to making parking accessible and convenient for persons with disability. Accessible parking bays are available adjacent to most community facilities, open space and commercial precincts.



Accessible Parking

When the Council upgrades its assets and community facilities, accessibility to the facilities, including the availability of accessible parking spaces, is given careful consideration to evaluate compliance with current accessibility standards.

Accessible parking spaces are sign-posted or have the accessibility symbol painted on the road surface or signs cover the space. When parking in a designated accessible parking space, the time limit on the sign applies (ie. no extra time is allowed).

The Disability Parking Permit that is issued by the South Australian Government, must be clearly displayed to be eligible for the extended time limit described above, either hanging from the rear-view mirror or on the passenger side of the dashboard of the vehicle.

A vehicle correctly and legally displaying a Disability Parking Permit, may be parked in a time limited parking space and be entitled to additional time beyond the signed time limit restriction as follows:

- for time restricted parking areas less than 30 minutes, the time for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be 30 minutes;
- for time restricted parking areas between 30 minutes and one hour, the time for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be two hours; and
- for time restricted parking areas where the time limit is more than one hour, the time limit for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be twice the period indicated on the sign.

Smart Parking Technology

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is committed to making use of Smart Technology to assist in the management and enforcement of parking areas and parking controls.

The use of smart technology to assist in the management and enforcement of parking areas and parking restrictions is rapidly expanding across Australia. Smart Parking comes in many forms and has many benefits. Where a need is identified, the council will consider the use of smart parking technology to assist with the management and enforcement of parking controls or to enhance wayfinding and other directional signage as well as experiences for the convenience of citizens.

Case Study – Webbe Street Car Park, Norwood

In 2024, the Council installed in-ground sensors for each parking bay located within the ground floor of the Webbe street car park, Norwood.

The Council's overall objectives for monitoring and enforcing time limited car parking spaces in the car park with the use of smart technology include:

- increasing turn-over of available parking spaces to benefit local traders;
- issuing or facilitating the issuing of expiation notices in an effective and efficient manner;
- improving the standard of proof of evidence for issuing expiations, using data obtained from technology such as in-ground-sensors;
- reducing the time the Council's Parking Compliance Officers need to patrol the car parking, in turn enabling them to perform more duties elsewhere; and
- monitoring of the car park usage rates, including during peak times and during community or significant events, to inform timing and delivery of council projects and initiatives such as capital works and other infrastructure upgrades.

Vehicle overstays trigger an electronic notification that is sent to hand-held devices used by the Council's Parking Compliance Officers, who will then attend the car park to address the parking issue.

This efficient use of technology will reduce the need for the traditional and time consuming foot patrolling of the car park and 'chalking' of tyres as the presence of the

Parking Compliance Officers will only be needed when a vehicle overstay is identified by the in-ground sensor technology.

This contemporary approach to monitoring parking controls will ensure that the Parking Compliance Officers use their time more effectively and efficiently to monitor other parts of the City and respond to parking overstays in the Webbe Street car park, only when the smart technology has identified a need.

Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

There are six publicly accessible electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, provided by JOLT and Evie in operation across the Council area.

EV charging station locations include:

- Webbe Street car park, Norwood;
- Osmond Terrace, Norwood (on street parking bay near the Republic Hotel);
- Dunstone Grove/Linde Reserve car park;
- Borthwick Reserve, Portrush/Payneham Road;
- Payneham Community Centre; and
- Gylnde Corner car park.

In collaboration with JOLT and Evie, the Council aims to provide up to 16 EV charging stations in the City over the next fifteen (15) years, subject to demand.

A map showing the location of the charging stations is available on the Council's website. The Council may take enforcement action and expiate owners of non-electric vehicles that park in designated electric vehicle parking spaces.

Charging of Electric Vehicles in the Public Realm

Charging of Electric Vehicles, caravans, motorhomes etc. located within an on-street parking space that is not a designated publicly accessible electric vehicle charging station location, using permanent or temporary charging facilities (including, but not limited to, the use of an electrical cable running from the property to the on-street parking space across the adjacent footpath and verge), is not allowed.

This restriction is to obviate the risk of electrocution, ensure the footpath and verge areas remain clear of physical obstructions for passing pedestrians and cyclists, including, but not limited to, visually impaired persons and to ensure that the provision of on-street parking remains unrestricted, where practicable, to maximise access for all road users.

Appendix A

Application of Parking Zones

The following overview provides examples of the various permissive parking controls that can be applied to effectively manage on-street parking. (Extract: Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 11 – Parking).

It is important to ensure that streets do not have too many different time restrictions as this will lead to confusion for drivers and an increase in disputes related to infringements. The start and finish times of the restriction will be clearly sign posted and be as consistent as practical (e.g. Mon–Fri 8am–5pm).

Where practicable, following investigations into on-street parking issues, implementation of changes to on-street parking arrangements may include consideration of area-wide parking controls across a large area, suburb or precinct. Further parking controls that may be considered, include, but are not limited to the following:

- 5 minute parking is appropriate in areas with a very high arrival rate e.g. where passengers are dropped off but some waiting is likely. It may apply near cinemas, post offices and hotels and may potentially be used in business districts and near schools.
- 10 minute or ¼ hour (15 minute) parking can provide for pick-up and set-down outside schools and for a high turnover outside commercial facilities providing a high level of convenience such as banks, post offices and newsagents. It is only appropriate for motorists who wish to go to the one address.
- 30 minute parking can be applicable directly outside local shops that rely on providing a reasonably high level of convenience to maintain a competitive market position. There is usually a high demand and 1-hour parking would result in inadequate parking turnover. A ½-hour restriction allows people to go to two or three shops.

- 1 hour parking is appropriate outside major shopping centres and in other locations where there is a demand for parking and the activity is likely to take longer than half an hour. This type of parking is able to be diverted into off-street locations but parking access needs to be clearly visible from the frontage road.
- 2 hour parking is sometimes appropriate outside major shopping centres although it can result in enforcement difficulties with some motorists staying excessively long times. It is more likely to be applicable in areas with developments containing professional and personal services. It is also applicable in streets where a resident parking permit scheme applies and time limited parking is available for non-residents. The 2 hour limit can be used to discourage or remove commuter parking.
- 3 or 4 hour parking is appropriate where it is desired to stop all-day commuter parking but allow parking by other local people. While it is desirable that car park access is identifiable from the arterial road it will often be acceptable to assume that motorists are relatively well-informed regarding the access arrangements for the site.
- Parking with no time limit (all day parking) is usually generated by employees or park-n-ride motorists and will occur across all types of development. It does not require signs to be used to indicate that parking is permitted where there is no time limit or no user limitation.

Please note that this overview provides general guidance only for the application of parking controls. Consideration may be given to local conditions and/or a combination of measures, including alternative measures, to address on-street parking issues in the City.

Further information

For information on the Council's On-Street Parking Policy, please visit www.npsp.sa.gov.au or phone 8366 4555.

You can also visit the Council's Citizen Service Centre at the Norwood Town Hall, 175 The Parade, Norwood.

Additional copies

The On-Street Parking Policy can be viewed online at www.npsp.sa.gov.au

Copies may also be obtained by:

- visiting Norwood Town Hall
- visiting any of the Council's Libraries
- emailing townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
- contacting the Council on 8366 4555
- writing to the Council at PO Box 204, Kent Town SA 5074

Document History and Status

Reviewed	Approved	Date
Revision A - Draft for Council endorsement for community consultation		
Council	Tonkin	30 November 2020
Revision B - Draft for consultation - as endorsed by the Council 7 December 2020		
Council	Council	21 December 2020
Revision C - Endorsed by the Council 1 November 2021		
Council	Council	1 November 2021
Revision D - Draft for consultation		
Council	Council	2 April 2024

Draft

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4555
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au
Socials  /cityofnpsp  @cityofnpsp



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

Attachment B

Review of the Council's On Street Parking Policy



CITY OF NORWOOD
PAYNEHAM
+ ST. PETERS

7.7.24

VISITOR PERMIT PARKING

Dear Sir,

I wish to express my concern as a resident of Hackney since 1966.

I wish the current system to be maintained and not to have the proposed vouchers.

Also, I have not received my 24-25 parking permit.

It was not included in your recent letter to me.

NR BRUSH

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Saturday, 6 July 2024 11:00 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Adrian and Veronica Bohm

We live at _____ and we don't agree with the proposed changes that we were advised about initially. The first priority should be for Council to look after their residents and rate payers. We should be allowed to have permanent access to parking outside our property. The proposed changes do not take residents into consideration and it's not fair that we are inconvenienced so people from outside our area can take up our parking spaces and we have to find alternative parking. We think the current permit situation works and should not be changed.

From our own personal viewpoint, we live in one of the busiest parts of Norwood as we are in between William Street and the Parade and we are affected by the traffic from Coles and the nearby restaurants and shops more than any other street in Norwood.

comment Since Coles has reopened the amount of traffic has increased significantly and particularly since the no right turn from the Parade to Edward Street has been introduced which we also disagree with.

Instead of vehicles turning right off the Parade to go to Coles, they now go via George Street, William Street and then Edward Street, right past our house and in busy times we have to wait ages to reverse out from our driveway.

I would like to emphasise that we strongly oppose any changes to the current permit parking.

We would also like to know why the residents of Edward Street, between The Parade and William Street were not consulted or advised about the addition of the no right turn sign. For us it means we now have to turn right into George Street and go around the block to get to our house.

We strongly object to this change.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/27

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2024 5:55 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Alan and Jenny Rumsby

Dear Mr Reschke,

Please take into consideration the detailed submission we previously made on this topic (pasted below).

In essence, we consider the proposed changes to the permit system to be a serious over-reach which is simply not justified by the prevailing parking conditions (at least in our part of Norwood). Council has failed to provide any evidence whatsoever to support these proposed changes...and the fact that the proposed parking permit changes are to be introduced across the board throughout all time-limited kerbside parking streets in the Council further demonstrates that the approach is not a targeted one based on a regular 85% exceedance of the available on-street parking spaces as your paper suggests. It is a blanket approach dreamed up without proper consideration or justification. In this context we are extremely disappointed and angry that Council is persisting with these draconian permit changes.

Mr Peter Reschke
 Team Leader Regulatory Services
 City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters
 By Email: townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au

Ticketed On-Street Parking Changes

Dear Mr Reschke,

comment Thank you for forwarding notice of the proposed on-street parking control changes – in respect of which we voice our strong objections.

Not only will it be a cumbersome and onerous system for Council to administer, it fails the stated policy objectives for the district in which our property lies – in the so-called Mixed Residential Use Precinct (MRU) – as it fails to take account of the visitor needs of all residents, the outcome of which (as below) would appear to prioritise the wider community and business access to on-street parking.

We ask that Council reconsider introducing this proposed new ticketing system, and more fully engage the community in a discussion on the available options, including the much-preferred 'do-nothing' option. In this respect, whilst we do not deny that Council may have posted some advice about the parking policy changes it was considering back in 2020, as long-term residents we do not recall notice of the proposed ticketing system being aired nor any serious discussion of the available options.

To provide some context, the policy statement says:

λ that no one-size-fits-all' approach is appropriate as there is a 'hierarchy' of needs throughout Norwood based on the local circumstances – in particular the land use mix and pool of available off-street parking;

λ in the MRU where our property lies, the goal is to give 'high prioritisation to the resident and visitor parking needs.'; and

λ the proposed ticketing system would only be taken up where there is a 'regular exceedance' of the 85% on-street parking occupancy.

Our observations are:

λ Montrose Avenue is a narrow road with very limited off-street and on-street

parking. It also contains a number of rental properties and (so it seems to us) some bnb accommodation. In these circumstances, it will be difficult if not impossible to transfer resident permits to new rental or short term occupiers – whom are, after all, the ‘residents’ the policy is supposedly directed to serve. Landlords of such properties will of course be affected but the real issue lies with the resident occupier; and

λ Charles Street is a wide street which is moderately trafficked at peak times. There are businesses at either end of the street and at limited select locations along its route. On-street parking is variable. Business parking can spill-over but is generally well tolerated and not problematic. From our perspective, the main concern is the flood of on-street parking generated at class times of the Hot Yoga facility on The Parade, a relatively recent addition in this area. This is especially so of a Tuesday morning (bin collection day) and during late trading on a Thursday evening. Even so, from our perspective there is no way the 85% parking occupancy threshold is regularly exceeded, and at most times at least one third of the street parking pool would be available for use.

Our concerns, in some detail, are:

λ given the limitations applying to the number and use of resident permits and the terms of the proposed visitor ticketing system, how in practice will a tenant or short-term occupier be accommodated?

λ tradespeople and visitors will not, in our experience, be catered for – whilst a lawn can be mowed, gutters cleaned and an appliance can be delivered and installed in the allowable timeframe, that is not the case where a building issue is involved, or a roof repair is required, nor for work involving a painter, or where a garden contractor is involved including where paving is installed etc; and

λ nor does the proposed system appear to accommodate a regional or interstate visitor arriving by car, whether staying overnight or not. Nor will it allow the time for a family visitor looking for moral support where undergoing medical treatment or a serious medical exploration, or hospital visit. The ticketing system also simply does not allow for any family gatherings or celebrations/events to be held given the proposed limit of 2 visitor/household ticketing.

We do acknowledge the reduction in on-street parking since the signposting of parking time limits in our area. This has largely eliminated commuter parking. However, for the above reasons, the current proposed visitor ticketing system is a retrograde step. From our perspective, no change is warranted as the 85% parking occupancy threshold is not regularly exceeded.

Being in a predominantly residential area of suburban Norwood, it seems us to be a ridiculous and demeaning impost to require visitors and tradespeople to fill in visitor forms on tickets and to adhere to a time limit that is in some circumstances (as noted above) unreasonable. Residents must also avoid having any more than two such visitors or guests at any one time, none of which is considered resident-friendly!

Nor are the needs of all residents met as the transfer of resident permits to new tenants and resident occupiers does not appear to have been considered.

Lastly, we consider that the only the parking ‘issue’ along our section of Charles Street is in respect of the Hot Yoga business on The Parade. It is unclear to us whether any controls exist or are enforced in respect of class sizes, the timing of successive classes, or the parking conduct carried out by its patrons.

Yours faithfully

Alan and Jenny Rumsby

cc: Cllrs S Whittington and G Piggott

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/22

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Alison Othen <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 5 July 2024 9:44 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Leave the system in place
Provide more parking inspectors

Changes to the current permit system would severely impact our family. We currently have four people living here, my husband and our two children, each with a car. Our daughter leaves her car at a friend's house leaving a pass for our son. We also have an elderly dependent who visits at least weekly and often stays all day for company.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007. To alleviate parking issues the provision of more inspectors enforcing the two-hour limit on cars parking without permits would help dramatically. This has been demonstrated in our street in the past. The day after tickets have been issued there are plenty of two-hour parks available.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict our ability to have visitors and work from home. From our experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking in our street and do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Alison Othen

This email was sent by Alison Othen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Alison provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alison Othen at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Alice WILSON <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 6:34 AM
To: Victoria McFarlane; Scott Sims; Connie Granozio
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Maylands/Trinity Ward

Cr Victoria McFarlane, Cr Scott Sims and Cr Connie Granozio

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Maylands/Trinity Gardens Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Alice WILSON

This email was sent by Alice WILSON via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Alice provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alice WILSON at .

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 12 June 2024 11:27 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Allen Parker

comment Please do not change the parking policy. We are very happy with the existing policy. Eastry street does not have any issues with parking pressures in the permit zone, but the proposed changes would create additional pressures to the non-permit zones. This is because any long-term visitors that we have from interstate or regional areas, would not be able to use the visitor booklet and would therefore need to use non-permit parking. The existing visitor pass allows my partner (lives in Port Augusta) to park in the permit zone for multiple days when she is visiting me. The booklet won't allow that flexibility. I think this is a very bad idea, and it would make me re-consider living in this area. I have lived in my current address for over 13 years. The permit parking system is very good in Eastry Street, but if this changed to the proposed booklet system, it would make my property less valuable, and i would look to sell my house immediately. Please don't change to the booklet! I would rather pay a nominal fee (say \$20) for a visitor pass than to get a booklet.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/6

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 5 June 2024 4:03 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Amy Mead

As long time residents of _____, we are discouraged by the lack of enforcement regarding permit only zones (7pm to 7am) in our street. It appears that parking inspectors are no longer patrolling on evenings, and the patrons of the two function centres in close proximity (Ellington and the Wine Centre) use the street as a carpark, despite plenty of parking available adjacent to the Gardens. On a busy night, this means residents cannot even get food delivered at night - I shudder to think what kind of delays would be incurred if I needed to call an ambulance on a night that the Ellington was hosting a big event. What are the point of the signs if they are not going to be enforced?

comment This issue is complicated by our off street parking. We are unable to get a parking permit as we have a driveway at the very back of our long block (on Nuffield Lane). However, our gate needs to be opened from the inside for obvious security reasons. We cannot afford to upgrade to an automated remote control gate at this time, so if I arrive home late at night I shouldn't be parking on the street, but I need to in order to go and open our gate! I'd be more than happy to discuss this further with a council employee so we can look for a resolution.

Additionally, cars parked on both sides of Osborne Street Hackney (in between North Tce and Westbury St) have been a problem for years - traffic turning from this street on to North Terrace or vice versa is often impeded by the cars parked on the street, and this causes problems for those turning right on to Osborne from Westbury too. I'm fearful one day there might be a serious accident due to this, combined with people using Westbury as a rat run during peak hour traffic.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/3

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Ann-Marie Hayes <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 5 July 2024 3:55 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Ann-Marie Hayes

This email was sent by Ann-Marie Hayes via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Ann-Marie provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ann-Marie Hayes at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From:
Sent: Tuesday, 28 May 2024 9:52 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: On-Street Parking

Hello,

My husband Andrew Raff and I are the owners of . This is our second home with our primary residence a Beef Cattle Property on King Island, Tasmania. I stay here during school term time with our children for their education, my husband remains on King Island to work the farm. Our property does not have a driveway and we rely solely upon On-Street Parking.

Often, I also need to return to King Island to help with farm. During these periods, both of my parents come to live in the house and look after our children. They have 2 cars and use the 2 visitor permits I have been issued with council. It is obvious for our situation, a voucher booklet system will not be suitable as we simply will not have enough vouchers.

I do hope council continues with the visitor permit system as it works well for our already difficult situation.

Kind regards,

Anna Raff
RAFF ANGUS

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 5 July 2024 12:24 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Anne Hill

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. We are very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is our submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing annual visitor permits for eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If we use all 50 tickets, we may be able to get another 50 permits but at the total discretion of Council staff. This policy will not work for our household.

We understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

comment Our strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict our ability to have visitors. The majority of our family live interstate. They regularly visit, arriving by car, often staying 1-2 weeks. In addition, several close friends live in regional and rural SA and visit regularly.

From our knowledge and experience of this area (29 years), there is little evidence to suggest that the current visitor permit system places undue pressure on parking on our street. There is already a 2 hour restriction between Kensington Rd and John Street which applies for non-residents / visitors. There is little evidence to suggest that residents are using the visitor permit as a "de facto" resident permit. I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

We are also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. If such evidence exists none has been provided to residents.

We urge the Council to maintain the existing visitor parking system which allows us to apply for permits and to use these flexibly to meet our own visitation needs. And to instead, urge Council to take targeted action in areas of high or specific concern, instead of taking what appears disproportionate action in such a blanket approach.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. We look forward to hearing from in due course.

Anne & Brian

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/26

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 6:40 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission**Name** Ashley Page

Please retain the existing system until ALL reasonable options have been tabled and appropriately scrutinised. The previous proposals are not reasonable in my opinion.

comment

I have lived in Paddington, Sydney from 1991 to 2021. That suburb and Norwood have many things in common, sadly including a permanent parking problem. They have dealt with it well in my humble opinion. May I suggest that council investigate their methods!

I understand that to get a universally acceptable parking plan will be near impossible to achieve, but one that is tolerable for the vast majority of residents is most definitely doable.

Thank you, regards
 ACP

NPSP Yes**Email**

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/29

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Ashley Page <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2024 12:13 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood.
I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system

My thoughts on this matter follow.

The 50 single use (4 hour only) visitor permit system proposal is cumbersome, antiquated and simply not acceptable, as is the booklet proposal.

The two bona fide visitor permits per eligible property should be retained as is, ie not reduced to one.

I lived in Dillon St, Paddington, Sydney for 30 years until relocating to Norwood in early 2021. We had serious problems with non local workers using our streets for full daytime parking in unrestricted spots. This was resolved by the Woollahra Council issuing up to two Residential Parking Permit car stickers per year. Normally for one or two hours between 0700 to 2000 Monday to Saturday. However each street had to provide a small number of unrestricted spaces. These of course were quickly identified and highly prized!
But, this system worked well.

I would prefer the current system be retained until a more satisfactory system can be developed.

Also, I would be more than happy to drop by and discuss this important topic with you. I truly hope we can resolve this tricky problem.

For your consideration

Yours sincerely,
Ashley Page

This email was sent by Ashley Page via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Ashley provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ashley Page at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Ben Mountford
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 12:57 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

Hi,

Comments on on-street parking policy:

‘PARKING PRECINCTS AND PRIORITY OF USE’- as related to HENRY STREET, NORWOOD:

As a resident of _____ for more than 15 years, I feel that the main issue with the draft report relates to the Councils ‘zoning’ of the street in the ‘Parking Precincts and Priority of Use’ and specifically the ‘low’ priority of parking consideration for residents. I feel this is the wrong prioritization because:

- Henry Street Norwood is a purely residential street.
- Limited Off street Parking: With relatively small block sizes and relatively high density of housing along it, the amount of off street parking along Henry Street is not high, including some residents with NO off street parking.
- It is the only purely residential street that has this ‘Commercial Activity District’ zoning on the current proposed masterplan - I feel it has flown ‘under the radar’ and needs to be considered in a more nuanced way, regardless of it’s proximity to the Parade.
- Currently there are no parking controls on the street and it is filled by 9am with cars parked there all day during the week by workers in the area. It is well above the 85% occupancy rate on any weekday, as well as Saturday and Sunday mornings.
- Overall - I think the Councils current proposed ‘low’ priority for residential use in Henry Street Norwood needs to be reconsidered.

Aside from the issues noted above, we feel this report has been well considered and give the Council credit for examining this in a way that looks at the whole district and the balance of different of uses that make our area such a vibrant and great place to live and work.

I hope this feedback is useful

Kind Regards

Ben Mountford

*I acknowledge the Kaurna people as the Traditional Custodians of the Adelaide Plains where I live and work.
I respect the continuing cultural, spiritual, and emotional connection that First Nations people have with the land and pay my respects to Elders past and present.*

Tala Aslat

From: Benjamin Grant <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 12:18 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon..

I think you owe your residents more respect than this !!

Yours sincerely,

This email was sent by Benjamin Grant via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Benjamin provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Benjamin Grant at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 7:21 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Brendan Grigg

I DO NOT support the proposal for:

-maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible residential property;

- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing four hour time limits for each permit or;

- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (as per the current system)

comment and enforcing four hour time limits during the day, allowing permit holders to park between 7:00pm and 7:00am the next day, without restriction or any time limits.

I DO SUPPORT MAINTAINING THE CURRENT SYSTEM.

There is no evidence that suggests we need a change.

I DO SUPPORT the proposal for a new policy in relation to Multi-Dwelling Developments

I DO NOT SUPPORT the proposal for time limits on Residential Parking Permits. What a waste of time for parking inspectors!

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/19

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 3 June 2024 3:40 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Brendan Grigg

I think the draft policy is fine.

comment I think any changes to car-parking permitting for Ann Street, Wells Street Stepney and the areas most closely associated with the Otto's development ought to be delayed until the development has finished. This will give residents and the Council a fuller understanding of the situation. Change the arrangements then, if necessary. It may well be necessary to consider one-way streets etc as part of the whole plan.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/2

Best Wishes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 27 June 2024 12:38 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Carolyn Wood

I have previously submitted comments on the draft policy. I am a property owner,

comment Additional comment in regard to visitor permits for on-street residential parking. I endorse the proposed changes to the above category. I believe purchasing books of visitor permits with time limited parking is an improvement to the current system. With the current system I have a neighbor who has given a visitor permit to another neighbor who now parks in the resident permit zone at all times. I have purchased a visitor permit but am unable to use it for visitors or trades as this car is always parked in the space.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/15

Best Wishes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 27 June 2024 12:21 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Carolyn Wood

My residential property is located at _____ and is between Queen St and Portrush Road. In this section of William St there are 2 schools (St Ignatius and St Josephs) St Ignatius church and one business, Norwood Garden Centre. This section is chaotic Mon to Fri with school drop off and pickup, after school care pick-up and all day teacher parking on the street. Funerals at the church add to the pressure particularly if scheduled around 3pm along with early church services several days a week. Weekends are also extremely busy with church services and weddings along with Parade shoppers and Garden Centre visitors.

comment I experience cars parked over my driveway on a daily basis 7 days a week. Neighbors from 2 other residents (public housing) have no alternative other than to place their bins over my driveway on collection days. I am unable to leave or return to my premises between 2.45 and 3.30pm on week days due to school pickup queues completely blocking lanes in this section of the street. This queue starts on The Parade, extends along Queen Street, completely blocks the roundabout (Queen and William St) and continues along William Street to Portrush Road. There have been occasions when ambulances have either been caught in the gridlock or unable to access these areas. In my opinion, council has failed to address this issue or put effective measures in place to mitigate the risks.

Parking inspection and traffic control during these peak periods is completely inadequate and unacceptable. This needs to be reviewed as a priority and considered within the parking policy.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/14

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Catherine Sarre <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 9:18 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

In my view, the main problem with the permit parking system is that it is not sufficiently policed. No system is going to provide an orderly solution if it is not enforced. I urge the Council to focus on enforcement of the existing system. It is clear that in Fisher St one resident is creating problems for everyone. The breakdown of the system is the failure to enforce the limits in relation to that individual. I urge Council to do its job and actively enforce the existing system.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Catherine Sarre

This email was sent by Catherine Sarre via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Catherine provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Catherine Sarre at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Charlie Scott <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2024 5:46 PM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007. If this isn't possible maintain the current system but reducing the visitor permit to 1 per household is my second best option.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Charlie Scott

This email was sent by Charlie Scott via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Charlie provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Charlie Scott at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Daisy Taylor <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 12:23 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

Additionally, they will also profoundly restrict our access to safe parking in proximity to our house, as we only have a single-car driveway in our four-person share house. As a young woman, it is simply unsafe for me to be parking in non ticketed areas that are located far away from our house. Doing so places me in danger when going to and from my car at night time or in the morning before the sun has risen. I don't believe I should have to sacrifice my sense of safety each day just to avoid a parking ticket. In the current economic environment, it is already difficult to rent and afford the cost of living. Given these conditions, our share-house living situation requires the four of us to have separate cars for travel to each of our jobs, and as of now, we have been able to use our visitor pass to accommodate for the limited parking accessibility at our rental house.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Daisy Taylor
41 Edward St, Norwood SA 5067, Australia

This email was sent by Daisy Taylor via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our

generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Daisy provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Daisy Taylor at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: David Ellis <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 11:25 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Clarke St. & agree something needs to be done.

Currently there are at least 6 vehicles in my street that have no permit and for some of the vehicles I recognise will stay parked in our street all day without consequence

I have no objection to limiting 1 permit per home owner but better policing of vehicles over staying their limit would solve the problem without doubt.

Yours sincerely,
David Ellis

This email was sent by David Ellis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however David provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Ellis at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Susanne McCoy <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 27 June 2024 9:11 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

Please just LEAVE THE PARKING SYSTEM AS IT IS. Stop messing around with it.
You are our elected representatives - so listen.

Yours sincerely,
Dr Sue McCoy

This email was sent by Susanne McCoy via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Susanne provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Susanne McCoy at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 10:31 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Elizabeth

As a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system (page 13) of the draft on-street parking policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4hrs per permit). This policy will not work for my household.

comment I strongly recommend Council keeps the status quo and maintains the current system which has been in place since 2007.

Other options are unworkable. From experience, visitor permits are not placing undue pressure with parking on my street, and I do not believe any change to the current system is warranted.

I am very concerned Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/30

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Elizabeth Giagtzis <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 9:46 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

As a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system (page 13) of the draft on-street parking policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4hrs per permit). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4hr time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system) but enforcing a 4hr time limit during the day (7am-7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm-7am)

I strongly recommend Council keeps the status quo and maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

Other options are unworkable. From experience, visitor permits are not placing undue pressure with parking on my street, and I do not believe any change to the current system is warranted.

I am very concerned Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this public consultation.

Yours sincerely,
Elizabeth Giagtzis

This email was sent by Elizabeth Giagtzis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Elizabeth provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elizabeth Giagtzis at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Elizabeth Pike <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 8:05 PM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a ratepayer of over 40 years of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict residents' ability to have visitors, especially friends and family from the country who may wish to stay for a few days. It would be completely impractical for them to have to move their car to another (remote) location after four hours if they are staying as house guests. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street. Many people who park near my house return to their cars with shopping trolleys that are subsequently left on the footpath for residents or Foodland staff to collect and return to the nearby Webbe Street carpark. I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Elizabeth Pike

This email was sent by Elizabeth Pike via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Elizabeth provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elizabeth Pike at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Melissa Meos
Sent: Thursday, 19 September 2024 8:54 AM
To: Townhall
Cc: Emily Bradley; Claudia Kerr
Subject: Timed parking restrictions, Stepney Street, Stepney
Attachments: Letter to NPSP Council 19.09.2024.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam

Southern Design Group is located between

Due to the growth of Southern Design Group as a business, we are increasingly facing parking issues for our employees. Accordingly, we ask you to please consider the attached letter of today's date.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Kind regards,

At SDG, we work flexibly and across various time zones. I'm sending this message now at a time that suits me. I don't expect you to read, action or respond out of your regular working hours.



Melissa Meos
Governance and Executive Administration Manager



Southern Design Group acknowledges that our Adelaide office is located on the traditional Country of the Kaurna people of the Adelaide Plains and pays respect to Elders past and present. We also extend that respect to other Aboriginal Language Groups and other First Nations.

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in the message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party. If you received this message by mistake, please notify the sender.

Think before you print.

19 September 2024

City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters
townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to you on behalf of Southern Design Group of 4-16 Stepney Street, Stepney regarding on-street parking measures currently in place. Please see a visual representation of our premises set out in Appendix A.

We are a South Australian company supplying architectural hardware products to a sales and distribution network spanning the entire Australasian region. We are currently seeing substantial growth and employ 81 Adelaide based staff.

Due to the growth of Southern Design Group as a business, we are increasingly facing parking issues for our employees. To do our part to sustain this growth we currently supply 53 off-street carparks spread across our three addresses, squeezing in as many as safely possible, with some carparks requiring employees to park two cars deep.

Southern Design Group has already put in place several other measures and strategies to reduce the number of cars requiring a park such as:

- implementing a rotating working from home roster for office-based staff to reduce on site numbers as much as possible without impacting business activities; and,
- encouraging those employees who can to walk, cycle or catch public transport to work, which currently 9 employees are able to and do so, or for those employees who live close to each other to carpool: and,
- approaching nearby businesses with under-utilised off-street car parks to offer to lease parking spaces from them with no success.

Our last option for our employees who require parking is on-street parking. We have provided our employees with a map of limited 'all day' parking spots (albeit, none are particularly close to our premises), but are still struggling to find everyone a car park.

After reading your On-Street Parking Policy, I understand that we are situated in the Commercial/Light Industrial (CLI) precinct area where the highest prioritisation of users is for Loading Zones and Long Term Employees. Stepney Street currently has 2hr parking restrictions in place, as do many of the surrounding streets. Appendix A in the Policy suggests that this type of parking control is usually used outside major shopping centres or in places to prevent commuter parking.

The Policy also suggests that on-street parking facility occupancy rates should fall between 65%-85%. It could be argued that the occupancy rate for commercial activity in our area falls well below 65% as most commercial businesses in our area are wholesale or warehouses, not retail businesses attracting Short Term Shopping.

SOUTHERN DESIGN GROUP

ABN: 18 008 154 041

P: 08 8362 1133

E: accounts@southerndesigngroup.com.au

southerndesigngroup.com.au

AUSTRALIA

Southern Design Group Pty Ltd

14-16 Stepney Street

Stepney,

South Australia, 5069

NEW ZEALAND

Tradco Hardware Limited

PO Box 4448

Manawatu Mail Centre,

Palmerston North, 4222

NORTH AMERICA

SDG North America LLC

16192 Coastal Highway,

Lewes, Delaware 19958

County of Sussex

Southern Design Group requests that the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters Council consider removing the time limitations in place on Stepney Street and Henry Street to allow for more Long Term Employee parking, not just for Southern Design Group, but also our neighbouring businesses.

Yours sincerely

Emily Bradley
Co-CEO
Southern Design Group

Appendix A



Tala Aslat

From: Erin Powell <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 10:28 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

Additionally, they will also profoundly restrict our access to safe parking in proximity to our house, as we only have a single-car driveway in our four-person share house. In the current economic environment, it is already difficult to rent and afford the cost of living. Given these conditions, our share-house living situation requires the four of us to have separate cars for travel to each of our jobs, and as of now, we have been able to use our visitor pass to accommodate for the limited parking accessibility at our rental house.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Erin Powell

This email was sent by Erin Powell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Erin provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Erin Powell at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Farzan Aboosaheed <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 1:58 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

I personally disagree with councils visitor parking policy in our street because I strongly believe visitor parking never caused any issues or problems for general public parking in our street. We have regular visitors in different time frame so this can cause very inconvenience to regular visitors to our home.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Farzan Aboosaheed

This email was sent by Farzan Aboosaheed via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Farzan provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Farzan Aboosaheed at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Faye Hambour <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 8:07 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

What council is proposing will increase more paperwork. Surely that is not a good more in itself.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Faye Hambour

This email was sent by Faye Hambour via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Faye provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Faye Hambour at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Fiona Mcinnes <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 10:54 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Fionna Mcinnes

This email was sent by Fionna Mcinnes via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Fionna provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fionna Mcinnes at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Fred Pedler <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 10:37 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff).

This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is considering other options but has failed to explain or justify the need for the proposed changes.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

However it is necessary that the Council maintain regular parking inspector services particularly where there are streets with a mix of residential and business premises. In my experience this is not always the case.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors that I am aware.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Fred Pedler

This email was sent by Fred Pedler via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Fred provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fred Pedler at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Saturday, 15 June 2024 3:25 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Gail Casey

Would like the current permit system to remain - but in my circumstances am happy with 1 visitor permit per household. As I am getting older - in my 70s, there is a high probability of needing family to visit more often to provide assistance.

comment

I think that the 4 hour permit system is discriminatory for persons with permit only parking in front of their residence. I heard on the radio someone from the Council say its not too bad because if you have 1 hr parking limit, the 4 hour permit would give them 5 hours and after 5 p.m most is free parking. Because I have permit only in front of my house and if I need to use the pass for family just to stay for 1 day, would use up 6 passes in one shot, this is presuming that I don't have to shift the vehicle after 4 hours. This is not fair nor equitable.

I have a motorhome which doesn't take up much more than a normal car space and cannot fit on my premises (hence I put it into storage) - I bring it down to be able load items into it before going away and to offload when I come home. I think this is discriminatory to the elderly.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/10

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Gavin Othen <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 5 July 2024 9:54 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

I feel the council needs to increase the parking inspectors, as well as the frequency they monitor the street.

Due to people working from home on Mondays and Fridays, we always have room for parking. The other days the street is full, so perhaps the parking inspectors should increase the inspections on the other days.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

This email was sent by Gavin Othen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Gavin provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gavin Othen at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Carlos Buzzetti
Sent: Thursday, 13 June 2024 6:05 PM
To: Records
Subject: FW: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Hello

Can the submission below be added to the submissions on the parking policy consultation.

qA152135

Regards,

Carlos Buzzetti RPIA (Fellow)
GENERAL MANAGER, URBAN PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4501

Mobile 0423 781 107

Email cbuzzetti@npsp.sa.gov.au

Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au

From: Christel Mex <cmex@electedmembers.npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2024 3:12 PM
To: Carlos Buzzetti <CBuzzetti@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Subject: Fw: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Over to you?

Many thanks, Christel

From: Gerald Covino <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 10 June 2024 7:46 PM
To: John Callisto <JCallisto@electedmembers.npsp.sa.gov.au>; Christel Mex <cmex@electedmembers.npsp.sa.gov.au>
Cc: James Stevens ; Cressida O'Hanlon <dunstan@parliament.sa.gov.au>; Jack Batty <Bragg@parliament.sa.gov.au>; City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters Citizen Services <townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au>; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team <fairpermitparkingteam@gmail.com>
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I recently received a letter in the mail from Council indicating that there was an impending change to the way that visitor permit parking will be treated from 1 July 2024. The implementation of this policy would have been impossible for my family.

Accordingly, I wish to thank you for the decision from Council to continue the status quo for visitor permit passes for FY24/25 and for the Council's decision to commit to resident consultation on the visitor permit passes process going forward.

I look forward to participating in the consultation. This has been ongoing for too long.

Yours sincerely,
Gerald Covino

This email was sent by Gerald Covino via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Gerald provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gerald Covino at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Gerry Krieg <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 9:30 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

AFTER having the OBahn development decimate the number of on street parking spaces in my vicinity I am not wishing for any messy, unnecessarily new, and more restrictive parking (for resident use) protocols.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.or failing that maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property.

I would be more in tune with any change that restricts the number of city commuters who use my area for parking throughout the day, every weekday. And indeed the forthcoming opening up of the 'huge' Hackney hotel site for high density residential use will obviously bring FAR FAR FAR more demand for parking AT ALL TIMES within my area.

From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Gerry Krieg

This email was sent by Gerry Krieg via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Gerry provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gerry Krieg at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

To: Peter Reschke
Team Leader, Regulatory Services
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

5 June 2024

Dear Mr Reschke

On Street Parking Policy Consultation

See attached.

In addition to my comments below, please refer to my email dated April 4, 2024 in response to the proposed changes to Off Street Parking Permits.

At 10 Sheldon Street, we have no off-street parking available to us, as is the case for a number of neighbouring residences.

We neighbours work well together in a cooperative way to ensure that we respectfully share the On-Street parking spaces available to us. For us, the current system works perfectly well. When space for a work vehicle is needed, we cooperate by ensuring there is adequate parking space for the time required.

If there are repeat offenders who use the parking spaces 'illegally' we notify the council who then send their parking inspectors to issue a fine when required.

Having talked to the affected neighbours, we are of the opinion that no changes to the current system is required.

The flexibility of the current system is ideal and shouldn't be changed.

We are an aging community and wish to remain in our houses and will therefore undoubtedly require hired assistance in the years to come. The current permit system is easy and reliable. We have our visitor permit(s) which can be kept safely ready for use and require no 'mucking around' with small pieces of torn off paper, which will probably require us to enter times and dates etc.

Why change something that is working so well.

Yours faithfully



Gillian Whittington



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **gillian whitington**

Date: Thu, Apr 4, 2024 at 5:29 PM

Subject: on street parking policy

To: <townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au>

Feedback on the proposed changes to on-street parking.

As my husband and I get older we are choosing to access outside help around the house and garden.

We have currently organised for help in the garden once per fortnight, as some of the jobs are now beyond our capability. We are also considering getting help in the house as we are finding the house work too challenging.

As 74 year olds we can see that we will be needing assistance more often as time goes by and the 50 vouchers would not cover our parking requirements.

We do not have any off-street parking.

Is Council considering what options there may be for people in our position? We will undoubtedly require more than 50 vouchers per annum, especially given that we are sure to have a few friends over for dinner now and then.

Best regards

Gillian Whittington

Tala Aslat

From: giuseppe rossi <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 30 June 2024 9:18 AM
To: Victoria McFarlane; Scott Sims; Connie Granozio
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Maylands/Trinity Ward

I am writing as a resident of Maylands/Trinity Gardens Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
giuseppe rossi

This email was sent by giuseppe rossi via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however giuseppe provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to giuseppe rossi at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 13 June 2024 2:39 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Hayden Chooi

comment I just want to make a note that in the prioritisation of parkers section of this draft, Residents are considered high priority in residential areas, whereas Long Term Commuters and Employees are at medium priority. And yet there has been a recent proposal to change the permit zone within College Park to allow the two latter groups to utilise the area for parking freely. ie they're being allowed to have equal priority with residents who formerly had the means of a permit to ensure they were able to park out the front of their own homes. This is a direct contradiction of the chart stating that residents are highest priority in what is declared a residential area. I would hope that those making a plan take this into account and note that most, if not all residents of the area would rather not allowed people to leave their cars on the street all day or night when they aren't the ones paying for the right to live here.

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/8

Best Wishes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Henry Keogh <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 8:46 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as an extremely concerned rate paying resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am alarmed & angered at the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Henry Keogh
 37 Edmund St, Norwood SA 5067, Australia

This email was sent by Henry Keogh via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Henry provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Henry Keogh at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 6 June 2024 5:37 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name howard

comment We need more restrictive parking, there needs to be a limit on residents owning too many cars and if sufficient off street at a residence (eg 5 or more) no off street permits to be issued
If the cars parked for more than 7 days and they have to be moved 4 spaces? Is that 4 full bays including the bay it's in or 4 full bays ??

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/4

Best Wishes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



7 July 2024

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade
Norwood SA 5067

Via email: townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

Comments on On-Street Parking Policy – Draft June 2024

Preamble

I am a resident of Willis Street, Norwood. Our street community has had a long interest in parking matters given the location and small size of our street and the parking demands on it.

Before today, both I and other members of the street have contributed to the larger discussion around this issue. My comments here represent both some of the consensus views on the parking policy and my own personal views (if and where they differ from the group thoughts).

This submission and comments follows the order of the issues outlined in the Draft June 2024 On-Street Parking Policy document.

INTRODUCTION

Context: No issue.

City Plan 2030:

- Shaping Our Future: No issue
- Key Objectives: Agreed
- Principles: Agreed

HOW WILL ON-STREET PARKING BE MANAGED:

- Land Uses and Competing Demands: I would suggest the inclusion of a phrase in the second dot point that makes some reference to residents.... For example “in other areas, controls might be needed to discourage all-day parking, provide parking protocols for residents and promote sustainable transport choices.”
- Parking Precincts & Priority of Use: I note that Willis Street, Norwood, is designated an MUR precinct (mixed use residential).
- Prioritisation of Users’ table: Noted – specifically that Residential parking has the rating of ‘high’ in the MUR precinct prioritisation.
- When is intervention needed: Noted. Pleased to note ‘stakeholder input’ in point 6.
- Occupancy Rates: Noted.
- Introducing or Altering Parking Controls: Noted

PARKING PERMITS:

Residential Permits

Understandably, there are a range of views from residents in our street on this particular topic.

I believe that the highest priority of this Draft Policy is to meet the needs of the broader community in relation to parking.

As resident in an MRU precinct with **High Priority** for Residential Parking (parking for residents and visitors) I agree that there needs to be some regulation of the parking in our street to prioritize residents’ parking in an equitable manner and I make the comments below.

In addition, I believe some small changes to the current proposals would provide a more flexible, more workable and more equitable solution for all.

- I do not believe the proposed Residential Permit Policy gives the Council’s designated “high priority” to all residents and to visitors in our precinct for their parking needs because:-
 - the lower the number of off-street parking spaces available to a residence results in a lower overall number of parking options available to that household. For example, households with **more** than two registered cars and with no off-street parking available to them, currently have no parking options beyond two permits under the current policy. This is a severe restriction for any family of two adults with two cars who have driving age young adults living at home or indeed for a group house with more than two tenants with cars
 - It results in a lack of day-time parking for some household members such as young people living at home, extended families and house sharing groups.
 - It has the potential to impose significant social and financial implications on some households, including the possibility of families needing to leave the area, the inability to continue to rent properties and/or to share households, and
 - Potentially forcing people to drive to work rather than using public transport in order to remove their car from the street because the two delegated permits are in use by other members of the family (eg retired parents, other household members or tenants).

- The clause relating to vehicles NOT remaining stationary in the same position when parked on-street for more than 7 days is particularly difficult for residents with no off-street parking who may go on holiday for over 7 days or who are ill for lengthy period (or indeed unable to drive for a prescribed period of time because of leg or knee injury for instance). Moving the car “four spaces” is difficult if a family is overseas for a month with no access to parking alternatives. I do not support this initiative in the policy.

- Principles of fairness and equity would ensure that all households have access to the same minimal number parking spaces for registered vehicles and therefore I would suggest the following:
 - a minimum of 3 ‘parking spaces’ per household, comprising a combination of off-street and on-street parking, in non-transferable and transferable permits
 - that Council consider up to two non-transferable permits per residence attached to registered vehicles, subject to the availability of off-street parking at that residence, and
 - one transferable parking permit to allow flexibility to households where the number of total of parks available to them does not equate to the number of vehicles registered at that property.

- Whilst I understand and acknowledge the concerns of Council staff that transferable permits could create an increased administrative burden I would urge council to consider that this alternative might achieve a better balance for both the needs of the parking community and Council's administrative capacity.

Visitor Parking Permits

I note that Council has put a hold on a decision about Visitor Parking Permits as part of this consultation process.

I believe it is important for Council to provide residents with one annual Visitor Permit per eligible property that permits all-day parking. We acknowledge there may be some overlap between visitor permits and the flexible permits we mention in the dot points above and we would be happy to discuss ways of integrating these two options.

Temporary Parking Permits

Noted.

Parking for Tradespeople

For major home renovations, a permit for only one trades vehicle is plainly inadequate and totally unrealistic. The simplest observation of a building construction (part or whole) in Norwood will reveal that one trades vehicle adjacent is vanishingly rare. Any builder, quoting on a significant renovation to an old house/cottage (of which there are many in Willis Street that has no off-street parking) would unquestionably see this as a disincentive to taking-on the building job.

I would urge the Council to seriously re-consider this aspect of the Policy.

NARROW STREETS POLICY

Noted: please consider that if the policy is introduced "in accordance with ARR Rules" the amount of available parking for everyone in Willis street would be dramatically reduced.

Members of our street have previously commented on this (in the February 2021 Consultation for on-street parking) stating: "*we recognize that Willis St is within a MUR zone is a narrow street by definition. Whilst the street is narrow, we believe that through ongoing negotiations with Council the needs of all users can continue to be met fairly and equitably, whilst retaining parking on both sides of the street*".

We believe consideration should be given to possible options that don't include closing down one side of the street . We have had such negotiations (with resultant solutions) before today such as closing down one side of the street between 9-12 on rubbish collection days only.

DRIVEWAYS

Noted.

CONSTRUCTION ZONES

Noted

WASTE COLLECTION

Noted

ACCESSIBLE PARKING

Noted.

SMART PARKING TECHNOLOGY:

Noted. One new EV parking station per year for the next 15 years seems exceptionally low for the predicted growth & take-up of EVs in this State.

APPENDIX A: APPLICATION OF PARKING ZONES

NOTED.

Yours sincerely,

Name: Angela May



Name: Ian Dobson



Name: Emily Dobson - May



Tala Aslat

From: Ingrid Winter <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 28 June 2024 8:19 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

The increase in parking pressure on our street has come about since the opening of the 24 hour 7 day a week gym around the corner on Sydenham Road. A more sensible option for our narrow street consisting mainly of historic cottages with no off street parking and with parking on one side of the street only would be to restrict parking to residents only, especially between Sydenham Road and Eastry Street.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Ingrid Winter

This email was sent by Ingrid Winter via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Ingrid provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ingrid Winter at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: James Gray <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 4:01 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillor.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
James Gray

This email was sent by James Gray via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however James provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to James Gray at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Jean Malcolm <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 5:47 PM
To: Victoria McFarlane; Scott Sims; Connie Granozio
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Maylands/Trinity Ward

Cr Victoria McFarlane, Cr Scott Sims and Cr Connie Granozio

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Maylands/Trinity Gardens Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007. This system has worked well and suits my needs.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Jean Malcolm

This email was sent by Jean Malcolm via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jean provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jean Malcolm at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 12 June 2024 9:58 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Jenna

comment As someone who lives on [redacted] t, with no off-street parking options, having on-street residential parking is crucial. Trying to find a park anywhere near our house during school pick-up time is impossible, as school parents are parked in our street for almost an hour around school finish time.
Also, our parents babysit our child multiple days of the week while we work, so having a visitor permit available to them for the whole day is essential.

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record__170/7

Best Wishes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
Social Equity
Economic Prosperity
Cultural Vitality
Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Jeremy Brown
Sent: Wednesday, 31 July 2024 10:09 PM
To: Townhall
Cc: Robert Bria (Elected Members); Hugh Holfeld; Garry Knoblauch; Josh Robinson; duke@electedmembers.npsp.sa.gov.au; Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham; Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott; John Callisto; Christel Mex; Victoria McFarlane; Connie Granozio; Scott Sims; Cressida O'Hanlon; Dunstan EO; James Stevens; Hartley (V Tarzia) Electoral Office; bragg@parliament.sa.gov.au
Subject: Re: Submission - Draft on-street parking policy (June 2024)

Good evening,

Further to my email below, my wife and I initiated the "Fair Permit Parking" campaign on Do Gooder.

We have noted that some residents who sent emails to Council before Council decided to conduct a fresh consultation, did not provide additional submissions through Do Gooder during the formal consultation process. We trust however that Council will still treat those previous emails as relevant submissions, as they are directed to the same topic.

We also wanted to highlight that we encouraged residents to customise the draft submission available on our Do Gooder campaign. While many submissions may look identical at first glance, the majority include customisations with more specific information about the residents' circumstances.

Regards

Jeremy Brown

On 23 Jun 2024, at 9:45 PM, Jeremy Brown

wrote:

Good evening,

Please find attached a submission on the draft on-street parking policy, which Council is currently consulting on.

Regards

Jeremy Brown

<2024 06 23 - On-Street Parking Policy - Submission - Jeremy Brown and Sara Bray.pdf>

Submission – Draft On-Street Parking Policy (June 2024)

23 June 2024

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

175 The Parade, Norwood

South Australia 5067

By email: townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed changes to the On-Street Parking Policy (draft June 2024), and in particular to how visitor parking will be managed in our Council. We are thankful that Council has decided to maintain the status quo while it undertakes consultation.

As explained in this submission, we urge Council to maintain the existing scheme and (if justified) take more targeted action to address the issue of concern instead of taking disproportionate and indirect action without proper evidence or justification.

Current Status

Currently, eligible residents have been able to purchase up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property and can use these flexibly to meet their needs. This scheme has been in place since at least 2007 when a previous policy was adopted by Council.

Council adopted a new Policy in November 2021 which was intended to introduce a new visitor permit scheme. Under that new scheme, residents would be able to purchase booklets of visitor permits 'as needed,' with the possibility of Council limiting the number of permits which could be purchased each year. Each permit would be restricted to four hours of parking.

Consultation on that new Policy was limited and did not involve Council writing to affected residents about the proposed change. We understand that only 4 responses were received by Council on visitor parking, out of 90 responses on the new Policy generally.

Council has not to date implemented that new visitor parking scheme, and instead has continued to issue visitor permits in accordance with its previous policy.

In the 2022-23 financial year — 502 residential permits and 599 visitor permits were issued across 630 households in the Council (source: page 215 of the 2022-23 Council annual report).

Council proposals

Under the draft Policy (June 2024), residents would generally only be entitled to purchase 50 single use visitor permits per year. Once used, residents could request additional permits. However, it would be a matter for Council to decide if additional permits would be issued, and Council has previously suggested that residents would not be able to obtain more than an additional 50 permits on request.

Council however has sought suggestions from residents as to how Council should administer visitor parking permits in a more convenient manner. It has proposed the following, non-exhaustive, options for consideration:

- maintaining the current system (i.e. issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property and no enforcement of any time limits);
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible residential property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing four-hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (as per the current system) and enforcing four-hour time limits during the day, allowing permit holders to park between 7:00pm and 7:00am the next day, without restriction or any time limits.

Council has explained that these options are aimed at providing all permit holders with more access to on-street parking spaces located in time restricted parking areas and Resident Only Parking Zones and to stop visitor permits being used as 'de facto' residential parking permits.

Submission

The chief reason given by Council for the need to change the current system is that some residents are using visitor parking permits as 'de facto' residential parking permits. There is no suggestion that residents are having too many visitors stay and are overusing the visitor permits for such visitors.

The task then for Council is to consider whether, and how, to address the issue of residents using visitor parking permits as 'de facto' residential parking permits.

This requires consideration of:

- the extent of the issue (are only a minority of residents using visitor permits in this way? and how does this affect the availability of parking?);
- the reason some residents are using residential parking permits as 'de facto' residential parking permits; and
- what is the best, most targeted way, of addressing the issue without causing significant inconvenience to the majority of residents who use visitor permits for visitors.

We submit that there is currently insufficient evidence for Council to conclude that the issue in question justifies a major change to the current visitor parking permit scheme (see paragraphs below on this issue from page 5).

We accordingly submit that Council should maintain the existing scheme, where residents are issued up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property which can be used flexibly.

Maintaining the existing scheme would not prevent Council directly targeting the issue in other ways which do not impact the vast majority of residents who use permits for their visitors.

Considerations if Council does change existing scheme

If Council nevertheless believes that some change is required from the current scheme, we submit that Council should **not** adopt a visitor permit booklet scheme, as:

- 50 or 100 single use visitor permits are completely insufficient to meet the needs of many residents who have visitors (see further below about our own situation from page 7);
- residents will be significantly inconvenienced in having to manually fill out information on each visitor permit, especially for visitors who stay for short term multi-day visits;
- this scheme would accordingly be disproportionate to the issue of concern, which could be targeted more directly.

We also submit that if Council decides to impose a time restriction on the use of visitor permits, this should be backed by evidence with consideration to how residents will reasonably need to use permits to accommodate their visitors.

Some of the options in the “Information About The Proposed Changes” document, include imposing a 4-hour time limit on parking. No justification however has been provided for why a 4-hour time limitation is appropriate. While this time limit is part of the current Policy (adopted in 2021), consultation on that Policy was limited noting Council only received 4 submissions on visitor parking. Further, no justification was provided during that consultation period for this time restriction. Council is not bound to use this (or any) time limit on visitor parking and should instead ensure that any time restriction is backed by evidence — which to date has not been provided to residents.

We submit that a 4-hour time limitation on visitor parking is very problematic. While some visitors stay for less than 4 hours, many others stay for a whole day or more. This is the case for trades persons, and friends and family who occasionally visit for short periods of time. It is also the case for house sitters, who would park at a resident’s house while the resident is away (and not themselves taking up a permit space with their own car). We submit that it is not unreasonable for a resident to have visitors stay for these short durations, which exceed 4 hours.

We accordingly also have significant concerns about the option of maintaining the existing scheme but imposing a 4-hour time limit during the day but with no limit overnight. While this proposal is generally superior (and more convenient) than the booklet scheme, it still has the very significant downside in restricting visitors to 4 hours at a time. And in fact, may be more restrictive in terms of time restrictions, as Council had previously suggested that the proposed single use permits could be used “back-to-back” to accommodate a visitor staying for more than 4 hours a time. We therefore urge Council to not adopt this option over maintaining the existing scheme.

We also observe that on our street, it is easy to find a permit parking spot during the day as many residents use their cars during the day. This is the case even now while 7 or so on-street car parks on Fisher Street, Norwood, are currently unavailable during the day due to the construction of houses at 41-43 Fisher Street.

So it is unclear, at least on our street, what the rationale would be for limiting visitor passes to 4 hours at a time during the day. In our case, that would involve imposing a time restriction at a non-peak time for visitation. And while there is typically more pressure on parking during the evening and night, in our experience this is not caused by visitor parking and we have always still managed to find a suitable park.

Options to directly target issue

An option Council could take to directly target the issue of concern is to:

- include in the Policy details of when it is permissible (if at all) for a resident to use a visitor permit for their own vehicle (for example, in cases where a resident’s car is being serviced and they are using a loan vehicle), and
- require residents to show that they have not been misusing the visitor permits for their own cars contrary to policy, in circumstances where Parking Officers reasonably believe that a permit is being used excessively for a vehicle registered to a person living at the resident’s address. A resident could, for example, provide the registration details of the vehicle in question, to show it is not registered to a person living at the address. The Policy could provide that if a resident does not provide such proof, that the visitor permit may be cancelled.

An option such as this would directly target the issue, without affecting the vast majority of residents who are not using visitor permission as 'de facto' residential permits (noting again the lack of evidence as to how widespread this issue is).

While this option would reverse the onus of proof (requiring a resident to prove a suspected vehicle is not registered to a person living at their address), this is not uncommon in a regulatory setting. There is no criminal or civil penalty for failing to provide the proof; just the cancellation of a conditional permit.

This option overall involves less of an infringement of the privacy of residents, than a scheme where residents are required to display to Council and to all who walk by how long particular visitors are staying at their house. It also does not have the same security risks associated with the public display of such information.

Exploring why some residents are using visitor permits for their own cars

Council may also wish to explore the reasons as to why some residents may be using visitor parking permits as de facto residential permits — and target those issues. On this topic:

- we have heard from some residents that they have resorted to this, due to living in a share house with 3 or more people. Those persons had asked Council how to obtain a third residential parking permit, and were told by Council staff that they should just apply for a visitor permit and use that. Does Council have an alternative solution for people living in share houses where each resident reasonably has their own car which needs to be parked at or near their house?
- has council considered if some residents are opting to 'misuse' a visitor permit, as a cheaper alternative to purchasing a second residential permit? While a change in policy may force such residents to purchase a second residential permit, this would not reduce any pressure on parking.

Unintended consequences

Council should also be mindful of unintended consequences of changing the existing scheme, and whether a radical change to the existing scheme will shift any parking issues to other streets or other types of on-street car parks.

We note that on our street, there are a few untimed parking spots. These are free from time to time, but are often used by residents who are eligible for (but have not purchased) a residential parking permit due to financial constraints, or for people in share houses who do not qualify for an additional permit.

If visitor permits are restricted under a booklet scheme, or otherwise time limited, this will place significant additional pressure on any untimed parking spots to the detriment of existing residents and visitors (on the same, or close by streets).

The current and draft Policy recognise that "*analysis of parking needs is best completed on a precinct basis so that parking demands are not moved to the next street following the introduction of change.*" The same principle should be adopted in introducing radical changes to visitor parking, and why it is so critical that Council acts on evidence collected in accordance with Policy as discussed in the following paragraphs. Acting on anecdotal evidence, without a proper evidence and analysis of the need for change, will likely result in a bad outcome for all.

Need to collect evidence in accordance with current Policy

It appears that the only evidence available to Council of the issue in question is purely anecdotal. In a Report contained in the Minutes of a Council Meeting on 2 April 2024, it is stated that "[o]bservations

and experiences from Council staff indicates that whilst many residents use these Permits as intended, there are some who are using these Permits to accommodate all-day-parking, rather than just to accommodate visitors to the household.” (page 13 of Minutes).

This anecdotal evidence suggests that the vast majority of residents do not use visitor parking permits as ‘de facto’ residential parking permits.

The current, and draft Policy, both state that:

“The Council will manage on-street parking based on evidence that demonstrates a need for parking controls. This evidence-based approach provides a framework for consistent and transparent decision-making to promote the efficient, fair and equitable use of available on-street parking.”

The Policy then sets out details of investigation steps the Council will generally take to inform its evidence-based decision making on parking controls, including undertaking parking surveys during daytime on a weekday or weekend. The draft Policy also states that the investigation steps will not necessarily be required for minor changes.

The proposed changes to visitor parking (as contained in the draft Policy) are not minor. They are a radical change compared with the current scheme, and are also a major change compared with the policy adopted in November 2021 given the general limit of 50 permits is not specified in the current policy.

As such, we submit that Council should follow the investigation steps outlined in the Policy in order to collect relevant evidence as to how visitor parking should be managed.

That evidence may include ascertaining approximately how many of the 599 odd visitor permits are being used for genuine visitors, the time of days they are being used, and overall how much pressure visitor parking puts on parking availability. Given the relatively small number of visitor permits, and small number of streets they are used on, it should not be an onerous undertaking for Council to obtain this type of evidence and other types of information envisaged by the current and draft Policy.

This evidence will assist Council to determine the extent to which the current visitor parking scheme is putting undue pressure on available parking at different times of the day, and whether there is a significant issue with residents using visitor Parking permits as ‘de facto’ residential parking permits.

The evidence may also help Council decide whether all streets which use visitor permits should be treated in the same way. It may be that different approaches are required for different streets or precincts.

Currently, no objective evidence has been provided which demonstrates that the current visitor parking scheme is not fit for purpose.

Our situation

To provide context, we are providing information about our personal living arrangements and why 50 or 100 passes will be insufficient for our household.

We are a married couple with one child (kindy age), and one new-born.

We have chosen to have only one car. Jeremy rides a bike most days to work and for child drop off. We do not have any off-street parking, and we are not seeking to use visitor passes as a 'de facto' residential permit.

Our estimated visitor pass usage for 52 Fisher Street, Norwood, SA 5067 for Financial Year 2024/2025 is:

Visitor type	Frequency	Yearly allocation of passes (assuming 4 hour limit)
Service provider	Weekly (2 hours)	52 passes
Jeremy's mother visit (from Melbourne)	Once a year for 8 days	48 passes (i.e. 6 required for a 24 hour visit, multiplied by 8 days)
Sara's Parents (from Goolwa) for childcare	Once a fortnight for 24 hours	156 passes (i.e. 6 required for a 24 hour visit, multiplied by 26 weeks)
Sara sibling visit (from Regional SA)	Once a month for 24 hours	72 passes (i.e. 6 required for a 24 hour visit, multiplied by 12 months).
Ad-hoc trades work	2 x 8hr days per year	4 passes
Trade quotes	4 x 15min visits per year	4 passes
Total passes		336 passes

Some discount could be made should a visitor move their car from time to time during the day, but this would not have a significant change to the number of passes required.

The above calculation also does not include the additional visits we are currently having due to having a new born, which include:

- at least 6 visits by midwives (which would require an **additional 12 passes**);
- Sara's parents staying for at least a week to look after our kindy age child (while we are in hospital), and to provide some support during first number of days since returning from hospital (an **additional 42 passes**)
- some additional health care professional visits; and
- some additional short term visits from other friends and family.

Conclusion

We again thank the Council for undertaking public consultation on the on-street car parking policy in response to the significant concerns raised by residents about the booklet scheme.

We are thankful that Council has recognised that the booklet scheme (as contained in the draft Policy) will not be convenient for residents, and will give serious consideration to alternatives including maintaining the existing scheme.

We again urge Council to maintain the existing scheme which allows residents to purchase up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property, and to use these flexibly to meet their visitation needs. And to instead (if justified) take more targeted action to address the issue of concern instead of taking disproportionate and indirect action without proper evidence or justification.

Jeremy Brown and Sara Bray

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 21 June 2024 1:23 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Jessica Flynn

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft On-street Parking Policy. I refer to the Council's proposed aim to provide up to 16 EV charging stations in the City over the next fifteen years, subject to demand.

comment Whilst I am uncertain of the proposed scope of this aim (if it excludes private companies establishing on-street EV charging stations, and am unable to contextualise with the Council's off-street EV charging plans), I would urge the Council to be more ambitious with it's public EV charging infrastructure. As an early adopter of this technology, anecdotally, I have seen the increasing use of public charging infrastructure in the area, which I rely on. I live in a block of units, and am therefore unable to have my own home charging infrastructure. Over the coming years, there will be more and more people relying on limited local chargers. I recommend that Council increase it's ambitions, and offer a range of destination and fast-charging options. Destination chargers should not be located in short-term parking as it undermines the usability of the charger (a 7kw destination charger will take several hours to charge an EV, therefore should not be located in a one-hour parking zone for example). This would be particularly helpful for those people who have to park and work in the area.

There have been many studies to demonstrate the economic benefits of placing public EV charging infrastructure in commercial areas - people charging their cars will attend local cafes, businesses and other amenities. It adds to the vibrancy of the area. Unfortunately 'ICEing' is an issue, and I welcome the state government's introduction of fines for this inconvenient and damaging practice. I acknowledge that Council will be responsible for enforcement as part of its regular parking inspections to monitor the proper use of on-street EV charging.

Thanks for your fantastic work.

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/13

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Jessica Gannon <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 29 June 2024 8:21 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

I work full-time and my mother provides carer support for my children. This system would limit her ability to park outside our house during business hours. Please do not change the parking permit system.

Yours sincerely,
 Jessica Gannon

This email was sent by Jessica Gannon via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jessica provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jessica Gannon at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Jewels Smith <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 12 July 2024 10:32 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. I use a wheelchair and rely on visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Jewels Smith

This email was sent by Jewels Smith via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jewels provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jewels Smith at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Jim Parsonage
Sent: Friday, 14 June 2024 2:17 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: On-Street Parking Policy

I have read your Draft of June 2024 and find it extremely interesting. I would make one overriding comment and that is that Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters appear to be well looked after whilst poor old Marryatville is not mentioned. We who live on the Southern side of Kensington Road are again left in the cold. Having made my point I shall continue.

I congratulate the people who were and are involved in the preparation and possible implementation of the Draft. Well thought out and easy to read. I fear that implementing all or even some of the recommendations in the Draft may not be so easy.

I only speak as a resident of Hackett Terrace and make the following comments:

Time limit parking at the southern end of the Terrace combined with Parking Permits would solve most of my parking problems and anything which would help the holders of Disability permits would be appreciated and if the lowering of the speed limit on the Terrace could be achieved it might help to save any of our elderly residents from being mown down by Mothers and others dropping or picking up children.

The shape and size of the majority of vehicles which both use and park on the Terrace has to be seen to be believed. I would hazard a guess that the width restrictions regarding parking on both sides of the road are being broken.

May one ask as to when any of the Draft Proposals might be implemented?

Jim Parsonage

Tala Aslat

From: Joanne McNamara
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 4:55 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: consultation : on street parking policy

Hi I wanted to second the feedback my partner sent in today (B Mountford, and offer to send you a statement he sent to council signed by 18 neighbours, during the last process / on street parking consultation. They all voiced the same concerns that Ben raised in his email to you today about our street being classified as commercial. Given this has not changed at all since the last "consultation" (the category used for Henry St; and the unfairness of the fact that our street is not given same consideration as similar streets in the area in this respect) plus, given that not many people will have had time to respond today (many are unaware of this consultation process), I feel you should be interested in the previous letter. I am happy to send it to you again.

We heard nothing back the last time we contacted the council with our feedback so I hope you will be in touch this time and am considering legal advice at this stage.

Kind regards & without prejudice

Joanne McNamara;

From: John and Adele Frayne <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 11:43 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

Address: 97a Edward St, Norwood

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

It is difficult enough under the current system, to reside in the small town houses in Norwood, and to have visitors or trades do any property maintenance, without the risk of parking fines.

Timed parking permits only put further stress on the residents of Norwood, who often require trades to be parked there all day, when having work done on their property.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

This is clearly a revenue raising exercise for council, and in no way helps the residents of Norwood, so just please leave things the way they are and stop trying to create more problems for the residents of Norwood.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
John and Adele Frayne

This email was sent by John and Adele Frayne via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email

to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however John and Adele provided an email address (maxtfra@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to John and Adele Frayne at .

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 11:54 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name John Connell

I have lived at [redacted] since 1964, when I married my late wife who had lived next door at 48 Torrens St College Park. Her aunt, Mrs. E Ryan had lived at [redacted] since 1930s although she was born at the turn of last century at 48 Torrens St to Jack & Mary FIGG, Jack being one of the original sand carters in the River Torrens area.

comment

I have therefore seen huge changes in the use and population in the area, particularly the advent of the linear park. The latter has been of mixed blessings. Now in my 84th year, I find myself in a home with a street view of a car park. Some all day parkers, who bike ride or walk to the city for work, Some have been known to leave their vehicles overnight in the street, risking theft or vandalism. Other parkers are users of the linear park, who park anywhere from an hour or more or up to over half the day, perhaps depending whether they enter the park on foot or bicycle, Another group are those seeking parking whilst using the FIX Coffee shop on the corner of Richmond and Torrens Street. Then there are those people who park in the street whilst waiting for accommodation in the nearby [Richmond St] caravan park; they often drive large motorhomes or have caravans in tow. The resulting competition for space outside my home means that I or my friends/family are unable to park outside my home or sometimes even close by! As I age and are less independent, services [cleaning, food deliveries] are unable to park outside my home. I am exasperated with all this, beyond belief! Can the Council please do something about this in a timely manner? I fear I will have left the area on way or another before something is done to improve the free for all that has developed, unchecked!

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/17

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: John Henderson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 9:41 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a home owner of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system) but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

* My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict residents' ability to have visitors, particularly family/friends from the country or interstate who may want to stay for a few days. In addition, it will restrict residents' access to convenient parking for tradespeople who may be undertaking maintenance work on their property. Norwood is an area with a high percentage of homes dating from the 1880s that require regular maintenance. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 John Henderson

This email was sent by John Henderson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however John provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to John Henderson at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: John Walters <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 11:04 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Dear Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott,

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens, and the Fair Permit Parking team,

I am writing to express my concerns as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward regarding the proposed visitor parking permit system outlined on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This letter serves as my submission to the ongoing public consultation on the draft policy.

The Council intends to discontinue the current practice of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, starting July 1, 2025, households will be able to purchase 50 single-use visitor permits annually (each valid for 4 hours). There is a possibility of acquiring an additional 50 permits, subject to Council discretion. Unfortunately, this proposed policy does not align with the needs of my household.

I understand that the Council is also considering several alternative options in this consultation:

- Maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- Continuing the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one per eligible property;
- Introducing visitor permit booklets with an annual cap of 50 or 100 permits (or no cap), each enforceable with a 4-hour time limit per permit;
- Issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property, akin to the current system, but enforcing a 4-hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm) while no time restrictions would apply at night (7pm to 7am).

I strongly advocate for maintaining the current system, which has been effective since at least 2007. The alternatives under consideration would severely restrict my ability to accommodate visitors. Based on personal experience, I do not believe that visitor permits are causing undue parking pressure on my street, nor do I see justification for altering the current system.

Furthermore, I am concerned that the Council's proposed changes lack sufficient empirical basis, contrary to its own policy requirements. No substantial evidence has been presented to justify such significant revisions to the existing visitor parking system, which is troubling.

Thank you for allowing residents to participate in this public consultation. I anticipate your prompt response.

Yours sincerely,

John Walters

This email was sent by John Walters via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however John provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to John Walters at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Jon Keatley <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 30 June 2024 6:39 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

The new plans will impact our household directly in a negative capacity and will not allow us to park the required number of vehicles at our place of residence. In the 2 years I have resided at this address I have never had an issue getting a park within a reasonable distance of our home.

I do not support this change.

Yours sincerely,
Jon Keatley

This email was sent by Jon Keatley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jon provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jon Keatley at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

8 July 2024

Mr Jonathon Main & Ms Abigail Leeuwenburg

Via email: townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

Comments on On-Street Parking Policy – Draft June 2024

Preamble

We have owned and resided at

Our property falls within the Mixed Use Residential (MUR) precinct of the draft Policy and corresponding High priority for residential parking and visitors. Our 4-bedroom property is occupied by us and currently two of our three children.

The majority of residents in our street are owner-occupiers, have been residents for many years and currently include those raising new, or with established families.

It is important to note that in Willis Street there are, and continues to be, sufficient on-street parking spaces available for residents, businesses and visitors (including trades persons).

- in over 24 years of living here we have never experienced conflicting requirements and demands for parking spaces at peak periods or at other times.
- vehicular access and parking in relation to residential and business activity (via rear access to businesses on The Parade) has been and continues to be **not a problem**. This includes a period over many years of sustained heavy rear access to the then Child and Family Health Service when it was located on The Parade. This is currently the case with those of us with driving-aged children living at home who now have their own vehicles.
- This includes managing the requirements of rental properties and currently our family and one other family in the street with more than two vehicles per property.

Our submission comments will be confined to those sections in the Draft June 2024 On-Street Parking Policy document that we believe need changed.

HOW WILL ON-STREET PARKING BE MANAGED:

Re: Land Uses and Competing Demands (p4): the second dot point does not reflect the High priority of residential parking use in MUR precincts and needs to be amended with the italicised text included as follows:

“in other areas, controls might be needed to discourage all-day *non-residential* parking and encourage alternative and sustainable transport choices.”

PARKING PERMITS:**Residential Permits (pp 11-12)**

As noted in our preamble there continues to be sufficient on-street parking spaces available for residents, businesses and visitors. However, we understand that in the future consideration may need to be given to some regulation of the parking in our street should there be demonstrated competing demands between drivers and stakeholders.

Should this occur, we believe some small changes to the current proposals to introduce Residential Parking Permits would provide a more flexible, workable and equitable solution for all. We also believe these changes will reduce the administrative burden and costs associated with many of the proposed elements of the draft Policy.

We do not believe the proposed draft Policy in relation to Residential Permits reflects the Council’s designated High Priority to residents and visitors in our precinct for their parking needs because:-

- the lower the number of off-street parking spaces available to a residence results in a lower overall number of parking options available to that household.
 - for example, households with **more** than two registered cars and with no off-street parking available to them, currently have no parking options beyond two permits under the current policy.
 - there is a severe restriction for any family of two adults with two cars who have driving age young adults living at home or indeed for a group house with more than two tenants with cars
 - it results in a lack of day-time parking for some household members such as young people living at home, extended families and house sharing groups.
 - it has the potential to impose significant social and financial implications on some households, including the possibility of families needing to leave the area, the inability to continue to rent properties and/or to share households, and
 - it potentially encourages people to drive to work rather than using public transport in order to remove their car from the street because the two delegated permits are in use by other members of the family (e.g. retired parents, other household members or tenants).
 - these are important elements to take into account especially in the current cost of living challenges being experienced across the community and especially in the rental and share accommodation environment.

- The exclusion of specific forms of vehicle is unreasonable and without basis and in particular small vehicles such as trailers, motor cycles and scooters. All vehicles that are currently registered and roadworthy have a legal right to be parked in the street.
 - Should Council believe there maybe an argument for certain vehicles to be excluded this should be articulated with respect to particular characteristics e.g. size and managed in keeping with Council’s principle of consultation with affected residents.
- The clause relating to vehicles NOT remaining stationary in the same position when parked on-street for more than 7 days is simply not feasible for residents with no or insufficient off-street parking and should be removed from the draft Policy.
 - those away from home for over 7 days for example, on holiday or ill/hospitalised for lengthy period or otherwise unable to drive for a prescribed period of time because of injury or use of medication for instance.
 - equally, moving the car “four spaces” is not possible, feasible or necessary in this context and should be removed from the draft policy.

Principles of fairness and equity would ensure that all households have access to parking spaces for registered vehicles based on the size of the residence in terms of number of bedrooms. This would ensure an equitable mixed-use response for residents and tenants regardless of whether they are individuals or families. Such a model would include:

- a combination of off-street and on-street parking that reflects residence size (i.e. number of bedrooms)
- provision of non-transferable permits per residence attached to registered vehicles, subject to the number of bedrooms and availability of off-street parking at that residence, and
- one additional transferable parking permit subject to the extenuating circumstances provision in the current draft Policy.

Visitor Permits (p 13)

Again we note Council’s intention for these permits will only apply when “there is demonstrated competing demand between parking users...” and also note there is currently no such competing demand in Willis Street nor has there been in the past 24 years of our residency here.

We believe it is important for Council to provide residents with one annual Visitor Permit per eligible property that permits all-day parking and acknowledge there may be some overlap between visitor permits and the flexible permits referred to in the dot points above.

Parking for Tradespeople (p13)

This provision is unacceptable for a number of reasons:

1. in the first instance, to institute such a provision is administratively burdensome for Council and expensive for the City and the rate payer.
2. it is also unnecessary and abrogates rate-payers responsibility to negotiate with neighbours the impact of any planned renovations or tradespersons access to work on their property.
3. in any home maintenance or renovations (either minor or major), a permit for only one trades vehicle is plainly inadequate and totally unrealistic.

- a. For example, in the last year we had solar panels installed and then some months later had a household battery installed on our premises. On both occasions this necessitated 2 trades vehicles for a full day and half day respectively and the total value of the work was approximately half the value of the development value suggested in the draft Policy.
4. major renovations will often involve multiple tradespersons on site at different points of the scheduled work. To impose a limit of one tradesperson's vehicles at a site is ridiculous.
5. a significant likely ramification of this clause is that any builder, tradesperson or maintenance worker quoting or providing any development necessitating trades vehicle support exceeding this ridiculous criterion would unquestionably see this as a disincentive to undertaking such work and inflate the costs of such jobs.
 - a. the administration required by Council to manage this and consequent and expense to ratepayer is totally unnecessary.

Again, in the context of Willis Street, a number of properties have embarked on major and minor renovations and maintenance work over the years of our residency and these have not negatively impacted sufficient on-street parking.

This clause would only serve to add an unnecessarily onerous burden and administrative costs to Council and thereby ratepayers and should be removed from the draft Policy.

NARROW STREETS POLICY (p14)

It is important to note that the 6.8 metre width of Willis Street has not prohibited access of large trucks including emergency vehicles in the time we have been a resident here. This has been the case notwithstanding the Australian Road Rules (ARRs) although we also note it is unclear what specific ARRs Council's draft Policy is referring to or how they inform Council's approach to managing parking.

Notwithstanding the stated "requirements" in the draft Policy relating to road widths and suggested margins between parked cars and for vehicle access, the 6.8 metre width of Willis Street to this day does not prevent large trucks or emergency vehicles accessing the Street. Indeed this once included the weekly rubbish collection (prior to the introduction of parking restrictions on bin collection days many years ago) and still on occasions includes rubbish trucks negotiating parked cars on both sides of the road depending on the driver's confidence.

Unnecessarily strict interpretation of the ARRs and adherence to treatments proposed in the draft Policy would result in over half of the current available car parking spaces being removed. This would be as untenable as it is unnecessary and consideration should be given to ensuring parking continues to be permitted on both sides of Willis Street.


It is acknowledged the draft Policy ensures Council will adopt a staged approach in managing parking controls in narrow streets commencing with education and reinforcing existing controls. What the draft Policy omits and should include is a "third stage" strategy of negotiating with local affected residents if these initial approaches are unsuccessful. Only if such consultation with local affected residents is unsuccessful should a fourth stage strategy of "...new or altered parking controls.." be implemented.

SMART PARKING TECHNOLOGY (p19):

The Council commitment to installation of EV charging stations is an important move to embracing renewable technology across the City.

However the provision for “..up to..” (my emphasis) 16 EV charging stations in the City over the next fifteen (15) years is inadequate and should be substantially revised.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Main', written over a faint, light blue circular stamp.

Jonathon Main and Abigail Leeuwenburg

Tala Aslat

From: Josephine Peoples <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 12:36 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one per household.

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). I am in favour of maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one per household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Josephine Peoples

This email was sent by Josephine Peoples via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Josephine provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Josephine Peoples at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Juanita Ielasi <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 8:53 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Hackney. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I am particularly concerned about the impact on our elderly residents near by who are socially isolated and will be terribly disadvantaged by this change.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Juanita Ielasi

This email was sent by Juanita Ielasi via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Juanita provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Juanita Ielasi at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 2:52 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Julieann Telford

I reside in _____ (an MUR precinct) and have read the Draft June 2024 On-Street Parking Policy document.

As mentioned in the document, parking for residents and visitors is to be given high priority. I would therefore respectfully suggest that further consideration be given to the following points before the draft policy is finalised.

comment

The proposal for a maximum of two parking permits for households with no off-street parking seems unfairly restrictive, particularly for families and those who live in share houses.

The maximum of 7 days in any one parking space is likely to cause problems for residents who are away from home for extended periods of time for any reason, eg periods away working or on holidays.

The maximum limit of one parking permit for tradespeople working on a major home renovation project doesn't appear to be very workable.

Consultation appears to be the best solution in dealing with narrow streets, rather than restricting parking to one side of the street only.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/36

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Karin Hatch
Sent: Monday, 27 May 2024 4:22 PM
To: ABP Consultation; Townhall
Subject: commentary on draft on-street parking
Attachments: parking policy webpage fail.jpg

Hello Council,

I was unable to submit my feedback regarding the On-street Parking Policy online so I'm copying it here via email. Small point; the email address on the consultation page is 'townhall' but when I copied and pasted it the address came out as ABPConsultation. Also, if it helps, I have included a screenshot of my online submission fail.

Full Name: Karin Hatch

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the on-street parking policy. It is a wicked problem for many councils. My name is Karin Hatch and we reside on Austral Place, Norwood. We currently have one residential parking permit and one visitor permit.

My only general comment is that there is very often considerable short-term parking available for 'shoppers' and other business visitors in off-street pay carparks. These include at least the topmost level of the Webbe Street Carpark and the Hoyts 'Norwood Place' Carpark. This point is important in that the two carparks sit within the area bounded by Osmond Terrace and Queen Street, which includes your high impact CAD and CAD-F designated areas. The cheapest and most effective action the Council could undertake to ease the parking crunch is to educate and encourage those above cohorts to utilise those spaces. I concede that the free parking in the Webbe Street Carpark, and that of the Norwood Mall carpark generally have high occupancy rates.

I have some specific comments that are most easily cross-referenced by referring to your downloadable pdf "Information about the Proposed Changes", and the subheadings within.

Visitor Permits: These permits are certainly abused, according to my observations over the past 16 years. The only way to eliminate visitor permits being used as a de facto residential parking permit is to enforce time limits. Whether by booklets or the regular permit system is a 2nd order topic; one would hope the Council will choose whatever is more sensible financially. But we cannot support residents having to pay for these permits. We should not be penalised for happening to live in a vibrant social and cultural environment like the Parade.

Residential Parking Permits – Multidwelling developments: While this proposed change will make parking on Harris Street (our permit street) nearly impossible, I recognise the difficulties for residents from pre-2021 developments. Additionally, pre-2021 developments are often occupied by older/lower SES residents who often may need easy access to transport, and easy access for visitors, especially carers. We support this proposal.


Residential Parking Permits – Other eligibility Criteria: These make sense. In particular, if dot point 3 were enforced, then residents of the Harris Street development would usually not be able to obtain residential permits, as their second car park spaces have been converted to alternative use by the property owner.

Residential Parking Permits – Time Limit for Vehicles: We do not support a requirement for moving a vehicle after any number of days. If a resident can successfully navigate transport options that do not include using a personal vehicle for say 7 days, they should be applauded not penalised for this.

Narrow Streets: We support strong action on this point. We are occasionally trapped at our residence due to vehicles blocking access through our street. There is no way to address this problem except by wasting police time by calling

them out to investigate, then to try and track down the owner. The danger of this problem with regard to police, ambulance and fire services' ability to reach us if necessary should not even need to be mentioned here.

Good luck with all this,
Karin Hatch



**Our
Community**

**Our
Environment**

**Business
& Economy**

**Our
Services**

**Planning &
Development**

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

Validation errors submitting form

Name

Karin Hatch

- Incorrect value provided

Please provide your comments below or email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au *

testing

Would you like to receive the Latest News from us direct to your email? *

Tala Aslat

From: Kate Eatts
Sent: Thursday, 30 May 2024 8:14 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: On street parking policy comments

Hello

I have tried to submit these comments using your on-line form but I kept getting a "validation error". Not sure why, so I'm emailing directly instead.

NAME Kate Eatts
SUBURB Kent Town

I am a resident of Kent Town and I have no off-street parking. I currently have a Residential Parking permit and one Visitors Parking permit.

I am supportive of the draft on-street parking policy particularly the recognition that northern Kent Town (MUHD) requires a different approach to southern Kent Town (MUR).

In northern Kent Town the mix of residential, apartment complexes with limited visitor parking, the many cafes and other mixed businesses especially in King William and Rundle St and Bunnings and the Kent Town Hotel all contribute to a consistently heavy use of on-street parking. Streets with no time restrictions (College Rd from Grenfell St to Little Dew St and Parade West from the PAC hockey fields to Capper St) are always fully utilised by 7:00am on weekdays, with all day parkers, many of whom work in businesses in Kent Town. There are a number of large employers who do not provide any parking for their employees (I particularly notice Bunnings and Small Animal Specialist Hospital staff) which means staff have no choice, if they miss out on an unrestricted space, but to park in 2 or 3 hour spaces and move their car throughout the day. In the last 6 months I've noticed a much more conspicuous and frequent patrolling of the streets in this part of Kent Town by the Council parking inspectors, which is very good to see. I believe the change to Visitor Permits is a positive move to ensure residents are not abusing the system.

I also strongly support the change that residential permits won't be issued to residents or owners of apartments which have off-street car parking facilities, and which were completed for occupation after 1 November 2021. It is not the Council's responsibility to provide parking if developers have not made provision within their designs.

Parking will always be a fraught issue in densely populated inner city suburbs like Kent Town and I think the Council is doing its best to manage a difficult problem. If Adelaide had better cross suburb public transport and more public transport options and routes the need for cars would not be so great.

Tala Aslat

From: Kate Hawtin <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 8:33 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

I wish to highlight that people with disability in particular will be disadvantaged, as often support workers are required to visit daily and park their cars. This proposed policy does not take into consideration at all, the visiting drivers providing critical services to people with disability as well as services providing in home aged care.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Kate Hawtin

This email was sent by Kate Hawtin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kate provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kate Hawtin at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Kate Taylor <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 5:38 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am EXTREMELY concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council MAINTAINS the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are just revenue raisers and extremely unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Kate Taylor

This email was sent by Kate Taylor via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kate provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kate Taylor at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 1:24 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Kathryn CRONIN

Hi, as a long term rate payer, I want to see Council maintain the current Visitor Parking (VP) system ie keep the Status quo.

comment I have frequent visitors to my cottage from the country for Health appointments, Sporting and Social occasions. My street has a 2 hour time limit 0700 - 1900, respective visitor stays are generally for some days and the current VP system works very well. I have discussed with my nearby neighbours and my visitors have not impacted on their parking needs.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/33

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Katie Fotheringham <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 6:45 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted. My elderly parents come to visit and the current system is what works.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Katie Fotheringham

This email was sent by Katie Fotheringham via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Katie provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Katie Fotheringham at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Saturday, 29 June 2024 7:16 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Kevin Husler

comment We are of the view that Council has failed to follow its own policy and provide evidence to residents and Councillors to justify a radical change to the visitor permit parking system. As such, we submit the current visitor permit parking scheme should be maintained without change.
 This appears to me as a money grab which will cause a major inconvenience to residents

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record__170/16

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 4:01 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Kevin Shepherdson of

1. Compliance.

Is not effectively being achieved at present so this new system will be no better than the current. Do not see compliance officers on a regular basis in my area and as you know there is a resident that is flouting the current on street parking regulations. You will need to employ at least 6 more compliance officers.

comment

2. Permits

This looks like a revenue raising affair.

I believe that if you qualify for a visitor parking permit and you "loose" one that you should sign a Statutory Declaration to that fact before you get issued with a replacement.

Audits should be made to ensure that the resident is not getting more than their allocation.

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission

https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/41

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Kevin Taylor <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 5:35 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for listening to the residents participating in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Kevin Taylor

This email was sent by Kevin Taylor via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kevin provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kevin Taylor at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Kira McMahon <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 2:47 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors.

This also strongly impacts my ability to park my own car near my house. I live in a share house which was very difficult to find during this rental crisis, which unfortunately only has one drive way, with 4 occupants who need a car to travel work work etc. with the proposed changes to parking permits, we risk parking fines or walking long distances to park our car on an untimed street. Not only is this inconvenient, but dangerous as a young woman. I often leave for work or return from work in the dark and would not feel safe walking the streets to return home with heavy work bags alone in the dark. Parking on an untimed street is also unfair to the residents living there as their parking space is taken.

Not only does it affect our ability as residents to park but our visitors too. This means our partners and friends can no longer park close to our home, making us more likely to visit their homes instead, spending money going out in their suburbs rather than Norwood.

From my own experience after living in Norwood now for several years, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors. I believe the council is just trying to free up parking room for people to shop along the Parade, without caring for or valuing their residents.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Kira McMahon

This email was sent by Kira McMahon via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kira provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kira McMahon at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Lachlan Fotheringham <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 6:53 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted. The current system works well as my in-laws who are quite elderly have an effective way to park.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Lachlan Fotheringham

This email was sent by Lachlan Fotheringham via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Lachlan provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lachlan Fotheringham at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Saturday, 6 July 2024 3:29 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Lachlan McMichael

I support the introduction of new visitor permits that are restricted to 4 hours visitation. The prior permits system allows residents to use permits for their own vehicles rather than visitors and takes up additional street parking for genuine visitors to the area.

comment

There are a large number of vehicles in my area that are essentially abandoned by their owner who lives in the area and take up valuable parking for visitors. This new scheme will not allow these residents to essentially use council streets as an extended car park for their additional vehicles.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/28

Best Wishes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Lance Martindale <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 2:28 PM
To: Victoria McFarlane; Scott Sims; Connie Granozio
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Maylands/Trinity Ward

I propose to keep the status quo to maintain the current system of 2 residential permits and 2 visitor permits

Yours sincerely,
Lance Martindale

This email was sent by Lance Martindale via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Lance provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lance Martindale at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 7:28 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Laura

I DO NOT support the proposal for:

-maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible residential property;

- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing four hour time limits for each permit or;

- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (as per the current system)

comment and enforcing four hour time limits during the day, allowing permit holders to park between 7:00pm and 7:00am the next day, without restriction or any time limits.

I DO SUPPORT MAINTAINING THE CURRENT SYSTEM.

There is no evidence that suggests we need a change.

I DO SUPPORT the proposal for a new policy in relation to Multi-Dwelling Developments

I DO NOT SUPPORT the proposal for time limits on Residential Parking Permits. What a waste of time for parking inspectors!

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/20

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Lina Boendergaard <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 11 July 2024 10:13 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

We do need tradies sometimes and they need to park outside our property much longer than for 4 hours. During a house renovation you also have several tradies with their cars, so you might need more than one visitor's permit.

We also have visitors, from interstate or/and overseas, that stays sometimes for days.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict our ability to have visitors. From our own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Lina Boendergaard

This email was sent by Lina Boendergaard via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Lina provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lina Boendergaard at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Lisa Cooksley <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 27 June 2024 9:49 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

My major complaint is people parking all day out the front and around our street to cycle/walk into the city etc leaving no parks for us or our visitors to use, most streets in the surrounds and close to the city should be considered to be timed parking.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Lisa Cooksley

This email was sent by Lisa Cooksley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Lisa provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lisa Cooksley at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Lottie Servin >
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 2:29 PM
To: Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Grant Piggott;
 fairpermitparkingteam@gmail.com; Christel Mex; bragg@parliament.sa.gov.au; John Callisto
Subject: On-street parking consultation

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007. The other options are not practical - specifically the 4hour time limit. If this is actioned I will not buy a booklet or permit at all rather then tell my guests they have to move their car after 4 hours.

Our house is the only one on our street (Charlotte Place) which does not have off-street parking. Could you share the requirements households have to meet to gain approval for permit parking? Is it only for houses without off-street parking? There are a number of houses in the surrounding streets that have driveways that do not seem to be in use so I would hope they are not being given a permit for their own convenience. If there is not already a process in place I would be supportive of houses with off-street parking not being approved for visitor permits.

From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted. Where we do see pressure is the man on 13 Fisher street who has 10+ cars he is able to park down the street taking up all the free parking, including several he parks in Charlotte Place. The current ute across the street

has been in the same spot for months and he's even put a note on the dashboard asking people to stop reporting it as abandoned (although it's as good as). When he does move his cars he rotates them so there are always his vehicles on our street. Why do my guests have to only spend 4 (paid) hours when his shitboxes have been on the streets for free for weeks?

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,
Lottie Servin

Tala Aslat

From: Luciano Dello-lacovo <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 6:15 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007. Alternatively, the option to maintain the current system but reduce the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property, could also work for my residence.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Luciano Dello-lacovo

This email was sent by Luciano Dello-lacovo via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Luciano provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Luciano Dello-lacovo at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Madeleine Ambrosini <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2024 1:47 PM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will absolutely not work for my household, as the current restriction on residential permits forces me to use a visitor permit as a substitute so I can park at my house.

As such, the proposed system of limiting visitor permits to four hours and only providing 50 permits will not work for any of the members of my residential address.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to park at my house and have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence of an issue with the current system has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Madeleine Ambrosini

This email was sent by Madeleine Ambrosini via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Madeleine provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Madeleine Ambrosini at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Saturday, 15 June 2024 5:00 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Madeleine Baillie

comment

Permit only parking for Gray Street Norwood is required and must be prioritised. The on-Street Parking Policy (the Policy), states that for Mixed Use Residential areas, residential parking is to be given high priority. Gray Street is in a Mixed Use Residential area. Due to the Derrimut Gym located on Sydenham Rd which has 6000+ members, residents are not able to park adjacent to their homes due to gym members taking up resident parking in the street.

A proposal to address this concern "in the next financial year" has been communicated to residents for the past 4 years. There is also no indication in the draft parking policy that residents will be able to access parking as a priority. This is unacceptable given Gray Street residents effectively are locked out of their homes for that time and not able to enjoy the amenity of their properties. This has dragged on for years already and the indications are that it will continue for another year with no action taken. Council is in breach of its own policy and in dereliction of its duty to residents in not acting for an unreasonably long period of time.

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission

https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/11

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Margaret Dodd <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 2:29 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007. Hackney's proximity to the city and Botanic Gardens makes it a popular parking place. Several homes in Osborne Street have no off street parking, and no options in nearby streets, being bounded by St Peters College, North Terrace and Hackney Road.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Margaret Dodd
 19 Osborne St, Hackney SA 5069, Australia

This email was sent by Margaret Dodd via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Margaret provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Margaret Dodd at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 10:33 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Mark Nesti

As a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward I am extremely concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system (page 13) of the draft on-street parking policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4hrs per permit). This policy will not work for my household.

comment I strongly recommend Council keeps the status quo and maintains the current system which has been in place since 2007.

Other options are unworkable. From experience, visitor permits are not placing undue pressure with parking on my street, and I do not believe any change to the current system is warranted.

I am very concerned Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/31

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Mark Nesti <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 9:54 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

As a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system of the draft on-street parking policy (page 13).

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4hrs per permit). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4hr time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system) but enforcing a 4hr time limit during the day (7am-7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm-7am)

I strongly recommend Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

From experience, visitor permits are not placing undue pressure with parking on my street, and I do not believe any change to the current system is warranted. Other options are unworkable.

I am very concerned Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Regards
Mark Nesti

This email was sent by Mark Nesti via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Mark provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mark Nesti at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Markus Gully <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 29 June 2024 7:18 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

Furthermore there is 2 hour parking on my street already and still my visitors can't find a park as the parking inspector only patrols on a predicable Friday!

I have previously requested Permit parking-denied- and a handicapped parking zone...apparently under review for a number of weeks now!

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Markus Gully

This email was sent by Markus Gully via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Markus provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Markus Gully at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 3:02 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Michael Zerman

I wish to comment on the draft changes regarding the on-street parking policy for visitor permits.

I live in Hackney which is a designated MUR, ie mixed use residential zone.

I support the option in the discussion which is articulated as: "maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible residential property."

comment This would enable any tradespeople providing goods or services to a residential property to be able to carry out their activities without having to constantly move their vehicles. In addition, it would enable family members visiting a resident in the MUR to be able to visit, again without having to constantly move their cars.

I realise that the position I support may not be appropriate for all of the zones described in the draft policy, but I wonder whether having a variable/varied policy for different zones makes some sense - by differentiating between the range of uses in different zones that are obviously causing some concern.

Michael Zerman

NPSP No

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/23

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Draft On-Street Parking Policy Consultation

100% Australian made
Recycled Paper

I am also writing to inform you that the Council is undertaking consultation on its draft On-Street Parking Policy, and you are invited to provide feedback.

Like many inner metropolitan Councils, the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters experiences parking pressures from a wide range of road users.

Most recently, the Council has received feedback from some citizens raising concerns about the proposed introduction of visitor permit booklets. In light of the feedback received, it has been determined to place the foreshadowed changes on hold, thereby allowing the Council to consider additional options for the future.

The Council values your input and seeks comments on the proposed changes to the Policy, including how the Council should administer Visitor Parking Permits.

then be good

This was a crazy idea

If we pay well in our Rates

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Cultural Vitality

Economic Prosperity

Environmental Sustainability

*allowed parking permits with no time limits —
Michelle Dotzore*

RECEIVED
17 JUN 2024
CITY OF NORWOOD
PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 8:36 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Nigel Sparrow

As im advised, the Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit).This policy will not work for my household for the below reason.

As I work from home, my car may be parked outside my front gate all day.

While my preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007, I appreciate that changes are required from time to time.

comment As such I would like to propose that an option would be to have both time restricted visitor permits, and have a resident pass. A resident pass that is linked to your car Registration plate number would ensure that these resident passes can be unlimited in time and not shared with visitors. I submit that there is plenty of evidence in SA and every other state of roads that have a time limit for parking but no limit for residents

While our street is different to others in Kent Town, on any given week day, our street is actually empty. As such I see no reason for a blanket change to cover the entire ward and which justifies the proposed changes.

As a resident and rate payer, can we please have the findings or evidence used by the council to justify these proposed changes to the current visitor parking system.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/32

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Nigel Sparrow <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 10:02 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward and wish to voice my objection in relation to the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

As im advised, the Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit).This policy will not work for my household for the below reason.

As I work from home, my car may be parked outside my front gate all day.

While my preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007, I appreciate that changes are required from time to time.

As such I would like to propose that an option would be to have both time restricted visitor permits, and have a resident pass. A resident pass that is linked to your car Registration plate number would ensure that these resident passes can be unlimited in time and not shared with visitors. I submit that there is plenty of evidence in SA and every other state of roads that have a time limit for parking but no limit for residents

While our street is different to others in Kent Town, on any given week day, our street is actually empty. As such I see no reason for a blanket change to cover the entire ward and which justifies the proposed changes.

As a resident and rate payer, can we please have the findings or evidence used by the council to justify these proposed changes to the current visitor parking system.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Nigel Sparrow

This email was sent by Nigel Sparrow via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Nigel provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nigel Sparrow at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Patricia Nayda <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 3:27 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

■ I would appreciate the current VPP system continuing because :

- I am 81yrs, disabled, have regular Resthaven workers to assist - a booklet of 50 vouchers would be used up very quickly.
- Occasionally need carer/person to stay overnight eg. Essential after operations, etc = 4 hours limit not workable - and • I'd rather not have to tell my (mostly elderly) visitors 'you can't come to visit as I have no spare parking vouchers' - or - 'I am enjoying your visit, but it's time for you to go now'.
- While our cottages on the western side have no driveways, we don't have any parking problems under the current system.

Thank you for the opportunity to note my needs.

Patricia Nayda
 (CONFIDENTIAL (not on Electoral Roll) :

Yours sincerely,
 Patricia Nayda
 In email

This email was sent by Patricia Nayda via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Patricia provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Patricia Nayda at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Feed Back on the Draft On street Parking Policy – Paul James.

I have read the draft on street parking policy document on the council web site and have some concerns. The main issue concerning my parking needs is the removal of the visitors permit and replacing it with a book of Visitor Permit Booklets. I currently work for a tourism operator that requires me to irregularly park a van on the street outside my house overnight as it is too big to fit in my garage. The van is used to take tour groups to the Barossa Valley, McLaren Vale or Adelaide Hills on day trips to explore these surrounding regions. I need to pick up these groups at various locations around the CBD, Hills and Barossa Valley, so I regularly keep the van between tours or collect it the night before so I can get to my pickups on time, often through peak hour traffic. At present I have a visitors permit which allows me to park the van overnight without fear of being fined but the introduction of a time limited coupon would make this impossible and I would need a lot of coupons to cover my needs for a whole year. Also it is not always the same van so the rego number will vary from time to time as will the style and look of the van up to a max of 12 persons. It is not possible to predict when or how often I need to park over night in Westbury st as it is dependent on how busy the company I work for is and varies markedly between summer and winter.

In short the system we have at the moment seems to work well and allows the residents the flexibility to have guests for a meal a sleepover or work related casual parking without fear of being fined. "If it ain't broke don't fix it"

Paul James



Tala Aslat

From: Paul McClure <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2024 10:22 AM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

I have had problems with the system in the past. I requested a residents pass as I had a property on Yorke Peninsula and often bought vehicles back from there. My application was knocked back as I have off street parking and I requested a review of my case but heard nothing back. My next door neighbours have 2 cars permanently on the street with residents permits.

The system currently in use is the best of a bad lot.

Yours sincerely,
 Paul McClure

This email was sent by Paul McClure via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Paul provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Paul McClure at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 11:11 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Paul Sawyer

Hello,
 Thankyou for running a consultation period.
 The changes to visitor parking capped at 4 hours will not work for us as we have a carer looking after our child in our apartment for a full day on nominated weekdays. The carer cannot move their car after the 4 hour period as they do not have a car seat (it would be unreasonable and impractical to require them to have a permanent car seat in their car for this purpose). Therefore they cannot leave our infant unattended to move their car.

comment

Instead we would suggest that this time limit be increased to 10 hours, to ensure people are forced to move their car over a 24 hour period.

thanks,

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/24

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

8 July 2024

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade
Norwood SA 5067

Via email: townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

Comments on On-Street Parking Policy – Draft June 2024

Preamble

I am a resident of . Our street community has had a long interest in parking matters given the location and small size of our street and the parking demands on it.

Before today, both I and other members of the street have contributed to the larger discussion around this issue. My comments here represent both some of the consensus views on the parking policy and my own personal views (if and where they differ from the group thoughts).

This submission and comments follows the order of the issues outlined in the Draft June 2024 On-Street Parking Policy document.

INTRODUCTION

Context: No issue.

City Plan 2030:

- Shaping Our Future: No issue
- Key Objectives: Agreed
- Principles: Agreed

HOW WILL ON-STREET PARKING BE MANAGED:

- Land Uses and Competing Demands: I would suggest the inclusion of a phrase in the second dot point that makes some reference to residents.... For example “in other areas, controls might be needed to discourage all-day parking, provide parking protocols for residents and promote sustainable transport choices.”
- Parking Precincts & Priority of Use: I note that Willis Street, Norwood, is designated an MUR precinct (mixed use residential).
- Prioritisation of Users’ table: Noted – specifically that Residential parking has the rating of ‘high’ in the MUR precinct prioritisation.
- When is intervention needed: Noted. Pleased to note ‘stakeholder input’ in point 6.
- Occupancy Rates: Noted.
- Introducing or Altering Parking Controls: Noted

PARKING PERMITS:

Residential Permits

Understandably, there are a range of views from residents in our street on this particular topic.

I believe that the highest priority of this Draft Policy is to meet the needs of the broader community in relation to parking.

As resident in an MRU precinct with **High Priority** for Residential Parking (parking for residents and visitors) I agree that there needs to be some regulation of the parking in our street to prioritize residents’ parking in an equitable manner and I make the comments below.

In addition, I believe some small changes to the current proposals would provide a more flexible, more workable and more equitable solution for all.

- I do not believe the proposed Residential Permit Policy gives the Council's designated "high priority" to all residents and to visitors in our precinct for their parking needs because:-
 - the lower the number of off-street parking spaces available to a residence results in a lower overall number of parking options available to that household. For example, households with **more** than two registered cars and with no off-street parking available to them, currently have no parking options beyond two permits under the current policy. This is a severe restriction for any family of two adults with two cars who have driving age young adults living at home or indeed for a group house with more than two tenants with cars
 - It results in a lack of day-time parking for some household members such as young people living at home, extended families and house sharing groups.
 - It has the potential to impose significant social and financial implications on some households, including the possibility of families needing to leave the area, the inability to continue to rent properties and/or to share households, and
 - Potentially forcing people to drive to work rather than using public transport in order to remove their car from the street because the two delegated permits are in use by other members of the family (eg retired parents, other household members or tenants).

- The clause relating to vehicles NOT remaining stationary in the same position when parked on-street for more than 7 days is particularly difficult for residents with no off-street parking who may go on holiday for over 7 days or who are ill for lengthy period (or indeed unable to drive for a prescribed period of time because of leg or knee injury for instance). Moving the car "four spaces" is difficult if a family is overseas for a month with no access to parking alternatives. I do not support this initiative in the policy.

- Principles of fairness and equity would ensure that all households have access to the same minimal number parking spaces for registered vehicles and therefore I would suggest the following:
 - a minimum of 3 'parking spaces' per household, comprising a combination of off-street and on-street parking, in non-transferable and transferable permits
 - that Council consider up to two non-transferable permits per residence attached to registered vehicles, subject to the availability of off-street parking at that residence, and
 - one transferable parking permit to allow flexibility to households where the number of total of parks available to them does not equate to the number of vehicles registered at that property.

- Whilst I understand and acknowledge the concerns of Council staff that transferable permits could create an increased administrative burden I would urge council to consider that this alternative might achieve a better balance for both the needs of the parking community and Council's administrative capacity.

Visitor Parking Permits

I note that Council has put a hold on a decision about Visitor Parking Permits as part of this consultation process.

I believe it is important for Council to provide residents with one annual Visitor Permit per eligible property that permits all-day parking. We acknowledge there may be some overlap between visitor permits and the flexible permits we mention in the dot points above and we would be happy to discuss ways of integrating these two options.

Temporary Parking Permits

Noted.

Parking for Tradespeople

For major home renovations, a permit for only one trades vehicle is plainly inadequate and totally unrealistic. The simplest observation of a building construction (part or whole) in Norwood will reveal that one trades vehicle adjacent is vanishingly rare. Any builder, quoting on a significant renovation to an old house/cottage (of which there are many in Willis Street that has no off-street parking) would unquestionably see this as a disincentive to taking-on the building job.

I would urge the Council to seriously re-consider this aspect of the Policy.

NARROW STREETS POLICY

Noted: please consider that if the policy is introduced "in accordance with ARR Rules" the amount of available parking for everyone in Willis street would be dramatically reduced.

Members of our street have previously commented on this (in the February 2021 Consultation for on-street parking) stating: *"we recognize that Willis St is within a MUR zone is a narrow street by definition. Whilst the street is narrow, we believe that through ongoing negotiations with Council the needs of all users can continue to be met fairly and equitably, whilst retaining parking on both sides of the street"*.

We believe consideration should be given to possible options that don't include closing down one side of the street . We have had such negotiations (with resultant solutions) before today such as closing down one side of the street between 9-12 on rubbish collection days only.

DRIVEWAYS

Noted.

CONSTRUCTION ZONES

Noted

WASTE COLLECTION

Noted

ACCESSIBLE PARKING

Noted.

SMART PARKING TECHNOLOGY:

Noted. One new EV parking station per year for the next 15 years seems exceptionally low for the predicted growth & take-up of EVs in this State.

APPENDIX A: APPLICATION OF PARKING ZONES

NOTED.

Yours sincerely,

Name: Peta Montgomery

Tala Aslat

From: Peter Atkinson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 7:08 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Peter Atkinson

This email was sent by Peter Atkinson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Peter provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Peter Atkinson at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 10:59 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: Feedback & Complaints Form

Feedback & Complaints Form form submission

Name peter Knowles

Email

Phone

Do you live here Yes

Postcode 5067

Feedback or complaint? Feedback
Complaint

Details

hello your parking policy should limit vistors parking I have no drive way with limited spaes in front of my home Vistors permits given to houses that have 2 spaces on their property wich is not fair the new policy may reduce the vistors using these spaces thank you sometmes a vechile with vistors permit is parked in front of my house for months while the property owners use there 2 spaces and too lazy to shuffle cars around to easy congestion thanks STAND BY YOUR NEW POLICY

View the full submission

https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_27/1755

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Philip Chetcuti <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 8:36 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Also, with the all night parking permit required in my street from 7pm to 7am, it is impossible for me to have multiple visitors and park in my street if they want to stay over the night. Special extra overnight parking permits should be allocated to residents of Westbury street, Hackney for this purpose. So not a decrease in permits, an increase.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Philip Chetcuti

This email was sent by Philip Chetcuti via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Philip provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Philip Chetcuti at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Pip Lewin <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 27 June 2024 3:22 PM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

With no clear or satisfactory resolution in sight, I am writing once again as a highly concerned resident of Kensington/East Norwood re the proposed visitor parking permit system. My submission is...

Either

*maintaining the current visitor permit parking system Or *maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one per household

Any other options would seem to shamelessly favour parking for non-residents to commercial businesses over that for rate paying residents. As a senior citizen who has now lived here for over 30 years, any restriction to my ability to have visitors would greatly and increasingly callously impact upon my overall welfare. I believe visitor permits for households place no undue pressure on parking on my street and that the draft policy Council changes to the current, well working system are unwarranted, unfair and inequitable for residents.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation.

Pip Lewin

This email was sent by Pip Lewin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Pip provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Pip Lewin at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Rachel Bartels
Sent: Wednesday, 5 June 2024 9:22 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: Draft On-street Parking Policy - Feedback

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the NPSP Draft On-Street Parking Policy.

I own a property in [redacted] I understand that Wakefield Street enjoys one of the lowest traffic numbers in the local government area.

I lived in the property for 2 years before placing it on the short term rental market 12 months ago. It is presented as a 2 bedroom property with one on-site parking space. The property attracts a wide variety of guests, including:

- Regional-based parents of boarders from local private schools.
- Interstate and international visitors attending the many close proximity cultural events such as Fringe, Adelaide Festival, Adelaide Oval, National Wine Centre, Adelaide Equestrian Event, Memorial Drive, Festival Theatre, Vailo to name just a few.
- Regional, interstate and international business professionals requiring easy CBD access.
- Health and university professionals attending the city university campuses, Royal Adelaide Hospital and Women & Children's Hospital.
- Locals requiring emergency insurance accommodation.
- Relocating families wanting to acquaint themselves with the local area.

The Asser Townhouse is a highly reputable, convenient and vital part of the local tourism, business, health and education economy – successfully filling a need for quality accommodation for the above family and professional groups, who require home-based accommodation over hotel arrangements.

I am extremely concerned that the introduction of a highly restrictive, 4 hour maximum booklet Visitor On-street Parking Policy will go well beyond creating an adverse affect for local properties used for the above purposes, (or indeed owner-occupier purposes). It renders them completely unworkable.

I highlight the following issues.

1. It is common for guests to bring 2 cars. While 1 can be parked on-site, the other must be parked on the street. If both cars are required to be left at the property all day, planned or unplanned, the 4 hour limit does not cover this scenario.
2. The purchase of multiple booklets of permits is cost restrictive, (especially on top off the Permanent Parking Permits in an owner-occupier scenario). To pass this cost on to short-term accommodation guest detracts from the convenience and desirability of my property.
3. The proposed limitation of the number of booklets available to a property in a year, to a maximum of 50 per year, is incomprehensibly low. That allows carparking for only 25 days per year, based on 1 car requiring 2 x Parking Permits per day. The time, money and inconvenience of requesting additional booklets is completely untenable.
4. These issues also apply when I move back into the property and have local or interstate family/guests staying, and no one will be at the property to replace the parking permit after the 4 hour limit, (whether it be a planned or unplanned time away from the property).

5. In both short term accommodation and owner-occupier scenarios, if my on-site carpark is being used for building/maintenance works, this puts further short term pressure on the issues above.

I, nor my guests, have never experienced any shortage of parking with the vicinity of my property and believe that the balance of a 2 hour parking restriction and the current Parking Permit arrangement has achieved a good balance, preventing parking issues in Wakefield Street. While I understand that other streets may require a different approach, I strongly urge the Council to make Wakefield Street exempt from any change to the current Visitor Permit Parking arrangements.

Kind regards

Rachel Bartels (BA in Urban & Regional Planning)

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 12:16 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Rebecca Coid

comment I currently live on _____ and find that all available street parking is being utilised by local business leaving residents and their visitors unable to park on the street. As there is currently no restrictions on parking on this street, the local businesses park their cars on the street for the entire duration of the business day. I know there is plans for the council to redevelop the Marryatville shopping complex and I fully support this, however I worry about this worsening the problem of parking in the local residential streets.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/18

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Rex Buckingham <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 July 2024 4:00 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system

To even consider a time limit is useless, council does not have enough staff to monitor.

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Rex Buckingham

This email was sent by Rex Buckingham via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Rex provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rex Buckingham at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Rigina Boyaci <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 30 June 2024 8:44 PM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

As a long term resident of my street, any changes will have a significant impact for all residents.

Yours sincerely,
Rigina Boyaci

This email was sent by Rigina Boyaci via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Rigina provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rigina Boyaci at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Robert Turnbull <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 4:03 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

I have seen no evidence that the current system is not working - what I do see is many cars without permits staying in our street all day without penalty.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Robert Turnbull

This email was sent by Robert Turnbull via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Robert provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robert Turnbull at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Robyn Reuther <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 5:28 PM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Why are we being disadvantaged. On Saturday mornings I run private piano lessons from home through my ABN. This proposal will mean I have to give up this work - I just moved it to home as I've had a spinal fusion surgery 2 months ago and being able to work from home rather than driving means I can return to this teaching. Why are we being disadvantaged in this way? No other suburb or district has these limitations. This is discrimination.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Robyn Reuther

This email was sent by Robyn Reuther via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Robyn provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robyn Reuther at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 1:55 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Roger Emery

comment I am strongly against the proposed Visitor Permit Parking (VPP) policy. It is unfair to residents who actually use their off-street parking facilities and rely on the VPP for visitors without the threat of getting a ticket. The Council would do well to penalise residents who have off-street parking garages/areas, but choose to park on the street at all times, thus clogging up parking spaces in the street. (in our case Osborne St Hackney)
Thank you

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/25

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Ros Marsh
Sent: Thursday, 11 July 2024 2:41 PM
To: Simonne Whitlock
Subject: Draft on-street parking policy
Attachments: Community Cosultation - On street Parking Policy - Ros Marsh.pdf

--

Ros Marsh

Draft on Street Parking Policy (June 2024)

Dear Council
Greg and Ros Marsh's submission

With reference to Jeremy and Sara's Submission we appreciate opening to provide feedback. And we too urge Council to maintain the existing scheme and (if justified) take more targeted action to address the issue of concern instead of taking disproportionate and indirect action without proper evidence or justification.

We would also ask the Council to consider whether, and how, to address the issue of residents using visitor parking permits as "de facto" residential parking permits. As is the case with Fisher Street, Montrose Avenue has several properties which are share houses with 3 or 4 people sharing and unable to park their vehicles on the property. Some are cottages and have 2 adjacent properties sharing very narrow lanes, night cart lanes, others are small villas with side "driveways" again night cart lanes and extremely narrow, some limited to access to front verandah area only for parking. And those that have garages, all have been there as long as us, 20 plus years, and will not accommodate modern cars' size. Something you need to include in your consideration of the needs of residents when parking in your calculations, the size of current vehicles. De Facto by necessity would be our sense of what may be happening in the shared housing in our street.

And wish to comment on Jeremy and Sara's reference to 502 residential permits and 599 visitors permits issued across 630 households in the Council, when considered alongside 2021 Census which gave the population count for NPSP as 37,487 persons living in 18,133 dwellings (ABS Estimated Resident Population 2023, 39,312). Under 4% of properties seemingly necessitating a radical extensive difficult to migrate parking control system, to be introduced in lieu of a system that in our experience residents who live in parking controlled areas are comfortable with, can operate in, and generate very few issues with their neighbours.

So very small no of residents are using, neighbours not in an uproar, why?. Given the discussion of the need for restrictions in particular applying to arterial roads and customer parking is it Commercial parking that is being affected by the current easy to use and effective visitor parking for Residents.

So we concur with Jeremy and Sara's conclusion that no objective evidence has been provided which demonstrates that the current visitor parking scheme is not fit for purpose.

In addition to Jeremy and Sara's Submission

ISSUING UP TO 2 VISITOR PER ELIGIBLE RESIDENT BUT ENFORCING 4 HOUR LIMIT EXCEPT 7.00PM TO 7.00 AM.

Note that there are existing 9 to 5, why 7 to 7. May have overnight guests but only between 7 and 7, then must move vehicle? Don't understand. But certainly more complicated and very likely to cause transgressions. Enforced 4 hour, move your car Mum and Dad? To? Thought through? Comfortable Residents and their Visitors will be able to migrate correctly? No please.

50 TO 100 PER YEAR

However many hours per ticket still only 50 or 100 visitors per annum. Seemingly from documents recognition that the 50/100 tickets solution will not be sufficient to deal with services required by residents, suggestion is they be accompanied by "temporary parking permits". For convenience for the delivery of materials to residential construction sites and for ease for tradespeople. That is irregular services to the residence. Critically they do not include delivery of essential, or useful regular services. As in cleaning or gardening for example, and which of course are not irregular.. As older residents we have our home cleaned fortnightly and are looking to get regular rather than occasional gardening, because life is getting harder. And there may come a point where our need for services will include Home Care. as would be the case already for numbers of your residents. Or disabled residents who along with elderly could require daily services. Even if your temporary parking permits could be handed out weekly consider the additional difficulties that would inflict on those not as able to cope with daily living as it is. And again migrating through a complicated, demanding parking scheme, with financial penalties for getting it wrong? Simplest, easiest to use and most community minded solution , status quo. Further a 4 hour time limit per tickets to meet such needs could also be an issue depending on the requirements of those residents. Answer is not to further complicate the scheme, more issues and work for residents, service providers and Council staff to boot.

REDUCING THE NUMBER OF PERMITS TO ONE PERMIT PER ELIGIBLE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

Immediate example of why insufficient for our circumstances which would be the same for not just elderly needing support services but any residents requiring services such as cleaning. Cleaners very often come as teams. Ours vary from 1, very seldom, to 3. We vacate our driveway, 1 park, and provide the 1 or 2 visitor permits for the personnel, on the day, every fortnight. And to require residents to limit the number of cleaners to 1 at a time achieves nothing as in 2 for 2 hours becomes 1 for 4 hours. Same limitations, different pattern. Same sort of issues would arise with other regular services such as gardeners. The 1 simply makes it more difficult for residents without improving the availability of parking. At the very least please have a look at West Torrens scheme to deal with these very important issues,

"The Council Parking Permit Policy (the Policy) provides you with a number of options to help meet your parking needs, as well as those of any visitors, tradespeople or carers who need to park close to your home.

visitors and tradespersons (when temporary or visitor on-street parking is required) employees or registered volunteers of community service organisations, or registered volunteers working under government community service programs, who provide home support services to residents of the city."

And of course there are other maintenance needs that occur regularly. And we feel that 50,000 limit for renovation permits again is to the detriment of needs and rights of the less affluent.

So in our opinion none of these suggestions other than status quo will adequately address genuine, necessary needs of residents. Any of the other 3 suggested schemes do not.

I conclude with reminding Council that our residence is in Montrose Avenue which has 1 hour parking limit. Aside from working out how to have access to that allowed hour without it being denied us by being inescapably engulfed by the 4 hour limit tickets when any visitor or service provides a service which is very often more than an hour, even our regular termite check. Just one aspect of the difficulties and complications these unsupported options will be putting upon us.

In fact given any of the the presented schemes to replace the status quo visitor parking scheme we will have to draw up budgets on an annual basis as how to how many tickets have to be reserved for essential services we require and how many we should be keeping in reserve and ipso facto, restrict visitors for example so we can manage our living in our home.

Given above may I remind Council that ageing in itself creates difficulties for living and inability to access services due to Council regulations without due consideration will add to those difficulties. Not just nerve wracking schemes to migrate to ensure services, but also as by necessity to meet the levels of control and brevity of parking, will contribute to social isolation. The schemes you should be considering should be premised on flexibility for the reasons we and Jeremy and Sara have put to you. Even our street, Montrose, is a complex system incorporated in the complex system that is parking and the complex system that is NPSP. We understand and acknowledge that change is an almost constant in today's world including suburban living. And that complex systems are ones for which it is difficult to model hence manage due dependencies, competitions, relationships, etc. But what we would hope for as residents of NPSP is that Council, rather than trying to make this issue, parking, into a rigid simple linear system, would be looking to facilitate a complex adaptive system. As in the parking scheme, for starters, it will have the flexibility the capacity, to adapt. The best scheme out of the options offered to achieve that is the current scheme.

And build community, not erode it. Wish to emphasise the issue of making radical changes to a working scheme that only a small percentage of residents use and will be very inconvenienced by rigid inflexible hard to migrate rules which are seemingly about another constituency within the Council boundaries. Rather than build community the mooted changes will almost certainly erode community, addressing the needs of one constituency at the cost of another. Yes only small sections of NPSP, but unhappiness can be infectious.

And one immediate cause for contest in Montrose Avenue could be the fact that despite Councils concerns that parking should not be captured by one constituency that is in fact already, indeed is longstanding, in Montrose. And we are being asked to essentially have our visitor, and residential, parking made less accommodating, while the commercial ratepayers

and their clients, some, are a bit of a cause of tension already. So, while there is no reserved parking for Residents there is in fact parallel parking on Montrose reserved 24 7 for Commercial ratepayers. About 4 to 5 parallel parks exclusive for commercial use. Achieved by granting the business premises right angle parking off the street on to their properties and hence removing the parallel parks for use by residents even in the evening, even if we were to be given 7 to 7 parking for our guests. 4 to 5 a lot of parks in Montrose. There are possible ways to ameliorate this parking exclusivity, like putting parallel on the other side of the road to these captured parks. Could be part of local discussions that are mooted to be part of any changes for those of us living within the 100 metres etc.

And again as Jeremy and Sara advise, unintended consequences! How to deal?

Our Thanks to staff with whom we have dealt, always pleasant, helpful and sympathetic. We experienced a change of use committee and that is not the same with all of the actors involved there.

Regards Ros Marsh

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 3:49 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Rosemary Cadden

I can see the benefits of having a booklet as this would provide more flexibility. That is: the resident can have multiple people at their home at the same time. I thn k it would be good to have the flexibility fcor some people qwho have busy households to be able to get a second booklet.

comment The four-hour limit seems reasonable - until you think of someone coming to, say, babysit for the resident, or spend the whole day with an elderly parent, that sort of thing..Also perhaps when tradespeople are involved. They could be at the site for many hours for many days - so I think perhaps a special case could be made for them.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/39

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...
 Social Equity
 Economic Prosperity
 Cultural Vitality
 Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Sam Hooper <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2024 9:47 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

We are writing as long standing residents of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward.

We are concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy.

This is our submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for our household.

We understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

Our strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place for many years.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict our ability to have visitors. From our own experience, we do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking in our street and we do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

We are also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council may not be relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Sam & Rebecca Hooper

This email was sent by Sam Hooper via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sam provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sam Hooper at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Sam Dyer
Sent: Tuesday, 9 July 2024 10:34 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: Email in support of parking permit changes - attn West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I'm writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I'm aware of a very public and determined push by one household in my street to stop the parking restrictions changing.

I daily experience frustration at difficulty being able to park near my home due to overcrowding, largely caused by one resident owning a very large amount of cars (15-16), and evidently misusing guest parking permits and other neighbours parking permits.

I strongly and overwhelmingly welcome any changes to prevent misuse of parking permits, and I understand majority of the neighbourhood is also in support of this change.

Due to the misuse of permits by some residents, I would suggest no visitor permits should be permanent.

Best wishes
Sam Dyer

Tala Aslat

From: Sari Alisalo <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 7:47 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Yours sincerely,
 Sari Alisalo

This email was sent by Sari Alisalo via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sari provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sari Alisalo at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Seona Payne <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 2:50 PM
To: Kester Moorhouse; Claire Clutterham
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for St Peters Ward

Attention:
Cr Kester Moorhouse and Cr Claire Clutterham

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of St Peters Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Seona Payne

This email was sent by Seona Payne via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Seona provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Seona Payne at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 3:55 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Shirley Rowe

I have read the Consultation document and would like to comment on the changes. I live at _____ which has very limited on-street parking available due to being a dead end street, narrow and houses on the northern side do not have off-street parking (other than at my address). The houses on the northern side have access to the residential permit system (24 hours). I have a permit for my vehicle and my husband parks on our property. I have one visitor's permit. This system works very well for the residents in Marchant Street. The main problem for visitors is the lack of parking in Phillips Street and surrounding side streets due to the parking being taken by the employees of Peregrine and possibly commuters. This is not a fair situation for the residents who are so close to the Peregrine head office. I have also read the Off-street Parking Policy that was on your website which discusses the manner in judging the preference for giving residents a higher ranking for parking than employees etc. How will that be

comment determined in Kensington?

Regarding the visitor permits, the current system works well in our street at the moment but it might not be in the future. Perhaps visitor permits should be for short term visits only but then again, a resident may have a friend stay overnight. I can understand that visitor permits could be used incorrectly which would cause annoyance for other residents. Perhaps a time limit should be applied to the permits and only allow one per household.

When we first had our permit allocated in 2004, the conditions allowed the permit to be transferred to any of the vehicles at the same property. I wish that was still the case as my husband parked outside our house and was fined for doing so. He didn't think of using our Visitor Permit - he isn't a visitor. It seems very unfair to be fined \$75 for parking in front of your own home.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record__170/40

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



**City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Shauna Potter
Sent: Tuesday, 9 July 2024 6:57 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: Car parking consultation

Hello

As a resident of I would like to advise my preferred option for permits is:

- maintaining the current system (ie. issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property and no enforcement of any time limits).

Regards

Shauna

Tala Aslat

From: Simon Allport <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 7 July 2024 7:26 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

It is ridiculous to provide a guest to your home a parking permit for the street, it seems very inhospitable.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Simon Allport

This email was sent by Simon Allport via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Simon provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Simon Allport at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 14 June 2024 1:05 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Simon Casson

My only comment is re the area around Fix Coffee/Twelftree Reserve/Richmond/Torrens Sts.

It is always very difficult to get a park on Torrens or Richmond during the week, during business hours.

comment I have observed a lot of cars parking and people then walking or riding to work (presumably in the city) due to the closeness to town.

The two streets then empty after hours.

Perhaps it may be worth considering the 3hr limit approach that the Town of Walkerville has taken in their similarly positioned precinct -

https://www.walkerville.sa.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/824043/Parking-Restriction-Map-REVISED.pdf

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission

https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/9

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

Tala Aslat

From: Sophie Gaynor <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2024 4:11 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Sophie Gaynor

This email was sent by Sophie Gaynor via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sophie provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sophie Gaynor at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Sophie Kleeman <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 27 June 2024 1:55 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely
Sophie Kleeman

This email was sent by Sophie Kleeman via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sophie provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sophie Kleeman at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 July 2024 3:44 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Stan Livissianos

As a long-term property owner/resident with over 70 years' residency at
t who has witnessed many changes in the district ranging from
totally free unhindered parking in the 1950's to the current relatively complex
system of paid annual permits (together with inconsistent parking signs which
confuse many casual car parkers), I propose ALL current restrictions be abolished
together with the reintroduction of FREE (for example, please refer to Walkerville
Council: \$0 residential parking permit fee for 2024/25 | Walkerville Council)
unfettered 24-hour, seven day a week RESIDENTIAL parking ONLY, as was the
case 25 years ago and is the current situation for Osborne Street Hackney
comment residents.

It is furthermore suggested Council issue official medallions to be affixed to eligible
vehicles, with medallions surrendered to Council upon property owners divesting
properties or tenants relinquishing rental entitlements. Any casually parked
transgressing vehicles could be fined in the usual manner.

Yours sincerely,

Stan Livissianos

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/38

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Stanley Toh <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 8:52 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Visitor permit parking

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

The current system is working fine for my street and the council proposal to sell permits is nothing but a blatant attempt to increase rates when rates are already at a record high due to property valuations.

The council should be more sensitive to cost of living issues faced by the residents.

Yours sincerely,
Stanley Toh

This email was sent by Stanley Toh via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Stanley provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Stanley Toh at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Stephenie Martin <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2024 8:06 PM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per person eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted. In the Hackney south corner, we have not had an increase in accommodation and the only people who will be advantaged by the ticket booklets are those who do not live in the area, which seems counter intuitive of a local council.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Stephenie Martin

This email was sent by Stephenie Martin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Stephenie provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Stephenie Martin at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 19 June 2024 3:06 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Steven Bernstein and Creina Campbell

comment I was disappointed to read that the council as put on hold the "voucher "system for visitors. Visitors don't just stay for a weekend some stay for weeks on-end!
 Residents now pay for the privilege of parking near their home (we didn't used to pay) and visitors don't pay! With the "gather round" the fringe, the 500, festivals and cabarets, parking for ALL residents is becoming a problem at times. Hopefully the council can find a solution for everyone.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record__170/12

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
 Norwood
 Payneham
 & St Peters



Tala Aslat

From: Susan McDougall <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 July 2024 6:56 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

A four hour restriction is unworkable, as it will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors, including my family. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Susan McDougall

This email was sent by Susan McDougall via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Susan provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Susan McDougall at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: Toby Nolan <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2024 9:31 AM
To: Sue Whittington; Grant Piggott
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Email to West Norwood/Kent Town Ward Councillors

Cr Sue Whittington and Cr Grant Piggott

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of West Norwood/Kent Town Ward. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

Additionally, they will also profoundly restrict our access to safe parking in proximity to our house, as we only have a single-car driveway in our four-person share house. In the current economic environment, it is already difficult to rent and afford the cost of living. Given these conditions, our share-house living situation requires the four of us to have separate cars for travel to each of our jobs, and as of now, we have been able to use our visitor pass to accommodate for the limited parking accessibility at our rental house.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
Toby Nolan

This email was sent by Toby Nolan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Toby provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Toby Nolan at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 12 June 2024 10:46 AM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Tom Fleming

Hi,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the new on-street parking policy.

Overall, I think the policy proposes some sensible improvements to the current management of on-street parking. However, as a resident in what has been identified as a Mixed-use Residential zone, and as a homeowner without off-street parking, there are some parking challenges that remain.

Firstly, the policy seems to focus on issues around the 8am to 5pm timeslot. In our area, this is not a significant problem since most on-street parking spaces are free during these hours. The real challenges arise during nights and weekends when the enforcement of the policy (understandably) does not take place.

comment Secondly, there appears to be an issue with the number of permits issued. While there are only five houses on the street without off-street parking, and the permit zone accommodates approximately five cars, it is evident that there many residences with multiple vehicles that have obtained residential parking permits and are using these permit and timed spaces, despite having access to off-street parking. This creates a significant inconvenience for those of us who rely solely on on-street parking.

Lastly, poor parking is one of the biggest problems. I understand there isn't much the council can do about peoples parking abilities however introducing line markings could help and ensure that available parking space are maximised.

Thank you for considering these points and I would be happy to discuss.

Regards,

Tom Fleming

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/5

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Tony D'Alessandro <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2024 9:10 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My strong preference is that Council maintains the current system which has been in place since at least 2007.

The other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have visitors. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

This council rarely consults and n matters concerning its constituents and often hides behind needing to go to council offices for information eg the increase in council rates. However propaganda information is mailed to constituents with no regard to costs, Cloke and dagger behaviour is rife.

Yours sincerely,
 Tony D'Alessandro

This email was sent by Tony D'Alessandro via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Tony provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tony D'Alessandro at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit:
<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

Tala Aslat

From: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters <website@npsp.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 3 June 2024 3:22 PM
To: Townhall
Subject: City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters - Form submission: On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024

On-street Parking Policy - Comments - 2024 form submission

Name Trevor Paynter

Implementing time limit controls to ensure a turnover of vehicles in our "Fringe" area - in our case close to The Parade and bus stop 7 - is very much needed by the residents. Unrestricted all day parking, which doesn't support retail on the Parade nor the residents wishing to have elderly visitors, family and, importantly, trades people attend their homes - for example pool cleaning, gardening, house and window cleaners, repairs and many other trades. Tradies need their vans and equipment near their clients and are often reduced to parking illegally. It's been known for service providers not to attend a job because of parking difficulties and even increasing their price to cover a possible parking fine.

comment In talking casually with Council personal about the difficulties we have, it has been discussed that a street such as Elizabeth Street Norwood should have two hour parking one side and all day parking the other - from The Parade down to Edwards Street. That make practical sense to me benefiting both residents and local traders. There is clearly a need for improvement as demonstrated by Council initiating the draft proposal. I hope the two-hour option is being considered and indeed implemented in the final Parking Policy proposal.

Having lived in my home at the corner of for 30 years I've witnessed many drivers park with little consideration for their fellow parkers, thoughtlessly taking up space for two cars and thus wasting the precious space that should have been available for another vehicle. It appears that this can be easily solved by painting line marking on the road thus dividing the roadside into individual car-length spaces. I'm aware that Burnside Council uses this method of painted road markings quite successfully, as does, I have been interested to note, many other Councils with high density parking like we are experiencing.

Thanks for the opportunity to put forward our views on the Council's parking proposal. Our household and I know other residents nearby eagerly await your final proposal.

NPSP Yes

Email

View the full submission
https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/admin/edit/form_record_170/1

Best Wishes

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Community Well-being is...

Social Equity

Economic Prosperity

Cultural Vitality

Environmental Sustainability



**City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**



Tala Aslat

From: Tylah Grummett <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2024 4:35 AM
To: John Callisto; Christel Mex
Cc: James Stevens; Cressida O'Hanlon; Jack Batty; Townhall; Fair Parking Permit Campaign team
Subject: Fair Permit Parking for Kensington and East Norwood Ward

Cr John Callisto and Cr Christel Mex

cc NPSP Council Citizen Services, State Member for Dunstan Cressida O'Hanlon, State Member for Bragg Jack Batty, Federal Member for Sturt James Stevens and the Fair Permit Parking team.

I am writing as a resident of Kensington/East Norwood. I am very concerned about the Council's proposed visitor parking permit system set out on page 13 of the draft on-street parking policy. This is my submission to the public consultation on the draft policy.

Council seeks to stop its current system of issuing up to two annual visitor permits per eligible residential property. Instead, from 1 July 2025, Council will sell households 50 single-use visitor permits each year (4 hours per permit). If I use all 50 tickets, I may be able to get another 50 permits (but at the total discretion of Council staff). This policy will not work for my household.

I understand that Council is also considering in this public consultation the following alternative options:

- maintaining the current visitor permit parking system;
- maintaining the current system but reducing the number of visitor permits to one permit per eligible property;
- introducing visitor permit booklets with a cap per year of 50 or 100 permits (or issuing permit booklets with no cap) and enforcing 4 hour time limits for each permit; or
- issuing up to two visitor permits per eligible residential property (like the current system), but enforcing a 4 hour time limit during the day (7am to 7pm). No time restriction would apply during the night (7pm to 7am).

My preference is that the number of visitor permits is reduced to one permit per eligible property, which is a compromise to increase the available parking.

With obvious exception to not changing the current parking system, the other options are unworkable, as they will profoundly restrict my ability to have housemates and will drive up the cost of rent and, therefore, the cost of living. From my own experience, I do not think visitor permits are placing undue pressure on parking on my street and I do not believe that any change to the current system is warranted.

I am also concerned that, contrary to the Council's own policy, Council is not relying on proper evidence to justify radical changes to the current visitor parking system. No such evidence has been provided to residents or Councillors.

Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity to participate in this public consultation. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,
 Tylah Grummett

This email was sent by Tylah Grummett via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Tylah provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tylah Grummett at

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834>

2/7/24

The Mayor,

I wish to object to the draft parking proposed changes. The existing permit system is perfect for us. Our friends and rels often stay with us after driving from interstate. Presently they can leave their car in the street all day whilst shopping/dining in the city.

Presently all cars park on the southern side of Montrose street where 2 or 3 car parks will be lost when construction of a new home is complete at no 16 or 18?

If all cars parked on the northern side of our street 6 to 10 more parks would become available due to lesser driveways on that side. Also if all rubbish bins were left out on the southern side of our street cars would not interfere with collection and the truck could collect bins in one pass rather than 2 passes as present.

Yours faithfully



Wendy for

V.A. S.K. ~~ANDERSON~~ ANDERSON

Attachment C

Review of the Council's On Street Parking Policy





On-Street Parking Policy

April 2025



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters



Contents

Introduction	2
<i>Context</i>	2
<i>Key Objectives</i>	3
<i>Principles</i>	3
How will On-Street Parking be Managed	4
<i>Not all Parkers are the Same</i>	4
<i>Land Uses and Competing Demands</i>	4
<i>Parking Precincts and Priority of Use</i>	5
<i>When is Intervention Needed?</i>	8
Parking Permits	11
<i>Residential Permits</i>	11
<i>Visitor Permits</i>	13
<i>Temporary Permits</i>	13
Narrow Streets Policy	14
Driveways	15
Construction Zones	16
Waste Collection	17
Accessible Parking	18
Smart Parking Technology	19
Appendix A - Application of Parking Zones	20



Introduction

Context

Like many inner urban Councils, the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters experiences parking pressures from a wide range of users including local residents, business and commercial activity and people who park within our City but work elsewhere (e.g. long term parkers walking/ riding into the Adelaide CBD).

Parking is an 'end game': the result of people wanting to drive cars to and from their destinations, including their home. Over time, the Council will influence travel choice to reduce the demand for on-street parking. This will be reflected in a range of integrated land use and transport strategies.

However, in the short term, the Council has an immediate role in managing overall parking supply. This includes parking on-street as well as the supply of additional off-street parking.

This Policy specifically deals with how on-street parking will be managed throughout the City. On-street parking is a limited resource with competing user requirements and demands. Managing these competing demands can be difficult and there is no one best solution for all situations.

The Council will also continue to monitor the need for additional off-street car parking in high demand areas.

Diagram 1.

Framework for Community Well-being Quadruple Bottom Line

The Council exists to improve the Well-being of their citizens and our community, through:

Social Equity

Cultural Vitality

Economic Prosperity

Environmental Sustainability



CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future

The Council has adopted a strategic plan—*CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future*. Ultimately, the provision and management of parking has a direct relationship to the Council's four pillars in *CityPlan 2030*.

Social Equity

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is a growing and culturally diverse community. Managing on-street parking needs to accommodate a changing social structure including age demographics, housing stocks, socio-economic profile, increases in the number of people working and studying from home, smaller allotment sizes, and alternative transport choices including sustainable and active transport.

Cultural Vitality

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has a strong 'sense of place' that is built upon the unique features of the built environment and streetscapes. The Council continues to encourage activities that involve community participation. The built form is a unique built heritage, featuring Adelaide's best concentration of early, mid and late Victorian residential development, ranging from small settler cottages to large villas and mansions. How parking is managed in these areas, and whether kerbside space is allocated to activities other than parking is an important consideration.

Economic Prosperity

The Council has taken both a precinct and sector approach to business and economic development. Maintaining access to local businesses, services and amenities with convenient parking provides fundamental support to the range of business activities and economic growth of our City.

Environmental Sustainability

The impacts of climate change will underpin the Council's operations. The vision for our City includes less cars on the road, improved air quality, attractive local streets which provide shade, with more people choosing sustainable transport choices like walking and cycling. The provision of unfettered parking will simply continue to support car usage, which cannot be sustained in the future.

Key Objectives

The Council will manage on-street parking on the following basis:

- 1 To provide a fair and equitable process in assessing and meeting the parking needs of all road users within our City;
- 2 To optimise the use of available on-street parking in a manner that best meets the needs of the precinct, taking into account the availability of off-street parking; and
- 3 Provide a clear and transparent basis, for the Council and the community on how on-street parking will be managed.

Principles

Parking will be managed on a precinct basis acknowledging that decisions made in one street can affect parking demand and availability in other nearby streets.

On-street parking will be available in a safe convenient and appropriate manner that supports the highest needs of the precinct (reflected by the range of activities and land uses).

On-street parking will not be allocated through the means of the exclusive use of a single space or spaces by any individual or group.

Where necessary and based on available evidence, on-street parking will be managed through the implementation of time limit controls in order to provide adequate turnover of parking vehicles to actively encourage use by all road users.

How will On-Street Parking be Managed

The allocation of parking will never satisfy all stakeholders and will be managed on the basis of a hierarchy of needs of the different precincts.

This approach acknowledges that there will be different demands throughout the City and that one approach will not be appropriate for all conditions. Ultimately, on-street parking will be managed in a manner that best meets the needs of the precinct taking into account the availability and limited supplies of off-street parking.

Not all Parkers are the Same

The Council strives to accommodate a wide range of different users throughout the City. These include:

- Residents;
- Cyclists;
- Disability permit holders;
- Pick-up and drop-off (private users);
- Shoppers;
- Loading (commercial);
- Long stay/employee parking – people who work in the Council area;
- Long stay/employee parking – people who work outside of the Council area;
- Motorcycle and scooter parking;
- School parking (employees as well as drop-off and pick-up times);
- Public transport (bus stops etc);
- Visitors;
- Trades and services;
- Taxis; and
- Ride share.

Land Uses and Competing Demands

In considering who has priority to a specific section of on-street space, the Council must consider the nature of the surrounding land use and the function that the particular road plays in the overall transport network. This allows for different priorities within the same precinct depending on the adjacent generators of on-street demand. These are:

- in some areas, this will favour visitors, shopping and traders to support the economic prosperity of our City; and
- in other areas, controls might be needed to discourage all-day parking and encourage alternative and sustainable transport choices.

There are some situations where the Council may determine to reallocate space within the public realm for reasons such as the implementation of landscaping, traffic control devices, protected cycle lanes, or improved crossings for active transport modes etc. In addition, the removal of on-street parking spaces may be necessary for traffic management or road safety purposes—e.g., removing parking on the approach or departure side of intersections, or along bends where safe sight distance cannot be achieved. In such cases, the proposed changes would typically be subject to site specific community consultation.

Parking Precincts and Priority of Use

Parking Precincts

Seven general precincts have been established based on known parking demand, land uses and overarching transport objectives. The precinct boundaries are not absolute and there will be areas that overlap in functionality and parking pressures.

Commercial Activity District (CAD) (Norwood Central)

This focuses on The Parade and side roads immediately abutting the Parade (generally within 50–100m of The Parade).

On-street parking will support the business and economic activities along the Parade. Parking will also be managed to support alternative sustainable transport modes. Parking controls will include short to medium term parking zones to manage vehicle turnover.

CAD Fringe

This includes roads beyond 50–100m from The Parade but with parking demand influenced by the commercial activity.

The focus of on-street parking will be to support the business and economic activities along The Parade, while acknowledging the competing demands for residential parking. Parking will also be managed to support alternative sustainable transport modes.

Residential

Properties in these precincts are residential with only a few other traffic and parking demands from other developments.

The Council will support parking for residents and discourage undue parking pressures from other demands. Some longer term commuter parking can be accommodated to support alternative transport modes, where it does not unduly reduce parking supply for residents and their visitors.

Mixed Use Residential

These areas include a mix of lower intensity developments including schools within mostly residential areas.

Parking will be managed to support the peak demands of the various activities. Higher levels of parking occupancy can be accepted to support the overall parking pressures. Longer term parking will be managed to support the longer term employment car parking, where inadequate off street parking is available.

Mixed Use Higher Density

There is ongoing development of higher density residential living throughout the Council—most notably in Kent Town where there is also pressure from surrounding business and commuters who work in commercial/light industrial.

These are predominantly employment areas that require a mix of short term customer car parking and longer term employment parking. The Council will not look to support surplus residential parking on-street for higher density developments.

Arterial Roads and Fringes

Roads adjacent to arterial roads require specific parking controls to supplement Clearway and Bike Lane conditions that are often applied and regulated by the State Government. Time limit controls will be used to manage turn over in business and commercial strips.

Local streets that have parking demands from business activity along the main roads, generally within 100m of the arterial roads.

Some longer term employee parking will be permitted as will parking to support public transport usage, to the point that it does not adversely compromise the availability of residential parking.

Commercial / Light Industrial

These areas that include a mix of commercial and light industrial land uses.


These areas predominantly employment areas that require a mix of short term customer car parking and longer term employment parking.

Parking Precincts Map

This map shows the parking precincts areas and the different parking pressures that apply throughout the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

The precinct boundaries are not absolute and there will be areas that overlap in functionality and parking pressures.

The map is intended as a guide to inform the priority of parking within each precinct.



Legend

- Arterial Roads
- Arterial Road Buffer 50–100m
- Commercial Activity District (CAD)
- Commercial Activity District Fringe (CAD-F)
- Commercial and Light Industrial (CLI)
- Mixed Use Residential (MUR)
- Mixed Use Higher Density (MUHD)
- Residential

Prioritisation Of Users

The following table provides general guidance on how the Council will assess the prioritisation of parking users in different precincts.

The table addresses the peak demands when there are conflicting requirements and demands for the parking spaces.

At other times (eg after business hours) parking will be managed on the needs at those times.

Prioritisation of Parking Users	Precinct						
	Commercial Activity District	CAD 'Fringe'	Residential	Mixed Use Residential	Mixed Use Higher Density	Commercial / Light Industrial	Arterial Roads and Fringes
Residential includes parking for residents and visitors	Low	Medium	High	High	Medium	Low	Medium
Disability permits	High	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
Short Term Shopping < 2 hours	High	High	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Loading Zones	High	High	Low	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Long term commuter / public transport working outside of the immediate area or the Council area	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Long Term Employee working within the precinct and generally staying within Council	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High	High
School Parking parking for employees and short term drop-off and pick-up activities	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
Ride Share including shared hire vehicle schemes	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	High	Low	Low
Taxi includes other short term commercial drop-off and pick-up areas	High	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low

When is intervention needed?

Overview of process

The Council will manage on-street parking based on evidence that demonstrates a need for parking controls. This evidence-based approach provides a framework for consistent and transparent decision-making to promote the efficient, fair and equitable use of available on-street parking.

Analysis of parking needs is best completed on a precinct basis so that parking demands are not moved to the next street following the introduction of change. This is especially true for shopping and commercial areas.

The following process provides an overview of the investigations the Council may undertake depending on the specific situation. It will allow the Council to respond to on-street parking needs on a strategic basis, rather than in reaction to a vested interest suggested resolution of a parking problem:

1. Define the precinct boundary. This will depend on the location and specific concern. The precinct should include any streets that might be affected by any changes.
2. Identify the hierarchy of parking uses that should apply to the precinct based on this section.
3. Undertake parking surveys during daytime on a weekday or weekend. This will establish parking demand and availability during the critical periods. The type of survey could include parking occupancy, turn over and compliance with the existing controls, depending on the issue being investigated.
4. Prepare an inventory of the current total parking supply (including on and off-street) in the precinct, including the current restrictions that apply at each.
5. Summarise public transport facilities, pedestrian and cyclist facilities within and in close proximity to the precinct and any other relevant data available from other State agencies and Local Government authorities.
6. Summarise the perceived issues for the precinct. Consider any inputs from the results of the parking surveys and stakeholder input.
7. Compare these issues with actual parking demand recorded by the parking surveys and identify areas of deficiency/surplus.

Recommendations should establish what measures are required to rebalance parking so that adequate provision exists for visitors and stakeholders in the precinct. An outline of the different application of parking zones is addressed in Appendix A (and further information in the Austroads guidelines).

Where the issues at hand are of a relatively minor nature, undertaking some of the investigation steps set out in this Policy will not necessarily be required or undertaken.

Implementation of minor changes to existing on-street parking controls to address local parking issues that will, in the opinion of the Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport or the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, not cause adverse on-street parking issues in the broader locality, will be determined by Council staff, having regard to the factors set out in this Policy that provide guidance in respect to when intervention may be needed and any other factors deemed relevant. Where it is deemed necessary to consult on any proposed changes of a minor nature, the consultation will be limited to persons who are deemed to be directly impacted by the proposed changes.

Other Factors

The following factors will also be considered by the Council when deciding the best way to manage parking in a certain precinct:

- safety;
- road type/function;
- road location;
- key land uses in the precinct;
- traffic flows within the precinct;
- public transport and bike requirements;
- availability of off street parking in the precinct; and
- service vehicles, emergency access.

Occupancy Rates

Parking occupancy describes the percentage of spaces occupied at any given time. Parking occupancy rates, also called utilisation, reflect the relationship between parking supply and demand.

Occupancy of on-street parking spaces should be high enough to ensure they are occupied at a level that justifies the supply, but not so high that it is unreasonably difficult to find a space.

Industry standards generally acknowledge that parking is considered at capacity when available spaces are 85% occupied at times of peak demand*. This equates to approximately 1 in 7– 8 spaces being available.

The optimum occupancy range is regarded as 65%– 85%. Occupancy below 65% or above 85% suggests that parking management intervention may be required.

When the average parking occupancy is regularly above 85%, a change to the parking management approach may be necessary to encourage turn-over of the spaces. Equally, if parking occupancy rates are consistently below 65% it

indicates there are many spaces that are empty or unused.


While this may be convenient for some drivers, lower occupancy rates can also mean that an oversupply of parking or inappropriate parking prices exist in the area. By contrast, an area with a very high level of occupancy could mean the available parking is limited and needs management to accommodate a certain level of demand.

The competing needs for on-street parking need to be balanced to ensure, where possible, that there is sufficient on-street parking spaces available for residents, visitors and businesses.

The Council considers that the ideal maximum occupancy rate for on-street parking is 85% before intervention should be considered, meaning that approximately one in every eight (8) on-street parking spaces should be vacant at any given time. In a practical sense, this approach should enable drivers to find an on- street parking space within reasonably close proximity to their destination, without excessive searching**.

Diagram 2.

Optimum occupancy range



Under 65% occupancy

Under 65% occupancy indicates additional parking controls could be relaxed.

In residential areas, low occupancy rates suggest that no further changes are needed.

Over 85% occupancy

Over 85% occupancy indicates additional parking controls may be needed to encourage turn over.

It may also indicate an overall shortfall in parking spaces that can only be addressed through additional (off-street) parking supply.

In residential areas, additional parking controls or permits may be warranted.

*Austroads Part 11, Parking "Generally, parking is considered 'at capacity' when available spaces are 85% occupied at times of peak demand" (Shoup 2005).

** Shoup, D. (2007) Cruising for Parking. Transport Policy 13(6), 479-486.[2].

Introducing or Altering Parking Controls

Parking occupancy surveys will be undertaken during business hours and/or outside of business hours on a weekday or on a weekend depending on the relevant issues that need to be addressed. This will establish on-street parking demand and availability throughout the day. The type of survey may include parking space occupancy, duration of stay, permit holder parking and compliance with the existing controls, depending on the issues being investigated.

Generally, at least three (3) surveys will be conducted throughout the day or on more than one day, to identify the relevant issues and to assist in determining what type of intervention may be required. Where parking occupancy rates are below 85% on average, intervention such as the implementation of additional parking restrictions, will generally not be considered. However, the Council may consider education initiatives, additional signage and enforcement of existing parking controls as alternative types of intervention, where such a requirement is identified.

Intervention where maximum occupancy rates are below 85%, may also be considered, when local conditions and other relevant factors are taken into account. This may also include the implementation of parking controls in areas adjacent to the area where new or altered parking controls are proposed to mitigate against the new parking controls shifting the parking problem to the next street or area.

If there are existing parking controls in a street where surveys identify that there is less than 65% occupancy, the alternation or removal of the controls will be considered.

Where on-street parking occupancy surveys are undertaken, average occupancy rates and other considerations, such as walkability, will be considered. For this, occupancy rates for on-street parking areas will be generally considered in grouped areas of up to 150 metres, which is considered a reasonable maximum distance that a motorist should have to walk to their vehicle within a suburban residential setting – all things being equal.

This may mean that is parking occupancy rates are high at one end of the street compared to another end of the street that may be separated by a significant distance. The need or otherwise for the parking controls will take into account, the average parking occupancy rates separately for both ends of the street, rather than grouping them together to ensure that occupancy survey results are not skewed.

Where intervention through new, altered or removed parking controls is deemed necessary, the Council will consult over a minimum period of two weeks, with the affected citizens and businesses.

The Council will carefully consider all responses that are received on proposed parking controls and use an evidence-based approach in determining and implementing parking management actions.

Parking Permits

Residential Permits

Residential Parking Permits may be provided for residential properties that do not have off-street (on-property) car parking and are in a street with time-limited controls or Residential Only Permit Zones.

Residential Parking Permits are also available for residential properties in precincts where the following conditions apply:

- there is limited available on-street parking;
- there are time limited parking controls applied to the street; and
- there is demonstrated competing demands between drivers due to other land uses in the precinct.

Residential Permits will not be issued to residents or owners of dwellings within multi-dwelling developments that have provision of off-street car parking facilities, constructed and completed for occupation after 1 November 2021. Residents living in these developments are expected to make adequate arrangements for on-site parking within their premises.

For the avoidance of doubt, multi-dwelling developments refer to single and multi-storey developments that include three or more dwellings and mixed-use developments that comprise a mix of residential and non-residential land uses and three or more dwellings.

Residential Permits do not guarantee an available on-street parking space. The permits can only be used in the street/s for which they are issued, which exempts the specified vehicle from any time limit restrictions that may be applicable.

Residential Permits will be provided on the following basis:

- maximum of two permits per residential property. An additional (transferable) permit, may be issued on application, where exceptional circumstances apply, such as a proven significant medical need. Such applications will be determined by the Council's Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, at his or her absolute discretion. For the avoidance of doubt, exceptional circumstances relates to a situation that is out of a person's control, that has a significant impact and where the timing of the circumstance is relevant to the claimed impact;
- permits will only be issued to residents and not business owners, operators, employees, landlords, tradespersons or property maintenance personnel;
- permits will be allocated to specific vehicles and are non-transferable (except for additional Residential Permits that are issued where proven extenuating circumstances apply);
- permits are only available for registered/roadworthy motor vehicles, motorcycles and scooters (excluding light weight recreational scooters intended for footpath use) and are not available for buses, trucks, boats, motor homes, trailers or caravans;
- permit/s will not be issued if parking spaces could reasonably be provided on the property. This includes, for example, where a garage, carport or other parking space has been converted to an alternative use or used for storage of any kind, including, but not limited to, items such as boats, jet skis, trailers or caravans;
- permits cannot be used to park a vehicle on The Parade, Norwood;
- permits may only be used in the street/s for which they are issued and only in Resident Only Parking Zones or time restricted parking spaces located adjacent to the relevant property. For the avoidance of doubt, this allows the permit holder, subject to meeting other eligibility requirements, to park in any Resident Only Parking Zone or time restricted parking areas located in a continuous arrangement within a street or section of a street, located adjacent to their property, including on the opposite side of the street.
- Residents who live in properties where time restricted parking areas or Resident Only Parking Zones are not located immediately in front of their property or on the opposite side of the street are not eligible for a Residential Permit;
- Residential Permits can only be used in parking permitted areas, cannot be used in parking zones of less than one-hour duration, and cannot be used in Loading Zones, No Parking Zones, Bus Zones etc; and
- Vehicles must not remain stationary in the same position when parked on-street within a Residential Only Parking Zone or time restricted parking area for more than seven (7) consecutive days. Vehicles must be moved a minimum distance equivalent to four (4) on-street parking spaces after this time if the vehicle is to remain parked in the same street.

The Council may, by notice in writing, revoke permit/s where:

- the holder of a permit ceases to reside in the dwelling in respect of which the permit was issued; and/or
- in the opinion of the Council's Chief Executive Officer, it is no longer appropriate that the resident/s of a particular street be issued with permits or the permit has been misused or misappropriated.

The Council will issue Residential Permits (other than visitor permits) for a maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, or part thereof, and permits will be subject to a fee as determined by the Council from time to time.

Table 1 sets out the Residential Permit eligibility for residents in streets with Resident Only Permit Zones and/or Time Limited Parking Areas. Eligibility for Residential Permits set out in Table 1 must be read in conjunction with all other Applicable eligibility criteria and limitations set out in this Policy.

Table 1. **Residential Permit Eligibility**

Number of off-street car parking spaces on the property	Number of vehicles registered at the property	Maximum number and type of Residential Permit
0	0	No Permit
0	1	1 non-transferable [#]
0	2 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
1	0 or 1	No Permit
1	2	1 non-transferable [#]
1	3 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
2	0, 1 or 2	No Permit
2	3	1 non-transferable [#]
2	4 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
3	0, 1, 2 or 3	No Permit
3	4	1 non-transferable [#]
3	5 or greater	2 non-transferable [#]
4 or greater	Number of registered vehicles exceeds the available spaces on the residential property by one vehicle	1 non-transferable [#]
4 or greater	Number of registered vehicles exceeds the available spaces on the residential property by two or more vehicles	2 non-transferable [#]

[#]Residents eligible for one or two Residential Permits may also be eligible for an additional (transferable) Residential Permit, where extenuating circumstances apply. See other Residential Permit eligibility criteria for more details.

Visitor Permits

Visitor Permits are intended for occasional use where additional time may be needed for visitations, for example friends, family or trades people/workers. The holder of a visitor permit is not guaranteed a parking space in the street for which the permit is issued.

Like the Residential Permits, Visitor Permits are only available in precincts where the following conditions apply:

- there is limited available on-street parking;
- there are time limited parking controls applied to the street; and
- there is demonstrated competing demands between parking users due to other land uses in the precinct.

Visitor Permits are not intended to be used for longer term parking needs or to supplement a shortage of on-site parking.

The permit allows parking up to a maximum of six hours. A maximum of one (1) Visitor Permit will be available per residential property.

Visitor Permits can only be used in time restricted parking areas or Resident Only Parking Zones, cannot be used in parking zones of less than one- hour duration and cannot be used in Loading Zones, No Parking Zone, Bus Zones or Taxi Zones etc.

All Permits must be displayed in the bottom passenger-side corner of the motor vehicle windscreen at all times when the vehicle is parked in the Resident Only Parking Zone or relevant time restricted parking area. Failure to display the permit will leave the vehicle owner liable for an expiation and or prosecution for illegal parking.

Temporary Permits

Events & Significant Activities

The Council, at its absolute discretion, may provide Temporary Parking permits to occupiers of residential and commercial premises located in parts of the City in which temporary parking controls are implemented from time to time to address accessibility issues for on-street parking arising from the staging of an event or the undertaking of a significant activity.

The aim of the temporary parking controls and permits of this kind, is to enable local residents and businesses to conduct their day-to-day business and activities and maintain reasonable access to on-street parking during the course of a significant event or activity.

The Temporary Parking Permit is transferable between vehicles and will only be issued in relation to significant or major events or activities, as determined by the Manager, Development & Regulatory Services, at his or her absolute discretion.

A Temporary Parking Permit related to significant or major events or activities will only be valid on the days where temporary parking controls are in places in the affected streets.

Parking for Tradespeople

The Council may, at its absolute discretion, provide a maximum of one (1) Temporary Parking Permit per residential property to occupiers or owners of residential properties to allow a tradesperson to park in a time restricted parking area or Resident Only Parking Zone, whilst the property is being renovated or new residential development is being constructed.

Such permits will generally only be issued where a major renovation or construction of residential development valued over \$50,000 is being undertaken and will not be issued in relation to maintenance works of any kind. The permits will only be valid for tradespeople vehicles that are no larger than a sedan, van, ute or SUV and where the total length of the vehicle including any overhanging materials or trailers or the like do not take up more than two on-street parking spaces at any one time.

Temporary Parking Permits issued in relation to tradespeople vehicles will be subject to a daily fee, must be displayed on the Tradesperson's vehicle and may be issued for a minimum of one (1) day up to a maximum of forty-two (42) days.

Narrow Streets Policy

There are many historic laneways and narrow streets throughout our City that significantly limit on-street parking. In these areas, the Council will manage parking through consultation with the local affected residents, and in accordance with the Australian Road Rules (ARRs).

Under the ARRs, drivers must leave a three (3) metre clear width between parked vehicles or the continuous centre line along the road (if one is marked). This requirement allows for emergency access.

This requirement affects all roads less than 7.0m wide (allowing 2.0m for each parked car and 3m for vehicle access). On these roads, it is not legally possible to park a car on each side of the road as there will be less than 3m left for vehicle access. On very narrow roads less than 5.0m, it may not be possible to allow any parking at all.

In managing parking controls in narrow streets, the Council will take a staged approach focusing on education about local conditions as the first stage, enforcing existing controls if education fails and implementing new or altered parking controls as the third stage.

This approach is underpinned by the principle that managing parking controls in narrow streets is very difficult and requires a collaborative approach with all affected parties.

The Council will engage with residents and businesses directly affected by any changes/decisions on the following basis:

- notification of the parking and access issues;
- education of the ARR requirements. This may include actions such as the installation of advisory signs along the street to highlight the narrowness and discourage parking opposite other vehicles and/or the distribution of educative material to local residents;
- enforcement of the ARR requirements. This may include actions such as proactive and regular enforcement of illegal parking;
- Restricting parking opportunities. If education and enforcement are ineffective, there may be need to implement new or alter existing parking controls to improve accessibility. Where such interventions are proposed, the Council will consult with directly affected parties to determine how parking restrictions might be applied (e.g. which side of the road); and
- ongoing monitoring and communication as may be required.

The Council's policy for managing parking in narrow streets is as follows:

Road Width (between kerbs)	Treatment
Less than 5.0m	No Parking allowed.
5.1m –7.0m	Parking on one side only or staggered parking may be considered. This will be negotiated with the local residents and could include implementing actions such as staggered parking along the road and parking controls to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection.
7.1m or more	Parking can be allowed on both sides of the road subject to other considerations such as driveway access.

Driveways

The Council has endorsed the following framework for the discretionary use of yellow line marking over property driveways.

Under the Australian Road Rules (ARRs), there is no requirement for a Council to install road markings or signage to indicate that it is illegal to park in a manner that obstructs a driveway. This is on the basis that the existence of the driveway should be sufficient notification to motorists not to obstruct or restrict access to and from the property.

However, there is a level of expectation from the community that the Council should provide some form of road making to assist in reducing the number of instances whereby vehicles are found to be obstructing/impeding access to driveways. This is exacerbated in areas where there is a combination of urban infill and business precinct areas.

The Council will mark a continuous yellow (No Stopping) edge line 500mm from the edge of the driveway in the following areas:

- all driveways located within areas of high on-street parking demand, around schools as identified in the City-Wide Schools Traffic, Parking and Safety Review report;
 - all driveways located within a designated zone, bounded by Portrush Road, Payneham Road/ North Terrace, Dequetteville Terrace and Kensington Road and the whole of the suburb of Hackney (as this area has been identified as having consistently high demands); and
- all other streets which are located outside the designated zone be assessed on a case-by-case basis and the following considerations be satisfied prior to the installation of driveway line marking:
 - consistent high demand for parking (typically exceeding 85% occupancy rates); and
 - regular disregard by drivers parking over driveway.

The isolated use of yellow marking over individual driveways along a street will not be considered as this creates an inconsistent use of the marking for drivers. Where applied, line marking over driveways will applied to a whole street or precinct.

Diagram 3

Line marking shown in the following diagram extending 500mm either side of the driveway.



Construction Zones

The Council will request developers of major and/or medium to high-rise development to prepare a traffic management and on-street parking plan in consultation with Council staff, with a view to identifying the most appropriate suite of controls during the construction period to minimise impacts on local residents and traffic management.



Constuction works, Third Creek

The Council requires developers of major and medium to high-density developments to prepare traffic management and on-street parking plans in consultation with Council staff, to identify the most appropriate suite of controls during the construction phase of developments to minimise traffic and parking related impacts. Traffic Management Plans may also be required for small-scale developments that, in the Council's opinion, are likely to have impacts on the public realm, including on-street parking.

Traffic Management and On-street Parking Plans should include at a minimum, information about the following aspects of the development construction which specifically relate to how traffic and parking impacts are proposed to be managed:

- requirements for temporary work zones in the public realm;
- hoardings;
- loading and unloading of building materials and supplies;
- traffic management;
- impacts on on-street parking arrangements;
- management of parking by tradespeople;
- traffic and parking signage requirements;
- proposals for required temporary parking controls, temporary signage; and
- how the local community will be informed about the management of on-street parking during the construction period and who they can contact on the developer's behalf to address concerns.

For further information or to discuss construction related requirements, contact the Council's Public Realm Compliance Officer on 8366 4530.

Waste Collection

There are many historic laneways and narrow streets throughout our City that significantly limit on-street parking. In these areas, the Council will manage parking through consultation with the local affected residents, and in accordance with the Australian Road Rules (ARRs).

Demand for on-street parking spaces is high across much of the Council area, particularly in areas located adjacent to the City of Adelaide Central Business District as well as suburbs such as Norwood, where there is a significant mix of traffic generating land uses and Kensington, which contains an historic pattern of development with limited space for the provision of offstreet parking facilities and relatively narrow streets.

These conditions result in high demand for on-street parking spaces across the City which, combined with the substantial number of narrow streets in the City, and historic housing stock that has limited or no off-street parking available, creates a conflict from time to time for the safe and convenient collection of waste.

The Council's waste collection service is provided by East Waste, which generally provides citizens with the following

bins and services:

- red lidded bin (140 litre) for general waste;
- yellow lidded bin (240 litre) for recycling;
- green lidded bin (240 litre) for food/kitchen organics; and;
- at call hard waste collection service.

General waste is collected weekly and alternate fortnightly pick-ups are scheduled for recycling and green organics. East Waste vehicles generally collect waste using a robotic arm that lifts bins into the truck's receptacle. However, from time to time, the waste collection trucks have trouble accessing narrow streets and or struggle to collect bins using robotic arms due to vehicles obstructing the location of the bins. To overcome this issue, many residents place their bins in driveway cross-overs or adjacent to neighbouring properties where access to the bins is more convenient.

In general, these ad-hoc arrangements work reasonably well, however, in some rarer cases, there are very limited opportunities to present bins in suitable and convenient locations for collection and this either results in the affected residents having to present bins a long distance from their property or in some cases, bins not being emptied which causes re-work for East Waste.

This can also cause frustration for the affected residents. To address this issue, the Council may implement shortterm parking controls to facilitate safe and convenient waste collection.

This type of intervention will only be considered where:

- there is high and regular demand for on-street parking spaces and high occupancy rates, including, but not limited to narrow streets and high density residential areas;
- East Waste has verified that the waste collection process has been regularly impeded by vehicles blocking access to bins presented for collection; and
- there are not reasonable alternatives available for the affected residents to present their bins for collection.

If parking controls are required, the restrictions will only apply to the relevant day of collection and will be generally limited to between 7.00am and 5.00pm or other such times as may be required by East Waste or the Council.

The Council does not generally endorse or support the use of stickers on bins to provide visual cues to motorists to avoid parking adjacent the bins on bin collection day. It is acknowledged that this approach is simple and likely to be effective in some cases, however, it places the burden of addressing the issue on residents rather than the Council, has the potential to lead to confrontation between residents and motorists, has no legal effect and if they are used 'en-masse' and heeded by motorists, this would displace many vehicles that would otherwise park in these areas, potentially shifting demand for on-street parking to adjacent streets.

Accessible Parking

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is committed to making parking accessible and convenient for persons with disability. Accessible parking bays are available adjacent to most community facilities, open space and commercial precincts.



Accessible Parking

When the Council upgrades its assets and community facilities, accessibility to the facilities, including the availability of accessible parking spaces, is given careful consideration to evaluate compliance with current accessibility standards.

Accessible parking spaces are sign-posted or have the accessibility symbol painted on the road surface or signs cover the space. When parking in a designated accessible parking space, the time limit on the sign applies (ie. no extra time is allowed).

The Disability Parking Permit that is issued by the South Australian Government, must be clearly displayed to be eligible for the extended time limit described above, either hanging from the rear-view mirror or on the passenger side of the dashboard of the vehicle.

A vehicle correctly and legally displaying a Disability Parking Permit, may be parked in a time limited parking space and be entitled to additional time beyond the signed time limit restriction as follows:

- for time restricted parking areas less than 30 minutes, the time for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be 30 minutes;
- for time restricted parking areas between 30 minutes and one hour, the time for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be two hours; and
- for time restricted parking areas where the time limit is more than one hour, the time limit for a Disability Parking Permit holder will be twice the period indicated on the sign.

Smart Parking Technology

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is committed to making use of Smart Technology to assist in the management and enforcement of parking areas and parking controls.

The use of smart technology to assist in the management and enforcement of parking areas and parking restrictions is rapidly expanding across Australia. Smart Parking comes in many forms and has many benefits. Where a need is identified, the council will consider the use of smart parking technology to assist with the management and enforcement of parking controls or to enhance wayfinding and other directional signage as well as experiences for the convenience of citizens.

Case Study – Webbe Street Car Park, Norwood

In 2024, the Council installed in-ground sensors for each parking bay located within the ground floor of the Webbe street car park, Norwood.

The Council's overall objectives for monitoring and enforcing time limited car parking spaces in the car park with the use of smart technology include:

- increasing turn-over of available parking spaces to benefit local traders;
- issuing or facilitating the issuing of expiation notices in an effective and efficient manner;
- improving the standard of proof of evidence for issuing expiations, using data obtained from technology such as in-ground-sensors;
- reducing the time the Council's Parking Compliance Officers need to patrol the car parking, in turn enabling them to perform more duties elsewhere; and
- monitoring of the car park usage rates, including during peak times and during community or significant events, to inform timing and delivery of council projects and initiatives such as capital works and other infrastructure upgrades.

Vehicle overstays trigger an electronic notification that is sent to hand-held devices used by the Council's Parking Compliance Officers, who will then attend the car park to address the parking issue.

This efficient use of technology will reduce the need for the traditional and time consuming foot patrolling of the car park and 'chalking' of tyres as the presence of the

Parking Compliance Officers will only be needed when a vehicle overstay is identified by the in-ground sensor technology.

This contemporary approach to monitoring parking controls will ensure that the Parking Compliance Officers use their time more effectively and efficiently to monitor other parts of the City and respond to parking overstays in the Webbe Street car park, only when the smart technology has identified a need.

Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

There are six publicly accessible electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, provided by JOLT and Evie in operation across the Council area.

EV charging station locations include:

- Webbe Street car park, Norwood;
- Osmond Terrace, Norwood (on street parking bay near the Republic Hotel);
- Dunstone Grove/Linde Reserve car park;
- Borthwick Reserve, Portrush/Payneham Road;
- Payneham Community Centre; and
- Gylnde Corner car park.

In collaboration with JOLT and Evie, the Council aims to provide up to 16 EV charging stations in the City over the next fifteen (15) years, subject to demand.

A map showing the location of the charging stations is available on the Council's website. The Council may take enforcement action and expiate owners of non-electric vehicles that park in designated electric vehicle parking spaces.

Charging of Electric Vehicles in the Public Realm

Charging of Electric Vehicles, caravans, motorhomes etc. located within an on-street parking space that is not a designated publicly accessible electric vehicle charging station location, using permanent or temporary charging facilities (including, but not limited to, the use of an electrical cable running from the property to the on-street parking space across the adjacent footpath and verge), is not allowed.

This restriction is to obviate the risk of electrocution, ensure the footpath and verge areas remain clear of physical obstructions for passing pedestrians and cyclists, including, but not limited to, visually impaired persons and to ensure that the provision of on-street parking remains unrestricted, where practicable, to maximise access for all road users.

Appendix A

Application of Parking Zones

The following overview provides examples of the various permissive parking controls that can be applied to effectively manage on-street parking. (Extract: Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 11 – Parking).

It is important to ensure that streets do not have too many different time restrictions as this will lead to confusion for drivers and an increase in disputes related to infringements. The start and finish times of the restriction will be clearly sign posted and be as consistent as practical (e.g. Mon–Fri 8am–5pm).

Where practicable, following investigations into on-street parking issues, implementation of changes to on-street parking arrangements may include consideration of area-wide parking controls across a large area, suburb or precinct. Further parking controls that may be considered, include, but are not limited to the following:

- 5 minute parking is appropriate in areas with a very high arrival rate e.g. where passengers are dropped off but some waiting is likely. It may apply near cinemas, post offices and hotels and may potentially be used in business districts and near schools.
- 10 minute or ¼ hour (15 minute) parking can provide for pick-up and set-down outside schools and for a high turnover outside commercial facilities providing a high level of convenience such as banks, post offices and newsagents. It is only appropriate for motorists who wish to go to the one address.
- 30 minute parking can be applicable directly outside local shops that rely on providing a reasonably high level of convenience to maintain a competitive market position. There is usually a high demand and 1-hour parking would result in inadequate parking turnover. A ½-hour restriction allows people to go to two or three shops.

- 1 hour parking is appropriate outside major shopping centres and in other locations where there is a demand for parking and the activity is likely to take longer than half an hour. This type of parking is able to be diverted into off-street locations but parking access needs to be clearly visible from the frontage road.
- 2 hour parking is sometimes appropriate outside major shopping centres although it can result in enforcement difficulties with some motorists staying excessively long times. It is more likely to be applicable in areas with developments containing professional and personal services. It is also applicable in streets where a resident parking permit scheme applies and time limited parking is available for non-residents. The 2 hour limit can be used to discourage or remove commuter parking.
- 3 or 4 hour parking is appropriate where it is desired to stop all-day commuter parking but allow parking by other local people. While it is desirable that car park access is identifiable from the arterial road it will often be acceptable to assume that motorists are relatively well-informed regarding the access arrangements for the site.
- Parking with no time limit (all day parking) is usually generated by employees or park-n-ride motorists and will occur across all types of development. It does not require signs to be used to indicate that parking is permitted where there is no time limit or no user limitation.

Please note that this overview provides general guidance only for the application of parking controls. Consideration may be given to local conditions and/or a combination of measures, including alternative measures, to address on-street parking issues in the City.

Further information

For information on the Council's On-Street Parking Policy, please visit www.npsp.sa.gov.au or phone 8366 4555.

You can also visit the Council's Citizen Service Centre at the Norwood Town Hall, 175 The Parade, Norwood.

Additional copies

The On-Street Parking Policy can be viewed online at www.npsp.sa.gov.au



Copies may also be obtained by:

- visiting Norwood Town Hall
- visiting any of the Council's Libraries
- emailing townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
- contacting the Council on 8366 4555
- writing to the Council at PO Box 204, Kent Town SA 5074

Document History and Status

Reviewed	Approved	Date
Revision A - Draft for Council endorsement for community consultation		
Council	Tonkin	30 November 2020
Revision B - Draft for consultation - as endorsed by the Council 7 December 2020		
Council	Council	21 December 2020
Revision C - Endorsed by the Council 1 November 2021		
Council	Council	1 November 2021
Revision D - Draft for consultation		
Council	Council	2 April 2024
Revision E - Endorsed by the Council		
Council	Council	7 April 2025

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4555
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au
Socials  /cityofnpsp  @cityofnpsp



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**

13.4 2022-2025 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY – FINAL PROGRESS REPORT & DRAFT 2025-2027 YOUTH ACTION PLAN

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Arts, Culture & Community Connections & Coordinator, Youth Programs
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manger, Community Development
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4550
FILE REFERENCE: A984817 A1087753
ATTACHMENTS: A – C

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To:

1. report on the achievements of the *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy*;
2. seek the Council's approval of the *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan*.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 6 December 2021, the Council endorsed the draft *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy* which is included as **Attachment A**.

Launched in 2022, the draft *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy* outlined four objectives for youth development and engagement, which were:

- Objective 1 Young people are connected, included and welcome in the life of the community.
- Objective 2 Young people are active and healthy.
- Objective 3 Young people have resilient futures.
- Objective 4 Young people are visible and heard.

The Strategy expired in January 2025 and this report provides an overview of its operation.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

- *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy*
- *CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future*

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Nil

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Nil

SOCIAL ISSUES

The *Strategy* sought to maximise young people's participation, provide opportunities for young people to feel socially connected, to develop and learn and to have a voice.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Findings from consultation with young people in 2023 identified the need and desire for increased participation opportunities for young people in creative workshops and projects. The direct input from young people, regarding ways to encourage creativity and participation in the arts, as well as celebrate the City's diverse cultural profile, presents an opportunity to develop contemporary ideas to bring cross-generational energy and vitality to the community.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

It is well documented that environmental concerns are a priority for young people. Throughout consultation with local young people, a desire to be heard and considered in the education surrounding the environment and supportive approaches adopted by the Council have been repeatedly expressed.

RESOURCE ISSUES

The Coordinator, Youth Programs, serves as the community connector between the Council and young people, local schools, universities, community organisations, sport, and recreational groups.

Delivery of the *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan* will be within the current annual Youth Development budget.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

DISCUSSION

The Council's *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy* outlines the Council's vision for youth within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, provides a framework for piloting various initiatives and ways of working with young people. Importantly, it underpins consultation and engagement with youth that was undertaken in 2023, culminating in the formation of the Council's *2024-2026 Voice and Vision of Young People Action Plan*.

The achievements outlined within this report reflect the positive impact and success of the Council's *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy*. Additional detail relating to the achievements are included in **Attachment B**.

Objective 1 Young people are connected, included and welcome in the life of the community.

Collaboration with local Schools

Between January 2023 and January 2025, the Coordinator, Youth Programs partnered with eight (8) schools involving 2,036 students across various projects. Project themes were diverse, providing access to subjects ranging from art, operation of government, environment, citizenship, and career. This included annual collaboration with local primary schools and kindergartens for the longstanding Mayor's Christmas Card Competition, realising an increase in participation from nine (9) local schools who submitted 132 entries in 2023, to fourteen (14) local schools who submitted 320 entries in 2024.

The schools involved were:

- St Peter's College
- Norwood Primary School
- Norwood International High School
- Marryatville High School
- Felixstow Primary School
- Trinity Gardens Primary School
- St Ignatius Junior School
- Prince Alfred College

Programs/Events

A total of twenty-six (26) programs and events targeting young people (excluding events delivered as part of collaborative projects with schools, the Young Achievers Program and Elevate Radio with Three D Radio which are outlined elsewhere within this report) were delivered over the life of the Strategy. These programs and events varied, ranging from Work Experience and Work Placement to Robotics STEM and Make-up and Self-Esteem Workshops, with approximately 1197 young people participating and attending.

The events provided young people with opportunities to learn, participate, represent the views of youth, and build confidence through participation within safe environments.

Art and STEM programs, along with opportunities to be active, featured amongst the event themes.

Elevate Radio, in partnership with Three D Radio

Formerly known as New Vibes, the Elevate Radio Programme was rebranded in 2024 in collaboration with former participants of the radio mentorship program and provided young people with radio broadcast training and a toolbox of skills to help launch them into a range of industries. The program continues to build community connection based on a shared interest in music, artists and local and international news and events.

Since 2015, 29 young people have participated in the program, of which 10 have continued as a volunteer with Three D Radio, leading their own radio program.

Expressions of Interest are currently open for the April 2025 intake.

Young Achievers Program Funding

The *Young Achievers Program* aims to celebrate the achievements of young people and improve their accessibility to local, interstate, and international competitions, events, and leadership development initiatives.

Over \$10,000 has been provided to 35 young people to support their development. This initiative regularly receives positive feedback. Examples include:

1. Matteo received \$500 in funding to attend an international sport event in Tokyo, Japan.

“This trip wouldn’t have been possible without the generous grant from our local council. Your support helped cover travel costs and made this opportunity achievable for me. It’s an experience I’ll never forget, and I’ve learned so much, both on and off the field.”

Matteo

South Australian State Soccer Team, Football SA Japan Tour 2024

2. Abbey received \$250 in funding to attend a Leadership event in Canberra, ACT.

“Unlike other experiences as a youth advocate, I and the other three SAYF members present, felt so heard and respected in the room. How hopeful it is, that so many young people are impassioned for political change, despite the poor education we have received on how to do just that. Imagine how many more young people will follow suit in years to come, having been educated on civics to the standard we advocated for that day and continuously. The Young Achiever’s Program funding from NP&SP Council supported the cost of flights. I am so grateful to have been supported by my council in this regard. Being able to represent SA youth, federally, for such essential civics reform has been a privilege and major highlight in my 19 years to date!”

Abbey

Leadership Appearance at the National Inquiry into Civics Education, Engagement and Participation at the Federal Parliament in Canberra, ACT.

Objective 2 Young people are active and healthy.

Health and Wellbeing Initiatives

Between January 2023 and January 2025, nine (9) workshops were delivered to approximately 100 young people supporting their mental and physical health journeys.

In 2023, *Come and Try* event directory posters were developed in partnership with local sport and recreational groups to introduce young people to local clubs and groups to try out a new sport or activity.

In 2024, *Come and Try* activations were also included in the Council's School Holiday Programs. Groups involved have included the Wings Basketball Academy, Stomping Ground Studios, Phoenix Cheer and Dance, and East Torrens Baseball Club.

Programs with a focus on mental health and well-being were also a focus of development for young people. These included breath-work focused initiatives, in addition to make-up and self-esteem focused workshops for teenage girls.

Feedback from guardians, educators and the participants were supportive of these initiatives and emphasised the importance of promoting positive health and wellbeing for younger people.

Objective 3 Young people have resilient futures.

Work Experience and Work Placement Program

In response to the high demand for annual work experience and work placements with the Council, a new Work Experience and Work Placement Application Process was implemented in January 2024.

A total of 15 secondary students participated in work experience at the Council and a total of 9 university students have completed work placements with the Council between January 2024 and January 2025.

Developing young people's skills in workplace environments where they can shadow staff within specialist fields allows a student the opportunity to learn valuable insights including communication, systems, and policies, managing difficult situations, building relationships and personal accountability. Work experience and work placement programs support students to build workplace understanding and form potential industry pathways.

Objective 4 Young people are visible and heard.

In ensuring young people feel heard and remain visible in our community, ongoing engagement and dialogue is essential to maintaining open communication. The *Coordinator, Youth Programs* has ensured both informal and formal engagement methods have continued to be utilised in a variety of instances where young people have had the opportunity to provide their thoughts, should they wish to. These engagement methods have included various face-to-face and online community surveys, informal conversations, and meetings with local Youth Networks.

The increase in engagement and subsequent changes have led to consistent and open channels of direct communication between young people, parents and guardians, educators and the Coordinator, Youth Programs. It has also improved communication through an expanded database of sector and program facilitator contacts, local School offices and educators, as well as community members that have requested e-Updates via the Council's website.

2025-2027 Youth Action Plan

The appointment of the new Coordinator, Youth Programs in January 2023, provided a catalyst to consult and engage with young people and the youth sector to adapt, evolve, and recalibrate the Council's approach to youth service delivery to ensure programs and initiatives supporting the achievement of the *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy* were effective, relevant, and accepted among young people. This resulted in the development of a draft *2025-2027 Voice and Vision of Young People Action Plan*.

At its meeting on 4 September 2023 the Council resolved to adopt the draft *2025-2027 Voice and Vision of Young People Action Plan*, subject to further community consultation and engagement. This consultation occurred from 5 September 2023 to 2 October 2023. The result of the community consultation was presented to the Council at an Information Briefing held on 28 August 2023.

Since then, Department of Human Services (DHS) developed a new *Youth Action Plan* for South Australia. This is due to be launched in April 2025.

The new Plan incorporates six key themes identified by young people:

- Greater access to mental health support and services.
- Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community.
- Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.
- More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'
- Greater access to housing and rental accommodation.
- Inclusion in decision-making.

As a member of the Local Government Youth Development Network (LGYDN), the Council's Coordinator, Youth Programs, has partnered with the LGYDN and DHS to ensure a shared narrative, synergy, and approach across State and Local levels of Government. Through these conversations with the LGYDN, SA Youth Forum and DHS, a clear expression of interest and need for support of young people in attaining true life skills and opportunities to increase employment prospects was highlighted by members of the SA Youth Forum. This led to further informal discussions between the LGYDN members on how to best approach, develop and co-plan future programs and reporting which would best support young people within the community whilst increasing their accessibility to targeted initiatives.

Importantly, the South Australian Government's methodology adopts an Action Plan to progress support for young people. In comparison to a 'strategy', this approach acknowledges a shared understanding of the need for a more tactile, responsive, accessible, and diverse method of working with young people.

In this regard, it is recommended that the proposed *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan* be adopted by the Council. In addition to aligning with the approach taken by the South Australian Government, it would be similarly consistent with many other local governments 'youth engagement' practices.

A range of priorities are proposed to be delivered over the next two years that align with the key themes of the new *Youth Action Plan* of South Australia:

- Greater access to mental health support and services.
- Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community.
- Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.
- More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'
- Inclusion in decision-making.

This alignment is important as it strengthens messaging and common efforts and interests.

The draft *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan* is included as **Attachment C**.

The draft *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan* identifies four (4) priorities and outlines a series of actions which build upon the success achieved to date. The Plan's priorities include:

Priority 1

Aspiration: Young people are included in decision-making and develop active citizenship skills.

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: Inclusion in decision-making.

Priority 2

Aspiration: Young People are work ready

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'

Priority 3

Aspiration: Utilise the Norwood Concert Hall to empower young people through the art of performance

Youth Action Plan of SA themes: Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community. Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.

Priority 4

Aspiration: Young People are building positive mental health habits

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: Greater access to mental health support and services.

The Plan will be supported by a range of 'business as usual' activities which include:

- Mayor's Christmas Card Competition.
- Administrating the Young Achievers Program.
- Participation in the Local Government Youth Development Network and Eastern Region Youth Network
- Coordination of the Council's work experience and work placement intake.
- Presentations at schools about Local Government and opportunities available to young people.

OPTIONS

Not Applicable

CONCLUSION

The Council's *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy* outlined the Council's vision for young people within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, providing a framework for piloting various initiatives and ways of working with young people. Importantly, it underpinned consultation and engagement with youth undertaken in 2023, culminating in the formation of the Council's *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan*.

As the *2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy* expires, the *2024-2027 Action Plan* aligns the Council's approach with other government organisations e.g. the South Australian Government, by providing a tangible and practical plan that younger people can engage with and understand whilst reflecting the Council's commitment to young people.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the draft *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan* be adopted.
2. The Council notes that an annual progress report on the implementation of the *2025-2027 Youth Action Plan* will be provided to the Council.

Attachments – Item 13.4

Attachment A

2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy Final Progress Report & Draft 2025-2027 Youth Action Plan





Youth Development Strategy

2022 – 2025



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

Contents

Youth in Context	2
Strategic Objectives	4
Our commitment to young people	5
Objective 1 – Young people are connected, included and welcome in the life of the community	7
Objective 2 – Young people are active and healthy	8
Objective 3 – Young people have resilient futures	9
Objective 4 – Young people are visible and heard	11

2022–2025

Youth Development Strategy

Supporting young people to engage in their community, lead healthy lifestyles and pursue opportunities for learning and citizenship builds their confidence and capacity—contributing to the prosperity and resilience of the broader community.

Youth in Context



Come and Try Program, FiitKids, Norwood

Young people are integral to the Council’s vision of a progressive City which is prosperous, sustainable and socially cohesive, with a strong community spirit.

For the purpose of this Strategy, the Council does not assign a specific age range. Instead the Council recognises that each age group of young people has varying needs.

The Council will therefore provide a range of programs for young people aged 25 years and under that meet the objectives set out in this Strategy and that are suited to the relevant age group.

The following snapshot indicates that young people in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters are slightly better off than their greater Adelaide peers as they are more likely to complete Year 12, be engaged in paid work and education, and volunteer.

It is important to acknowledge that these relatively high levels of engagement across the community can mask pockets of disadvantage and isolation that may be experienced by different groups of young people. Young people who may need extra support to engage in the community include those:

- living in lower income households;
- living with disability or caring for someone with disability;
- from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds; and
- with diverse gender or sexual identities.

Community Snapshot of Youth in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.



17.6%
of the population are young people

79%
young people aged 15–24 years were born in Australia

6,211
young people aged 10–24 years
72 of those young people years identify as Aboriginal

25%
volunteer

1.4%
require help with core activities

3.6%
live alone

1.3%
are married

37%
dependant students

63%
completed year 12

44%
engaged in higher education

92%
engaged in paid work and education

2016 Census data

Strategic Objectives

This Strategy outlines how the Council will integrate positive outcomes for young people across everything it does. Its objectives support those of *CityPlan 2030: Shaping Our Future* and align with the State Government’s Strong Futures: SA Youth Action Plan.

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is committed to providing opportunities for young people to be visible, valued and involved in the community. The Council values the contribution young people make to shape the future direction of our community.

Through our infrastructure, services, programs and events, the Council will continue to find ways to support our young people to thrive.

This Strategy outlines four objectives for youth development and engagement. These objectives are informed by consultation with young people and those who support them. They align with the State Government’s Strong Futures: SA Youth Action Plan and are integral to achieving the goals of *CityPlan 2030: Shaping our Future*.

Figure 1: *CityPlan 2030*



Figure 2: Key areas of focus

Physical Activity

Ensuring there are places, spaces and opportunities for young people to engage in physical activity.

Arts and Culture

Providing opportunities for young people to showcase talent.



Social Inclusion

Ensuring marginalised young people have opportunities to participate in the community.

Engagement

Through volunteering, work experience and skill development.

Integrating youth outcomes with *CityPlan 2030*

- ✔ Young people are connected, included and welcome.
- ✔ Young people are active and healthy.
- ✔ Young people have resilient futures.
- ✔ Young people are visible and heard.

Our commitment to young people

Our commitment to young people will:

- ensure diverse young voices are heard through consultation and representation;
- ensure Council facilities and infrastructure are inclusive and accessible to all young people;
- deliver a range of Council programs that meet the needs of young people under 25 years; and
- provide opportunities for learning, training and work experience.

We will:

- **partner** with local schools and service providers to build on local strengths in youth development;
- **communicate** effectively to keep young people connected to community;
- **promote** positive and diverse images of young people; and
- **advocate** for young people.



Come and Try Program, FiitKids, Norwood

Objective 1

Young people are connected, included and welcome in the life of the community

The Council provides a range of places, programs and events for young people to engage with each other and participate in the life of the community.

Libraries, swimming centres and other sport and recreation facilities are well used by young people. Main streets and green spaces offer opportunities for young people to come together with each other and with the community.

Community events such as the Norwood Christmas Pageant and St Peters Fair provide opportunities for intergenerational interaction.

What we heard

Young people want to be able to hang out with friends in safe and interesting places. They want more opportunities to enjoy activities and events as part of the community. They want their main streets and areas around their schools to offer more relevant retail options.

Key opportunity

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is a well connected and thriving community. There is an opportunity to build on existing strengths to be more

“I wish there was a communal area where kids could hang out after school with games etc. Or more cafes with a games arcade so that I could catch up with friends and have a place to meet new people.” Joe (age 12)

inclusive of young people, particularly those aged between 14–17 years and those from groups more likely to experience isolation.

Applying a youth lens over Council activities will identify where value can be achieved for young people and how the participation of young people can add value to community.

Strategies	CityPlan 2030 Alignment	Measures of Success
1.1 Develop communication practices that resonate with young people. 1.2 To continue to effectively promote and provide information to local young people about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council facilities and parks; • Civic participation activities and opportunities; and • programs which are available for local young people through the Council and other service providers. 	Cultural Vitality Social Equity	Increased numbers of young people attending and participating in Council events and programs. Young people participating in Council programs and events are from a variety of age groups.
1.3 Connect marginalised youth to opportunities to engage in community life (including young people with disabilities, Aboriginal, CALD, LGBTIQ+, young people disengaged from education and work). 1.4 Increase diversity of participants in Council programs.		Young people in attendance at Council programs rate the program at least a 4 out of 5.
1.5 Tailor a range of Council programs and activities aimed at a variety of ages to maximise participation. 1.6 Continue to offer arts and culture focused programs and events.		Young people report community inclusion as high.
1.7 Increase opportunities for intergenerational interaction through community events and programs. 1.8 Work with main streets and businesses to attract young people to shop, eat and hangout.		
1.9 Apply a youth lens across all Council business.		

Objective 2

Young people are active and healthy

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has more than 180 hectares of open space including 69 parks, 28 playgrounds and cycling and walking paths along the River Torrens. The Council also provides a range of sport and recreation facilities including swimming centres, tennis courts, football ovals, cricket pitches and indoor facilities for sporting clubs, gyms, yoga and other activities.

What we heard

Young people want more opportunities to be active. They recognise a range of options for structured activity but desire more opportunities for safe, unstructured physical activity and play (across all age brackets). Some young people need better access to services that respond to difficult life circumstances and mental health.



Key opportunity

The Council does not provide mental health services, however opportunities exist to support community and local service providers to deliver activities that enhance the well-being of young people and contribute to positive mental health.

The Council provides and maintains significant built and natural infrastructure designed to contribute to the health and well-being of the whole community. Applying a youth lens over asset renewal and new infrastructure projects will increase opportunities for safe, unstructured physical activity.

Strategies	CityPlan 2030 Alignment	Measures of Success
2.1 Support community and local service providers to deliver activities that enhance well-being and mental health in young people (e.g. venues, promotion and funding).	Cultural Vitality Social Equity Economic Prosperity	Young people report that they see themselves as physically and mentally fit.
2.2 Include mental health information in current and new programs where appropriate.		Increased numbers of sporting and recreation clubs involved in Council programs.
2.3 Encourage and promote unstructured physical activity and play for young people by promoting spaces to young people.		Increase in the number of learn to ride participants.
2.4 Add physical activities to Council events to increase incidental physical activity.		
2.5 Facilitate connection of young people to local sport and recreation opportunities.		
2.6 Promote and encourage sustainable transport options for young people (cycling, walking and public transport).		

Objective 3

Young people have resilient futures

The Council recognises that a resilient community is built on social equity and cohesion, broad economic participation and a capacity to adapt to emerging needs and challenges associated with social, economic and environmental change.

In addition to programs available to the whole community, the Council provides several targeted opportunities for young people to be visible, valued and involved. New Vibes, CANVAS Youth Art & Design Exhibition, the Young Achievers Program, Skills Sessions and youth volunteering opportunities are all designed to celebrate young people, build confidence and provide opportunities to develop skills and capacity that will contribute to resilient futures.

What we heard

Young people are concerned about transitions to high school, year 12, further education and meaningful work. They are concerned about what the future will look like and how they fit into it. Fitting in socially, economically and professionally was linked to ideas about being the person they want to be and being successful.

Young people are aware of the changing nature of work as a result of technology. They worry about climate change and want to live in a more equitable society where there is no homelessness. Organisations supporting young people highlight the need to continue to engage families to achieve the greatest outcomes for young people.



Key opportunity

There is an opportunity to build on the strengths of the Council's Youth Development Programs by considering how to embrace new technologies and apply existing resources to more diverse programs.

Partnerships and funding can support activities that harness the enthusiasm of young people to contribute to community building activities focussed on environmental sustainability. Opportunities exist to facilitate local schools and service providers to support the aspirations of young people to successfully navigate a range of transitions.

Strategies	CityPlan 2030 Alignment	Measures of Success
3.1 Facilitate connections between local schools and service providers to support the aspirations of young people to successfully navigate a range of transitions.	Cultural Vitality Economic Prosperity Environmental Sustainability	Increased numbers of local students participating in work experience at the Council.
3.2 Facilitate community participation by connecting young people to volunteering opportunities or work experience with local community groups or organisations.		Increased number of young Council Volunteers.
3.3 Build on the strengths of current youth development programs to expand learning opportunities and career pathways.		Young people report they feel confident in their future working prospects.
3.4 Create pathways to employment for local young people through the creation of work experience and volunteer programs.		Increased number of young people attending job related skill development programs.
3.5 Support young people in entry to work.		
3.6 Encourage and support young people with environmental initiatives.		At least one environmental initiative is held each year.



Objective 4

Young people are visible and heard

The Council is committed to effective consultation with the community because it improves decision-making. Open communication and consultation builds community capacity and contributes to the development of cooperative partnerships which deliver more for the community.

What we heard

Young people want to be heard and they appreciate the opportunity to share their experience and ideas. Young people find out what's going on in various ways, most commonly through social media, word of mouth and signage. They often do not know what is going on in the local area or how to find out. While they are unlikely to visit the Council's website, they notice posters and signage that are visible in the places where they spend time.

"Let us know what's going on through posters in the places we hang out, like Marden." Samir (older teen)

Key opportunity

There is an opportunity to tailor communications and consultation processes to the needs and communication styles of young people. The Council has existing programs, resources and networks which could be used to maximise engagement with young people.

Strategies	CityPlan 2030 Alignment	Measures of Success
4.1 Encourage young people to have their say in all relevant Council consultation.	Cultural Vitality Social Equity Economic Prosperity	Young people are represented in relevant Council consultations.
4.2 Develop a network with a small number of young people who are widely connected to young people in the community.		Young people report that they know how to have their say on Council matters.
4.3 Maximise the potential of current youth programs to contribute a youth advisory and promotional function.		Young people report that they are satisfied they are being heard.
4.4 Promote youth diversity, capacity and potential through all relevant Council publications and promotions, including text and images.		Relevant Council publications and promotions include diverse representations of youth through images and text.
4.5 Continue to explore ways of communicating effectively with young people.		



Further Information

For information on the Council's Youth Development Strategy 2022–2025, please visit www.npsp.sa.gov.au or phone 8366 4555.

You can also visit the Council's Customer Service Centre at the Norwood Town Hall, 175 The Parade, Norwood.



Additional Copies

The Youth Development Strategy 2022–2025 can be viewed online at www.npsp.sa.gov.au

Copies may also be obtained by:

- visiting Norwood Town Hall
- visiting any of the Council's Libraries
- emailing townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
- contacting the Council on 8366 4555
- writing to the Council at PO Box 204, Kent Town SA 5074

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4555
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au
Socials  /cityofnpsp  @cityofnpsp



City of
**Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters**

Attachment B

2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy Final Progress Report & Draft 2025-2027 Youth Action Plan



Summary of Youth Development Strategy Key Deliverables January 2023 to January 2025

Youth Development Strategy Objective 1

Young people are connected, included and welcome in the life of the community.

COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS WITH SCHOOLS

Project	Partnering School(s) & other partners	Number of participating students	Year level(s)	Aim
Planting & Weeding in the St Peters Billabong	St Peter's College Friends of the Billabong Volunteers	84	Year 4	200 native plants planted. Education around the need for maintenance in our public landscapes and wildlife corridors. Discussed the importance of weeding in addition to planting.
Department for Education Problem Based Learning Program: Wildlife and Water Corridors'	Norwood Primary School Department of Education	50	Year 5	To provide students with problem solving skills through a medium which allows them to discover varied solutions to a multi-faceted problem.
Careers Expo 2023	Norwood International High School	1500+	Year 7- Year 12	To engage with students and bring more awareness to opportunities available to them through the Council.
Artwork Exhibition in Norwood Town Hall Foyer	St Peter's College Norwood International High School	5 31	Year 10 Year 7 Year 8	Coil Vases A4 coloured pencils shading compositions
Gather Round art competition 2024	Marryatville High School Norwood Primary School Trinity Gardens Primary School	2 1 2	Year 9 Year 6 Year 1 Year 4	The winning submission was framed and displayed in the Mayor's office at the Norwood Townhall.
Gather Round 2024 Osmond Terrace Signage art project (x4 workshops)	Norwood Primary School Felixstow Primary School Artist, Lucinda Penn	60 30	Year 4 Year 5	Provide local Schools and their Students with an opportunity to be involved with a Statewide initiative and to have their art on public display during the weekend of events.
Mayor's Christmas Card Competition 2023 Mayor's Christmas Card Competition Display	9 local Schools	132	Pre-School to Year 6	Christmas and MCCC Display in Norwood Town Hall Foyer, November-December 2023 Attract more young people to our City (and their families) during the Christmas Holiday period.

Welcome to New Citizens Messages and creation of Slideshow Presentation and Postcards	St Ignatius Junior School.	51	Year 6	Students are able to connect with new citizens at Citizenship Ceremonies by sharing their own life experiences in Welcome Messages and Letters to New Citizens.
Council presentations (various dates)	Prince Alfred College	60	Year 4	To provide local Schools with an understanding of Local Government, its processes and policies, and how they differ to other levels of Government. To support young people in learning about opportunities and activations that Council facilitates for their age groups.
	St Ignatius Junior School	80		
	Marryatville High School	20		
Traffic Presentation	St Ignatius Junior School Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport	60	Year 4	
Mayors Christmas Card Competition 2024	14 local Schools	320	Pre-School to Year 6	Christmas and MCCC Display in Norwood Town Hall Foyer, November-December 2024 Attract more young people to our City (and their families) during the Christmas Holiday period

PROGRAMS LED BY COORDINATOR, YOUTH PROGRAMS

Program/Event	Partners	Number of participants	Age range	Aim
Dig-A-Dino Workshop Activation, Payneham Library	Dig-A-Dino	40	Ages 7 +	Science week 2023 activation and experience.
Movie Nights and Norwood Splash Events at the Norwood Swimming Centre 2023, 2024 and January 2025	Various Adelaide Outdoor Cinema St Louis Gelato Catering Cart Local musicians, Amber MIC Productions Norwood Rotary Club & Payneham Swimming Club (BBQ fundraising)		All	To activate our Norwood Swimming Centre, provide the community with events and activations which also support local community groups, vendors and suppliers. Movie Nights at the Pool and Norwood Splash Events offer young people in our community with age
Passata Experience 2024	Fogolar Furlan	40	All	Skill Development, Intergenerational & Culture experience. Increased exposure for Fogolar Furlan in the local community.
Paint a Football (Gather Round 2024)	Artist, Cat Dean	10	-	Young People advised that they want more art opportunities that are more than simple craft activities, in creating the connection between art and football, the purpose was to provide young people that have an interest in sport/football with an opportunity to be creative.

What's on this Christmas & Elves 2023 and 2024	-	-		To provide children and families with an add-on to Events/Locations that assist in promotion and participation.
The Lounge – Youth Space Takeover at Payneham Library (July, October & December school holidays)	Libraries	-	10 to 18	Firstival, October & December School Holidays Program 2024 Fill a gap in our School Holiday program to target 10 to 18 age group.
Tabletop Games workshop at St Peters Banquet Hall Dungeons & Dragons	Tabletop Warfare	12	12 & Up	Firstival & July School Holidays Program 2024 Fill gap in the School Holiday program to target teen age group, 10 to 18.
2 x Robotics Workshops at Payneham Library	CreativiTek	20	10 to 18	Firstival & July School Holidays Program 2024 Fill a gap in the School Holiday program to target STEM focused programs and opportunities.
2 x Game Development Workshops	Catalyst Games	8	10 to 18	January School Holiday Program 2025 Provide young people with more accessibility and opportunities to learn STEM Robotics Gaming Programs.
Botanical Art Workshop at St Peters Banquet Hall	Artist,Cat Dean	10	13 to 25	October School Holidays 2024
Nature Journaling Workshop at St Peters Banquet Hall	Cosmophylla, Jenny Deans	20	7 & Up	October School Holidays 2024
Animals Anonymous at Payneham Library	Animals Anonymous	30	5 to 18	October School Holidays 2024
Cyanotype Workshop at St Peters Banquet Hall	Stitch,Paint Burn	15	-	October School Holidays 2024
Nitro Nat Science Workshops at St Peters Banquet Hall	Nitro Nat			Christmas – December School Holidays 2024
Astonishing Astronomy		30	-	
Phantastic Physics		50	-	
Emerging makers and artists stalls at St Peters Fair				To support Young Entrepreneurs & Creatives in gaining Market Experience and exposure within the community.
2023		6	10 to 30	
2024		6	10 to 30	
VR Gaming Activation at St Peters Fair 2024		-	-	To provide young people with something to do at an Event that is mostly promoted towards families.

APPROVED YOUNG ACHIEVERS FUNDING APPLICATIONS

Category	Section	Number of young people	Total funding provided
Leadership Program	Youth SA: State Conference	2	\$300
Interstate	24 Sport, 1 Academics/Leadership, 1 Leadership	26	\$6,500
International	6 Sport & Recreation and 1 Culture	7	\$3,500

Youth Development Strategy Objective 2

Young people are active and healthy.

HEALTH AND WELLBEING INITIATIVES

Program/Event	Partners	Number of participants	Age range	Aim
Local Come & Try Promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World Taekwondo Oriental Sports Academy - Wings Basketball Academy - East Adelaide Payneham Tennis Club - St Peters Tennis Club - Phoenix Cheer and Dance - Just for Fun the Dance Company - Youth Fitness Co - Stomping Ground Studios - Payneham Swimming Club - Adelaide Taekwondo Academy - Azzurri Sports Club Adelaide Blue Eagles - East Torrens Baseball Club - Payneham Norwood Union Football Club 	-	-	Sharing 'what is available in our council area'. Disseminated to clubs, community organisations and schools and available to download on via our website.
Breathsmart Functional Breathing for Emotional Fitness' Mental Health Workshop	The Big AL Foundation	22	Year 10	To assist teenagers in learning to increase their emotional fitness through the process of breathing techniques which work through their emotions, self-regulation, and stressors.
Wheel Park	Ride-A-Bike Right	5	-	January School Holiday Program 2023
3 x Make-up & Self-Esteem Workshops	Larissa Jones	24	10 to 18	Firstival & December School Holidays Program 2024
'Little Breathers' Mental Health Workshop	The Big AL Foundation	10	5 to 12	October School Holiday Program 2024 To introduce the benefits of Breathwork and techniques which can assist children of all ages in processing their emotions and help them to self-regulate.
Wings Basketball Academy Come & Try Session	Wings Basketball Academy	-	U10, U12, U14, U16, U18	October School Holiday Program 2024

Stomping Ground Studios Come & Try Session	Stomping Ground Studios	20	-	December 2024	School Holiday Program
Phoenix Cheer and Dance Come & Try Sessions	Phoenix Cheer and Dance	-	-	December 2024	School Holiday Program
East Torrens Baseball Club Come & Try Sessions	East Torrens Baseball Club	-	7-10 9-13	January 2025	School Holiday Program 2025

Youth Development Strategy Objective 3

Young people have resilient futures.

WORK EXPERIENCE STUDENTS

School	Business Unit/ Department	Number of students	Duration	Project/ key activities
Marryatville High School	Library Facilities	1		
	Norwood Townhall	1		
Urrbrae Agricultural High School	Library Facilities	1		
	Norwood Townhall			
Norwood International High School	Arboriculture Unit,	3	July 2024	
	Library Facilities			
	St Peter's Childcare Centre & Preschool			
St Aloysius College	Events Unit	1	October 2024	
Loreto College	Library Facilities	1	September 2024	
Marryatville High School	Citizen Services	1	December 2024	
	Library Facilities	2		
	St Peter's Childcare Centre & Preschool	2		
	Information Services	1		
Maxima Support	Citizen Services	1	November 2024	

WORK PLACEMENT STUDENTS

University	Business Unit/ Department	Number of students	Duration	Project/ key activities
Torrens University	Community Care Services, Community Development	1	January-April 2024	
Flinders University	Arts, Culture & Community Connections, Community Development	1	February-June 2024	Community facilities for hire data collection.
University of South Australia	Information Services	1	May-September 2024	
University of South Australia	St Peters Childcare Centre & Preschool	3	May to June 2024	
University of South Australia	Library Facilities, Community Development	1	July 2024	
Flinders University	St Peters Childcare Centre & Preschool	1	August 2024	
	St Peters Childcare Centre & Preschool	1	October – December 2024	

3 x Students that were approved for Work Experience however have cancelled for differing reasons (2 from Loreto College and 1 from University Senior College).

Youth Development Strategy Objective 4

Young people are visible and heard.

FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

ENGAGEMENT TECHNIQUE	DETAILS / LOCATION	TARGET AUDIENCE	DATES
Face to Face Community Survey at St Peters Fair	St Peters Fair – Linde Reserve	NPSP young people / community	25 March 2023
Online Survey for Young People	NPSP Website	NPSP young people / community	25 March 2023 – June 2023
Online Youth Sector Survey	NPSP Website	Service providers and facilitators	25 March 2023 – June 2023
In Person Workshops	Library facilities	NPSP Young Adults and Senior School Students	April 2023
Letter box drop	Cater to age demographic locations & suburbs – see density data gained via 2021 Census data	Ages 10 – 30.	April – May 2023
Public Display	Norwood Townhall CS area, Libraries, CHC, PCC & Norwood Swimming Centre	NPSP Community, facility visitors	25 March 2023 – June 2023
Email	Service providers, sporting groups, Primary and Senior Schools in the NPSP Council area	Youth Networks and Service providers Schools NPSP young people / community	28 March 2023 – June 2023
Community Survey online and hardcopy	– The Council's website and Norwood Townhall Citizen Service Centre	Various	5 September 2023 – 2 October 2023
Quick Response Mini Survey	Norwood International High School Students		August - September 2024
Eastern Region Youth Development Network	Local Councils within the Eastern Region of Adelaide, local youth service providers and organisations	Youth Networks and Service providers	Various 2023 - 2024
Local Government Youth Development Network	South Australian Local Government Youth Development and Program Coordinators and Officers, Youth Sector members, Youth service providers and organisations	Local Government and Youth Networks and Service providers	Various 2023 - 2024

Attachment C

2022-2025 Youth Development Strategy Final Progress Report & Draft 2025-2027 Youth Action Plan



Youth Action Plan 2025-2027

Contents

- Introduction
- Young People in our City
- Strategic Alignment
- What we heard from Young People
- Our Approach
- Our Plan
- Developing the Draft Youth Action Plan 2025-2027
- Youth Action Plan 2025-2027
- Review and Continuous Improvement Process

Introduction

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, *Youth Action Plan 2025-2027* will assist in achieving our collective goals, while keeping the needs and aspirations of young people front of mind. It seeks to guide our intentions, activations and determinations when developing, delivering, and reviewing the Council's Youth Service priorities and actions over the coming two financial years (2025-2026 and 2026-2027).

The Plan is designed to be an adaptable and agile approach to ensure the evolving aspirations of young people is consistently being heard, considered, and implemented where possible and practical.

The *Youth Action Plan 2024-2026* is to be considered alongside the *CityPlan 2030: Shaping our Future*, in shaping the preferred future of our City.

Young People in the City

In the 2021 Australian Census, The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters population was 37,823 of which 9,833 were aged 0-25 years old.

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters 2021 Service Age Groups (Compared to Greater Adelaide)¹

	Babies & pre-schoolers 0-4 Years	Primary Schoolers 5-11 Years	Secondary Schoolers 12-17 Years	Tertiary Education & Independence 18-24 Years	Young Workforce 25-34 Years
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters	4.3%	6.9%	6.4%	8.7%	15.4%
Greater Adelaide	5.4%	8.2%	6.9%	8.8%	14.0%

The major differences between the age structure of the City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters and Greater Adelaide were:

- A larger percentage of 'Young workforce' (15.4% compared to 14.0%)

Education and Employment

The 2021 Australian Census reports that 92.6% of young people living in the City aged between 15 and 24 years were participating in education and/or employment, compared to 4.63% who were disengaged from work or training.

Norwood Payneham & St Peters 2021 Youth Engagement (15-24 Years)

Young People aged 15-24 Years	Persons	%
Engaged in Education & Employment	1,738	38.89%
Engaged in Education	1,442	32.27%
Engaged in Employment	958	21.44%
Disengaged Youth	207	4.63%
Not Stated	124	2.77%
Total	4,469	100%

¹ Per the 2021 Australian Bureau of Statistics, Census Data, collected via the REMPLAN Community Website. <https://login.rempln.com.au/community/>

Strategic Alignment

The Council's strategic management Plan *CityPlan 2030: Shaping our Future* is a comprehensive community vision for the Council area to 2030. The Plan is underpinned by four outcomes:

Social Equity

Aspiration: An inclusive, connected, accessible and friendly community.

Cultural Vitality

Aspiration: A culturally rich and diverse city, with a strong identity, history and sense of place.

Economic Prosperity

Aspiration: A dynamic and thriving centre for business and services.

Environmental Sustainability

Aspiration: A leader in environmental sustainability.

SA Youth Action Plan- consultation mid-2023 to inform the new SA Youth Action Plan

In April 2025, the Department of Human Services (DHS) will launch a new *Youth Action Plan* for South Australia.

The new Plan incorporates six key themes identified by young people:

- Greater access to mental health support and services.
- Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community.
- Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.
- More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'
- Greater access to housing and rental accommodation.
- Inclusion in decision-making.

As the Council's current *Youth Strategy 2022-2025* concludes, this presented an opportunity to align the Council's Youth Service delivery with the new *Youth Action Plan* for South Australia. In accord with the shift at a State and Local Government level away from strategies with broad goals toward youth action plans, the Council's *Youth Action Plan 2025-2027* will focus on concrete actionable steps to respond to the needs of young people in the City.

As a member of the Local Government Youth Development Network (LGYDN), the Council's Coordinator Youth Programs has partnered with the LGYDN and the Department of Human Services (DHS) to ensure a shared narrative, synergy, and approach across State and Local levels of Government and reflect within the *Plan* this shared understanding for a more tactile, responsive, accessible, and diverse approach of working with young people.

Through these conversations with the LGYDN, SA Youth Forum and DHS, a clear expression of interest and need for support of young people in attaining true life skills and opportunities to increase employment prospects was highlighted. This led to further informal discussions between the LGYDN members on how to best approach, develop future programs and reporting which would best support young people within the community whilst increasing their accessibility to targeted initiatives.

Key themes that fall within the remit of the Council's service delivery include:

- Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community
- Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities or opportunities
- More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult'
- Inclusion in decision making.

<https://dhs.sa.gov.au/how-we-help/youth/sa-youth-action-plan>

These key themes and feedback from local young people, as summarised in the following section, have informed the development the Council's *Youth Action Plan 2025-2027* and the actions contained within the *Plan* reflect the local context of young people within the City.

What we heard from Young People

Below is a snapshot of what we heard from young people. For an in-depth overview of the community engagement process and feedback, please refer to the Voice & Vision of Young People Community Engagement Report accessible via the Council's website.

Would like more...

- Opportunities to have a say, to be heard and to make an impact on decisions and setting priorities.
- Access to information & events.
- Inclusive workshops and events
- Frequent events and programs
- Art by and for young people.
- More art initiatives, opportunities to be involved in art workshops, displays and decisions.
- Opportunities for young musicians & live music performances
- Visibility in events and community programs.
- Training opportunities at little to no cost to participants
- Youth-led opportunities
- Outcomes directly beneficial to young people.
- Access to gain experience outside of university and school.
- Planting, greenery, and garden beds
- Education around waste
- Recycling and composting
- Recycled and sustainable Art workshops

Key issues preventing participation...

- Events and initiatives are often too family or elderly focused.

Concerned about...

- Climate Change
- Not being heard by adults and people in charge.
- Cost of living stresses.

Program Development ideas...

- Outcome focused rather than reactive initiatives.
- Programs and initiatives to be held in a variety of facilities.
- Outdoor Sport
- Study Space

Ideas...

- Consider Neurodiverse needs.
- Interactive page within the NPSP website aimed at young people.
- Cost and location
- Consider not placing age restrictions, where appropriate, on programs to enable diverse age groups to connect over shared areas of interest.
- Night life and safety when walking to and from locations or facilities.
- Lighting along walking and riding trails
- A space to come together
- Youth events and forums regarding climate change.

Our Approach

Whilst young people have been at the heart of what we do, the *Youth Action Plan 2025-2027* recognises that for programs and initiatives to be effective and accepted among young people aged 25 years and under, they must be established and maintained through a two-way dialogue with young people, where their voices are heard, they feel encouraged to share their aspirations and needs, and are supported to achieve their desired outcomes.

To inform and ensure meaningful action and outcomes for young people, implementation of the *Plan*, program and project planning, and youth service delivery will be guided by the following principles:

Work Together:	Act in a deliberate and collaborative way to facilitate meaningful engagement and collaboration with young people and stakeholders to identify and develop a local response to unmet community need or opportunity.
Create the Enabling Environment:	Reduce red tape, streamline processes and work collaboratively to support improved outcomes. Utilise community facilities as a resource to support wellbeing outcomes.
Discover:	Test and trial ideas, seek feedback, recognise learnings, refine, and adapt.
Develop:	Collectively plan and prioritise programs and initiatives based on the Council's strategic priorities, demonstratable need and aspirations of young people.
Share:	Share information, opportunities, success stories and discoveries. Embed feedback and review mechanisms into project and program planning.

Developing the Draft Youth Action Plan 2025-2027

A range of priorities are proposed to be delivered over the next two years that align with the key themes of the new *Youth Action Plan* of South Australia:

- Greater access to mental health support and services.
- Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community.
- Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.
- More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'
- Inclusion in decision-making.

The *Youth Action Plan 2025-2027* priorities include:

Priority 1

Aspiration: Young people are included in decision-making and develop active citizenship skills.

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: Inclusion in decision-making.

Priority 2

Aspiration: Young People are work ready

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'

Priority 3

Aspiration: Utilise the Norwood Concert Hall to empower young people through the art of performance

Youth Action Plan of SA themes: Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community. Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.

Priority 4

Aspiration: Young People are building positive mental health habits

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: Greater access to mental health support and services.

Priority 1

Aspiration: Young people are included in decision-making and develop active citizenship skills.

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: Inclusion in decision-making.

Activities/ actions (outputs)	Inputs (staff resources & partners, if known)	Target Group/ demographic	Short term outcome targets (skills, knowledge, attitudes, awareness raising, motivation outcomes).	Medium term outcome targets (change in behaviour or the application of skills and knowledge)
Co-design a school holiday program in partnership with young people	Library Program Staff Coordinator Youth Programs	School Age	Sharing program decision making power. Young people are partners in the decisions that impact them.	More engaging and relevant programs.
Develop a changemaker program	Library Program Staff Coordinator Youth Programs External mentors/ facilitators related to area of interest.	12 -25 years of age	Young people co- design a local community project (social, environmental and/or creative outcomes). Young people have increased awareness of local issues and how to contribute to solutions.	Young people are empowered and contribute to stronger and more resilient communities.

Trial interactive engagement and consultation with young people to inform playground and open space designs.	Coordinator Youth Programs Project Managers Artist, Seb Humphreys	Young Adult	Temporarily install flowbars sculpture in Addey Reserve, Firle. (Interactive outdoor 'play spaces' outcomes by artist Seb Humphreys that underpin a broader range of learning outcomes and inter-generational participation than traditional play-spaces). The flowbars will be an attractor for young people, while engaging with the installation QR codes and information at the site will be available for young adults to provide feedback and assess interest in investigating permanent custom designed flowbars or other ideas young people have for the playground upgrade.	Creating spaces and places for young people and involve young people in the planning process. All ages play to enhance movement, autonomy, creativity, and navigational decision making.
Develop a program survey to assess impact and inform future programming.	Coordinator Children's & Youth Services (libraries) Coordinator Youth Programs	All	Immediate feedback on programs, events, and outcomes.	Long term assistance in determining program planning and development.
Department for Education Problem Based Learning Program	Coordinator Youth Programs Local schools	Year 5 & Year 6 Students	Exposure to an alternate method of learning.	Problem solving experience with a real-life problem. Experience with teamwork and partnerships.

Tree Planting Day	Trees for life Coordinator Youth Programs	St Peters College Students Year 4	Give back to their community and contribute to the preservation of biodiversity and enhance the beauty of local open spaces. Time in nature and being physically active, contributing to overall wellbeing.	Environmental education exposure to climate concerns.
The Lounge – Youth Space Takeover of Payneham Room	Coordinator Children's & Youth Services (libraries) Coordinator Youth Programs	10 to 18 years of age	Time and space to connect in a safe place for free.	Allow a space to be utilised as a safe space away from outside factors or influences.

Priority 2

Aspiration: Young People are work ready

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: More support with post-school pathways, including the teaching of 'life skills' or 'how to adult.'

Activities/ actions (outputs)	Inputs (staff resources & partners, if known)	Target Group/ demographic	Short term outcome targets (skills, knowledge, attitudes, awareness raising, motivation outcomes).	Medium term outcome targets (change in behaviour or the application of skills and knowledge)
My First Job Program	Facilitated by the 1530 Network 2026-2027 partners to be confirmed.	Teens and Young Adults	Knowledge to empower likelihood to achieve a successful job application.	Support in workplace environments and skills required to maintain employment.
Essential Job Skills Program	Facilitated by the 1530 Network. 2026-2027 partners to be confirmed.	Teens and Young Adults	Develop knowledge and skillset to empower young people in achieving a successful job application and maintaining the employment contract.	Support in workplace environments and skills required to maintain employment.
Resume workshops	Facilitated by Sue Venn in 2025. 2026-2027 partners to be confirmed.	Teens and Young Adults	Provide knowledge, skills and support in developing current and new resumes to achieve employment. Provide positive motivation for entering the workforce.	Support in gaining and maintaining employment. Skills to further develop resumes and cover letters in future phases of employment.
Continue emerging makers and artist stalls at St Peters Fair	Events Coordinator Youth Programs	Teens and Young Adults	Provide market experience and skills in setting up and selling items in a community market space.	Entrepreneur experience in an environment that requires skills and attributes which attract customers and public awareness.

Explore adding work ready resources and training modules on our digital library and/or website.	Library Digital Services Officer Marketing and Place Activation Coordinator Youth Programs	Teens and Young Adults	Increase accessibility to work ready information (may include videos of local business owners sharing what they look for when recruiting new staff).	Young people have access to work ready information that is relevant to them.
---	--	------------------------	--	--

Priority 3

Aspiration: Utilise the Norwood Concert Hall to empower young people through the art of performance

Youth Action Plan of SA themes: Connection to services and activities available in the young person's community. Increased access to age appropriate, affordable, and accessible sport and recreation activities and opportunities.

Activities/ actions (outputs)	Inputs (staff resources & partners, if known)	Target Group/ demographic	Short term outcome targets (skills, knowledge, attitudes, awareness raising, motivation outcomes).	Medium term outcome targets (change in behaviour or the application of skills and knowledge)
Explore collaborations with local schools to utilise the Norwood Concert Hall for live skills-based learning experiences.	Coordinator Youth Programs Norwood Concert Hall Coordinator Local Schools	School Age	Enhance drama and theatre production skills. A creative outlet for young people to express themselves and to form friendships. Challenge young people to open their minds, explore different worlds through characters, dance, song, and stories.	Cultivate essential soft skills such as collaboration, communication, empathy, and confidence. Enhanced wellbeing, self- esteem, and resilience.
Explore collaborative partnerships with productions, for or by young people, within the Norwood Concert Hall & Community Facilities	Partners to be confirmed.	Teens and Young Adults	As above Achieve more by working together and utilising local assets.	As above

Priority 4

Aspiration: Young People are building positive mental health habits

Youth Action Plan of SA theme: Greater access to mental health support and services.

Activities/ actions (outputs)	Inputs (staff resources & partners, if known)	Target Group/ demographic	Short term outcome targets (skills, knowledge, attitudes, awareness raising, motivation outcomes).	Medium term outcome targets (change in behaviour or the application of skills and knowledge)
Mental Health Seminars	Facilitated by the Big AL foundation in 2025. 2026-2027 partners to be confirmed.	5 to 12 years of age 13 to 18 years of age	Breathwork and emotional awareness. Education surrounding the importance of self-awareness in the mind and body.	Behavioural improvements developed through improving their skills in utilising their breath to manage emotional responses.
Self-esteem workshops	Facilitated by Larissa Jones in 2025. 2026-2027 partners to be confirmed.	10 to 18 years of age	Makeup skill development to enhance natural features, product knowledge and self-esteem and breathwork awareness.	Self-esteem knowledge and management improvements which assist in the long-term stability of emotional foundations. Improved capacity to manage emotional responses.
Art workshops targeted at Young People	Botanical art workshop facilitated by Cat Dean in 2025 2026-2027 partners to be confirmed.	13 to 25 years of age	Skill development with acrylic paint and canvas mediums, awareness on the benefits of being able to express oneself through art.	Use art as a tool to reduce stress and develop individual self-expression. Further development of knowledge and skills in specific art mediums and visual art.

These actions will be supported by a range of 'business as usual' activities which include:

- Mayor's Christmas Card Competition.
- Administrating the Young Achievers Program.
- Participation in the Local Government Youth Development Network and Eastern Region Youth Network.
- Coordination of the Council's work experience and work placement intake.
- Presentations at schools about Local Government and opportunities available to young people.

Review and Continuous Improvement Process

The *Youth Action Plan 2025-2027* is intended to be an agile document, where the actions under each of the four priority areas may vary and be adapted to better meet the needs of young people in the community.

To remain accountable to young people, progress will be reviewed annually and reported to the Council.

The interactive webpage for young people on the Council's website will be updated every three (3) months to ensure that the information we are sharing with young people is current and engaging https://www.npsp.sa.gov.au/our_community/youth

Section 2 – Corporate & Finance
Reports

13.5 2024-2025 THIRD BUDGET REVIEW

REPORT AUTHOR: Senior Finance Business Partner
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Finance Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4548
FILE REFERENCE:
ATTACHMENTS: A - C

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with a summary of the forecast Budget position for the year ended 30 June 2025, following the Third Budget Review. This forecast is based on the year-to-date February 2025 results.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Section 123 (13) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Council must, as required by the Regulations reconsider its annual business plan or its budget during the course of a financial year and, if necessary or appropriate, make any revisions.

The Budget Reporting Framework set out in Regulation 9 of the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011* (“the Regulations”) comprises two (2) types of reports, namely:

1. the Budget Update; and
2. the Mid-year Budget Review.

1. Budget Update

The Budget Update Report sets out the revised forecast of the Council’s Operating and Capital investment activities compared with the estimates for those activities set out in the Adopted Budget. The Budget Update is required to be presented in a manner consistent with the note in the Model Financial Statements entitled *Uniform Presentation of Finances*.

The Budget Update Report must be considered by the Council at least twice per year between 30 September and 31 May (both dates inclusive) in the relevant financial year, with at least one (1) Budget Update Report being considered by the Council prior to consideration of the Mid-Year Budget Review Report.

The Regulations requires a Budget Update Report to include a revised forecast of the Council’s operating and capital investment activities compared with estimates set out in the Adopted Budget, however it is recommended by the Local Government Association that the Budget Update Report should also include at a summary level:

- the year-to- date result;
- any variances sought to the Adopted Budget or the most recent Revised Budget for the financial year; and
- a revised end of year forecast for the financial year.

2. Mid-Year Review

The Mid-Year Budget Review must be considered by the Council between 30 November and 15 March (inclusive) in the relevant financial year. The Mid-Year Budget Review Report sets out a revised forecast of each item shown in its Budgeted Financial Statements compared with estimates set out in the Adopted Budget presented in a manner consistent with the Model Financial Statements. The Mid-Year Budget Review Report must also include revised forecasts for the relevant financial year of the Council’s Operating Surplus Ratio, Net Financial Liabilities Ratio and Asset Sustainability Ratio compared with estimates set out in the budget presented in a manner consistent with the note in the Model Financial Statements entitled *Financial Indicators*.

The Mid-year Budget Review is a comprehensive review of the Council's Budget and includes the four principal financial statements, as required by the Model Financial Statement, detailing:

- the year-to-date result;
- any variances sought to the Adopted Budget; and
- a revised full year forecast of each item in the budgeted financial statements compared with estimates set out in the Adopted budget.

The Mid-year Budget Review Report should also include information detailing the revised forecasts of financial indicators compared with targets established in the Adopted Budget and a summary report of operating and capital activities consistent with the note in the Model Financial Statements entitled *Uniform Presentation of Finances*.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The Third Budget Review provides the opportunity to reflect any changes in projections based on the actual year-to-date results to February 2025 and forecast the 2024-2025 Operating result.

Details of material movements in the forecast from the Adopted Budget are contained in the Discussion section of this Report.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

This report provides information on the planned financial performance of the Council for the year ended 30 June 2025 and has no direct external economic impacts.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Nil.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Nil.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Nil.

RESOURCE ISSUES

There are no resource implications arising from this issue.

RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no risk management issues arising from this issue. All documents have been prepared in accordance with the statutory requirements.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

The Council considered the First Budget Update and the Mid-year Budget Review at its meetings held on 8 October 2024 and 3 February 2025 respectively.

- **Community**

Not Applicable.

- **Staff**

Responsible Officers and General Managers.

- **Other Agencies**

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

Budget Review

In determining the Adopted Operating Surplus, the Council considers the financial resources which are required to provide the ongoing services, programs and facilities (Recurrent Operating Budget), which encompass the responsibilities, which the Council is required to provide under the *Local Government Act* and other relevant legislation, plus ongoing services and programs as a result of community needs and expectations as determined by the Council.

Such on-going services include regulatory services, such as animal management and parking management, street cleaning and rubbish collection, maintenance of basic infrastructure including roads, footpaths, parks, public open space, street lighting and storm-water drainage, development planning and control, library and learning services, community support programs, environmental programs, community events, community recreational facilities and home assistance service.

In addition, the Council considers the funding requirements associated with the introduction of new services and initiative or the enhancement to existing services (Operating Projects).

The 2024-2025 Adopted Operating Budget projected an Operating Surplus of \$229,418. At the Council meeting held on 3 February 2025, the Council endorsed the Mid-Year Budget Update, which reported a forecast Operating Surplus of \$1,740,061. The increase in Operating Surplus was primarily due to the inclusion of the advancements of the *2024-2025 Financial Assistance Grant* from the Federal Government.

Following the Third Budget Review, the Operating Surplus is now forecasted to increase to \$2,763,936.

The material movements in the components that make up the Operating Surplus following the Third Budget Review detailed below.

A. Recurrent Operating Budget changes to the Adopted Budget – surplus increase (\$3,016,402)

The Council adopted a 2024-2025 Recurrent Operating Budget Surplus of \$1.14 million. In the First Budget Update, this Budget remained unchanged. As a result of the Mid-Year Budget Update, the Recurrent Operating Surplus increased by \$1,992,527 to \$3.133 million.

Following the Third Budget Review, the Recurrent Operating Surplus is forecast to increase by a further \$1,023,875 from the Mid-Year Update, resulting in a Recurrent Operating Surplus of \$4.157 million. The major reasons for the movement in Recurrent Operating Surplus are detailed in Table 1.

TABLE 1: MAJOR VARIANCES IN RECURRING BUDGET – THIRD BUDGET REVIEW

	Increase/ (Decrease) \$
Reduction in Finance costs to reflect realised to date budget savings in interest expenses as a result of the timing of loan borrowings.	(500,000)
Reduction in Staff Salaries & Wages Budget during the financial year 2024-2025 as a result of positions that are not currently being substituted by contractors or substituted for a short time (i.e. Development Officer, Buildings (new position), Organisational Development Specialist, Infrastructure & Major Projects Executive Assistant, Manager, City Services, Project Manager, City Projects, Senior Mechanic, Project Officer, Procurement Specialist, Finance Business Partner, portions of other roles that are not fully covered by contractors).	(951,875)
Increase in depreciation expenses as a result of the revaluation of capital assets in the 2023-2024 financial year. This represents timing of budget for depreciation versus finalisation of assets capitalisation and revaluation processes.	298,000
Increase in water charges due to increase in usage of water mainly for reserve and open space maintenance as a result of lower than expected rainfall during the year.	130,000

B. Operating Projects Budget changes to the Adopted Budget – cost increase \$481,885

The Adopted Budget includes a proposed estimate of operating project expenditure for the year under review and the following changes:

- previously approved First Budget Review which included carried forward projects from the prior budget year as well as an additional fund requests,
- previously approved additional funding request in Second Budget Review,
- identified increments or reductions to the current year approved projects proposed in current Third Budget Review.

The Adopted Budget that was endorsed by the Council for 2024-2025, included a total expenditure on Operating Projects of \$0.911 million. As a result of the First Budget Update, the total forecast expenditure on Operating Projects increased to \$1.522 million, due to inclusion of the Carry Forwards totalling \$610,747 from the 2023-2024 Financial Year. As a result of the Mid-Year Budget Review, the total forecast expenditure on Operating Projects decreased to \$1.393 million, due to reduction in current year projects by \$128,862.

No changes are proposed to be made to the Operating Projects Budget as part of the Third Budget Update.

In reviewing the progress of the endorsed the Operating Projects, the projects that may be carried forward into the next financial year are detailed in Table 2 below. Total value of Carry Forward budget required will be confirmed at year end validation.

TABLE 2: OPERATING BUDGETS LIKELY TO BE CARRIED FORWARD TO 2025-2026

Operating Projects

The **Heritage Protection Opportunities** project continues to be implemented. Due to timing of the Code Amendment processes, it is anticipated that part of the budget may need to be carried over into the next financial year (2025-2026).

The Consultant brief has been prepared for the **Glynde Heavy Vehicle Traffic Study** and the study is on track to be undertaken by 30 June 2025. However, the community consultation is unlikely to occur during the current financial year (2024-2025), due to other priorities and workload. It is anticipated that the remainder of the project budget will need to be carried forward into the next financial year (2025-2026).

Part of the **Verge Upgrade** project is likely to be carried forward into the next financial year. The Program is anticipated to be open to residents in April 2025.

A status report on the Operating Projects is contained in **Attachment A**.

C. Capital Projects Budget changes to the Adopted Budget - \$17,420,485

The Council endorsed the Adopted Budget for Capital Projects of \$59.792 million for 2024-2025. As a result of the First Budget Update, the total forecast expenditure on Capital Projects increased to \$77.732 million, due to the inclusion of Carry Forwards from the 2023-2024 Financial Year of \$17.940 million. In the Mid-Year update, the Capital Project expenditure was decreased by \$520,000 to \$77.213 million, mainly as a result of recognising the Grant funding for the Burschell Reserve upgrade and the reduction of some Capital projects during the year.

Following the Third Budget Review, no changes are proposed to be made to the Capital Expenditure.

In reviewing the progress of the endorsed Capital Projects, the projects that may be carried forward into the next financial year are detailed in Table 3. Total value of carry forward budget required to be confirmed at year end validation.

TABLE 3: CAPITAL BUDGETS LIKELY TO BE CARRIED FORWARD TO 2025-2026

Capital Projects

Remaining budget for **Renewal Program – Stormwater Drainage** is anticipated to be carried forward into the next financial year (2025-2026) as a result of the Trinity Valley Stormwater Drainage Project Stage 4 that is currently underway and due to be completed by March 2026.

Remaining budget for **Renewal Program – Buildings, Civil and Recreation & Open Space** will be carried forward into the next financial year (2025-2026) as there is currently insufficient resources to undertake design and construction work the current financial year.

George Street Upgrade Project is currently being tendered. The construction works will commence in early 2025-2026 and therefore it is proposed that the budget be carried forward to 2025-2026.

Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre Redevelopment is on track for completion by June 2026.

Traffic Management at Payneham South, Firle & Trinity is to be carried forward to 2025-2026. The sharrow line marking work is to be completed for St Morris Bikeway within Trinity Gardens in the current financial year (2024-2025).

Richmond Street, Hackney & Eighth Ave, St Peters is to be carried forward to 2025-2026, due to other priorities.

Implementation of the Parade Master Plan is to be carried forward to 2025-2026 due to extended consultation with the Department of Infrastructure & Transport on the detail design.

Private Laneway for Rosemont Lane contract has been awarded and construction is to commence in April 2025. Therefore, remaining budget is to be carried forward to 2025-2026.

Black Spot Grant Project is to be tendered in Q4 of 2024-2025 and the remaining budget is to be carried forward into the next financial year.

A status report on the endorsed Capital Projects is contained in **Attachment B**.

Regulation 9 (1) (a) of the Regulations states the Council must consider:

“at least twice, between 30 September and 31 May (both dates inclusive) in the relevant financial year (where at least 1 report must be considered before the consideration of the report under subregulation (1)(b), and at least 1 report must be considered after consideration of the report under subregulation (1)(b))—a report showing a revised forecast of its operating and capital investment activities for the relevant financial year compared with the estimates for those activities set out in the budget presented in a manner consistent with the note in the Model Financial Statements entitled Uniform Presentation of Finances.”

The revised, as a result of the Third Budget Update, Budgeted Financial Statement entitled Uniform Presentation of Finances is included in **Attachment C**.

OPTIONS

The Council has the following options in respect to this issue:

1. adopt the Third Budget Review as recommended; or
2. amend the Third Budget Review as it sees fit.

The Third Budget Review is forecasting an Operating Surplus in line with the Adopted Budget. Therefore Option 1 is recommended.

CONCLUSION

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Third Budget Update Report be received and noted.
2. That project progress report contained in Attachment A, be received and noted.
3. That project progress report contained in Attachment B, be received and noted.
4. That Pursuant to Regulation 9 (1) (a) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011, Budgeted Financial Statement as contained within Attachment C, be adopted.

Attachments – Item 13.5

Attachment A

2024-2025 Third Budget Review





FINANCIAL YEAR 2024-2025 THIRD BUDGET REVIEW OPERATING PROJECTS PROGRESS

Project Name	2024-2025 Budget	First Budget Review Carry Forward Budget	2024-2025 First Budget Update Request	2024-2025 Second Budget Update Request	2024-2025 Third Budget Update Request	2024-2025 TOTAL	Current YTD Spending	Has Project Commenced? (Y/N)	HAS PROJECT COMPLETED?	Comments	Forecasted Completion Date
TOUR DOWN UNDER	60,000	-				60,000	53,048	Y	Completed		
EASTSIDE BUSINESS AWARDS	40,000	-				40,000	19,779	Y	Progressing	Event to take place in April 2025	Apr-25
DOG & CAT MANAGEMENT PLAN EDUCATION CAMPAIGN	-	27,928		20,000		7,928	400	Y	Completed		
RAISING THE BAR ADELAIDE	25,000	-				25,000	19,781	Y	Completed		
URBAN GREENING PROGRAM	10,000	-				10,000	5,275	Y	Progressing	Tree vouchers to be issued	May-25
PUBLIC ART STRATEGY	-	25,089				25,089	6,132	Y	Progressing	Project anticipated to be completed by June 2025	Jun-25
40KPH EVALUATION MARDEN TO HACKNEY	-	11,374				11,374	639	Y	Progressing	Speed limit signage to be installed	Jun-25
GATHER ROUND	200,000	-				200,000	27,111	Y	Progressing	Event to take place in April 2025	Apr-25
ART & CULTURE PLAN	68,874	-				68,874	-	N	Progressing	Project has commenced and anticipated to be completed by June 2025	Jun-25
MUSIC MONTH IN THE LIBRARIES	4,300	-				4,300	3,178	Y	Completed		
CULTURALLY DIVERSE EARLY LITERACY PROJECT	3,300	-				3,300	3,000	Y	Completed		
FIRSTVAL FESTIVAL	4,000	-				4,000	4,269	Y	Completed		
VERGE UPGRADE	20,000	-				20,000	-	N	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026	
AUTHORITY APP	43,862	-		43,862		-	-	N	Removed	Removed in 2nd budget review	
IT STRATEGY	180,000	-				180,000	90,000	Y	Progressing	To be completed by 31 March 2025	Mar-25
ST PETERS BILLABONG	100,000	-				100,000	37,670	Y	Progressing	Consultant work is mostly final. Project likely to be completed by June 2025	Jun-25
DEVELOPMENT OF TREE INVENTORY	20,000	-				20,000	-	N	Progressing	Request for Quotes sent to suppliers. Project on track to be completed	Jun-25
GLYNDE HEAVY VEHICLE TRAFFIC STUDY	25,000	-				25,000	-	N	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026	
ELECTRONIC PERMITS	20,000	-		20,000		-	-	N	Removed	Removed in 2nd budget review	
FOOD SECRETS OF GLYNDE	-	31,850				31,850	72	Y	Progressing	Project planning in progress and due to be completed by June 2025	Jun-25
REPRESENTATION REVIEW	-	16,566				16,566	2,017	Y	Progressing	Project is near completion	Apr-25
FEASIBILITY INTO ADDITIONAL LEVEL ON THE WEBBE ST PARKING	-	25,000				25,000	-	N	Progressing	Due to be completed by June 2025	Jun-25
MARRYATVILLE PRECINCT MASTER PLAN	-	29,196				29,196	29,000	Y	Completed		
SIGNALISED PAC MAGILL ROAD	-	160,000				160,000	162,668	Y	Completed		
HERITAGE PROTECTION OPPORTUNITIES	-	58,781				58,781	90	Y	Carry forward	Will be carried forward to 2025-2026	
40KPH IN GLYNDE, PAYNEHAM, FIRLE, TG & ST MORRIS	-	104,964				104,964	-	N	Progressing	Speed limit signage to be installed	Jun-25
HR INFORMATION SYSTEM	-	120,000		120,000		-	-	N	Removed	Removed in 2nd budget review	
CITY WIDE PARKING REVIEW	-			35,000		35,000	36,771	Y	Progressing	Near completion and to be completed by June 2025	Jun-25
OPEN SPACE & PLAYGROUND STRATEGY	-					-	3,233	Y	Progressing	Near completion - spend set off against Strategy salaries budget	Jun-25
IMPLEMENTATION OF CLOUD-BASED AGENDA & MINUTES SOFTWARE	-				40,000	40,000	-	N	Progressing	Subscription to be paid by June	Jun-25
	824,336	610,747	- -	128,862	-	1,306,221	504,132				
ADDITIONAL ADMIN STAFF 0.6 FTE- REGULATORY SERVICES*	47,336					47,336	47,336		Completed	resource hired	
IS PROJECT SUPPORT*	40,000					40,000	40,000		Completed	resource hired	
	911,672	610,747	- -	128,862	-	1,393,557	591,468				

* Reallocated to Recurring Budget in line with the actual cost reporting as part of payroll

Attachment B

2024-2025 Third Budget Review




FINANCIAL YEAR 2024-2025 THIRD BUDGET REVIEW CAPITAL PROJECTS PROGRESS

Project Name	2024-2025 Budget	First Budget Review Carry Forward Budget	FIRST BUDGET REVIEW REQUEST	MID YEAR BUDGET REQUEST	THIRD BUDGET REVIEW REQUEST	2024-2025 TOTAL	Current YTD Spending	HAS PROJECT COMMENCED (Y/N)	HAS PROJECT COMPLETED?	COMMENTS
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - ROAD RESEALING	4,176,766	1,161,337				5,338,103	1,676,284	Y	Progressing	Jun-25
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - KERB	1,515,862	399,532				1,915,394	1,086,315	Y	Progressing	Jun-25
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - FOOTPATH	951,400	416,462				1,367,862	631,065	Y	Progressing	Jun-25
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - DRAINAGE (incl Trinity Valley)	11,426,234	3,131,927				14,558,161	376,033	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - BUILDING	1,503,500	642,448				2,145,948	427,535	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - REC & OPEN SPACE	690,500	660,947				1,351,447	169,917	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - CIVIL CAPITAL UPGRADE	30,000	149,039				179,039	43,569	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
RENEWAL PROGRAMM - OTHER	130,000	29,438				159,438	140,165	Y	Progressing	Jun-25
CAPITALISATION OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT ON-COST	1,101,342					1,101,342	828,185	Y	Completed	
LINEAR PARK PATH UPGRADE	-	47,433				47,433	49,593	Y	Completed	
GEORGE STREET UPGRADE	1,560,000	800,000				2,360,000	39,826	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
DUNSTAN ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND		9,100				9,100	13,650	Y	Completed	
CRUICKSHANK RESERVE FACILITY UPGRADE		40,000				40,000	15,643	Y	Completed	
PAYNEHAM MEMORIAL SWIMMING CENTRE UPGRADE	35,000,000	9,271,841				44,271,841	18,138,690	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
QUADRENNIAL ART PROJECT	9,000					9,000	-	N	Progressing	Apr-25
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MARDEN & ROYSTON PARK	280,000			280,000		-	-	N	Removed	Removed in 2nd budget review
TRAFFIC MGMT PAYNEHAM SOUTH, FIRLE & TRINITY GDNS	70,000					70,000	-	N	Carry forward	Will be carried forward to 2025-2026
RICHMOND ST, HACKNEY & EIGHTH AVE, ST PETERS	50,000					50,000	-	N	Carry forward	Will be carried forward to 2025-2026
40KM SPEED LIMIT HACKNEY TO MARDEN	70,000					70,000	-	N	Progressing	Contract awarded. To be constructed in Q4 of 2024-2025
STAFF BIKE PARKING WEBB ST	30,000			30,000		-	-	N	Removed	Removed in 2nd budget review
LANGMAN GROVE SPEED CUSIONS	150,000					150,000	85	Y	Progressing	Contract awarded. To be constructed in Q4 of 2024-2025
UPGRADE OF IT EQUIPMENT	47,500					47,500	-	N	Progressing	Equipment to be ordered for meeting room by May 2025
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARADE MASTER PLAN	1,000,000	71,821				1,071,821	101,595	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
BURCHELL RESERVE UPGRADE	-	95,634		210,000		114,366	73,049	Y	Completed	
PRIVATE LANEWAY	-	295,933				295,933	27,983	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
GEORGE STREET STORMWATER	-	600,000				600,000	-	N	Carry forward	Will be carried forward to 2025-2026
SMART PARKING PROJECT	-	23,095				23,095	1,816	Y	Completed	
STANDBY POWER FOR ST PETERS LIBRARY	-	78,550				78,550	-	N	Progressing	Currently evaluating options for a cloud based solution
MEETING ROOMS UPGRADE	-	15,948				15,948	4,174	Y	Progressing	Equipment to be ordered for meeting room by May 2025
SECOND CREEK OUTLET UPGRADE						-	41,325	Y	Completed	
BORTHWICK PARK CREEK IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN & CONST.						-	9,913	Y	Completed	
BLACK SPOT GRANT						-	25,522	Y	Carry forward	Part budget will be carried forward to 2025-2026
	59,792,104	17,940,485	-	520,000	-	77,212,589	23,921,933			

Attachment C

2024-2025 Third Budget Review



City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
UNIFORM PRESENTATION OF FINANCES - GENERAL FUND



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

	Adopted Budget	1st budget revision	2nd budget revision	New recurring requests	New Operational projects requests	New Capital projects requests	3rd budget revision
	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25	2024/25
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Income							
Rates	47,230,089	47,230,089	47,230,089	-	-	-	47,230,089
Statutory Charges	2,180,953	2,180,953	2,180,953	-	-	-	2,180,953
User Charges	4,006,554	4,006,554	4,006,554	-	-	-	4,006,554
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions - operating	2,676,675	2,676,675	3,943,469	-	-	-	3,943,469
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions - capital	444,393	444,393	444,393	-	-	-	444,393
Investment Income	77,965	77,965	77,965	-	-	-	77,965
Other Income	461,434	461,434	461,434	-	-	-	461,434
Net gain - equity accounted Council businesses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Income	57,078,063	57,078,063	58,344,857	-	-	-	58,344,857
Expenses							
Employee Costs	19,485,196	19,485,196	19,485,196	(951,875)	-	-	18,533,321
Materials, Contracts & Other Expenses	21,646,858	22,257,605	22,123,010	130,000	-	-	22,253,010
Depreciation, Amortisation & Impairment	13,078,887	13,078,887	13,078,887	298,000	-	-	13,376,887
Finance Costs	2,375,037	2,375,037	1,655,037	(500,000)	-	-	1,155,037
Net loss - Equity Accounted Council Businesses	262,666	262,666	262,666	-	-	-	262,666
Total Expenses	56,848,645	57,459,392	56,604,796	(1,023,875)	-	-	55,580,921
Operating Surplus / (Deficit)	229,418	(381,329)	1,740,061	1,023,875	-	-	2,763,936
Timing adjustment for grant revenue	(444,393)	(444,393)	(444,393)	-	-	-	(444,393)
Adjusted Operating Surplus / (Deficit)	(214,975)	(825,722)	1,295,668	1,023,875	-	-	2,319,543
Net Outlays on Existing Assets							
Capital Expenditure on Renewal and Replacement of Existing Assets	(20,424,262)	(27,015,392)	(27,015,392)	-	-	-	(27,015,392)
add back Depreciation, Amortisation and Impairment	13,078,887	13,078,887	13,078,887	298,000	-	-	13,376,887
add back Proceeds from Sale of Replaced Assets	36,000	36,000	36,000	-	-	-	36,000
Total Net Outlays on Existing Assets	(7,309,375)	(13,900,505)	(13,900,505)	298,000	-	-	(13,602,505)
Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets							
Capital Expenditure on New and Upgraded Assets (including Investment Property & Real Estate Developments)	(39,367,842)	(50,717,197)	(51,554,656)	-	-	-	(51,554,656)
add back Amounts Received Specifically for New and Upgraded Assets	5,924,000	5,924,000	7,281,459	-	-	-	7,281,459
add back Grants, subsidies and contributions – Capital New/Upgraded	444,393	444,393	444,393	-	-	-	444,393
add back Proceeds from Sale of Surplus Assets (including Investment Property, Real Estate Developments & non-current assets held for sale)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets	(32,999,449)	(44,348,804)	(43,828,804)	-	-	-	(43,828,804)
Annual Net Impact to Financing Activities -surplus / (deficit)	(40,523,799)	(59,075,031)	(56,433,641)	1,321,875	-	-	(55,111,766)

13.6 DRAFT ANNUAL BUSINESS PLAN & DRAFT 2025-2026 BUDGET

REPORT AUTHOR: Senior Finance Business Partner
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Financial Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4548
FILE REFERENCE:
ATTACHMENTS: A - E

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present and obtain “*in principle*” endorsement of the Draft 2025-2026 Budget.

BACKGROUND

Section 123(8) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, requires the Council to adopt an Annual Business Plan and a Budget for the ensuing financial year after 31 May and except in a case involving extraordinary administrative difficulty, before 15 August.

The Draft Budget comprises the Recurrent Budget, which incorporates the revenue and expenditure which is required to provide the “*Business as Usual*” services that are provided by the Council. The second component of the draft Budget incorporates the Capital and Operating Project Budget. The Operating Projects Budget encompasses services, programs and activities that are outside the “*Business as Usual*” services and are considered discretionary in nature, (the Council is under no legislative obligation to provide the services, activities or programs or if required to undertake the activity (For example the current Representation Review that is being undertaken by the Council is irregular in nature). Operating Projects generally include one off activities or programs, an expansion of an existing service or program or proposals to introduce a new service or program. Operating Projects are funded from Rate Revenue or a fee for service charge.

The Capital Works Budget encompasses projects which involve the renewal, upgrading or creation of new infrastructure assets. Examples of some projects are the Civil Infrastructure Whole-of-Life Program (referred to as renewals), Playground/Reserve Redevelopment (referred to as upgrades). Renewal Capital Projects are funded through Rate Revenue, via the depreciation charge, with new or upgrade works funded through borrowings or cash reserves.

The final Draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan, will be considered at the Council Meeting scheduled for 5 May 2025.

The Draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan and Budget will be released for public consultation for a period of twenty-one (21) days as required by the *Local Government Act 1999*.

RELEVANT POLICIES & STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

The Council's long-term strategic direction is outlined in its Strategic Management Plan *City Plan 2030: Shaping our Future*. The Draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan and supporting Draft 2025-2026 Budget, set out the proposed services and programs and explains how the Council intends to finance its continuing and new activities which are proposed to be undertaken during the year.

The Council's Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP), is a key document in the Council's Planning Framework. It is the primary financial management tool which links the Council's Strategic Plan, *City Plan 2030: Shaping our Future*, Whole-of-Life Assets Management Plans and the Annual Business Plan and Budget.

Financial sustainability underpins the Council's Financial Goals and Outcomes, which are set out in the Long-Term Financial Plan. In general terms, financial sustainability is ensuring that the Council has the financial resources to meet the long-term service and infrastructure needs of the community, without any severe increases in rate revenue or cuts in service provision and standards.

From an operational perspective, financial sustainability is being able to manage the conflict between keeping rate revenues increases to a reasonable level, maintaining existing service standards and financing new services and major capital investments.

The Draft 2025-2026 Budget has been developed on the basis of ensuring that it will assist in delivering on the Council's Long-Term Strategic direction and financial objectives set out in the LTFP.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

For the 2025-2026 Financial Year, the Draft Budget estimates an Operating Surplus of \$906,006 based on a Rate Revenue increase of 8%. The Long-Term Financial Plan has since been updated in line with the Draft 2025-2026 Draft Operating Surplus.

To ensure that the Council can deliver on its financial objectives as set out in the Council's Long-Term Financial Plan, the Draft Recurrent Budget has been prepared taking into account the budget parameters which were adopted by the Council at its meeting held on 20 January 2025.

At the time of writing this report, the Rate increase for the average residential ratepayer is not available (noting that the Rate Revenue increase is 8% as contained in the LTFP and does not necessarily translate to the same percentage increase in the average rate for property owners).

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

As the national economy continues to be impacted by high inflation, the South Australian economy has continued to perform well in a number of economic indicators, as the State took the lead in real economic growth (measured using real state demand plus real net trade in goods and services) and ranked second on two of the key economic indicators compared to other Australian States and Territories (i.e. in Unemployment and Construction work). South Australia's unemployment rate fell to 3.7% in February, down 0.4% points from January and 0.4% points below the national average of 4.1%. However, the pace of economic growth appears to be moderating, influenced by both global and domestic factors. The subdued economic growth forecast should therefore, balance demand and supply of goods and services.

The outlook for inflation has been revised downwards, as it is expected to eventually decline to the Reserve Bank of Australia's (RBA) target range of 2%–3% in 2025 and reach the midpoint of 2.5% in 2026. The Adelaide Consumer Price Index (CPI) fell 0.1% in the December quarter, led by the 2024-25 Commonwealth Energy Relief Fund rebates resulting in a fall in electricity prices this quarter.

SOCIAL ISSUES

No Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

The Draft 2025-2026 Budget will be impacted upon by the decisions made by the Federal Government and State Government in their respective budgets. No information regarding these budgets is available at the time of preparation of this report.

As a result, the Draft 2025-2026 Budget presented in this report, has been developed on the following assumptions:

The Recurrent Operating Budget is and has for the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, been prepared on a “*business as usual*” basis. This means:

- no new services are proposed to be introduced as part of Draft Budget;
- includes increases to the services that are currently provided as approved by the Council during 2024-2025;
- incorporates revisions to the existing budgets to identify any savings, including indexation not being applied to some budget lines to reflect the pattern of actual costs incurred in the past couple of years;
- includes expected savings, in line with process changes where relevant (for e.g. \$130k reduction in electricity cost for the sites that were included in Long-Term Procurement Project for renewable energy; \$30k reduction in printing, postage and bank charges in relation to rates paid via ‘Payble’ platform);
- the Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre will not be operational during 2025-2026 financial year however the relevant recurring costs for the period between construction completion and the expected opening of the centre have been factored into the draft Budget. This period is anticipated to be from April 2026 to June 2026. The assumed costs are water, electricity, insurance, security and maintenance charges for the aforementioned three (3) month period. It does not, however, include any allocation for the promotion or opening of the centre;
- does not include any additional costs that may be required as a result of Service Reviews that took place during the current financial year 2024-2025 (such as the Libraries Review or the Information Technology Strategy. Noting that the Council IT system, The Authority system, will be upgraded during 2025-2026 and \$516,000 has been factored into the draft Budget as an Operating Project).

Any adjustments to the Draft Budget arising from the State Budget will be incorporated into the Council’s 2025-2026 Budget when this information becomes available.

Notwithstanding this, the preparation of the Draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan and Budget has been prepared to ensure the Council meets its legislative responsibility in accordance with the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1999* and the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011*.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

An overview of the Draft 2025-2026 Recurrent Budget, Capital Works program and Operating Projects was provided to Elected Members at the Budget Workshop held on 11 March 2025.

- **Audit Committee**

The Audit Committee will consider a report on the Draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan and 2025-2026 Budget Draft at its Meeting to be held on 11 April 2025.

- **Community**

Citizens will be provided the opportunity to have input into the Draft 2025-2026 Budget through public consultation on the Draft Annual Business Plan, which is scheduled to be undertaken on 26 May 2025.

- **Staff**

The preparation of the Draft 2025-2026 Budget has been completed with the involvement of the Chief Executive Officer, General Managers and staff responsible for management of the Budget.

- **Other Agencies**

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

The Draft 2025-2026 Budget is based on the continuation of existing services and priorities, as determined by the Council, being appropriately resourced and that the Council can maintain the service standards for its existing services to support the delivery of the Strategic Objectives outlined in *CityPlan 2030: Shaping our Future* and that those services receive appropriate funding.

The key objective therefore, is to develop a Budget that not only contributes to the Council's broader strategic objectives of achieving *Community Well-being*, but also ensures that the Council is managing its financial resources in a sustainable, prudent and equitable manner and to ensure that future financial impacts can either be avoided or managed in a measured way, so that the funding requirements are balanced with ensuring that the community does not face unreasonable increases in their annual rates contribution.

Budget Parameters/Assumptions

In developing the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, the following principles and assumptions have been applied:

- the Recurrent Budget is based on the provision of existing services, programs and activities;
- the cost escalation for Material, Contracts and Other Expenses has been set at a 3%; with some material and contractor costs adjusted to reflect the real increases in market prices greater than 3% (such as Energy prices, Construction materials etc); and
- Wages and Salaries increases are based on the Council's Enterprise Agreements i.e. the Municipal Officers Agreement (MOA) budgeted at 3% (for inside staff) and the Local Government Employees Award (LGE) budgeted at its current rate increase at 3.5% (field staff) for the period from 1 November 2024 to 31 October 2025 and 3% annually after.

Budget Overview

Table 1 below sets out the Draft Budget, based on the LTFP recommended Rate Revenue increase of 8% which is estimated to deliver an Operating Surplus of \$906,006.

Following further information, post the Elected Members Budget Workshop that was held on 11 March 2025, there were number of adjustments made which improved the Operating surplus by \$672,990. These adjustments are:

- \$470,990 - Timing reallocation of State Grant 'Road to Recovery' from 2024-2025 (was planned to be included in Third Budget Review) to 2025-2026;
- \$50,000 – Increase in User Charges Income; and
- \$152,000 – Reduction in Finance Cost as a result of better information on the timing of Capital Projects

The Recurrent Budget and programs, which incorporates the revenues and expenditure required to provide the "*Business as Usual*" services, provides a surplus of \$2.225 million, which will be used to fund the delivery of the proposed Operating Projects, which are set out in **Attachment A**, and additional interest costs to cover the additional finance costs associated with borrowings required to fund the delivery of the proposed Capital Works Program, which is contained in **Attachment B**.

The value of Operating Expenditure is \$59.570 million, with \$42.487 million (71%) being influenced by the decisions made as part of the budget preparation process while the remaining \$17.083 million (29%) of expenditure relates to the depreciation of existing and new assets, as well as finance costs.

It should be noted that while the cost to finalise any carry forward Operating Projects from 2024-2025 are not included in the Draft 2025-2026 Operating Surplus, the funding to undertake these projects will be sourced from cash reserves.

At this stage, the Draft Budgets of the Regional Subsidiaries have not been incorporated into the Council's Draft Operating result for 2025-2026, as the Council is yet to receive the finalised budgets from the Regional Subsidiaries. The Council is required to report its share of the Regional Subsidiaries operating results and while this will have an impact on the Council's reported Operating Result, this is a non-cash transaction that does not have an impact on the Council's cash position.

TABLE 1: 2025-2026 PROPOSED STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME

	Recurrent Budget 2025-2026	Operating Projects 2025-2026	Proposed Budget 2025-2026
	\$	\$	\$
INCOME			
Rates	50,904,915		50,904,915
Statutory Charges	2,239,311		2,239,311
User Charges	4,370,061		4,370,061
Grant Subsidies, Contributions	3,124,948		3,124,948
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions - capital	579,679		579,679
Investment Income	55,000		55,000
Other Income	521,676		521,676
Net gain - equity accounted Council businesses	-		-
Total Income	61,795,590	-	61,795,590
EXPENSES			
Employee Expenses	20,313,052	-	20,313,052
Materials, Contracts & Other Expenses	21,911,405	1,319,300	23,230,705
Depreciation, Amortisation & Impairment	13,696,916	-	13,696,916
Finance Costs	3,386,245	-	3,386,245
Net Loss - Joint Ventures & Associates	262,666	-	262,666
Total Expenses	59,570,284	1,319,300	60,889,584
OPERATING SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)	2,225,306	(1,319,300)	906,006
Net gain (loss) on disposal or revaluation of assets	36,792		36,792
Amounts specifically for new or upgraded assets	2,800,000		2,800,000
NET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	5,062,098	(1,319,300)	3,742,798

Table 2 below sets out additional information on the Recurrent Operating Budget by functional area. The services, programs and activities which make up each element of the draft Recurrent Budget is contained in Table 2 below and **Attachment C**.


TABLE 2: DRAFT 2025-2026 RECURRENT BUDGET BY OUTCOME

OUTCOME	Income	Expense	Net Operating Surplus/ (Deficit)
Rates	50,679,915	1,955,131	48,724,784
Cultural Vitality	2,226,777	10,735,274	(8,508,497)
Libraries & Community Facilities	635,352	2,064,642	(1,429,290)
Community Events, Arts and Heritage	600,677	2,063,462	(1,462,785)
Trees Parks Sport & Recreation	302,162	4,291,929	(3,989,767)
Planning	688,586	2,315,241	(1,626,655)
Economic Prosperity	225,000	1,445,667	(1,220,667)
Economic Development	225,000	1,445,667	(1,220,667)
Environmental Sustainability	43,200	8,061,621	(8,018,421)
Environmental and Planning	2,000	2,806,274	(2,804,274)
Waste & Recycling Services	41,200	5,255,347	(5,214,147)
Social Equity	7,263,698	12,478,267	(5,214,569)
Regulatory Services	1,437,025	1,778,750	(341,725)
Community, Health Aged & Youth Services	4,220,554	4,427,293	(206,739)
Subsidiaries	-	262,666	(262,666)
Infrastructure Management	1,606,119	6,009,558	(4,403,439)
Corporate Management	1,357,000	24,894,324	(23,537,324)
Governance, Communication & Administration	1,307,000	7,811,163	(6,504,163)
Financing	50,000	3,386,245	(3,336,245)
Depreciation	-	13,696,916	(13,696,916)
Total	61,795,590	59,570,284	2,225,306

DRAFT RECURRENT BUDGET: COST ELEMENTS

As set out in Figure 1 below, services, programs and activities that are delivered through the Recurrent Budget (excluding Operating Projects), represent the range of services, programs and infrastructure to meet the needs and expectations of the community. A number of these services are the responsibility of the Council by virtue of the requirements set out in the *Local Government Act 1999* and other relevant legislation. These services, programs and activities are supported by the Council's *Governance, Communication and Administration* structure which represent 19% (\$7.8m) of the draft Recurrent Budget, excluding Depreciation and Finance costs.

**FIGURE 1: COMPONENTS OF THE DRAFT 2025-2026 RECURRENT EXPENDITURE BUDGET \$42.66M
 (Excluding Depreciation and Finance costs)**



Employee Expenses

The increase of 4.3% from 2024-2025 Budget, is a result of impacts from Wages and salaries increases in line with Enterprise Agreements, increase in Superannuation employee contributions to 12% (by 0.5% from the previous year) and one additional role for Development Officer, Building in the Urban Planning & Environment Department as approved by the Council at its meeting on 20 January 2025. Budget assumes all current established positions are filled.

Materials, Contracts and Other Expenses

Material, Contracts and Other Expenses year-on-year increase is set at CPI (3%) however in some areas the increase is noticeably higher due to real increase on the market prices (such as Power, Construction materials etc). Therefore, the cost increase compared to the 2024-2025 Budget is 5.4%. Staff made an effort to review and release unused budgets in an attempt to partially offset higher than anticipated cost increases.

Finance Costs

Finance costs included in the Draft Budget are based on existing loan repayments and banking transaction costs. Finance costs have increased by 42.5% compared to the 2024-2025 Budget. This increase is in line with the additional borrowing requirements to fund Major Capital Projects as outlined in Long-Term Financial Plan and Draft Budget, anticipated impact of Carry Forward projects from 2024-2025 (i.e. the Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre & the Trinity Valley Stormwater Drainage) and commencement of the Parade Master Plan from 2026-2027. This is coupled with the reduction in LGFA Interest rates by 0.4% (an ‘out of cycle’ rate reduction on LGFA Variable Cash Advance Debentures facilities of 0.15% announced in January 2025 and 0.25% following the Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA) decision to lower the cash rate in February 2025).

It is planned to convert at the appropriate time part of borrowing from Cash Advance Debenture to a Fixed rate Loan to reduce exposure to variable rates and secure lower than Cash Advance interest rate.

The Recurrent Expenditure Budget (excluding Depreciation and finance costs) based on the *CityPlan 2030* outcomes are shown in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF DRAFT 2025-2026 RECURRENT EXPENDITURE BUDGET BY OUTCOME
(excludes Depreciation and Finance Costs)

Cultural Vitality	Economic Prosperity	Environmental Sustainability	Social Equity	Corporate Management	Costs associated with Rates
\$10.735M	\$1.446M	\$8.062M	\$12.478M	\$7.982M	\$1.955M
Community Events, Arts and Heritage	Economic Development	Environmental and Planning	Community, Health Aged & Youth Services	Governance, Communication & Administration	*Rates
Libraries & Community Facilities		Waste Management	Infrastructure Management		
Planning			Regulatory Services		
Trees Parks Sport & Recreation			Subsidiaries		

* Costs associated with rates represents preparation, printing, mailing of rates invoices, Value General dealing as well as Natural Resource Management recharge from Green Adelaide.

DRAFT RECURRENT BUDGET: INCOME ELEMENTS

Rate Revenue is the Council's major source of income and funds in the order of 84% of the Council's Operating Expenditure. The balance is funded from non-rate revenue. Non-rate revenue is predominately made up of **User Charges** (represents 40% of Non-rate income) which incorporate fees from the St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-school, Swimming Centre charges, Hire and Lease fees associated with Council facilities, HACC Services; **Grants, Subsidies and Contributions** that are received by the Council (represents 34% of Non-rate income) and **Statutory Charges** (which represents 21% of Non-rate income) which incorporates Dog Registration fees, Parking Infringements, Residential Parking permits, Planning & Development fees, Hoarding Licenses, Outdoor Dining permits.

Rates Income

The Rate revenue increase in the Draft Budget is in line with the increase of 8% as contained in the LTFFP. The Draft Budget includes the continuation of Separate Rate for The Parade Precinct (\$225,000) as approved by Council. The Draft Budget incorporates increase in Regional Landscapes Levy is in line with the State Government's 'Green Adelaide'. This is pass through income for the Council and has no impact on the Budget except for a small additional charge of \$10,000 that the Council receives from the State Government.

Grant, Subsidies and Contributions

The Draft Budget is prepared under the assumption is that Federal Government *Financial Assistance Grants* to continue to be received in advance. The Draft Budget also includes the *Road to Recovery Grant* (Federal Government) and other grants such as the *Commonwealth Home Support Program Grant*, *Public Library Services Grant*, etc.

Statutory Charges

Statutory charges increased by 2.7% compared to the 2024-2025 Budget. Parking Infringements, Dog & Cat Registrations and Planning & Development fees have been all increased in line with the Fees & Charges schedule that have been endorsed in '*in principle*' by the Council. Reduction in Permit Income in Sustainability due to exclusion of e-scooters permit income for operation of e-scooters in the City until further decisions made.

User Charges

User Charges increased by 9.1% compared to the 2024-2025 Budget. Some Fees and charges are not set by legislation and therefore, have been increased by 3.0% at a minimum with benchmarking where applicable. For instance, the childcare Centre fees have increased by 4.8% based on benchmark of other Centres in the area.

Investment Income

Investment income which consists of interest income on the Council's cash deposit decreased by 29.5% compared to the 2024-2025 Budget. The Reduced Investment Income is in line with the expectation of cash balances being at a minimum to fulfill cashflow requirements for the Major Capital Projects, as well as reduction in LGFA cash deposit interest rate by 0.25% following the Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA) Board decision to lower the cash rate.

Other Income

In line with previous years, other income incorporates insurance rebate and other sundry income.

Non-rate revenue represents 18% of the Council's total revenue, with \$10.891 million being factored into the draft Recurrent Budget, an increase of 10.2% compared to the 2024-2025 Budget. The increase is mainly due to increase in Grants as a result of the inclusion of the *Roads to Recovery Grant* allocation for 2024-2025 from the Federal Government in the 2025-2026 Draft Budget as construction is anticipated to be completed in financial year 2025-2026.

FIGURE 2: BREAKDOWN OF NON-RATE REVENUE \$10.89M




TABLE 4: BREAKDOWN OF NON-RATE REVENUE BY OUTCOME

Cultural Vitality	Environmental Sustainability	Social Equity	Corporate Management	Rates and Financing
\$2.227M	\$43.2K	\$7.264M	\$1.207M	\$150K
Community Events, Arts and Heritage	Environmental and Planning	Community, Health Aged & Youth Services	Governance, Communication & Administration	Financing
Libraries & Community Facilities	Waste Management	Infrastructure Management		*Governance, Communication & Administration
Planning		Regulatory Services		
Trees Parks Sport & Recreation				

* Revenue under Rate and Financing includes Rates search income, Natural Resource Management admin fee and Bank Interest income.

DRAFT BUDGET: 2025-2026 PROPOSED OPERATING PROJECTS

The Council's Executive Leadership Team have recommended an allocation of \$1,319,300 for the approved Funding Submissions for Operating Projects and there have been, included into the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, noting that it is at the Council's discretion as to whether it agrees with the submissions that have been received for funding,

The Draft Budget as set out in Table 1, incorporates funding allocation for new Operating Projects to the value of \$1,319,300.

The proposed Operating Projects for 2025-2026 have been broken down by individual project as detailed in Table 5 below:

TABLE 5: OPERATING PROJECTS 2025-2026

Operating Projects	\$
Authority Upgrade	516,000
2026 AFL Gather Round	200,000
William Street Bikeway - Street Lighting Upgrade	115,000
Participation in 2026 Tour Down Under Stage	55,000
Traffic Management at Ninth Avenue Christmas Lights Display	50,000
Eastside Business Awards	50,000
Library Services Catalogue and Program Review	50,000
40kph speed limit implementation in Kensington and Felixstow	45,000
<i>On-Street Parking Policy</i> Implementation in Norwood and Kensington Precincts	40,000
Public Consultation for traffic Management Concept Designs for Payneham South, Firle and Trinity Gardens	40,000
Raising the Bar	38,000
Arts and Culture Plan Year 2 Implementation	25,000
Development of Tree Inventory	20,000
Verge Upgrade Program	20,000
Street Lighting Upgrade & Renewal	15,000
Public Health Plan	13,000
Urban Greening Program	10,000
Urban Tree Canopy Regional Mapping Contribution	10,000
Firstival 2025	4,000
Culturally Diverse Early Literacy Project	3,300
Total Operating Projects Expenditure	1,319,300

A review of the 2024-2025 Operating Projects is in progress and hence, the 2024-2025 Operating Projects to be carried forward into the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, have not been included. However, any Operating Projects carried forward will be funded by cash reserves from Income collected in 2024-2025.

Operating Projects that were recommended for approval are contained in **Attachment A**. Copies of the Funding Submissions for Capital and Operating Projects are contained in **Attachment D**.

DRAFT BUDGET: 2025-2026 PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECTS

The Draft 2025-2026 Budget, as presented, incorporates Capital Projects to the value of \$23.167 million (which is the net of Grant funding and total expenditure required). It also includes staff costs of \$1.109 million which are to be capitalised (i.e. staff involved in the delivery of the projects involving physical assets).

The proposed Capital Projects for 2025-2026, have been broken down into a number of categories as set out Table 6 below.

TABLE 6: CAPITAL PROJECT CATEGORIES

Capital Expenditure Project	\$
Whole-of-Life Capital Works Program	
* Road Resealing	3,511,262
* Footpath Reconstruction	1,214,561
* Kerb Reconstruction	1,495,505
* Stormwater Drainage Program	2,100,000
* Building	2,590,000
* Other Infrastructure Asset Renewal	1,975,688
Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre – Year 3	11,071,956
Sail Shades (Adey Reserve & St Peters Child Care Centre)	120,000
Quadrennial Art Project	279,000
Kent Town Public Realm Upgrade	400,000
Building Accessibility Improvements	100,000
Capitalisation of Salaries (existing staff)	1,108,999
Total Capital Projects Expenditure	25,966,971
Grant Funding	2,800,000
Net Cost	23,166,971

A review of the Capital Projects for the current year (2024-2025) is still currently being undertaken based on year to date expenditure and project timelines to evaluate if any project will need to be carried forward and included as part of the Budget, and not included in the Draft Budget at this point in time.

Borrowings

Capital expenditure of \$25.967 million, as set out in **Attachment B**, is proposed to be funded as shown in Table 7 below:

TABLE 7: CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDING

Use of depreciation recovered through Rate Revenue	\$13,996,015
Grant Funding	\$2,800,000
Borrowings	\$9,170,956
TOTAL	\$25,966,971

In determining the timing and the level of borrowings that are required to fund the proposed Capital Program, consideration has been given to the cash flow requirements and to intergenerational equity between current and future ratepayers (that is, an asset is funded from loan borrowings which is paid off over the life of the asset rather than raising rate revenue from current rate payers to pay for the asset).

The Council has an option in respect to its borrowing arrangements using financial instruments such as Cash Advance Debenture (CAD) or Traditional Loan (Loan) provided by the Local Government Financing Authority (LGFA). It is important that borrowing decisions are made strategically, considering factors such as cost, risk, and suitability to the Council's financial objectives and for its ongoing financial sustainability.


Following consideration of the above mentioned borrowing options, and conducting a thorough assessment of the financial needs as part of the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, in order to minimise the interest costs and debt servicing needs, it is anticipated that the Council will convert part of the CAD Facilities in 2025-2026 into Traditional Loan. A debenture loan option will provide lower interest rates and a longer repayment period which may become more viable in the future as the interest rate environment stabilises.

DRAFT UPDATE LONG-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN

Pursuant to Section 122 4 a(1) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Council must undertake a review of its Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP) on an annual basis. To meet this legislative requirement, a review of the LTFP financial targets, which takes into account the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, as presented in this report and its impact on the financial projections set out in the Long-Term Financial Plan, has been undertaken.

Presented in Figure 3 is the forecasted timeline for Capital projects to be undertaken by the Council in the next 10 years, and which are incorporated into the Draft LTFP.

FIGURE 3: CAPITAL PROJECTS TIMELINE




Outcome 1: A Balanced Budget

Council’s services and programs, including depreciation of infrastructure and assets, is fully funded and the costs are shared equitably between current and future ratepayers.

The Council’s long-term sustainability is dependent upon ensuring that on average, over time, the Operating Expenses are less than the associated revenues. The Council’s performance in respect to this indication is measured by the Operating Ratio which measures the Council’s Operating Result, whether that is a surplus or a deficit, as a percentage of operating revenues.

FIGURE 4: OPERATING SURPLUS RATIO




For 2025-2026, the Draft Budget has been prepared on the basis of a Rate Revenue increase of 8%, which results in an Operating Surplus ratio of 1.5%.

Outcome 2: Rate Stability

Annual rate collections are fair and equitable for our residents and ratepayers with the aim to keep rate revenue increases stable over the medium term.

Rate Revenue is a major component of the Council’s revenue base. The Council’s objective is to have a Long-Term Financial Plan that is based on consistent Rate Revenue increases which meet the increased cost of the base level services and programs that are provided by the Council but also reflect growth in the number of assessments (i.e. properties) and increased service levels. The benchmark target hat has been set by the Council is between 4% and 8%. The Rate Revenue increase in line with the increase in CPI, Development Growth and growth in Capital Initiatives.

FIGURE 5: RATE REVENUE INCREASE




The Draft 2025-2026 Budget is based on a Rate Revenue increase of 8%, which is an increase in Rate Revenue from 2024-2025, of \$3,710,000. At the time of writing this report, the initial rate modelling of the impact of the Rate Revenue increase for the average residential ratepayer, was not available.

Outcome 3: Infrastructure and Asset Management

Maintain Infrastructure and Assets in line with the Council’s Whole of Life Infrastructure framework to achieve the outcomes and objectives, as set out in City Plan 2030.

The Council will measure its performance in achieving this outcome through the Asset Renewal Funding Ratio. The Asset Renewal Funding Ratio measures how well the Council is performing in respect to the renewal or replacement of existing physical assets, such as roads, footpaths, kerbing, buildings, council plant etc. The ratio is calculated by measuring capital expenditure on renewal or replacement of assets, relative to the planned spend outlined in the Council’s Asset Management Plans. Ideally, physical assets should be renewed or replaced at the same rate the stock of assets is wearing out, however it is recognised that there may be some instances that require that the Council to either accelerate or decelerate the renewal or replacement of its existing asset base.

FIGURE 6: ASSET RENEWAL FUNDING RATIO



The Asset Renewal Funding Ratio in 2025-2026 is reflective of the renewal expenditure associated with Open Space and Recreation, Civil works, Drainage as well as Buildings capital maintenance renewals. It is expected that renewal spend will be at the level of rate collection expectations (in the form of depreciation) until the next Asset Management Plan is developed.

Outcome 4: Debt Management


Prudent use of debt to invest in new long-term assets to ensure intergenerational equity between current and future users.

Prudent debt management is the process of establishing and executing a strategy for managing a Council debt in order to raise the required amount of funding to achieve its capital investment objectives. It is important that the use of debt is balanced with other funding sources, such as grants and cash reserves, to ensure that the members of the community that receive the benefits from the investment, share the cost. In addition, the Council must ensure that it has the capacity to service its debt.

Net Financial Liabilities


The Net Financial Liabilities Ratio measures the extent of the Council's indebtedness as a percentage of operating revenue. If the ratio falls over time, this indicates that the Council's capacity to meet its financial obligations from operating income is strengthening.

FIGURE 7: NET FINANCIAL LIABILITY RATIO



As a result of the increase in the Long-Term Borrowings as projected in the Long-Term Financial Plan, the Net Financial Liabilities are projected to be over 100% from 2024-2025 and eventually reduce to the desired below 100% target by 2035.

FIGURE 8: DEBT SERVICING RATIO



The Debt Servicing Ratio measures the extent of rate revenue that is used to meet interest and principal loan repayments.

OPTIONS

The Council has the following options in respect to this matter:

- endorse *'in principle'* the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, as set out in the Financial Statements contained in **Attachment E**, which incorporates the proposed Operating and Capital Projects that are contained in Attachments A and B; or
- vary the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, as set out in the Financial Statements contained in **Attachment E**, which incorporates the proposed Operating and Capital Projects contained in Attachments A and B by either:
 - reducing Operating and Capital Projects; and/or
 - increasing or decreasing non-rate revenue; or
 - increasing or decreasing the proposed Rate Revenue increase; or
 - increasing or decreasing recurrent expenditure.

CONCLUSION

The Draft 2025-2026 Budget is based on the Council continuing to deliver its existing services, programs and activities, at the existing endorsed standard.

To ensure that a responsible budget is set by the Council, a series of Budget Parameters have been adopted by the Council to guide staff in preparing the respective budget estimates and submissions. As detailed in this report, the Draft 2025-2026 Recurrent Budget has been prepared with reference to these guidelines and where the parameters have not been achieved, the reasons for the departure have been provided.

Financial sustainability underpins the Council’s Financial Goals and Outcomes, which are set out in the Draft Long-Term Financial Plan. In general terms, financial sustainability is about ensuring that the Council has the financial resources to meet the long-term service and infrastructure needs of the community, without any sharp increases in rate revenue or cuts in service provision and standards.

From an operational perspective, financial sustainability is being able to manage the conflict between keeping Rate Revenues increases to a reasonable level and without significant fluctuation, maintaining existing service standards and expenditure on new services and major capital investments that are required to ensure that the objective of Community well-being is achieved.

As previously advised, decisions regarding the Draft 2025-2026, need to take into account the impact on the Council's ability to continue to meet its operational and financial outcomes in the future.

With reference to the financial targets set out in the Draft Long-Term Financial Plan, Table 8 sets out the performance of the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, as set out in this report, against the LTFP Financial Outcomes.

TABLE 8: LONG-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN TARGETS

Outcome	Measure	Target	Draft Budget
A Balanced budget	Operating Ratio <i>Measures the Councils Operating result, whether that be a surplus or deficit as a percentage of operating revenues.</i>	Between 0% and 10%	1.5%
Rate Stability	Rate Revenue Increase <i>The annual increase in revenue generated from general rates.</i>	Between 4% and 8%	8.0%
Infrastructure and Asset Management	Asset Renewal Funding Ratio <i>Measures the rate at which the Councils assets are being renewed or replaced against the Infrastructure & Asset Management Plan.</i>	Between 90% and 110% on a rolling three (3) year average	96.2%
Debt Management	Net Financial Liabilities Ratio <i>Measures the percentage operating revenues that would be required to settle the net amount owed by the Council.</i>	Less than 100%	148.0%
	Debt Servicing Ratio <i>Measures the Council's commitment to interest costs and debt repayments are met by general rate revenue.</i>	less than 15%	7.6%

DRAFT BUDGET: MATTERS REQUIRING FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre

The current draft Budget includes the operational model as outlined in the existing Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP). However, a separate report will be presented to the Council, which will introduce additional considerations that may impact the draft Budget.

An additional Budget Funding Submission request

A late Budget Funding Submission was received on 24 March 2025, *Traffic and Parking Management*. However, due to the timing of its presentation, it has not been incorporated into the draft Budget or the draft updated Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP). Nevertheless, a high-level presentation of the revised draft Budget Operating Surplus/(Deficit), including this submission, is provided below. If this submission is approved by the Council, it will be incorporated in the draft Annual Business Plan and Long-Term Financial Plan update which will be provided to the Council at its meeting to be held on 5 May 2025. A copy of this Funding Submission is contained in **Attachment D**.

The additional Funding submission impact on 2025-2026 Operating Surplus as outlined in the Table 9.

TABLE 9: 2025-2026 PROPOSED STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME - INCLUDING THE LATE BUDGET FUNDING SUBMISSION

	Recurrent Budget	Operating Projects	Proposed Budget
	2025-2026	2025-2026	2025-2026
	\$	\$	\$
INCOME			
Rates	50,904,915		50,904,915
Statutory Charges	2,239,311		2,239,311
User Charges	4,370,061		4,370,061
Grant Subsidies, Contributions	3,124,948		3,124,948
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions - capital	579,679		579,679
Investment Income	55,000		55,000
Other Income	521,676		521,676
Net gain - equity accounted Council businesses	-		-
Total Income	61,795,590	-	61,795,590
EXPENSES			
Employee Expenses	20,313,052	-	20,313,052
Materials, Contracts & Other Expenses	21,911,405	1,619,300	23,530,705
Depreciation, Amortisation & Impairment	13,696,916	-	13,696,916
Finance Costs	3,439,197	-	3,439,197
Net Loss - Joint Ventures & Associates	262,666	-	262,666
Total Expenses	56,354,814	1,619,300	61,242,536
OPERATING SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)	5,440,776	(1,619,300)	553,054
Net gain (loss) on disposal or revaluation of assets	36,792		36,792
Amounts specifically for new or upgraded assets	2,800,000		2,800,000
NET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	5,440,776	(1,619,300)	3,389,846

The impact of the additional Funding submission on the Long-Term Financial Plan is outlined in Table 10 below.

TABLE 10: UPDATE TO LONG-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - INCLUDES THE LATE BUDGET FUNDING SUBMISSION

Indicator	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2033/35
Operating Surplus / Deficit %	4.7%	0.9%	1.7%	3.6%	4.7%	3.2%	4.0%	5.0%	6.1%	7.3%	8.7%
Net Financial Liabilities Ratio	142.6%	152.9%	150.4%	155.1%	155.3%	149.3%	143.4%	133.7%	123.1%	111.8%	99.5%
Debt to Total Income Ratio	4.8%	7.7%	12.8%	13.3%	12.8%	15.8%	15.6%	15.3%	14.8%	14.1%	13.5%

COMMENTS

The information contained in this report will form the basis of the Draft Annual Business Plan which will be presented to the Council at its meeting to be held on 5 May 2025.

If Elected Members have any questions in relation to specific budget items or proposed allocations, please contact the Chief Financial Officer on 8366 4548, prior to the meeting as these discussions may assist in resolving any enquiry.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the proposed Operating and Capital Projects as set out in Attachments A and B be endorsed “*in principle*”.
2. That the Draft 2025-2026 Budget, set out in the Financial Statements contained in Attachment E, which incorporates the proposed Operating and Capital Projects contained in Attachments A and B, be endorsed “*in principle*”.
3. The Council notes that a report on the adoption of the Draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan and Budget, which includes the 2025-2026 Rating Strategy, will be prepared for the Council’s consideration at its meeting to be held on 5 May 2025.

Attachments – Item 13.6

Attachment A

Draft Annual Business Plan & Draft 2025-2026 Budget



2025-2026 DRAFT BUDGET

OPERATING PROJECTS

CITY PLAN 2030 OUTCOME	PROJECT NAME	Project Description	TOTAL APPROVED	GRANT FUNDING	RATES FUNDING	BORROWING FUNDING
	TOTALS		\$ 1,319,300	\$ -	\$ 1,319,300	\$ -
Cultural Vitality	TOUR DOWN UNDER	The Tour Down Under, a nationally and internationally recognised cycling event that attracts media attention from all over the world, therefore providing an excellent platform for the Council to market the City as a tourism destination and showcase the Norwood Parade Precinct to an international audience. The funding is requested to host a stage of the 2026 Tour Down Under.	\$ 55,000		\$ 55,000	
Economic Prosperity	EASTSIDE BUSINESS AWARDS	To recognise the best small businesses – retailers, restaurants, cafes, venues , professional services and food and beverage manufacturers within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	
Economic Prosperity	RAISING THE BAR ADELAIDE	Annual event is aimed at positioning education as part of the City's popular culture by simply mixing learning and debate into a fun-night out to support the City's hotels.	\$ 38,000		\$ 38,000	
Economic Prosperity	GATHER ROUND	Hosting AFL matches at Norwood Oval during the 2026 AFL Gather Round period, provides an opportunity to Council to establish the Norwood Oval as a premier venue for AFL matches, enhancing the City's reputation as a must-visit destination, attracting visitors thereby stimulating the local economy.	\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000	
Cultural Vitality	ART & CULTURE PLAN	The project is related to the Heritage Collection Digitisation Project Objective. It aims to create a searchable online catalogue to improve community access to the Council's heritage collection via personal or public devices.	\$ 25,000		\$ 25,000	
Cultural Vitality	CULTURALLY DIVERSE EARLY LITERACY PROJECT	The Project aims to provide bi-lingual early literacy sessions through employing the provider 'Chinese School of Music and Arts" to conduct sessions at the library service. These sessions will include bi-lingual stories, songs and activities, that will build community knowledge of a range of cultures and languages (not only Chinese)	\$ 3,300		\$ 3,300	
Cultural Vitality	FIRSTIVAL FESTIVAL	Firstival is a festival of new experiences, introduced by the Public Libraries SA in 2023, which aims to increase customer engagement with libraries, and drive visitation and membership among non-library goers.	\$ 4,000		\$ 4,000	
Social Equity	PUBLIC HEALTH PLAN	The project involves the review and development of the Council's Public Health Plan. The request for funding is to engage a consultant for this purpose.	\$ 13,000		\$ 13,000	

2025-2026 DRAFT BUDGET

OPERATING PROJECTS

CITY PLAN 2030 OUTCOME	PROJECT NAME	Project Description	TOTAL APPROVED	GRANT FUNDING	RATES FUNDING	BORROWING FUNDING
	TOTALS		\$ 1,319,300	\$ -	\$ 1,319,300	\$ -
Cultural Vitality	LIBRARY SERVICE CATALOGUE & PROGRAM REVIEW (MOTION)	Funds are requested to engage a consultant to support the achievement of recommendations within the recent Library Services Review undertaken by BRM Advisory. This includes reforming the libraries catalogue to provide more accessible and quality community resources, releasing valuable floor-space to enable improved capital and developing a strategic approach to library programs.	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	
Enviromental Sustainability	DEVELOPMENT OF TREE INVENTORY CONTRACTOR	This project entails a detailed audit of the City's Street Trees and capturing of that data into the Council's tree asset management system, 'Forestree'.	\$ 20,000		\$ 20,000	
Enviromental Sustainability	URBAN GREENING PROGRAM	The proposed program will provide the Council with an opportunity to promote the importance of greening and canopy cover on private land (as opposed to Councils' traditional role of greening of public land). This program is one of the actions under the Council's Tree Strategy. This program will assist in funding 100 established trees and 600 native plants to be planted on private property.	\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000	
Enviromental Sustainability	URBAN TREE CANOPY REGIONAL MAPPING CONTRIBUTION	Green Adelaide is in the early stages of planning for the next repeat tree canopy and green spaces data capture, anticipated to occur January 2026. Green Adelaide has requested a financial contribution from each of the eighteen (18) affected Councils in the Metropolitan Adelaide study area to cover the cost of the multispectral imagery and Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data capture, data analysis and reporting.	\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000	
Social Equity	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT - NINTH AVENUE CHRISTMAS LIGHTS DISPLAY	The Ninth Avenue, St Peters Christmas Lights displays has evolved from a small scale display of Christmas lights to a large-scale event that attracts many vehicles and pedestrians. This has resulted in significant traffic congestion during peak periods, accessibility issues for residents and raised concerns for pedestrian safety in recent years. To address these issues, in 2024 the Council has approved funds to provide traffic management to help manage traffic flows at the event. The Budget amount was revised after further consideration.	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	
Social Equity	ON-STREET PARKING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN NORWOOD & KENSINGTON PRECINCTS	The project is the implementation the On-Street Parking Policy as endorsed by Council at its meeting held on 1 November 2021. Implementation is being undertaken on an area or precinct basis. Funding is requested to engage a consultant to undertake initial investigations and undertake community consultation.	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000	

2025-2026 DRAFT BUDGET


OPERATING PROJECTS

CITY PLAN 2030 OUTCOME	PROJECT NAME	Project Description	TOTAL APPROVED	GRANT FUNDING	RATES FUNDING	BORROWING FUNDING
	TOTALS		\$ 1,319,300	\$ -	\$ 1,319,300	\$ -
Social Equity	40KPH SPEED LIMIT IMPLEMENTATION IN KENSINGTON & FELIXSTOW	Continues the preparation of a Traffic Impact Statement and signage layout plan, associated with the implementation of 40kmp/h speed limit reduction in the residential streets of Kensington and Felixstow, as well as funding for the procurement and installation of speed limit signs, and temporary 'speed limit changed' signs, which are required to be installed for a minimum period of 2 months as part of the implementation process.	\$ 45,000		\$ 45,000	
Social Equity	PUBLIC CONSULTATION FOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONCEPT DESIGN FOR PAYNEHAM SOUTH, FIRLE AND TRINITY GARDENS	A traffic study was undertaken for the suburbs of Payneham, Glynde, Payneham South, Firle, Trinity Gardens & St Morris, which resulted in the preparation of concept designs for traffic management to improve road safety and primarily address vehicle speeds and 'rat running'. To progress this project further, community consultation is required to be undertaken on the concept plans for the study area.	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000	
Corporate Management	AUTHORITY UPGRADE	Civica Authority v7.0 (version of the Enterprise management software Council is currently operating on became 'End of Life' in November 2023. Therefore, Civica is no longer selling or actively developing this version and is not supported by third party providers like Google and Microsoft. Funding is required to upgrade the legacy version Authority v7.0 to Authority Altitude and cover additional costs of Data migration and rebuilding integration to existing systems. The Budget amount was revised after further consideration.	\$ 516,000		\$ 516,000	
Social Equity	WILLIAM STREET BIKEWAY - STREET LIGHTING UPGRADE	Following the William Street Bikeway Upgrade works, multiple areas along the road were identified as not complying with the relevant Australian Standards in respect to street lighting. These non-compliances pose a risk. Funding is requested to address these non-compliances.	\$ 115,000		\$ 115,000	
Social Equity	STREET LIGHTING UPGRADE & RENEWAL	Internal reviews have identified non-compliance and street lighting standards. Therefore, funding is requested to undertake the design, and construction works to ensure street lighting is upgraded and renewed. The Budget amount was revised after further consideration.	\$ 15,000		\$ 15,000	
Environmental Sustainability	VERGE UPGRADE	Continuation of a Verge Greening Incentive Fund, to financially assist residents with the cost of growing greenery in its place. This Fund will contribute to meet our Council's CityPlan2030 greening objectives, beautify our city and bring cooling to high surface temperatures hotspots. The Budget amount was revised after further consideration.	\$ 20,000		\$ 20,000	

Attachment B

Draft Annual Business Plan & Draft 2025-2026 Budget






2025-2026 DRAFT BUDGET

CAPITAL PROJECTS

CITY PLAN 2030 OUTCOME	PROJECT NAME	Project Description	TOTAL APPROVED	GRANT FUNDING	RATES FUNDING	BORROWING FUNDING
	TOTALS		\$ 25,966,971	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 13,996,015	\$ 9,170,956
Social Equity	RENEWAL PROGRAMM incl TRINITY VALLEY	To deliver the 2024-2025 Capital I Works Program for the replacement and upgrade of selected civil, drainage, recreation & open space, and building assets, in accordance with the Council's plans.	\$ 12,887,016		\$ 12,887,016	
Social Equity	PAYNEHAM MEMORIAL SWIMMING CENTRE - YEAR 3	The full redevelopment of the Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre, as per the Council's Swimming Centres Strategy.	\$ 11,071,956	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	\$ 8,271,956
Social Equity	SALARY CAPITALISATION	Wages and salaries incurred by the Council's employees who involve in the delivery of the projects involving physical assets.	\$ 1,108,999		\$ 1,108,999	\$ -
Social Equity	ADEY RESERVE PLAYGROUND SHADE SAIL STRUCTURE	Renewal of the Adey Reserve playground equipment is in the draft 2025-2026 Capital Works Program (funding for this component is from the Renewals Budget). Funding is proposed for an accompanying new shade sail structure for the playground as this is a new development. The structure will provide protection against risk of sunburns and long-term skin damage. There are also added benefits in terms of prolonging the useful life of the playground assets, maintaining the aesthetic appeal of the play equipment, and allowing increased playtime for its users.	\$ 60,000		\$ -	\$ 60,000
Social Equity	ST PETERS CHILDCARE CENTRE & PRE-SCHOOL SHADE SAIL STRUCTURE	Funding is requested for new shade sails to be installed in the playground area following the removal of two trees from the playground area at the St Peters Child Care Centre & Preschool.	\$ 60,000		\$ -	\$ 60,000
Social Equity	KENT TOWN PUBLIC REALM UPGRADE	The Kent Town Urban Design Framework and Public Realm Manual were endorsed by the Council in 2019. These documents provide guidance on how the Council will undertake streetscape enhancements, including working with developers to make improvements adjacent new development sites. Several development sites are now under construction. This proposed new capital budget is intended to pay for the difference between renewal and upgrade costs for footpath paving, landscaping and furniture in Kent Town.	\$ 400,000		\$ -	\$ 400,000
Social Equity	BUILDING ACCESSABILITY IMPROVEMENTS	In 2024, an accessibility audit of the Norwood Swimming Centre, Norwood Oval and St Peters Town Hall Complex was undertaken. This proposed new capital budget is to undertake accessibility improvements at these sites to achieve compliance with the national building code and to improve access and safety.	\$ 100,000		\$ -	\$ 100,000



2025-2026 DRAFT BUDGET

CAPITAL PROJECTS

CITY PLAN 2030 OUTCOME	PROJECT NAME	Project Description	TOTAL APPROVED	GRANT FUNDING	RATES FUNDING	BORROWING FUNDING
	TOTALS		\$ 25,966,971	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 13,996,015	\$ 9,170,956
Cultural Vitality	QUADRENNIAL ART PROJECT	The Quadrennial Public Art Commission is an important initiative that underpins the outcomes of Council's Public Art Policy, providing high quality works of art by contemporary professional artists for our public places. The Project is delivered across two (2) financial years. Funds were approved in 2021/2022 as \$75,000 annual cost for four (4) financial years and will now be spent in the 2025/2026 financial year for the detailed design, fabrication and installations of the artwork.	\$ 279,000		\$ -	\$ 279,000


Attachment C

Draft Annual Business Plan & Draft 2025-2026 Budget



2025-2026 DRAFT BUDGET

RECURRENT BUDGET BY OUTCOME



		Income	Expense	(Surplus)/Net Cost
Cultural Vitality		(2,226,777)	10,735,274	8,508,497
Community Events, Arts and Heritage	Community Art	(5,000)	671,402	666,402
	Cultural Heritage	0	210,360	210,360
	Events	(1,957)	681,198	679,241
	Concert Hall	(593,720)	500,502	(93,218)
Libraries & Community Facilities	Community Facilities	(502,642)	233,065	(269,577)
	Library Services	(132,710)	1,831,577	1,698,867
Planning	Planning Operations	(688,586)	2,315,241	1,626,655
Trees Parks Sport & Recreation	Parks & Gardens	0	657,620	657,620
	Reserve Maintenance	0	2,051,342	2,051,342
	Sporting & Recreational Facilities	(17,590)	539,431	521,841
	Swimming Centres	(284,572)	1,043,536	758,964
Economic Prosperity		(225,000)	1,445,667	1,220,667
Economic Development	Economic Development	0	1,126,169	1,126,169
	Precinct Management	(225,000)	319,498	94,498
Environmental Sustainability		(43,200)	8,061,621	8,018,421
Environmental and Planning	Creek Maintenance	0	16,824	16,824
	Environmental Management	(2,000)	1,691,805	1,689,805
	Street Trees	0	1,097,645	1,097,645
Waste Management	Waste Management	(41,200)	5,255,347	5,214,147
Social Equity		(7,263,698)	12,478,267	5,214,569
Subsidiaries	Joint ventures and Associates	0	262,666	262,666
Community, Health Aged & Youth Services	Community Support & Development	(1,349,988)	1,488,183	138,195
	Youth Service	(1,000)	165,412	164,412
	Child Care Centre	(2,869,566)	2,773,698	(95,868)
Infrastructure Management	Asset Maintenance (Admin)	0	452,325	452,325
	Asset Management	(1,590,669)	1,150,402	(440,267)
	Footpath, Kerb & Watertable	0	698,027	698,027
	Infrastructure Management	0	1,689,023	1,689,023
	Public Lighting	0	658,874	658,874
	Road & Traffic Management	0	1,065,426	1,065,426
	Stormwater Network	(15,450)	236,333	220,883
	Streetscape Maintenance	0	59,148	59,148
Regulatory Services	Animal Management	(147,550)	109,416	(38,134)
	Building Inspections	0	299,693	299,693
	Parking Management	(1,281,475)	183,634	(1,097,841)
	Pest Management	0	217,996	217,996
	Regulatory Services	(8,000)	968,011	960,011
Corporate Management		(1,207,000)	7,981,938	6,774,938
Governance, Communication & Administration	Communications	0	278,093	278,093
	Corporate Expenses	(1,202,000)	1,828,865	626,865
	Corporate Governance	0	1,200,367	1,200,367
	Finance Management	(5,000)	1,376,408	1,371,408
	HR & Employee Services	0	1,153,549	1,153,549
	Information Technology	0	1,179,289	1,179,289
	Administration	0	965,367	965,367
Rates, Depreciation and Financing		(50,829,915)	18,867,517	(31,962,398)
Rates	General Rates	(49,163,104)	348,320	(48,814,784)
	Regional Landscape Levy	(1,616,811)	1,606,811	(10,000)
Depreciation	Depreciation	0	13,696,916	13,696,916
Financing	Financing	(50,000)	3,215,470	3,165,470
(Surplus)/Net Cost		(61,795,590)	59,570,284	(2,225,306)

Attachment D

Draft Annual Business Plan & Draft 2025-2026 Budget



PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Altitude (Authority) Upgrade
PROJECT OWNER	Aerken Kuerban
REQUEST DATE	28/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Lisa Mara
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	NO
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 21 November 2023, Civica Authority v7.0 became 'End of Life', where Civica is no longer selling or actively developing this version (i.e. no new features or enhancements). As of 31 December 2023, Civica will focus on ongoing maintenance on P1 and P2 issues only, which means that all P3 and P4 tickets will be closed out. The risk of moving forward without upgrading will be that Civica will not attend to any non-urgent calls or develop new updates or features.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Over the last 12 months, Council has lost a number of features crucial to its operations, like Google Maps integrations to CRM due to the integrations no longer being supported in the current version. Council was not able to implement ACTUS, a mobile platform for field operations.

On 20 January, Google Chrome no longer supports 'Cross-platform', which is crucial for Authority to work on Council workstations. Information Services have had to stop Chrome updates which puts Council at a significant Cyber Security risk. Additionally, the Finance Team had struggled to get general support.

Alternative options have been reviewed and since alternative products don't provide significant efficiencies, the Council would not benefit from migrating to a new product.

Three leading solution providers with custom-built Local Government products are Civica, Datacom Datascape and Technology One.

Technology One and Civica are the preferred products by most councils. Civica has 150 Local Government users in Australia and New Zealand. Datascape is new to the market and only has a handful of Customers.

Cost comparison (per year):

Datacom Datascape \$350,000

Technology One \$500,000 base (all modules 750k)

Civica Authority \$220,642

Migration Cost:

Datacom Datascape: \$950,000

Technology One: \$2,000,000+

Civica Authority Altitude: \$100,000

**DESCRIPTION OF
PROPOSED PROJECT
INITIATIVE / PROGRAM**

Upgrade Authority to Altitude.
Implement additional module:

Actus

HR

Payroll

Additional cost for Data migration and rebuilding integration to existing systems.

RISK MANAGEMENT

**DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED
OR POTENTIAL RISKS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE
CURRENT SITUATION**

The legacy Authority application no longer support by vendor and third party provides like Google and Microsoft. Council will not be able to conduction business since Authority is the core product that manages land and finances.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET -
project is 'one off' and will not be on
recurrent basis

**IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS**

YES

**SELECT ROLE OR TEAM
THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO
CONTRIBUTE TO THIS
PROJECT**

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
Authority Users	no	no

**PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL
CONFIRMATION FROM THE
TEAM MANAGER/S**

- [Authority-Modules.png](#)

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

**OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST**

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Upgrade Authority to Altitude	Upgrade Authority to Altitude	350,000
Additional Modules	Additional Modules	100,000
Support Staff	Support Staff	80,000

Rebuild integration	Rebuild integration	20,000
		550,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

The cost for rebuilding the integration is an estimate.

PLEASE ATTACH SUPPORTING FILE (IF REQUIRED)

- [CIVICA-Authority.docx](#)

ATTACH QUOTES IF APPLICABLE

- [Altitude-Proposal_Norwood-PSP_Nov-2023.pdf](#)

PROPOSED START DATE

01/10/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

6 Months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	2026 AFL Gather Round
PROJECT OWNER	Skye Grinter-Falzun
REQUEST DATE	28/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Mario Barone
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	NO
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The AFL Gather Round 2026, endorsed by the Premier of South Australia, is a statewide celebration designed to showcase and promote South Australian tourism and community engagement. It is anticipated to draw thousands of visitors and provides a unique platform to highlight NPSP's cultural and sporting vibrancy. We aim to establish Norwood Oval as a premier venue for AFL matches during this period, enhancing the City's reputation as a must-visit destination.

By hosting AFL matches at Norwood Oval and coordinating supplementary events, our objectives include:

- Attracting visitors to explore NPSP's diverse range of restaurants, shops and cultural landmarks, thereby stimulating the local economy.
- Involving local traders and businesses to promote community spirit and participation in the event's activities.
- Showcasing local culture by highlighting the vibrancy of NPSP through curated events that celebrate our community's unique identity.

The Council is committed to making the AFL Gather Round 2026 an even greater success to previous years. With an allocated budget of \$200,000, we are in the process of planning a range of activities that will promote local tourism, enhance community engagement and showcase our cultural vitality.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

f

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

As above.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

- There is a risk of exceeding the allocated budget of \$200,000, leading to potential financial strain on the Council.
- Managing the logistics of hosting AFL matches, coordinating events and ensuring smooth execution of activities can pose operational challenges.
- Large-scale events can sometimes disrupt daily life for residents, affecting transportation, parking and local businesses negatively.
- Any issues arising during the event, such as organisational mishaps or negative community feedback, could affect the Council's reputation.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
Marketing & Place Activation	Yes	Potentially
Traffic Engineer	Yes	No
Works Depot	Yes	No
Strategic Communications & Advocacy	Yes	No

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL CONFIRMATION FROM THE TEAM MANAGER/S

- [2026-AFL-Gather-Round-Notification.msg](#)

INCLUDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEPENDANCIES ON OTHER TEAM OR TEAMS

The success of the AFL Gather Round 2026 event depends on collaboration across various teams within the Council.

Manager, Marketing & Place Activation will oversee City-wide activations, event activities, vendor coordination and promotional campaigns to attract visitors and create a vibrant atmosphere.

Manager, Strategic Communications & Advocacy will manage internal and external communications, media relations, public announcements, and community outreach to promote the event's benefits and public perception.

Traffic Engineer will work with the Manager, Marketing & Place Activation to plan and assist with traffic management strategies, including road closures, parking and ensuring safe traffic flow to minimise disruptions.

Works Depot will coordinate the maintenance of public amenities and waste

management before and during the event to enhance the visitor experience.

These positions will collaborate with other teams to ensure regulatory compliance and address operational challenges.

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Events/Activations/Marketing/Comms/Etc.	Unable to identify specific costs at this time	200,000
		200,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

The AFL Gather Round 2026 will include previous events such as the Rivals Long Lunch and the Champions Lunch, which will showcase the spirit of rivalry and celebrate the success of past AFL champions. These events will attract significant attention, offering unique opportunities for networking, community engagement and promoting the vibrancy of NPSP.

In addition to local activations, we will support the South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) and AFL through targeted marketing and communications strategies. This will ensure consistent messaging, promote event benefits and enhance public perception both locally and beyond.

PROPOSED START DATE

01/10/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

6 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	William Street Bikeway Street Lighting Upgrade
PROJECT OWNER	Josef Casilla
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Jared Barnes
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.2 A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	During the 2023-2024 financial year, the William Street Bikeway Upgrade Works were undertaken. As part of the project, the traffic control devices along William Street were reviewed and amended to ensure compliance to the relevant guidelines and standards. Due to the changes in the traffic control devices, the street lighting along William Street was subsequently reviewed.
BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION	Multiple areas along the road were identified to not comply to the relevant Australian Standards with regards to street lighting. These non-compliances pose a risk for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and property.
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM	A street lighting consultant was engaged to undertake design works to address these non-compliances. The detailed design drawings have been finalised and the construction works can commence.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION	As mentioned above, these non-compliances pose a risk for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and property. There are no foreseeable constraints at this time which are expected to impact the delivery of the project.
---	--

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET -
project is 'one off' and will not be on
recurrent basis

**IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS**

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

**OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST**

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Materials/Contracts & Other Expenses	Materials/Contracts & Other Expenses	115,000
		115,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

**PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)**

6 months to complete

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Tour Down Under Stage 2026
PROJECT OWNER	Claire Betchley
REQUEST DATE	23/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Mario Barone
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.3 An engaged and participating community
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tour Down Under, a nationally and internationally recognised cycling event, is held in South Australia during January and comprises a series of races with a start and finish being held in different parts of the State. The start and finish components of each stage of the Tour are changed on a regular basis and the right to host a start or a finish, is strongly contested by councils.

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has previously hosted thirteen (13) start events, with the most recent event held in January 2025. The Council has also hosted the Amateur Tour as part of the event on eight (8) occasions.

The staging of an international event such as the Tour Down Under, enables the Council to showcase the City, both locally, nationally and internationally. The Social Audience (social media audience), recorded by Events SA for the 2023 TDU, was averaged at 223,000 and a Live Audience (watching the broadcast via TV or web stream) of 779,000.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The fee to host a stage of the Tour Down Under is expected to be in the order of \$20,000. In addition, there are other costs with hosting a Stage (ie additional toilets, waste bins, marketing and the road closure) which are funded by the Council.

In this respect, the Council allocated \$55,000 in the 2024-2025 Budget to host the 2025 Tour Down Under and it is estimated that a similar amount will be required to host a stage of the 2026 Tour Down Under.

The Tour Down Under is promoted as an inclusive, family event, therefore meeting

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

the Council's aims of encouraging "an engaged and participating community" and attracting "more community life in public spaces".

Hosting a Stage of the Tour Down Under provides the Council with an ideal opportunity to become involved with a major international sporting event and promote the City to local, interstate and overseas visitors.

The Tour Down Under attracts media attention from all over the world, therefore providing a perfect platform for the Council to market the City as a tourism destination to an international audience.

Additionally, the proposed event will aim to showcase the precinct and keep visitors in the area after the start of the race, therefore encouraging visitor expenditure in local retail outlets, cafes and other businesses.

The deliverables for this initiative include but are not limited to:

- engagement with the SATC;
- engagement with local Norwood Parade Precinct Traders;
- the development of a comprehensive marketing campaign across the Council and precinct online channels and in print publications; and
- providing a safe location for the Race to take place.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

- What are the risks associated with the current situation to the Council and or the Community?

There are a number of risks associated with events which need to be managed effectively during the set-up, duration and the pack down of the event, therefore an Event Risk Management Plan will be developed to ensure all risks associated with the event are managed effectively.

- How would you rate these risks? What is the potential cost to Council if the project does not proceed?

The potential cost if this project didn't proceed would be nil, however the Council has previously hosted twelve (12) start events, with the most recent event held in January 2023 and has also hosted the Challenge Tour as part of the event on seven (7) occasions. If an Expression of Interest is not put forward, the reputation risk of not applying to host this event could have implications of the opportunity to host this Race and it not returning to Norwood in the future.

- What constraints/other expectations that will impact on the delivery of the Project Outcome?

If the Council does not allocate the budget, it will not be able to deliver or give the event justice, given the resources that need to be invested to deliver a successful event.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Marketing/Subscription/Admini- stration	This includes the Host fee	55,000
		55,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/12/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

3 months - event in January 2026

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Traffic Management - Ninth Avenue Christmas Lights Display
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	23/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	CULTURAL VITALITY - 2.5 Dynamic community life in public spaces and precincts
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting held on 8 October 2024, the Council resolved to provide traffic management for the Ninth Avenue, St Peters Christmas Lights displays on private property, given the high popularity of the light displays and the large number of vehicles and pedestrians visiting Ninth Avenue during December.

The Council will be considering a report in March 2025, following a review of the 2024 event, to determine if it will provide further traffic management for the event, and if so, to what extent. However, due to the timing of the preparation of the 2025/2026 Budget, there is a need to consider this funding submission prior to the Council's consideration of the report on the review of the Ninth Avenue, St Peters Christmas Lights event. The funding amount sought in this proposal may need to be adjusted depending on the outcomes of the Council's consideration of the 2024 event.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Ninth Avenue, St Peters Christmas Lights displays has evolved from a small-scale display of Christmas lights by two property owners at Ninth Avenue, St Peters to a large-scale event that attracts approximately 70,000 vehicles and over 50,000 pedestrians annually.

The large scale of the event has resulted in significant traffic congestion during peak periods and this has caused accessibility issues for some local residents and raised concerns for pedestrian safety in recent years. To address these issues, the Council resolved to provide traffic management for the 2024 event and anecdotal evidence suggests that the traffic management was positively received and helped to manage

**DESCRIPTION OF
PROPOSED PROJECT
INITIATIVE / PROGRAM**

traffic flows at the event.

The traffic management plan includes:

- managing traffic flows at the event for a period of 15 nights during the month of December;
- observation of traffic flows and issues at the event by traffic engineers and the Council's Compliance Officers; and
- undertaking traffic counts to gain a more accurate assessment of the number of attendees to the event.

For the 2024 event, a detailed Traffic Management Plan was prepared by a consulting traffic management firm, in consultation with Council staff. Following consideration of the issues and potential options, the option to ban all right turn movements into and out of Ninth Avenue, for the duration of the event, was determined to be the most effective. To facilitate this, traffic control equipment (ie barriers) was erected and taken down each day of the event and traffic controllers were present during the event.

RISK MANAGEMENT

**DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED
OR POTENTIAL RISKS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE
CURRENT SITUATION**

Risk considerations were considered in detail by the Council at its meeting held on 8 October 2024. A summary of the advice which was received from the Local Government Mutual Liability Scheme is set out below:

'Ultimately, this comes down to the Council's risk appetite and its willingness to support the event. However, the Council should be aware that if a foreseeable risk is not addressed, it could potentially lead to a claim of negligence against the Council. If the event will be run and organised by the Council in collaboration with resident input, then the LGAMLS will indemnify the Council (subject to the Scheme rules - risk management practices, etc.).

If the event will be run and organised by the unincorporated volunteer group (resident group), then the Council should consider obtaining necessary third-party permits, insurances, and risk management plans from that group. If the Council is aware of a traffic management issue and fails to address it properly, resulting in injury, property damage, or even fatality to a third party, the Council could be held responsible for not taking appropriate action in the circumstances.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

**IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS**

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT

BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
0	0	55,000
		55,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

The funding submission includes funding for the following:

- Implementation of a Traffic Management Plan, including the provision of on-site traffic controllers and physical traffic barriers during the event - \$40,000
- Traffic Counts - \$5,000
- Traffic Management Observations and Event Patrols - 20 days - \$10,000

PROPOSED START DATE

13/12/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

1 month

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Eastside Business Awards
PROJECT OWNER	Claire Betchley
REQUEST DATE	23/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Mario Barone
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	ECONOMIC PROSPERITY - 3.2 Cosmopolitan business precincts contributing to the prosperity of the City
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Eastside Business Awards program is specifically for businesses trading within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters. The aim of the Awards is to recognise the best small businesses – retailers, restaurants, cafes, venues, professional services and food and beverage manufacturers within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

The awards encourage businesses and the public to vote for their favourite business in one or all of the relevant categories, which have been designed to reflect the City's mix of businesses. The 2024 Eastside Business Awards Program received a record 10,974 votes across eleven (11) categories.

In this competitive environment, any form of marketing and promotion is welcomed by businesses. Whilst winning an award in any category would be the ultimate goal for most businesses, the value of being named as a finalist can improve brand awareness and provide new customers with a better understanding of particular businesses.

Being selected as a finalist for an award is like a third-party endorsement of the services or products that a business offers. Being named a winner is like a seal of approval and is a sign of quality and excellence. However, from a business perspective, just being nominated provides an opportunity for the business to look at its business from a different perspective, evaluate its offering and determine what it is that it does best.

In addition, the amount of promotion associated with the initiative through Solstice

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

In 2018, the Council delivered the inaugural Eastside Business Awards in partnership with News Corp Australia. This partnership arrangement continued in 2019 and 2020 and as a result of the Messenger print publication ceasing operation in mid-2020, News Corp Australia were unable to fulfil the editorial and marketing activity that was required to deliver the 2021 program.

As a result, in 2021, the Council partnered with Solstice Media, which includes brands InDaily, SALIFE, CityMag, and InReview. This diverse suite of brands provides the Council and therefore the program, with the flexibility to promote to different markets across all brands and platforms.

As outlined above, the Council partnered with Solstice Media in 2022 to deliver the Program within a budget of \$37,000. This included \$30,000 to cover the cost of the sponsorship package with Solstice Media, printed marketing collateral and distribution, as well as advertising costs through the Council-owned social media platforms. The remaining \$7,000 was allocated to cover the costs associated with hosting the Awards Ceremony where the winners were announced.

A budget of \$40,000 has been endorsed by the Council as a part of the 2024-2025 Budget to deliver the 2025 Eastside Business Awards. It is anticipated that the sponsorship package and other operational costs will not vary significantly in 2026, therefore it is proposed that \$40,000 be allocated to deliver the 2026 Eastside Business Awards.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The deliverables, which will be jointly managed and delivered by Solstice Media and the Council include:

- the development of a creative concept for the Awards;
- a comprehensive marketing campaign across the Solstice Media brands (InDaily, SA Life, CityMag, InReview) in both print and digital format;
- digital posters, flyers and any livery, which will be organised by Council Staff;
- the website, which will be managed by Solstice Media;
- the creative development of awards for the winning businesses;
- monitoring and facilitation of the nomination/voting processes;
- editorial support for the Awards carrying the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters logo;
- joint City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters and Solstice Media judging process; and
- 'in partnership with the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters' in logo format included on all collateral relating to the Awards.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

- What are the risks associated with the current situation to the Council and or the Community?
There is no direct risk to the Council of not participating in the initiative, however given the current state of the economy and the difficulties that many small businesses have had over the last few years, are currently facing, particularly in the hospitality and retail sectors, any support and recognition that the Council can provide to small business, is crucial. Also given that this initiative has been successfully delivered since 2018, there is an expectation from the City's businesses that it will continue to be delivered by the Council.
- How would you rate these risks? What is the potential cost to Council if the project

does not proceed?

The Eastside Business Awards offer the opportunity to promote and celebrate all businesses within the Council area, not just those who are located within designated precincts.

Having committed to the Eastside Business Awards since 2018, and due to the success and positive feedback of the program, there may be a risk that businesses will question the Council if it is decided to not invest in the 2026 program.

- What constraints/other expectations that will impact on the delivery of

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Marketing/Administration		35,000
Event Management		15,000
		50,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/01/2026

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

3 months from start of promotions to event

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Library Services - Catalogue and Program Review
PROJECT OWNER	Andrew Hamilton
REQUEST DATE	04/02/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.3 An engaged and participating community
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to Cr Sims Motion on Notice resolved by the Council at its meeting on the 3 February 2025, this bid seeks \$50,000 in 2025-26, to support the achievement of recommendations within the recent Library Services Review undertaken by BRM Advisory. This includes:

- 1) Reforming the libraries catalogue to provide a smaller, more accessible and high quality community resource, whilst simultaneously releasing valuable floor-space to enable improved capital responses to community priorities.
- 2) Developing a strategic approach to library programs to ensure programmatic responses respond to community priorities and deliver meaningful impact.

A further \$60,000 will be sought as part of the 2026-27 budget to support the third element outlined within the Motion on Notice:

- 3) Re-designing each of the three libraries spaces to ensure the appropriate spaces and features are provided to support the specific areas of focus of each of the libraries.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters was formed with three resident libraries, with each designed to provide discreet library services to their respective communities. Whilst managed collectively, their service design largely reflects duplicated and historic offerings as opposed to a configuration that responds to the emerging needs of the community.

BRM Advisory were engaged to undertake a Service Review of the City's library

function to provide benchmarked comparison and advice for an improved service. On completion of the Review, the Council the adopted a range of recommendations aimed at improving community impact. This included the creation of unique library experiences within each Library.

The achievement of this aspiration comprises multiple steps, many of which are inter-related.

Three critical elements include:

- 1) Reforming the libraries catalogue to provide a smaller, more accessible and high quality community resource, whilst simultaneously releasing valuable floor-space to enable improved capital responses to community priorities.
- 2) Developing a strategic approach to library programs to ensure programmatic responses respond to community priorities and deliver meaningful impact
- 3) Re-designing each of the three libraries spaces to ensure the appropriate spaces and features are provided to support the specific areas of focus of each of the libraries.

The delivery of 1) and 2) are required to be completed to, in part, to inform future design.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

Three consultancies are proposed:

to be completed during 2025-26:

- 1) Identify a framework and strategy to reform and reduce the libraries catalogue to provide a smaller, more accessible and high quality community resource, whilst simultaneously releasing valuable floor-space to enable improved capital responses to community priorities.
- 2) Identify a strategic approach and develop a three year program for library programs to ensure programmatic responses respond to community priorities and deliver meaningful impact

To be completed during 2026-27:

- 3) Develop concept designs for each of the three library spaces to ensure the appropriate environments and features are provided to support the specific areas of focus of each of the libraries and deliver the necessary functionality to achieve the recommendations of the Library Services Review..

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Access to expertise to support the achievement of the proposed projects is necessary to ensure the workforce has access to a strategic and considered implementation.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET -
project is 'one off' and will not be on
recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Consultants	Consultants	50,000
		50,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/09/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

by 30 June 2026

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	40 kp/h Speed Limit Implementation - Kensington and Felixstow
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	07/02/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.2 A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting held on Monday 3 February 2025, the Council resolved to consider, as part of the 2025-2026 Budget, the implementation of 40kp/h speed limit reduction in the residential streets of Kensington and Felixstow, when resources are available, without undertaking community consultation. This funding submission requests funding to enable the preparation of a Traffic Impact Statement and signage layout plan for each suburb as well as funding for the procurement and installation of speed limit signs, and temporary 'speed limit changed' signs, which are required to be installed for a minimum period of 2 months as part of the implementation process.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

This project has been requested for consideration by the Council's resolution, at its meeting held on Monday 3 February 2025. Refer to Item 12.6.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The implementation of speed limit reductions requires the preparation of Traffic Impact Statements (TIS) for the affected areas. A TIS details the traffic management and road safety effects for all road users, including cyclists and pedestrians, expected by the installation, operation, alteration or removal of traffic control devices. The TIS will provide the justification and need for new speed limit signs (also including temporary 'speed limit changed' signs) and will, for this project, underpin the preparation of speed limit sign layout plans for Kensington and Felixstow. The speed limit sign layout plans will be the source document used to tender for the manufacture and installation of the 40kp/h signs.

Funding will also be required to inform (not consult) affected citizens and properties on the speed limit change and new signs.

The project also requires liaison with the Department for Infrastructure & Transport (DIT) and adjoining Councils as part of the determination of the 40kp/h precinct boundaries. Ministerial approval will also be required before the Council can implement the speed limit reduction.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

The Council has already considered the risks of implementing 40kp/h in Felixstow and Kensington, without community consultation, and has determined to proceed on this basis. (Refer to Item 12.6, Council Meeting, 3 February 2025).

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Contractors & Consultants cost	Preparation of Traffic Impact Statements and Sign Layout Plans	15,000
Plant/Equipment Purchase	Manufacture and Installation of 40kp/h signs	26,000
Other Costs	Preparation/Mail Out of Information to affected Citizens	4,000
		45,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/10/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

6 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	On-Street Parking Policy Implementation - Norwood & Kensington Precincts
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	16/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Mario Barone
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.2 A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The On-Street Parking Policy (the Policy) and implementation was endorsed by the Council at its meeting held on 1 November 2021. Implementation is being undertaken on an area or precinct basis. Funding is requested in order to engage a consultant to:

1. Undertake the initial stages of investigation and recommendations in the study area comprising the suburb of Norwood and to lead community consultation in respect to the proposed parking control recommendations for Norwood; and
2. Undertake community consultation in respect to the proposed parking control recommendations for Kensington, for which an Investigations report and recommendations has already been completed.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

To date, as required by the Policy, Investigations and Recommendations Reports have been completed for the precincts of Kensington, Marryatville and some localised areas of Norwood and St Peters and consultation for these recommendations is scheduled to be undertaken in 2025. However, funding is requested to engage a consultant to lead community consultation for the Kensington study area, given the extent of issues and extent of consultation will require significant resource allocation and to prepare final recommendations following community consultation.

In addition, the next priority precinct has been identified as the suburb of Norwood as there is significant competing demand for the limited amount of on-street parking available due to the extensive mix of land uses in the precinct, combined with a high

rate of visitors and mix of housing densities.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The Norwood study area is bound by Magill Road, Portrush Road, Kensington Road and Fullarton Road. The surrounding arterial roads are excluded from the study area as those roads are primarily under the care and control of the Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT).

The Consultant would be expected to prepare an Investigations and Recommendations for the Norwood study area. This initiative would include an analysis of parking and land use issues in the study area, existing transport options such as public transport and cycling networks, review existing parking conditions, undertake car parking occupancy surveys and prepare evidence-based recommendations that align with Council's On-street Parking Policy for all on-street parking in the Study Area.

The second phase of the project is to undertake community consultation for the Norwood and Kensington study areas and provide final recommendations for implementation, following the conclusion of the community consultation.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

The key risks related to this purchasing activity and the mitigation strategies are:
 1. The project timeline may not be met due to the complexity and scale of the project.
 2. The project due to its complexity and scale may require scope and cost variations.

These risks can be mitigated through the appointment of an experienced consultant that has experience and an excellent understanding on on-street parking management and traffic engineering.

No other significant risks identified.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
0	0	40,000
		40,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

-

PROPOSED START DATE

01/09/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

5 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Public Consultation for traffic Management Concept Designs for Payneham South, Firle and Trinity Gardens
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	31/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.2 A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A traffic study was undertaken for the suburbs of Payneham, Glynde, Payneham South, Firle, Trinity Gardens & St Morris in 2022. Since that time, the Council has consulted on a speed limit reduction to 40kp/h in the residential streets of these suburbs. The speed limit reduction was supported by the local community and has since been approved by the Department for Infrastructure & Transport. The reduced speed limit will be implemented by 30 June 2025.

The traffic study resulted in the preparation of concept designs for traffic management to improve road safety and primarily address vehicle speeds and 'rat running'. To progress this project further, community consultation is required to be undertaken on the concept plans for the study area. However, given the large size of the study area and resource capacity to undertake the consultation, it is proposed to engage a consultant to assist staff to undertake community consultation for suburbs of Trinity Gardens, Firle and Payneham South.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

See above.

The Council has committed to undertaking the traffic management study and, following advice from the Council's Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee, endorsed the preparation of concept plans. Consultation with the community was undertaken in relation to the study and further consultation is now required to ensure that local citizens affected by the proposed changes have an opportunity to provide input into the concept designs.

DESCRIPTION OF

It is proposed to engage a consultant to assist staff to undertake community

**PROPOSED PROJECT
INITIATIVE / PROGRAM**

consultation for suburbs of Trinity Gardens, Firle and Payneham South. The consultation would include sending information to affected citizens, information sessions with Elected Members and interested stakeholders as well as collation of submissions.

RISK MANAGEMENT

**DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED
OR POTENTIAL RISKS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE
CURRENT SITUATION**

If further consultation on traffic management devices within the study area is not undertaken, the Council may face criticism from the community that it does not take its responsibility for traffic management seriously and there is also a risk to the Council's reputation.

In addition, the traffic study identified some 'hotspots' where traffic management devices are needed to address speeding and if this is not addressed, there is a traffic safety risk that will remain outstanding. The measures proposed are complementary to the 40kp/h speed limit reduction.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

**IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS**

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

**OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST**

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Consultant Costs	-	30,000
Preparation/mail out of consultation materials	-	10,000
		40,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/10/2025

**PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)**

5 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Raising the Bar
PROJECT OWNER	Claire Betchley
REQUEST DATE	23/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Mario Barone
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	ECONOMIC PROSPERITY - 3.5 A local economy supporting and supported by its community
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Raising the Bar Adelaide is aimed at positioning education as part of the City's popular culture by simply mixing learning and debate into a fun-night out.

Through the transformation of ten (10) of the City's pubs into a learning campus for one night, the Council is able to successfully raise the bar on the content people are able to consume in their everyday lives. The format of the event is twenty (20) talks in one night; across ten (10) venues throughout the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

The Council strives to deliver events that have a strong social presence, encouraging the community to be engaged and connected. The Raising the Bar events have proven to be a popular volunteering opportunity and positively challenged the leadership and skills of the Council's volunteers. In addition, the event generates a range of positive effects that include the reinforcing of collective ideas; encouraging alternate environments for learning; promoting wellbeing and increasing civic pride.

The education sector has the ability to significantly impact on culture. It spreads different ideas among masses, teaches a person to think in a different way than they might have before, and gives them access to the sciences, arts, politics and entrepreneurial ideas and events of the time. Past events have achieved this, and by doing so, provide the community with the setting to debate ideas in an accessible, non-threatening and open forum.

In order to deliver this initiative

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Since 2018, the Raising the Bar Adelaide events have provided the opportunity to showcase the diverse pub scene within the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, raise the awareness of the City's night time offering, whilst creating a one-of-a-kind, knowledge driven event.

Raising the Bar Adelaide achieves several objectives and strategies outlined in the fourth pillar of the Council Strategic Management Plan of 'a dynamic and thriving centre for businesses and services'.

In this competitive business environment, any form of promotion or marketing is welcomed by businesses, and particularly in this instance where an initiative with a growing brand is again being presented. With several of the venues located on or adjacent to The Parade and Magill Road, it provides opportunity for additional promotion through the precincts' marketing channels. The strong social media following contributed to the prosperity of the event and the City.

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has a strong 'sense of place' and belonging, created by the City's history and culture. Supporting and encouraging greater creativity, contributes to the City's future ideas, with direct benefit to the community.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is passionate about the power of education and new ideas to change communities and the world. Raising the Bar Adelaide provides the Council the opportunity to connect and engage with the universities, and to play a major role in moving learning out of the classroom into spaces where people already gather. The winter activation event provides a reason for people to visit and connect with our City all year round.

The deliverables for this initiative include but are not limited to:

- partnering with venues across the City and liaising with venue managers ahead of, during and after the event to deliver the initiative;
- matching speakers that have complementary topics and allocating them to appropriate venues;
- the development of a comprehensive marketing campaign across the Council and precinct online channels and in print publications;
- liaising with the Raising the Bar staff on the website development, including providing all imagery and content; and
- liaising with Raising the Bar staff on all marketing and communication activity to ensure cohesive and consistent messaging.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

- What are the risks associated with the current situation to the Council and or the Community?

There is no extreme risk to the Council and or the community in the delivery of this initiative. Previous events provided the local pubs and bars a promotional opportunity during quieter months and due to their success, they are keen to be involved year after year.

Although there is no extreme risk, if the Council decides not to support this initiative in 2025-2026, there is a very likely chance that one of the States three (3) universities will take up the opportunity, alternatively another Council within South Australia will sign the license to deliver the event.

- How would you rate these risks? What is the potential cost to Council if the project does not proceed?

As above, the community was very supportive of this initiative, this was displayed through their attendance and feedback after the event. If the Council decides not to proceed, the Council's reputation will be at risk.

- What constraints/other expectations that will impact on the delivery of the Project Outcome?

If the Council does not allocate the budget, it will not be able to deliver or give the event justice, given the resources that need to be invested to

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Marketing/Subscription/Administration	License to use the concept included	38,000
		38,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

3 months - event in August

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Arts and Culture Plan - Year 2 Implementation
PROJECT OWNER	Navian Iseut
REQUEST DATE	24/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	CULTURAL VITALITY - 2.2 A City which values and promotes its rich cultural and built heritage
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following the endorsement of the Arts and Culture Plan 2024-2026 in January 2024, a 2024-2025 funding submission was approved that detailed the three year spend to deliver the foundation projects outlined within the plan:

Year 1 Spend Commitment (2024-2025) - \$68,874 (in progress)

Year 2 Spend Commitment (2025-2026) - \$25,000 (this funding submission: stage 2 of the Heritage Collection Digitisation Project).

Year 3 Spend Commitment (2026-2027)- \$25,000

Heritage Collection Digitisation Project Objective: create a searchable online catalogue to improve community access to the Council's heritage collection via personal or public devices.

Milestones completed in 2024/2025

- Discovery: Digital management best practice, platforms and case studies.
- Planning & prioritise: collection and analysis of 2023-2024 & 2024-2025 community research request data, to inform and deliver the project in incremental stages and prioritise effort in a way that is responsive to stakeholder and citizen needs. Additionally, an assessment of the collection has been conducted to prioritise items for digitisation that are volatile or in fragile condition.
- Systems & equipment: the Cultural Heritage Centre has been setup with equipment to digitise the majority of the collection. Large and fragile items requiring specialised scanning have been identified.
- Year 1 scanning of at risk Kensington and Norwood Council Assessment registers.
- Public Art Masterplan (draft in progress).

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Cultural Heritage service receives in excess of 500 community research enquires per year, the project will produce a searchable catalogue, accession register and index of the Council's collection in digital form to facilitate community access and self search functionality.

In addition to enabling community access, the project will digitise a copy for posterity to ensure that metadata is retained past the useful physical life of the individual collection items, future-proofing the Council's historical collection and information.

Potential benefits for the Council and the Community include:

- Protect and preserve Council's heritage collection from environmental damage, such as, humidity, fire, theft and accidental damage.
- Improve accessibility and facilitate improved knowledge sharing.
- improve business process efficiency, quality and consistency
- reduce costs (staff research time) and improve response time and citizen service.
- integrate collection into library catalogues that are easily accessible and searchable by the community.

Other Arts & Culture Plan actions scheduled for the 2025-2026 financial year will be funded from the Arts, Culture & Community Connections recurrent budget.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

COMMUNITY VALUE

Information contained in the original documents are of internal, local and state interest and value and are essential for researching the history of our City. Dating back to 1853, information includes, but not limited to, property owners and tenant names, building descriptions and use, where prominent early settlers resided, former names of historic properties and streets, street profiles, land subdivisions, boundary realignments and the development of Council suburbs as they rolled out after colonisation.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL RECORDS

The project will create a digital copy of at risk historical documents that the Council are required to maintain under State Government Statutory obligations. Specifically, 61 Payneham Council Assessment Registers and other Council historical documents. The registers and documents are original records and the only hard copies that exist. They are progressively deteriorating due to decades of handling. If they are not digitised the historical information is at risk of being lost.

Due to the nature and size of the documents, they require specialised third party scanning that can scan over the curvature of the books and then compensate for this curvature when it creates the final image so that the image is not skewed and is fully readable.

Once scanned the original documents will be transferred to State Records, providing improved preservation conditions, slowing the rate of deterioration.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Potential Risks

1. Resourcing

The demand on the Cultural Heritage Centre research service is consistently high (more than 500 enquiries per year). As research is currently conducted manually, without easily searchable metadata or electronic databases, each enquiry is labour intensive (average research time per enquiry is 49 minutes).

Mitigation: digitise items regularly requested by community to provide self-search option.

2. Constraints

Underpinning digitising each item are time consuming collection management and preservation processes. These include, but are not limited to, identification of materials at risk; cleaning and conservation work for any fragile items; health and safety assessment and measures when handling potential dangerous items; identification of legal requirements; copyright and other constraints; standards that should be followed; retrieving related records; conducting research to fill in record gaps; applying metadata; valuing item for insurance purposes; ensuring appropriate storage and returning item to storage.

Mitigation: develop annual implementation plans to prioritise and set realistic digitisation objectives for the year.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Arts and Culture Plan	Year 2- Heritage Collection Digitisation Project	25,000
		25,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

6 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Development of Tree Inventory
PROJECT OWNER	Matthew Cole
REQUEST DATE	16/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY - 4.1 Sustainable and efficient management of resources
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Forestree tree asset management system was selected as the chosen software program and procured by the Council in July 2023. The Forestree software will be fully operational for identifying and managing the City's estimated 30,000 trees once all relevant data for each street tree has been populated into the system.

The first year of data collection is scheduled to commence toward the end of the 2024/2025 financial year and data for approximately 5000 trees is anticipated to be collected.

This project will entail a detailed audit of the City's Urban Forest and capturing of that data into the Forestree software platform.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The project involves the collection of data for street trees across the City. The data will be interrogated and analysed for the purpose of driving the development of forward programs (maintenance, planting, etc.), regular and ongoing inspections required to address safety and risk management issues and other requirements. The Tree Inventory will also be important in addressing climate change adaptation, with the need to understand vulnerable tree species, cater for succession planting strategies and ensuring canopy cover targets can be met and monitored. Currently there are 8,205 trees already recorded in Forestree. There has been collection and uploading of the following information into Forestree in relation to each tree: Location of tree, species, health and age of tree, height, canopy spread, useful life expectancy (based on average), pest management treatment. In 2024 the Council planted 480 street trees, and data for these trees has been uploaded into Forestree. An additional 500 street trees will be planted in 2025. All of the data associated with

these tree plantings will also be uploaded into Forestree. To date, over 1,000 planting locations have been identified and mapped into the Forestree platform. Once fully populated, the data will become dynamic and will be updated by internal and external staff to reflect ongoing tree management activities including watering visits, pruning occurrences, tree removals and replacements and the reason for removal.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

(Background and justification cont.) This information will be readily available and easy for staff to locate on enquiry. The remaining costs to complete the entire data collection (predominantly using outsourced specialist consultants) for whole streets at a time, is anticipated to be:
 22,000 trees x (approx.) x \$4.00 per tree data collection = \$88,000

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE/PROGRAM

Typically, the audit will record data such as species, height, location, legislative status (Regulated or Significant), general condition and health, etc. The data will be collated into the Forestree database which will then be integrated into the Council's Asset Management System and GIS system and used to assist in the forward planning of future tree planting programs, plan for climate change adaptation, streamline tree watering programs etc.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Robust risk management of the Council's tree inventory will be improved the collection of data and the maintenance of a tree inventory.

Currently, the Council primarily manages risks associated with trees along The Parade and within the Norwood Swimming Centre complex, because these areas have been identified as high risk areas due to the proximity of trees to high volumes of pedestrians or visitors to events and facilities. Other areas and other tree species have not been comprehensively reviewed in terms of their risk to people and property.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
\$0	\$0	20,000
		20,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/10/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

1 month to complete

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Street Lighting Upgrade & Renewal
PROJECT OWNER	Josef Casilla
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Jared Barnes
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.2 A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	In response to street lighting non-compliances identified through a combination of internal reviews and resident complaints, funding will be allocated to undertake design and construction works to ensure that non-compliant and inadequate street lighting within the City's streets are renewed or upgraded.
BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION	The installation of a compliant level of street lighting will ensure that the street infrastructure is safe and is consistent with the level of service generally provided throughout the City.
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM	The works will be a combination of street lighting compliance reviews, detailed design works and minor construction works, depending on the nature of the matter which has been raised.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION	<p>Public lighting can pose a risk to the Council and the community where the lighting infrastructure is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. approaching the end of useful lives; b. not compliant with current standards; and/or c. is out-dated and not considered fit for purpose. <p>These risks may lead to negative impact (damage, injuries, etc) with both property and citizens.</p> <p>There are no foreseeable constraints at this time which are expected to impact on the delivery of the project.</p>
---	---

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET -
project is 'one off' and will not be on
recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Materials/Contracts & Other Expenses	Materials/Contracts & Other Expenses	50,000
		50,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

12 months to complete

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Public Health Plan
PROJECT OWNER	Rosanna Busolin
REQUEST DATE	17/12/2024
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.1 Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Councils are recognized by the State for their vital role in delivering infrastructure and services that enhance the health and social wellbeing of their communities. This recognition extends to their responsibility for developing Public Health Plans, which integrate planning and implementation activities related to public health and social wellbeing.

Under Sections 51 and 52 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 (the Act), all local councils in South Australia are required to prepare, implement, and report on an individual or Regional Public Health Plan (RPHP). These plans should align with the State Public Health Plan and address public health challenges specific to their local area or region.

Section 51(19) of the Act further mandates that Public Health Plans be reviewed at least once every five years. This review process requires the Council to consider any changes in circumstances that have occurred since the Plan was first developed or last reviewed.

In 2020, the constituent councils of the Eastern Health Authority collaboratively developed the second iteration of the Regional Public Health and Wellbeing Plan, titled Better Living, Better Health 2020–2025. This plan will be due for review and updating in 2025.

The purpose of this funding submission is to engage a consultant to review the current plan and develop a new Public Health Plan for the Council's endorsement for the period 2025–2030.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

In 2014, the constituent members of the Eastern Health Authority (comprising the Cities of Burnside, Campbelltown, Prospect, Norwood Payneham & St Peters, and the Town of Walkerville) collaborated to develop the first Regional Public Health Plan.

This plan highlighted the collective contributions of the Councils and the Eastern Health Authority to public health.

In 2020, the Regional Public Plan was reviewed and updated. This iteration of the Public Health Plan 2020-2025 took on a more aspirational approach, focusing on regional projects and fostering collaborations. In accordance with legislative requirements, the plan is due for its next review in 2025, as public health plans must be reviewed every five years.

While the current Public Health Plan reflects a regional approach with the Local Government members of Eastern Health Authority, some Councils (specifically Campbelltown and Burnside) have chosen to develop their own Public Health Plans post 2025. In light of this, it is recommended that this Council also prepares its own Public Health Plan.

To facilitate this process, a consultant with expertise in developing public health plans will be required. The consultant's responsibilities will include reviewing the existing plan, developing a new Public Health Plan, and establishing a framework for reporting and monitoring its implementation.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The aim of the project is to review and develop the Council's Public Health Plan. The request for funding is to engage a consultant for the purpose of developing a Public Health Plan for the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters. The role of the consultant will include

- Researching Emerging Health Issues in our Community.
- Desktop review of Existing Strategies and Actions that need to be integrated into the Plan
- Developing Public Health Plan for the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
- Development of reporting and Monitoring Framework for the plan

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

If the project does not succeed the Council will not be complying with the requirements under the State Public Health Act 2011

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
--------------------------	---------	--------------------------

13,000	no income for this project	13,000
		13,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

Amount requested includes some funding for consultation phase of the Plan - promotion of consultation opportunities seeking feedback on the plan

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2024

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

8 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Urban Greening Program
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	15/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY - 4.4 Mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the Council's 2021/22 budget, the introduction of an Urban Greening Program was endorsed as a trial for residential property owners to have increased support for planting trees and natives on private land to increase, enhance and add value to the overall City's green cover specifically increase canopy, biodiversity and habitat.

The trial Program directly addresses a number of CityPlan 2030 greening objectives.

The trial program was separated into two (2) incentives (giveaways):

1. Tree Incentive (nursery voucher)
2. Native Plant Giveaway.

The Program has been successful in each year it has been offered, with high demand and positive feedback received from participants for both incentives. The initial response to the program was extremely high and resulted in an amendment to the budget, requested by Council, to double the original allocation.

To continue to support the number of trees and native plants being planted on private land and given the popularity and feedback received it is recommended that the Council continue the Urban Greening Program for a fourth year.

The proposed program budget of \$10,000 would fund 100 established trees and 600 native plants, which would be offered to NPSP households to be planted on private land.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

In the face of experiencing longer and hotter heatwaves and increased infill development, it is critical to plan for green cover in backyards, streets and

neighbourhoods.

Planting on private land will increase tree canopy and compared to the cost to the Council of planting and watering one street tree (approximately \$450), represents good value for money. Furthermore, though this program, the Council is not responsible for on-going maintenance costs. The Council will continue to deliver its CityPlan minimum of 500 new trees per year in streets and/or public spaces. This initiation complements the Council's own planting efforts to assist residents with increasing tree canopy across the City.

Strategy 5.1 Tree Strategy 2022-2027

Educate and incentivise the community to retain existing trees and plant new trees on private property.

Action 5.1.1.

Continue delivering Urban Greening Programs (education and incentives)

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The proposed program budget of \$10,000 would fund 100 established trees and 600 native plants to be planted on private property.

Delivery of this Program will provide the Council an opportunity to widely promote the importance of greening and canopy cover on private land (as opposed to Councils' traditional role of greening of public land). This is one of the required actions under the Tree Strategy.

During the implementation of the 2024/2025 Program, a few citizens wanted to use the tree voucher to procure fruit trees or other trees with minimal mature canopy cover, which was not considered to fully align with the project objective of improving the City's Urban Tree Canopy, as fruit trees and similar size trees do not provide a lot of shade and require a lot of water to maintain. To address this, it is proposed to limit the type of trees citizens can procure to a range of predetermined species by the Council's City Arborist.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

This Program would assist the Council to meet Target 5 in the State Government's 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, Urban green cover, which seeks an increased canopy cover by 20% in metropolitan Adelaide by 2045. There is a risk that without substantial planting on private land, the 30 Year Plan target for canopy cover will not be able to be achieved in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters by 2045.

• How would you rate these risks? What is the potential cost to Council if the project does not proceed?

Likelihood: Likely Consequence: Moderate Risk: Substantial (14)

Having conducted this program in 2021/22 until 2023/24, there is very low risk that the program will not be well received.

The past four annual Tree Incentive programs and Native Plant Giveaways have demonstrated to the community that the Council is being proactive in responding to data and community desire to increase canopy cover and greening within the City.

There is a risk that Council is not delivering an action under the Tree Strategy, in promoting planting on private land.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
Events	Yes	No

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL CONFIRMATION FROM THE TEAM MANAGER/S

- [Email-of-support-from-Claire-Betchley-to-support-Funding-Submission-for-Planting-on-Private-Land.msg](#)

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
0	0	10,000
		10,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

to be completed by June 2025

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Urban Tree Canopy Regional Mapping Contribution
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	21/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	CULTURAL VITALITY - 2.4 Pleasant, well designed, and sustainable urban environments
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Green Adelaide is in the early stages of planning for the next repeat tree canopy and green spaces data capture, anticipated to occur January 2026. This will follow a similar process for the procurement of LiDAR (Light detection and ranging) data in 2018 and 2022, to produce both tree canopy and urban heat maps. For the second time, Green Adelaide will be leading the procurement and engagement process and all metropolitan Councils are being asked to make a financial contribution to cover the cost of capturing the data. At this stage, it is not proposed that urban heat mapping be undertaken as part of this exercise. Further investigation will be undertaken determine the most appropriate method for urban heat mapping.

Capture and analysis of tree canopy and green space data will be undertaken, having regard and consistent with the specifications applied to the 2018/19 and 2022 data. This will allow an assessment of trends in metro Adelaide's tree canopy and green space extents across a 7-year period.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Green canopy or tree canopy cover has become an important metric and strategic goal for both Councils and the State Government. This data needs to be obtained relatively regularly (every 3-4 years) to monitor trends in urbanisation and tree/greening policy.

An indication of 2026 data capture and analysis costings will be sought in April 2025. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in the cost of LIDAR and multispectral imagery capture and analysis compared to previous years. This will however be offset, with the total overall project costs likely to be lower given the omission of

thermal imagery.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

Green Adelaide is requesting a \$10,000 financial contribution from each of the eighteen (18) affected councils in the metropolitan Adelaide study area to cover the cost of the multispectral imagery and LiDAR data capture, data analysis and reporting. It is expected that this request will be a high-value proposition for each council to obtain high quality canopy and green cover analysis for their area compared to individual capture and analysis. Partners will be informed when a clearer indication of costings is received from suppliers. Green Adelaide will also seek funding contributions from relevant state government agencies and seek to leverage funds to reduce the overall cost and/or to obtain additional relevant analysis. Project funding partners will receive regular updates on project progress and be provided all data and technical reports for their area of interest. It is anticipated that \$10,000 will be the maximum contribution required from each Council.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

The Council has an important strategic target of "an increase of 8% green cover in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters" as set out in CityPlan 2030 and the Tree Strategy 2022-2027.

By not participating in a metropolitan wide canopy mapping project, led by State Government partners, the Council may be criticised for not diligently monitoring outcomes for green cover. This would form a data gap and may risk unformed decision making and policy setting in the absence of this important data set.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
Information Systems	Yes	No

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL CONFIRMATION FROM THE TEAM MANAGER/S

- [RE-Budget-bid-support-Tree-Canopy-mapping-spatial-data.msg](#)

INCLUDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEPENDANCIES ON OTHER TEAM OR TEAMS

Liaising with Green Adelaide about our data requirements and receiving the data files to load onto our system for staff and public access to the mapped tree canopy information and analysis.

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
0	0	10,000
		10,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

The final costs may vary, with Green Adelaide to confirm this in March/ April 2025.

PLEASE ATTACH
SUPPORTING FILE (IF
REQUIRED)

- [Urban-tree-canopy-mapping-recapture-evaluation-and-planning.msg](#)

PROPOSED START DATE

01/01/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

8 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Firstival 2025
PROJECT OWNER	Simone Wise
REQUEST DATE	24/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.3 An engaged and participating community
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Firstival is a festival of new experiences, introduced by the Public Libraries SA in 2023. The aim of the festival is to increase customer engagement with libraries, and drive visitation and membership among non-library goers. In its second year, Firstival 2024 again presented a diverse program featuring opportunities for connection, discussion, and discovery. NPSP participated in Firstival in 2023 and 2024, providing a varied program of workshops, events and activities for all ages. The programs were well attended and received by the community. Funding received for the 2024 program allowed us to offer a wider range of quality activities to our community, and funding for the 2025 program will allow the libraries to continue to build on the success of the Firstival program.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

In collaboration with libraries across SA, Public Libraries SA designed Firstival to meet several objectives, including:

- Increase customer engagement with libraries, including current and prospective members
- Increase collaboration across the statewide network
- Expand perceptions of what libraries offer and who they're for

Building on the success of Firstival 2023, the 2024 program statewide achieved high attendance from the public across more than 300 events. The project also received high levels of media exposure including paid media campaigns and street level promotions, and significant unpaid media coverage. This media coverage included highlighted NPSP events. In July 2023, NPSP Libraries ran 5 events for Firstival, with around 113 attendees. With additional funding received for the 2024 program, together with our CD

colleagues, the Lifelong Learning Team ran 16 events, with attendance reaching 365. The wide range of events were free or low cost and designed to meet a variety of ages and interests. Events ranged from cooking and sustainability, creative arts, STEAM activities, gaming and robotics, and life skills and wellbeing workshops. Feedback was highly positive:

- Freestyle creativity, nothing to improve! It was perfect.
- It was fantastic and so affordable nothing to improve on
- The team running this event are so so welcoming. Thank you so much!
- Librarians great with kids. Thank you!
- Thank you for putting this on. Amazing.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The Community Development Team will again take part in Firstival in 2025, building on the success of 2024's program. Alongside the state's 130 public libraries, we will again deliver a diverse program workshops, events and activities for all ages across council, to the theme of 'a festival of new experiences'.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Low Risk. Low Attendance.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
MARKETING & PLACE ACTIVATION	Yes	No
Arts, Culture & Community Connections	Yes	No

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL CONFIRMATION FROM THE TEAM MANAGER/S

- [Re-Funding-Submissions-for-Budget-20252026-reminder.msg](#)
- [Re_-Funding-Submissions-for-Budget-2025_2026-reminder.msg](#)

INCLUDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEPENDANCIES ON OTHER TEAM OR TEAMS

Collaboration with other Community Development teams (Arts, Culture and Community Connections) to deliver programs
Support from Comms team for promotion of program

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Workshop costs	Program facilitator fees	3,800
Marketing	Digital or hard copy promotion	200
		4,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

1 month

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Culturally Diverse Early Literacy Project
PROJECT OWNER	Simone Wise
REQUEST DATE	24/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	CULTURAL VITALITY - 2.3 A community embracing and celebrating its social and cultural diversity
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NPSP is an increasingly culturally diverse community, with 29.1% of the community speaking languages other than English in their homes. In this cohort 5.3% use Mandarin, and 5.0% use Italian, 4.2% of people living in our area were born in China. The NPSP Library Service is committed to programs, services and activities that allow parents and caregivers in our community to develop the early literacy skills of their young children, as well as developing a lifelong love of reading and learning. The library seeks to expand on our offerings to local families by including multicultural and bilingual storytime sessions which not only will further develop early literacy skills in children, but provide opportunities for cultural awareness, and diverse and inclusive programming.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Research has shown the significant benefits that reading and singing regularly with children from birth provide. Early literacy activities stimulate patterns of brain development and strengthen parent and child relationships, while building on language, literacy, and social-emotional skills. Through our weekly family early literacy programs, the library is committed to providing families in our community with regular opportunities to build these vital skills, and develop a lifelong love of language and learning.

By adding a multicultural and bilingual element to our preschool programs, we further strengthen this early literacy skill development, while also reflecting and celebrating our culturally diverse community. In 2024 the library service introduced the 'Everybody Sing' program, which built upon our existing Storytime model. Facilitated by Zhao Liang from the Chinese School of Music and Arts, these sessions had a highly positive reception from our attendees. Songs, stories and rhymes were

presented in a variety of languages including Chinese. All families were able to benefit by hearing language, music and folklore from other cultures. Families attending who were from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds were able to see their culture and language celebrated and valued.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

Provide bi-lingual early literacy sessions that have diverse content through employing the provider 'Chinese School of Music and Arts' to conduct sessions at the library service. These sessions will include bi-lingual stories, songs and activities, that will build community knowledge of a range of cultures and languages (not only Chinese).

Deliverables: 12 diverse early literacy sessions to be delivered by the 'Chinese School of Music and Arts'.<https://www.chinesemusic.com.au/> CSMA have performed in many public libraries, increasing attendance to programs and library use. Additional benefit of promoting and engaging citizens to utilising our LOTE (Languages Other Than English) collection at Payneham Library.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Low Risk. Low attendance and participation rates.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
MARKETING & PLACE ACTIVATION	Yes	No

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL CONFIRMATION FROM THE TEAM MANAGER/S

- [Re-Funding-Submissions-for-Budget-20252026-reminder3.msg](#)

INCLUDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEPENDANCIES ON OTHER TEAM OR TEAMS

Assistance from comms team in promoting program. Marketing collateral created for the 2024 program can continue to be used.

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT

Empty input field for Operational Project details.

BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Contractor costs	fees from Chinese School of Music and Arts	3,300
		3,300

PROPOSED START DATE

01/10/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

Term 4 2025

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Replacement of 12 Seater Community Bus
PROJECT OWNER	Rosanna Busolin
REQUEST DATE	08/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.1 Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Council's Ford Transit community bus is a 12-seater vehicle that primarily provides transportation for older citizens to shopping venues and social programs. Purchased in 2011, the bus is now an aging asset, with recurring issues affecting its air-conditioning and engine due to its age (ie the engine mounts are starting to fail which causes the bus to shake). This funding request aims to initiate the process of ordering a replacement bus, as it currently takes 6–12 months for a new vehicle to arrive once the purchase has been made .

A range of alternative options have been explored to see whether there was more cost efficient options , including purchase of smaller vehicle, leasing bus and hire of 12 seater bus .

The proposed replacement would include minor modifications, such as a step for improved access, a storage barrier and Council branding. The estimated cost for a new bus, is between \$75,000–\$90,000 (including modifications and branding). This budget bid seeks \$90,000 in funding for the purchase of a 12-seater community .

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The City has an ageing population. Based on a recent review of needs of our older citizens transport and connecting to services was identified as an important need . The Council owns 2 community buses which are used for social outings and shopping . The Ford Transit requires replacement to ensure that the service can be delivered reliably and passenger comfort is maintained . In reviewing the necessity of a replacement bus and exploring alternative options, the following have been considered:

1. Transferring All Shopping Runs to the Council's Fuso Rosa

2. Purchase of a hybrid or electric bus.
3. Purchase of a Smaller Vehicle (8 Seater) Hyundai Staria and Kia Carnival;
4. Leasing a Bus for 5 years
5. Hiring A 12 Seater Bus for 3 days a week .

The average cost of a new bus is between \$75,000-\$90,000. This includes the cost of modifications and branding.

The purchase of a new 12-seater vehicle is the most suitable option for the following reasons:

- Cost-Effectiveness: An outright purchase provides better value over the bus's lifespan (10 years) compared to leasing or hiring.
- Accessibility: Tailored modifications ensure suitability for older passengers.
- Continuity: Ensures service continuity of service .

For further information ,please refer to supporting information provided in document on Budget Request details .

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

Purchase of a 12 Seater Community Bus to replace the existing Ford Transit Bus. Features of the bus will include automatic transmission and accessibility features such as automatic step and rails and storage barriers for storage space for shopping bags. The current Ford Transit will be auctioned to offset the cost of the bus . According to redbook.com.au the market value of the Ford Transit is between \$10,000 – \$15,000.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

As mentioned previously there is a 6-12 month waiting period for the new vehicle to arrive . This bid is to start the process of tendering and ordering the vehicle . The vehicle is an ageing asset and is having issues with how it functions (ie air-conditioning keeps breaking down , the automatic step is breaking down). The passengers of this service are rely on this service for their shopping needs. With time it is expected that the wear and tear of the vehicle will worsen and impact the reliability of the service .

A strategic review of the future direction of Community Services is currently underway, with the outcome expected to be confirmed by June 2025. Although unlikely, there is a small risk that the Council may decide to discontinue the Community Bus Shopping service. If this decision is made, the budget request for a new bus can be withdrawn.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
City Assets	Yes	no

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL
CONFIRMATION FROM THE
TEAM MANAGER/S

- [RE_-Budget-Bid-Replacement-of-Ford-Transit-Community-Bus-.msg](#)

INCLUDE BRIEF
DESCRIPTION OF
DEPENDANCIES ON OTHER
TEAM OR TEAMS

Costs for the regular maintenance of the new bus are already included in Community Services recurring Budget – will continue with new bus .

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET
REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
\$10,000	from sale of Ford Transit	90,000
		90,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

Ford Transit will be sold at auction.

PLEASE ATTACH
SUPPORTING FILE (IF
REQUIRED)

- [Funding-Submission-Community-Bus-January-2025.docx](#)

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)

4 Months for the preparation and evaluation of Tender and purchase of asset , At least 6- 12 months for receipt of Asset

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Library Review Recommendation Implementation Phase 1
PROJECT OWNER	Josephine Gaskell
REQUEST DATE	30/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.1 Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to the recent Library Services Review, we are requesting funding to implement key recommendations aimed at enhancing the quality of services, increasing citizen engagement, and improving overall user satisfaction with our library facilities. The proposed initiatives are aligned with our goal to ensure the library remains a vital, accessible, and engaging resource for the community. This funding request specifically targets areas for improvement in collection development and access, enhancing customer engagement, and customer experience. By addressing these critical components, we aim to foster a more inclusive, well utilized, and user-friendly library environment that meets the evolving needs of our community. This funding will be used specifically for enhanced collection storage and display, signage (wayfinding), including foyer access to collections (Review recommendations) and a budget for local purchase of specialised collections that cannot be procured through the PLS systems. To better manage the catalogue, additional equipment such as stocktaking technology will be sourced from this budget. Finally, funds are requested to engage an Information Technology and Communications consultancy to assess the library's service needs and to inform the next phases of implementing the Library Review recommendations. This will ensure that the next steps align with our technological and communication needs, improving service delivery and resource management.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Library Services Review (October 2024) highlighted several key areas for improvement, setting the stage for a phased approach to transform the library's collection, infrastructure, and services. The first phase of implementation will focus on revitalizing the current catalogue, improving the library's physical space, and

enhancing catalogue offerings to better meet the needs of the community. A critical component of this phase is the analysis of the library's existing collection. The review will determine which materials should be retained, reduced, or replaced, ensuring the collection is both relevant and accessible to all patrons. This will be followed by the introduction of flexible, modern shelving that can easily integrate into any future library design. The new shelving systems will allow for dynamic displays and better organization of materials, creating a more engaging and user-friendly environment. These upgrades will also create additional space for programming and further service differentiation in future phases, ensuring that the library evolves to meet growing community needs. To ensure that these improvements are supported by the necessary infrastructure, an Information Technology (IT) and Communications consultancy will be engaged. The consultancy will assess the current IT systems and communications platforms and services, providing expert recommendations for upgrades and future planning, providing a vital roadmap for the next phases of implementation.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

Shelving, Display, and Equipment

Objective: To optimize the organization and presentation of the library's collection, enhancing user experience, accessibility, and visibility.

Outcome: By improving the ease of access and visibility of library materials, we anticipate increased loan rates and enhanced customer satisfaction, fostering greater engagement with library resources.

Local Procurement of Collections

Objective: To source locally procured content that caters to high-demand and specialized collection needs.

Outcomes: This approach will diversify and enrich the library's collection, driving higher usage and reinforcing the library's role as a trusted resource for education, personal growth, and leisure. Collaborating with local suppliers, such as Dillions, strengthens community partnerships, promotes sustainability by reducing the carbon footprint associated with transportation, and supports the local economy.

Information Technology and Communications Consultancy

Objective: To assess and address the library's technological and communication needs, ensuring that the infrastructure supports growing service demands and aligns with the strategic goals outlined in the Library Review.

Outcome: This consultancy will provide a clear understanding of current and future technological requirements, guiding decisions on resource allocation and the development of a technology roadmap. These insights will enhance the library's capacity to deliver modern, efficient service

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

While the proposed improvements will have a significant positive impact on the library's services and community engagement, there are potential risks that the Council should be aware of in order to mitigate them effectively. Below are the key risk associated with the implementation of the Library Services Review

recommendations: Financial Risk: Budget Overruns

Risk: The projected costs for collection development, promotions implementation, wayfinding enhancements, and shelving may exceed the initial budget due to unforeseen challenges or price fluctuations in materials and services. Mitigation: We will closely monitor spending and adjust the scope of certain initiatives as necessary.

Failure to implement the recommendations from the Library Services Review will hinder the library's ability to deliver a high-quality, accessible, and user-friendly experience for its patrons. Inaction will significantly increase the risk of customer

dissatisfaction, potentially leading to disengagement and patrons seeking services from other council libraries, ultimately diminishing the library's relevance and community impact.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Consultancy	IT & Communication Needs	10,000
		10,000

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Local Purchase catalogue materials	Digital content: Studiosity and specialised collections	35,000
Library Layout & Display Enhancement	Equipment, Shelving and Displays	48,000
		83,000

ATTACH QUOTES IF APPLICABLE

- [Sales-Quotation_35012_20240213_132845.pdf](#)
- [Sales-Quotation_34115_20230220_124514.pdf](#)
- [Sales-Quotation-36602.pdf](#)
- [Partnership-Custom-Package-City-of-Norwood-Payneham-St-Peters-.docx.pdf](#)
- [Partnership-Custom-Package-City-of-Norwood-Payneham-St-Peters-.docx1.pdf](#)

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

12 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Adey Reserve Playground Shade Sail Structure
PROJECT OWNER	Josef Casilla
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Jared Barnes
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY - 4.2 Sustainable streets and open spaces
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

According to Council's asset management register, assets within the Adey Reserve Playground are due for review from a renewal perspective. Additionally, numerous requests have been received by Council to renew the playground equipment. A site inspection confirmed the aged condition of the assets and the need for renewal works. The most recent annual comprehensive playground inspection identified issues which were deemed as "High" risk and are able to be addressed through the renewal of the playground equipment. As such, the renewal of the Adey Reserve playground equipment is on the draft 2025-2026 Capital Works Program.

This submission is for the proposed accompanying new shade sail structure for the playground.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

At its meeting held on 4 October 2011, the Council resolved the following:

2. That shade structures be endorsed for installation to playgrounds which are categorised as Level 1 and Level 2 within the Council's Playground Strategy (2006).

Adey Reserve Playground is categorised as Level 1 and should therefore have a shade structure.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

To ensure efficient and economical outcomes, it is proposed that the installation construction works of a new playground shade sail structure be undertaken in conjunction with the renewal construction works of the playground equipment. The new shade structure is to be funded through "new capital" budget and the playground equipment renewal is to be funded separately through "renewal capital" budget (i.e., the Capital Works Program).

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Shade sail structures provide protection against risk of sunburns and long-term skin damage. There are also added benefits in terms of prolonging the useful life of the playground assets, maintaining the aesthetic appeal of the play equipment, and allowing increased playtime for its users.

There are no foreseeable constraints at this time which are expected to impact on the delivery of the project.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Materials/Contracts & Other Expenses	Materials/Contracts & Other Expenses	60,000
		60,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/09/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

6 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	St Peters Childcare Centre Shade Sail Structure
PROJECT OWNER	Jared Barnes
REQUEST DATE	28/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Jared Barnes
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.1 Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MINOR PROJECT - Less than \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Acting Director, Child Care Centre has requested for new shade sails to be installed in the playground area as it the soft fall becomes very hot in direct sunlight and makes half of the yard unsuitable and unsafe for children to play in. The current level of shade is considered to be inadequate and raises potential legal implications under Sections 114 and 167 of the Education and Early Childhood Services Act 2011. The most practical solution to address the issue of inadequate shade is the installation of new shade sails.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

In late 2023 and 2024, two trees were removed from the playground area at the St Peters Child Care Centre. The former trees provided a substantial amount of shade to the playground area and there is now a lack of shade.

The Acting Director, Child Care Centre has requested for new shade sails to be installed in the playground area as it the soft fall becomes very hot in direct sunlight and makes half of the yard unsuitable and unsafe for children to play in.

The current level of shade is considered to be inadequate and needs to be addressed. The most practical solution is the installation of new shade sails.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

Install new shade sails over a portion of the playground area to provide an adequate shaded area for outdoor activities at the Child Care Centre.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

The current lack of shade raises potential legal implications under Section 114 of the Education and Early Childhood Services Act 2011, which pertains to child protection. In particular, Section 114 Outdoor space – shade states that “the approved provider of a centre-based service must ensure that outdoor spaces provided at the education and care service premises include adequate shaded areas to protect children from overexposure to ultraviolet radiation from the sun.”

The penalty is \$1100, and a compliance direction may be issued for failure to comply with this regulation.

Additionally, under Section 167 of the Act, the Council has a duty of care and must ensure that every reasonable precaution is taken to protect children being educated and cared for by the service from harm or from any hazard likely to cause injury. Penalties of \$11,400 for individuals and \$57,000 in any other case could apply if the Council doesn't act.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
397.301 Construction/Contracted Services	Supply and install of new shade sail structure	60,000
		60,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

The amount of the budget request is an educated guess. Quotes are currently being obtained.

PROPOSED START DATE

04/08/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

1 month to complete

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Major Public Art Project
PROJECT OWNER	Navian Iseut
REQUEST DATE	22/01/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Andrew Hamilton
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	CULTURAL VITALITY - 2.1 An artistic, creative, cultural and visually interesting City
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Council's Public Art Policy states that the Council will ensure the adequate and on-going funding of public art through the creation of a Reserve Fund of \$300,000 is set aside for the purpose of funding a commission for a quadrennial public artwork. This project will result in the installation of a significant public artwork within the public realm in 2026. This project is for the Council's fifth Quadrennial Public Artwork.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Often reflecting the identity and values of the local community, public art has the potential to uplift and create a sense of community pride, distinguishing the City as a unique and distinct place to live and visit.

Public art also plays a pivotal role in sharing diverse sentiments, ideas, and concepts with a broad audience, inviting exploration of the spaces that host it, encouraging dialogue and community interaction and deepening community connections.

In addition to enhancing the aesthetic of a place, public artworks often become iconic symbols of their locations, attracting visitors, cultural tourism, new businesses, and residents, generating economic returns through the creation of City identity, pride and placemaking.

The Quadrennial Public Art Commission is an important initiative that underpins these outcomes, providing high quality works of art by contemporary professional artists for our public places.

DESCRIPTION OF

To ensure a high quality outcome, the project is delivered across two financial years:

**PROPOSED PROJECT
INITIATIVE / PROGRAM**

2024/2025 (Year 1 Concept design) and 2025/2026 (Year 2 Detailed design, fabrication & installation).

Key Project Phases:

2024/2025 Year 1: Concept design

- Project plan, Completed September 2024
- Research locations and site considerations, Completed November 2024
- Council endorse location, February 2025
- Confirm selection panel, February 2025
- Artist brief (EOI) – open competition commission, February 2025
- EOI released, late February to March 2025
- Shortlist Artists, April 2025
- Site visit with shortlisted artist, April 2025
- Concept design and draft budget, June 2025

2025/2026 Year 2: Detailed design, fabrication & installation

- Concept design presentation to assessment panel, July 2025
- Concept recommendation report to Council (Council briefing), August/ September 2025
- Commissioning artist agreement, September 2025
- Detailed design package (includes installation and risk management plan), October 2025
- Approve detailed design and installation plan, November 2025
- Fabrication (may be brought forward if do not require entire fabrication time). Identify and detailed plan for landscape and lighting improvements as required, November 2025 to May 2026
- Installation & landscape and lighting improvements as required, June 2026
- Post handover (maintenance manual, 12-month defect materials warranty and intended lifespan), June/July 2025

RISK MANAGEMENT

**DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED
OR POTENTIAL RISKS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE
CURRENT SITUATION**

Reputational risk if the project does not proceed: at its meeting held on 11 April 2023, the Council reviewed the Public Art Policy. The Council will ensure the adequate and on-going funding of public art through the creation of a reserve fund where \$75,000, is set aside annually for the purpose of funding a commissioned art work during the term of each Council, subject to annual budget deliberations.

Limitation of location (eg. ground not suitable for type of footings): A Before You Dig (BYDA) report will be conducted on the preferred location to inform site consideration information for inclusion in the artist expression of interest (EOI) documentation.

Fabrication and installation risks: in addition to the terms and conditions of the contract, the artist will be responsible for identifying and effectively managing the risks and hazards for the commission. A risk management plan, insurance coverage and safe works methods statement will be submitted by the artist as a component of the detailed design and installation plan stage of the project and the documentation reviewed by the Quadrennial Public Art Committee.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development,

improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

YES

SELECT ROLE OR TEAM THAT MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS PROJECT

TEAM	Involvement with the projects was discussed with the relevant team Manager	Will there be an additional expenditure expected by this team
Infrastructure & Major Projects	Yes	No

PLEASE ATTACH EMAIL CONFIRMATION FROM THE TEAM MANAGER/S

- [Funding-submission-Major-Public-Art-Project-5th-Quadrennial-support-email.msg](#)

INCLUDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEPENDANCIES ON OTHER TEAM OR TEAMS

Internal:

Representative from Infrastructure & Major Projects on selection panel (advisory role only to provide advice on artwork installation, landscaping & lighting considerations).

External:

Two arts sector representatives on selection panel (assess concept & detailed design and provide best practice advice).

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
New capital project	Major artwork commission	279,000
		279,000

ADD DETAILS (IF REQUIRED)

Refer to attached itemised budget and payment milestones

PLEASE ATTACH SUPPORTING FILE (IF REQUIRED)

- [Quadrennial-Public-Art-Project-Budget.xlsx](#)

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

1 year to complete

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Kent Town Public Realm Upgrades
PROJECT OWNER	Jared Barnes
REQUEST DATE	26/03/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Jared Barnes
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	CULTURAL VITALITY - 2.4 Pleasant, well designed, and sustainable urban environments
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kent Town Urban Design Framework and Public Realm Manual were endorsed by the Council in 2019. These documents provide guidance on how the Council will to undertake streetscape enhancements, including working with developers to make improvements adjacent new development sites. Several development sites are now under construction, including the Parkline by Chasecrown at 9-11 Dequetteville Terrace. This proposed new capital budget is intended to be used to pay for the difference between renewal and upgrade costs for footpath paving as well as new landscaping and furniture in Kent Town adjacent to new developments.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Construction activity associated with new developments in Kent Town generally requires occupation of the public realm (i.e. footpaths and roads). This construction activity causes damage to existing infrastructure. Developers are required to make good to the pre-existing condition of the public realm infrastructure post development. This involves like-for-like replacement of paving materials that are no longer suitable to the desired character of the Kent Town Public Realm. The Kent Town Urban Design Framework and Public Realm Manual were endorsed by the Council in 2019. These Kent Town Urban Design Framework provides guidance on how the Council will to undertake streetscape enhancements, including working with developers to make improvements adjacent new development sites. The Kent Public Realm Manual provides the palette of approved materials and guidance on how they are to be used in the public realm to create more liveable streets. Several development sites are now under construction, including the Parkline by Chasecrown at 9-11 Dequetteville Terrace. This proposed new capital budget is intended to be used to pay for the difference between the developer's reinstatement

costs (i.e. renewal) and upgrade costs for footpath paving as well as new landscaping and furniture in Kent Town adjacent to new developments.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM

The proposed project will deliver new footpath paving, landscaping and furniture adjacent new developments in accordance with the Kent Town Urban Design Framework and Public Realm Manual. The delivery of the new infrastructure assets will be coordinated to align with with timeframe for the completion of new developments.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Construction - Contractors & Consultants costs	397.301 Construction/Contract ed Services	400,000
		400,000

PROPOSED START DATE

02/02/2026

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

4 months to complete

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Community Facilities Access Improvements
PROJECT OWNER	Jared Barnes
REQUEST DATE	26/03/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Jared Barnes
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.1 Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	<p>In 2024, the Council undertook access audits for the Norwood Pool, Norwood Oval and St Peters Town Hall Complex. This proposed new capital budget is to undertake accessibility improvements at these sites to achieve compliance with the national building code and/or improve access and safety for all users of these community facilities.</p>
BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION	<p>The Council adopted the 2024-2028 Access & Inclusion Strategy in May 2024. The Strategy Vision is "an accessible and connected City where people feel safe and included. Priorities of the Strategy include creating Accessible Environments, including addressing issues related to physical access at the Council's community facilities. One of the actions of the Strategy is to undertake access audits of Council owned facilities by December 2026.</p> <p>After the Strategy was adopted, the Council undertook comprehensive access audits for the Norwood Pool, Norwood Oval and St Peters Town Hall Complex. The aims of the audits were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identify all non-compliances with current standards and regulations; - understand the heritage value of the facilities, including existing risks and barriers to access; and - recommend a plan to rectify issues to enhance user experience and safety. <p>Each audit identified and prioritised recommended items to achieve improved access and safety.</p>
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM	<p>The proposed project will deliver access and safety improvements some or all of the following Council owned community facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Norwood Oval (e.g. grandstand stair nosings and hoop handrails);

- Norwood Swimming Centre (e.g. changerooms); and
- St Peters Town Hall Complex (e.g. accessible toilets).

The designated budget will be used to plan and implement some of the high priority improvements identified in the audits for each facility. Access improvements which cannot be undertaken within the allocated budget or 2025/2026 Financial Year will be scoped and costed for a budget allocation in the next financial year.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT SITUATION

Failure to make access improvements to community facilities may leave the Council exposed to a potential claim under the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA).

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER INTERNAL UNITS

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET REQUEST

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Implementation - Contractors & Consultants costs	397.301 Construction/Contract ed Services	100,000
		100,000

PLEASE ATTACH SUPPORTING FILE (IF REQUIRED)

- [Norwood-Oval-Grandstands-Access-Report-01-Site-Audit-Report-1.pdf](#)
- [Norwood-Swimming-Centre-Access-Report-01-Site-Audit-Report.pdf](#)
- [St-Peters-Town-Hall-Accessible-Toilets-Access-Report-01-Site-Audit-Report.pdf](#)

PROPOSED START DATE

01/07/2025

PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3 MONTH TO COMPLETE)

12 months

PROJECT REQUEST OVERVIEW

PROJECT NAME	Traffic & Parking Management (Funding Request by Cr Scott Sims)
PROJECT OWNER	Carlos Buzzetti
REQUEST DATE	24/03/2025
BUDGET YEAR	2025-2026
RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER	Carlos Buzzetti
RELATIONSHIP TO CITYPLAN 2030	YES
RELEVANT OUTCOME AND STRATEGY AS OUTLINED IN CITYPLAN 2030	SOCIAL EQUITY - 1.2 A people-friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network
TYPE OF FUNDING REQUEST	MAJOR PROJECT - Equal or Over \$100,000 investment required

BUSINESS CASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	Traffic management and parking are critical issues that demand immediate attention and funding. Our streets are deteriorating, and hoon drivers continue to wreak havoc on our already congested roads. Furthermore, outer suburban park'n'ride commuters are unfairly taking advantage of locals by occupying prime parking spots. These challenges are among the most urgent faced by the Council, yet progress has been stymied by insufficient funding. The widespread perception that this Council has been ineffective in tackling these concerns must be addressed without delay.
BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION	It is essential that traffic management receives a greater share of our budget to address community concerns. We need decisive action to curb rat running and ensure our staff have adequate resources to implement properly funded speed-calming measures and effective parking solutions. By prioritising these initiatives, we can create safer streets, improve accessibility, and demonstrate our commitment to resolving the pressing issues affecting our community
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT INITIATIVE / PROGRAM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic Management Interventions to curb rat running; - Additional resources to implement speed-calming measures and effective parking solutions.

RISK MANAGEMENT

DESCRIBE ANY IDENTIFIED OR POTENTIAL RISKS	The Council faces a reputational risk, in that if it does not commit sufficient resources and funds to undertake traffic management interventions and address on-
--	---

**ASSOCIATED WITH THE
CURRENT SITUATION**

street parking concerns in a timely manner, citizens will continue to be frustrated and heighten a negative perception that the Council is not responding well to community concerns.

FUNDING REQUEST

BUDGET TYPE

OPERATIONAL PROJECT BUDGET - project is 'one off' and will not be on recurrent basis

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - new asset, asset development, improvement, upgrade etc

**IS THERE A REQUIREMENT
FOR INVOLVEMENT OF
OTHER INTERNAL UNITS**

NO

BUDGET REQUEST DETAILS

**OPERATIONAL PROJECT
BUDGET REQUEST**

Type of Income / Cost (e.g. Consultants)	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Concept/Design - Contractors & Consultants costs	Preparation of Traffic Impact Statements, parking and traffic surveys and studies, concept designs and consultation costs	300,000
		300,000

**CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET
REQUEST**

Nature of Income / Spend	Comment	Budget Request Amount \$
Construction - Other costs	Traffic Management Devices implementation	2,700,000
		2,700,000

PROPOSED START DATE

01/09/2025

**PROJECT TIMELINE (E.G. 3
MONTH TO COMPLETE)**

2 years

Attachment E

Draft Annual Business Plan & Draft 2025-2026 Budget





Statement of Comprehensive Income for the year ended 30 June 2026

	Actual 2021-2022 \$'000	Actual 2022-2023 \$'000	Actual 2023-2024 \$'000	Proposed 3rd Budget Review 2024-2025 \$'000	Proposed 2025-2026 \$'000
Income					
Rates	37,938	39,974	43,667	47,230	50,940
Statutory charges	2,003	2,039	2,112	2,181	2,239
User charges	3,561	3,668	3,823	4,007	4,370
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions - operating	3,433	3,540	1,643	3,943	2,654
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions - capital		553	571	444	1,051
Investment income	24	171	61	78	55
Other income	848	852	1,019	461	487
Net loss joint ventures & associates	122	50	39	-	-
Total Income	47,930	50,846	52,935	58,345	61,796
Expenses					
Employee costs	14,126	14,531	16,700	18,533	20,313
Materials, contracts & other expenses	19,832	21,983	22,331	22,253	23,231
Depreciation, amortisation & impairment	10,766	11,562	12,852	13,377	13,697
Finance costs	346	458	611	1,155	3,386
Net loss Joint Ventures & Associates	214	357	334	263	263
Total Expenses	45,284	48,892	52,827	55,581	60,890
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	2,645	1,954	109	2,764	906
Net gain (loss) on disposal or revaluation of assets	(2,371)	(1,502)	(4,491)	36	37
Amounts specifically for new or upgraded assets	2,341	640	6,442	7,281	2,800
Physical resources received free of charge	-	-	-	-	-
Non Operating Items - Joint Venture and Associates	-	-	-	-	-
Net Surplus (Deficit) transferred to Equity Statement	2,615	1,092	2,060	10,081	3,743
Other Comprehensive Income					
Changes in revaluation Surplus- infrastructure, property, plant & equipment	34,462	49,031	39,253	5,508	20,000
Share of Other comprehensive Income - joint ventures and associates	(5)	(12)	631	-	-
Total Other Comprehensive Income	34,457	49,019	39,884	5,508	20,000
Total comprehensive Income	37,072	50,112	41,944	15,589	23,743

Pursuant to S123 (10)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999 and Clause 7 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 2011, as detailed in the Statement of Comprehensive Income, the projected Operating Income of \$61.796m is sufficient to meet the projected Operating Expenditure (\$60.89m) for the 2025-2026 Financial Year.



Statement of Financial Position as at 30 June 2026

	Actual 2021-2022	Actual 2022-2023	Actual 2023-2024	Proposed 3rd Budget Review 2024-2025	Proposed 2025-2026
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Assets					
Current Assets					
Cash and cash equivalents	11,393	4,317	997	500	500
Trade & other receivables	2,675	2,193	3,720	2,632	2,454
Total Current Assets	14,068	6,511	4,717	3,132	2,954
Non-current Assets					
Financial Assets	113	104	111	130	140
Equity accounted investments in Council businesses	1,931	1,949	3,175	2,912	2,650
Infrastructure, Property, Plant & Equipment	543,710	594,771	645,596	716,407	748,677
Other Non-current Assets	4,324	5,707	8,873	8,873	8,873
Total Non-current Assets	550,078	602,531	657,755	728,322	760,340
Total Assets	564,146	609,041	662,472	731,454	763,294
Liabilities					
Current Liabilities					
Trade & Other Payables	13,031	8,819	8,828	10,749	12,009
Borrowings	1,021	1,097	1,136	1,081	3,295
Short-term Provisions	3,004	3,872	3,624	3,301	3,301
Other Current Liabilities	-	-	-	-	-
Liabilities relating to Non-current Assets held for Sale	-	-	-	-	-
Total Current Liabilities	17,056	13,789	13,588	15,132	18,604
Non-current Liabilities					
Long-term Borrowings	8,527	7,522	19,020	70,546	75,170
Long-term Provisions	1,280	288	460	782	782
Liability - Equity accounted Council Businesses	904	952	970	970	970
Total Non-current Liabilities	10,712	8,763	20,450	72,298	76,922
Total Liabilities	27,767	22,551	34,038	87,430	95,527
Net Assets	536,379	586,490	628,435	644,024	667,767
Equity					
Accumulated Surplus	62,709	63,789	66,480	76,562	80,304
Asset Revaluation Reserve	473,670	522,701	561,954	567,462	587,462
Total Equity	536,379	586,490	628,435	644,024	667,767



Statement of Changes in Equity for the year ended 30 June 2026

	Actual 2021-2022 \$'000	Actual 2022-2023 \$'000	Actual 2023-2024 \$'000	Proposed 3rd Budget Review 2024-2025 \$'000	Proposed 2025-2026 \$'000
Accumulated Surplus					
Balance at end of previous reporting period	60,099	62,709	63,789	66,480	76,562
Net Surplus/ (Deficit) for year	2,615	1,092	2,060	10,081	3,743
Other comprehensive Income	-	-	-	-	-
Share of other Comprehensive Income- joint venture and associates	(5)	(12)	631	-	-
Balance at end of period	62,709	63,789	66,480	76,562	80,304
Asset Revaluation Reserve					
Balance at end of previous reporting period	439,208	473,670	522,701	561,954	567,462
Gain on revaluation of infrastructure, property, plant & equipment	34,462	49,031	39,252	5,507	20,000
Balance at end of period	473,670	522,701	561,954	567,462	587,462
Total Equity at end of reporting period	536,379	586,490	628,435	644,024	667,767

Statement of Cash Flow for the year ended 30 June 2026

	Actual 2021-2022 \$'000	Actual 2022-2023 \$'000	Actual 2023-2024 \$'000	Proposed 3rd Budget Review 2024-2025 \$'000	Proposed 2025-2026 \$'000
Cash Flow from Operating Activities					
<u>Receipts</u>					
Rates - general & other	37,859	39,979	43,219	47,011	51,202
Fees & other charges	2,010	2,039	2,112	2,331	2,236
User Charges	4,592	3,668	3,823	4,275	4,349
Investment receipts	24	171	61	80	56
Grants utilised for operating purposes	3,440	3,540	1,643	3,950	2,723
Other Income	913	1,120	134	525	477
<u>Payments</u>					
Employee Costs	(15,627)	(15,075)	(16,241)	(18,664)	(20,268)
Contractual services & materials	(17,515)	(25,105)	(23,882)	(19,862)	(23,033)
Finance payments	(156)	(448)	(521)	(1,248)	(2,792)
Net Cash provided by (or used in) Operating Activities	15,540	9,888	10,348	18,398	14,949
Cash flow from Investing Activities					
<u>Receipts</u>					
Amounts specifically for new or upgraded assets	5,785	753	7,133	7,777	3,067
Grants utilised for capital purposes	-	-	571	500	1,077
Sale of replaced assets	50	0	17	36	37
Repayments of loans by community groups	6	-	-	-	-
Capital Distributions from associated entities	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Payments</u>					
Expenditure on renewal/replacement of assets	(8,937)	(11,193)	(12,994)	(27,015)	(12,887)
Expenditure on new/upgraded assets	(6,941)	(5,168)	(18,961)	(51,555)	(13,080)
Capital contributed to associated entities	(170)	(289)	(872)	-	-
Net Cash provided by (or used in) Investing Activities	(10,208)	(15,897)	(25,106)	(70,257)	(21,786)
Cash Flow from Financing Activities					
<u>Receipts</u>					
Proceeds from Borrowings	-	-	12,543	52,505	45,000
<u>Payments</u>					
Repayments of Borrowings	(1,010)	(1,067)	(1,105)	(1,144)	(38,163)
Net Cash provided by (or used in) Financing Activities	(1,010)	(1,067)	11,439	51,362	6,837
Net Increase (Decrease) in cash held	4,322	(7,076)	(3,320)	(497)	0
Cash & cash equivalents at beginning of period	7,071	11,393	4,317	997	500
Cash & cash equivalents at end of period	11,393	4,317	997	500	500



Uniform Presentation of Finances for year ended 30 June 2026

	Actual 2021-2022 \$'000	Actual 2022-2023 \$'000	Actual 2023-2024 \$'000	Proposed 3rd Budget Review 2024-2025 \$'000	Proposed 2025-2026 \$'000
Income	47,930	50,846	52,935	58,345	61,796
less Expenses	(45,284)	(48,892)	(52,827)	(55,581)	(60,890)
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	2,645	1,954	109	2,764	906
Less: Grants, subsidies and contributions – Capital				(444)	(1,051)
Adjusted Operating Surplus / (Deficit)				2,320	(145)
less Net Outlays on Existing Assets					
Capital Expenditure on renewal and replacement of Existing Assets	8,937	11,193	12,994	27,015	12,887
Depreciation, Amortisation and Impairment	(10,766)	(11,562)	(12,852)	(13,377)	(13,697)
Less: Grants, subsidies and contributions – Capital				-	(1,051)
Proceeds from Sale of Replaced Assets	(48)	(0)	(17)	(36)	(37)
	(1,876)	(369)	126	13,603	(1,897)
less Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets					
Capital Expenditure on New and Upgraded Assets (including investment property & real estate developments)	7,216	5,168	18,961	51,555	13,080
add back Grants, subsidies and contributions – Capital New/Upgraded				(444)	-
Amounts received specifically for New and Upgraded Assets	(2,341)	(753)	(7,133)	(7,777)	(3,067)
Asset Received Free of Charge	(2)	-	-	-	-
Total Net Outlays on New and Upgraded Assets	4,873	4,414	11,828	43,334	10,013
Net Lending / (Borrowing) for Financial Year	(351)	(2,091)	(11,845)	(54,617)	(8,261)

Financial Indicators

	Actual 2021-2022	Actual 2022-2023	Actual 2023-2024	Proposed 3rd Budget Review 2024-2025	Proposed 2025-2026
Required by Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1999 Section 5B(d)					
Operating Surplus Ratio					
<u>Operating Surplus/(Deficit)</u>	5.5%	3.8%	0.2%	4.7%	1.5%
Total Operating Revenue					
<i>This ratio expresses the operating surplus as a percentage of total operating revenue.</i>					
Net Financial Liabilities Ratio					
<u>Net Financial Liabilities</u>	28.3%	29.5%	53.4%	142.6%	148.0%
Total Operating Revenue					
<i>This ratio expresses the extent of Operating Revenue required to meet all monies owed by the Council Net financial liabilities are defined as total liabilities less financial assets (excluding equity accounted investments in Council businesses).</i>					
Asset Renewal Funding Ratio					
<u>Expenditure on renewals</u>	80.4%	77.1%	81.2%	117.8%	96.2%
Asset Management Plan					
Rolling three-year average	98.8%	89.2%	79.5%	90.1%	91.6%
<i>This ratio measure the extent existing assets are being renewed compared to the Infrastructure & Asset Management Plan Net asset renewals is defined as capital expenditure on the renewal and replacement of existing assets, and excludes new capital expenditure on the acquisition of additional assets.</i>					
Interest Cover Ratio					
<u>Net Interest Expense</u>	0.7%	0.6%	1.0%	1.8%	5.4%
Total Operating Revenue excl Interest income					
<i>This ratio expresses the operating surplus as a percentage of total operating revenue.</i>					

13.7 SHORT-TERM RENTAL PROPERTIES RECLASSIFICATION FOR RATING PURPOSES

REPORT AUTHOR: Chief Financial Officer
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4548
FILE REFERENCE:
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present information to the Council regarding the classification of residential properties that are used as short-term accommodation as commercial properties for rating purposes.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 2 September 2024, the Council considered a Notice of Motion regarding the potential to apply commercial rates to residential properties that are used for short-term accommodation (ie Airbnb, Stayz, etc). Following consideration of the Motion, the Council resolved the following:

Council staff prepare a report on the feasibility of properties used for short-stay accommodation, such as Airbnb, being charged Council rates at the commercial rate, rather than at the residential rate.

The rapid expansion of short-term rental accommodations which refers to apartments, houses and rooms rented through online providers, such as Airbnb and Stayz has significantly altered the property rental landscape.

Platforms such as Airbnb have provided homeowners with an alternative revenue stream and at the same time, have also raised concerns regarding its impact in respect to housing availability, affordability and in the case of Local Government, revenue in terms of should such use be rated differently. Unlike hotels and motels, which are subject to commercial rates and additional compliance requirements, short-term rental properties typically remain classified as residential properties.

Traditionally, residential properties are rated differently from commercial properties, leading to disparities in tax contributions despite the income-generation potential of these properties. This has prompted discussions about whether a commercial classification would provide a more equitable approach.

The classification of short-term rental properties, such as those listed on Airbnb and Stayz as commercial properties for rating purposes, has been a topic of growing debate in Australia, particularly in Local Government. Councils face the challenge of balancing revenue generation with fair taxation, while considering the economic impact on property owners and the broader issue of housing availability.

This report examines the financial viability and practicality of classifying short-term rental properties, such as Airbnb, as commercial properties for rating purposes. The report also explores the potential financial benefits for the Council, legal and regulatory implications, and the impact on property owners and housing accommodations.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The Council's *Rating Policy* outlines the Council's approach to determining and collecting rates from the community.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

From a financial perspective, the Council could potentially benefit from increased revenue by reclassifying short-term rental accommodations as commercial properties, similar to the classification imposed on hotels, which would ultimately generate additional rate revenue which can be invested back into the community through services, programs and facilities.

However, a significant financial challenge is the absence of a centralized database or mandatory registration system for properties that are used as short-term accommodation premises (Airbnb, Stayz, etc). Without comprehensive data, Councils face difficulties in identifying short-term rental accommodation and therefore the ability to accurately classify the property and associated financial impact on the Council's rate revenue is limited.

The inconsistency in the available data further complicates financial forecasting and budget planning, making it difficult to project potential revenue. The absence of a clear regulatory framework across jurisdictions also creates uncertainties in enforcement, potentially leading to uneven application of commercial rates and legal disputes with property owners.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

In the absence of a mandatory registration system, compliance and enforcement costs, would also potentially increase as the Council would be required to allocate additional costs for resources to identify and monitor Airbnb listings, potential legal fees budget to address objections, resulting in increased administrative expenses.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
This matter was considered by the Council at its meeting held on 2 September 2024.
- **Community**
Nil.
- **Staff**
Not Applicable.
- **Other Agencies**
Nil.

DISCUSSION

The legal landscape surrounding short-term rental accommodations varies across Australian States and Local Government. Some jurisdictions have implemented specific zoning laws to regulate short-term rentals, however there is a lack of consistency across the nation.

The introduction of commercial property taxation for Airbnb listings, would require changes in existing zoning regulations, which could face resistance from property owners who could argue that their properties are primarily residential.

In the determination of a classification of land use, the South Australian Valuer-General has regard to the predominant use of the land. This also assists the Valuer-General in meeting their obligation to provide an opinion of predominant land use for the property, between one (1) to five (5) categories of land use, under the *Emergency Services Funding Act 1998*, which is then used to calculate the Emergency Services Levy.

In some instances, where a dwelling has been let on a short-term basis, this does not necessarily warrant a review of the land use. Whilst a commercial operator may manage or own several such properties for a commercial gain, in the context of land use for statutory application, it is the “*predominant use*” of the land that the Council is required to have regard to, and in most cases this will remain residential.

This may incorporate the character of the property – and where the typical short-term rental accommodation is traditionally a house or a unit, the use is therefore residential. At this time and noting the above, there is no immediate requirement for the Valuer-General to change the existing methodology or the application of land use for residential properties let under short-term rental accommodation arrangements differently than is currently warranted. There is however, as with any property, exceptions that can be assessed on a case-by-case basis and with regard to the parameters of the *Valuation of Land Act 1971* and the predominant use for land use codes.

Implementing a commercial classification for short-term accommodation such as Airbnb and Stayz, presents several practical challenges. One of the primary issues is defining what constitutes commercial use. Without clear guidelines or a widely accepted practice, it is difficult to determine at what point a residential property engaged in short-term letting qualifies for a “commercial” status. Factors such as the number of nights rented per year or revenue thresholds could serve as potential criteria, but enforcing such classifications would require access to detailed occupancy data from the relevant platforms (ie Airbnb, Stayz, etc), which currently do not provide this information to Councils. The lack of a standardised regulatory framework for short-term rentals complicates enforcement and policy implementation.

Another challenge is ensuring compliance. In the absence of a comprehensive and regulated database or mandatory registration, Councils would need to establish robust monitoring systems or purchase services to track short-term rental properties accurately. Without a centralised database or a requirement for short-term rental hosts to register their properties, the Council will have difficulty in identifying, tracking and regulating listings effectively and will need to rely on external companies with innovative technology to provide this information.

Some Councils have attempted to address these issues with varied success. For instance, Byron Shire Council (NSW), and certain regions in Victoria, have proposed higher rates for short-term rental accommodation to offset infrastructure costs and address housing shortages. However, enforcement challenges and legal opposition from property owners have limited the effectiveness of these measures. Legal challenges have arisen as a result of property owners contesting the reclassification based on the argument that short-term letting does not fundamentally alter the primary residential use of their properties.

In contrast, Councils in Sydney and Melbourne have considered alternative approaches, such as levies, instead of applying a commercial classification.

The City of Adelaide, with a significantly higher percentage of short-term rental properties and accommodation, have engaged the services of an external, internationally based company (based in the United States of America), that uses an AI powered tracking approach. While the company's main purpose is to increase compliance in revenue declaration and improved rates collection, this company is also able to provide an information on short-term rental identification.

Based on this data, the City of Adelaide has implemented a process which reclassifies the land use category that is provided by Valuer General, from residential to commercial for any properties that were available for Short-term rental of 90 days or more in a year. Properties that provide a one room sublet are not included in this process.

These experiences highlight the complexities involved and suggest that a one-size-fits-all approach in the absence of a State or Federal Government framework, may not be suitable for all regions. Councils that are considering a similar approach to those as set out above, must prepare for potential legal disputes, which could lead to prolonged court battles and significant enforcement costs.

The City of Unley has recently also considered the application of a Commercial Rate based on a land use of "*tourist accommodation*" to short-term rental properties that are used for this purpose on a consistent basis. The City of Unley also engaged an external company to identify residential properties that are listed on short-term accommodation platforms such as Airbnb, Stayz, etc.

The City of Unley has identified approximately 85 residential properties that have been available for short-term accommodation for the majority of 2023-2024. Based on the 2024-2025 Differential Rates in the dollar, the City of Unley has estimated an increase in Rates Revenue as a result of the change in land use that is applied to commercial properties by the City of Unley ("*tourist accommodation*") for the 85 properties would be approximately \$200,000.

It is important to note however that this increase is based on the City of Unley's rating category of "Commercial – Other" which set, for the 2024-2025 period, the Rate-in-the-dollar at 155% (2.55 times), higher than the Rate-in-the-dollar for residential properties.

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters 2024-2025 Rate-in-the-dollar is currently set at 20% higher than the Residential Rate-in-the-dollar.

Following consideration of this matter, the City of Unley has determined to undertake consultation regarding the proposal to apply a Category 3 (Commercial – Other) to short-term rental properties with the City of Unley as part of the 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan.

At this stage, therefore it is unknown if the City of Unley will proceed with this proposal to apply the Category 3 (Commercial – Other) to short-term rental properties.

On the basis of the City of Adelaide's approach, staff have held discussions with the organisation that the City of Adelaide has engaged, to determine if a similar approach would be financially viable for this Council.

Based on the information received relevant to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters area, a number of properties were identified as being advertised for short-term rental accommodation – at the time approximately 300 short-term listings were identified. However of the 300 listings, it is estimated that there could be between 50 and 100 short-term rental properties in the City, as a single property short-term rental listing can be advertised on more than one (1) platform.

Table 1 below contains data that demonstrates the potential financial impact if the Council implements a similar practice to the City of Adelaide (ie when a property owner has made their residential property available for short-term rental accommodation for 90 days or more).

TABLE 1

Residential Average Rate 2024-2025	No of Short-term stay properties	Expected Rate Revenue	Impact of applying a Commercial Rate of 20%	Additional Rate Revenue	Cost to access Short-term Stay Reporting Platform*	Potential Net income
\$2,040	50-100	\$102,000 - \$204,000	\$122,400 - \$244,800	\$20,400 - \$40,800	\$7,500	\$16,650 - \$33,300

* the cost provided is based on the current number of properties range. It does not include additional resources for customer service, enforcement, disputes, or objections.

OPTIONS

The Council can determine to implement a process to apply a Commercial Rate to properties that are used for short-term accommodation purposes, however on the basis of the issues associated with implementing a suitable process, the resources required and the limited additional rate revenue which would be generated through the process, this is not recommended at this stage.

Whilst any additional source of revenue should be investigated (particularly in this case where residential properties are ostensibly being used for commercial purposes), given the marginal difference between this Council’s Rate-in-the-dollar for residential properties compared to the Rate-in-the-dollar for commercial properties, the additional revenue does not warrant pursuing this initiative at this stage.

It is therefore recommended that the Council monitor the situation and reconsider the matter if a centralised database or mandatory registration process is implemented in South Australia.

However, if the Council forms the opinion to pursue this initiative then staff will progress this initiative as part of the draft 2025-2026 Annual Business Plan and Budget.

CONCLUSION

While there are some financial benefits associated with reclassifying short-term rental properties such as Airbnb and Stayz accommodation, as commercial, the challenges surrounding data accuracy, enforcement, and legal disputes must be considered.

The implementation of a centralized database or mandatory registration system for short-term rental accommodation would provide accurate data which would allow Councils to make more informed policy decisions.

However, if a regulated system was in place, further economic impact analysis would be necessary to determine how such changes would affect local tourism and housing affordability. Engaging key stakeholders, including property owners, the hospitality industry, etc would be essential in developing a fair and effective policy framework.

COMMENTS

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application of a commercial rate on residential properties that are used as short-term accommodation, be reconsidered when a mandatory registration system for short-term rental accommodations is implemented in South Australia in the event of a review of the Council’s Rating Strategy.

**Section 3 – Governance & General
Reports**

13.8 COUNCIL OWNED LEASED PROPERTIES

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE:
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present information to the Council regarding the current lease arrangements for all Council owned and leased properties.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 3 February 2025, the Council considered a Notice of Motion requesting that a report be provided to the Council setting out the details of Council owned leased properties. Following consideration of the matter, the Council resolved the following:

That Administration provide a report to Council detailing all leased properties of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters to include intended use, expiry date of lease and any automatic extensions, annual rental, any terms & conditions considered relevant and in the case of leases being "held over", reasons and planned resolution.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The various financial arrangements for the Council's leased properties are set out in the Discussion section of this report.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Written legal agreements are in place for Council owned facilities that are used by third parties, to ensure legislative compliance and reduce exposure to claims from third parties who suffer injury or loss, whilst using Council facilities.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
Nil.
- **Community**
Nil.
- **Staff**
Nil.
- **Other Agencies**
Nil

DISCUSSION

A total of 20 Council owned properties are currently used by external parties, which includes buildings and/or halls, sporting facilities and playing surfaces (ie ovals, tennis courts and bowling greens).

A map showing the locations of the properties and photographs of the properties are contained in **Attachment A**.

The details of the properties and the various arrangements (ie location, lessee, permitted use, term of lease and lease fees), are included in **Attachment B**.

There are 16 current leases with various organisations for the use of Council premises, including three (3) commercial lease arrangements and 13 lease arrangements with community groups.

Staff are currently in negotiations with six (6) organisations to progress the finalisation of new lease arrangements.

There are 9 organisations that are currently in “holding over” provisions or who fall under a previous management agreement.

Holding Over provisions within a Council lease are a standard clause within a lease and have been included in leases for a number of years. Holding Over clauses that are contained in leases are typically set out as follows:

Holding Over

If, with the Council’s consent, the Lessee continues to occupy the Premises after the end of this lease, the Lessee does so under a monthly tenancy which:

- *either party may terminate on one month’s notice given at any time; and*
- *is on the same terms as this lease.*

Holding Over clauses deal with what happens to the status of a lease at the expiry of the fixed term in the event that the parties do not extend the lease, but the lessee continues in occupation of the premises.

The standard Holding Over provision sets out that if the lease comes to an end but the Lessee remains in occupation with the Lessor’s consent (the Council), then the lease will effectively become a month to month periodic tenancy on the same terms and conditions as set out under the lease, but which either party can terminate with one month’s notice.

The Lessor’s consent for the Lessee to remain in occupation is implied where the lease comes to an end and the Lessor does not notify the Lessee of its intent to reclaim the premises, so the lease would go into Holding Over automatically. However, at any time the Lessor can terminate with one (1) months’ notice once a lease is in holding over.

The utility of the Holding Over clause from a Lessor's perspective is that all obligations under the lease, including rent, maintenance, insurance, indemnities etc. continue.

It is not the case that when a lease ends and the Lessee remains in occupation that it does so with no applicable lease terms and conditions. Both parties still need to comply with the terms and conditions of the lease.

Given that the majority of the Council's lease arrangements are with community groups and not-for-profit organisations, at times the negotiation process for a new lease can often be protracted, particularly if there are legacy issues that have been in place for decades and which are required to change. As such, the Holding Over clause allows these negotiations to proceed whilst the provisions of the lease remain in place.

As set out above, staff are currently working to finalise the lease arrangements with six (6) organisations.

As Elected Members will recall, a number of leases have recently been finalised (ie Women's Community Centre, No Strings Attached, Next Step Physio, Holmesdale Tennis Club, Eastern Health Authority).

Staff are continuing to address each of the leases that are currently in "holding over" and as set out above, staff are currently progressing six (6) lease arrangements.

In terms of any relevant terms and conditions contained within lease arrangements with the various groups, all leases are structured in accordance with the relevant legislative provisions at the time the lease is prepared and are based on contemporary practises and are very similar in terms of conditions.

In some cases, however "special conditions" are applied to a lease. These may include requirements that do not fall within a standard lease such as the requirement for a tennis club to undertake court resealing and maintenance every 7-8 years. In these situations, a special condition may be applied in lieu of the payment of an annual lease fee.

Details of these arrangements are set out in Attachment A.

OPTIONS

This report is presented for information purposes only.

CONCLUSION

A number of organisations have long standing lease arrangements with the Council. The negotiation process to renew leases, particularly those leases with community organisations that have been in place for a number of years, can be a complex and protracted process.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.

Attachments – Item 13.8

Attachment A

Council Owned Leased Properties



Legend

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Adey Reserve | 12. Patterson Sportsground |
| 2. Beulah Road Community Hall | 13. Payneham Oval |
| 3. Buttery Sportsground | 14. Payneham Senior Citizens Centre |
| 4. Cruickshank Reserve | 15. Payneham Youth Centre |
| 5. John Horrocks Memorial Gardens | 16. Richards Park |
| 6. Linde Reserve | 17. St Peters Rotary Club Shed |
| 7. Marden Practice Pitches | 18. St Peters Town Hall Complex |
| 8. Nelson Street Cottages | 19. Syd Jones Reserve |
| 9. Norwood Institute Building | 20. Trinity Gardens Soldiers' Memorial Reserve |
| 10. Norwood Oval | |
| 11. Norwood Town Hall Civic Centre | |



- 1. **Adey Reserve**
Scott Street, Firlé



- 2. **Beulah Road Community Hall**
31 Beulah Road, Norwood



- 3. **Buttery Reserve**
259 Portrush Road, Norwood



4. Cruikshank Reserve
Phillis Street, Maylands



5. John Horrocks Memorial Gardens
65-69 Breaker Street, St Morris



6. Linde Community Garden
Stepney Street, Stepney



7. Marden Practice Pitches
57-59 Lower Portrush Road, Marden




8. Nelson Street Cottages
64,66 and 68 Nelson Street, Stepney



9. Norwood Institute
110 The Parade, Norwood



10. Norwood RSL and Norwood Oval
4 Woods Street, Norwood and 75 The Parade, Norwood



11. Norwood Town Hall Complex
49 George Street, Norwood



12. Patterson Sportsground
20 Turner Street, Payneham



13. Payneham Oval
26 Rosella Street, Payneham




14. Payneham Senior Citizens
54-58 Coorara Avenue, Payneham South



15. Payneham Youth Centre
24 Turner Street, Felixstow



16. Richards Park
6-10 Osmond Terrace, Norwood



17. St Peters Rotary Shed
46A Henry Street, Stepney



18. St Peters Town Hall Complex
101 Payneham Road, St Peters



19. Syd Jones Reserve
77-81 Coorara Avenue, Firlie



20. Trinity Gardens Soldiers' Memorial Reserve
Corner Hereford Ave, Albermarle Ave and Canterbury Ave, Trinity Gardens



Attachment B

Council Owned Leased Properties



COUNCIL LEASED FACILITIES

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
1	Adey Reserve	Scott Street / Hampden Street, Firle.	Italian Home Delivered Meals & Services Inc (‘Nonna’s Cucina’)	1 September 2003 – 31 August 2008 (in holding over)	Portion of premises – Building	Meal preparation and related services.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded).
2	Beulah Road Community Hall	31 Beulah Road, Norwood.	Beulah Road Community Hall Management Committee	Constitution Agreement in place since 1990 Negotiations currently in progress re new lease.	Whole of premises.	Operation of a community facility.	Nil
3	Buttery Sportsground	259 Portrush Road, Norwood.	Norwood Tennis Club Inc	1 July 2021 – 30 June 2041 As part of the lease a schedule of payments has been prepared to cover the Club’s contribution to the upgrade of the courts project which was completed in 2021.	Portion of premises – tennis courts and clubrooms.	Tennis games and training.	Nil The Club is responsible for court resurfacing and general court maintenance.
			Norwood Croquet Club	Former Management Agreement.	Portion of premises – croquet green and clubrooms.	Croquet games and training.	Nil.

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
			The South Australian China Painters' Association Inc.	Former Management Agreement	Portion of premises – clubrooms.	Art and cultural recreation.	Nil.
4	Cruickshank Reserve	Corner of Phillis Street & Clifton Street, Maylands.	Maylands Sports Centre Incorporation (St Peters Tennis Club & Gems Netball)	1 January 2004 – 31 December 2023 (in holding over) Currently in negotiations with the Centre to upgrade the courts which will be included in the new lease arrangements.	Portion of premises – tennis / netball courts and building.	Tennis and netball games and training.	Peppercorn (\$10 if demanded) The Club is responsible for court resurfacing and general court maintenance.
5	John Horrocks Memorial Green	65-69 Breaker St, St Morris.	Holmesdale Memorial Tennis Club Inc	1 April 2023 – 31 March 2033	Whole of premises	Tennis games and training.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) The Club is responsible for court resurfacing and general court maintenance.

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced

Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
6	Linde Reserve	Stepney Street, Stepney.	NP&SP Community Garden Association Inc	1 April 2021 – 31 March 2026	Portion of premises – Linde Community Garden.	Operation of community garden	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) Permitted to keep up to 10 chickens and hens on the Premises but no roosters.
7	Marden Practice Pitches	57-59 Lower Portrush Road, Marden.	Azzurri Club Limited ('Azzurri Soccer Club')	1 January 1996 – 30 December 2094	Whole of premises (practice pitches).	Soccer training and games.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) Club is required to pay 25% of maintenance costs.
8	Nelson Street Cottages	64 Nelson Street, Stepney.	Women's Community Centre (SA) Incorporated	1 December 2023 – 30 November 2028	Portion of premises – cottage and yard.	Provision of information, programs and services to women and ancillary purposes.	\$9,000
		66 Nelson Street, Stepney.	No Strings Attached Theatre of Disability Inc	1 September 2023 – 31 August 2028	Portion of premises – cottage and yard.	Conducting workshops, office and storage.	\$8,000

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
		68 Nelson Street, Stepney.	Commercial Tenancy Next Step Physio Clinic Pty Ltd	1 June 2024 – 31 May 2025 Commercial Tenancy	Portion of premises – cottage and yard.	Operation of a physiotherapy practice and associated activities.	\$50,519
9	Norwood Institute Building	110 The Parade, Norwood.	Roma Mitchell Community Legal Centre Incorporated	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2022 (in holding over)	Portion of premises – basement.	Provision of community legal services.	\$1,005.53
			South Australian Chess Association Incorporated	Ongoing (in holding over)	Portion of premises on the 1 st floor.	Playing of chess.	Nil
10	Norwood Oval	4 Woods Street & 75 The Parade, Norwood.	Norwood Football Club Incorporated	1 January 2018 – 30 December 2022 (in holding over) Negotiations currently in progress for a new lease.	Portion of premises – Oval and buildings.	Playing of AFL matches and training and approved sporting / social / cultural purposes.	Not Applicable. The Club maintains the Oval.
			Norwood RSL Subbranch Incorporated	29 January 2012 – 28 January 2017 The RSL is currently being wound up by the State RSL.	Portion of premises – RSL building.	Operation of Norwood RSL.	Nil

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
11	Norwood Town Hall Complex	49 George Street, Norwood.	House of Health Norwood Pty Ltd	Commercial Tenancy 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2026	Portion of premises – 49 George Street premises.	Operation of a health food and sustainable living store, café, and education and event space.	\$50,000
12	Patterson Sportsground	20 Turner Street, Felixstow.	East Torrens Baseball Club Incorporated	1 July 2021 – 30 June 2026	Portion of premises – clubrooms.	Operation of Baseball Club.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) Club is required to pay 25% of maintenance costs associated with the playing fields.
			East Torrens Payneham Lacrosse Club Incorporated	1 July 2021 – 30 June 2026	Portion of premises – clubrooms.	Operation of Lacrosse Clubrooms.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) Club is required to pay 25% of maintenance costs associated with the playing fields.

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE	
13	Payneham Oval	26 Rosella Street, Payneham.	Payneham Sports Association Incorporated	1 November 2001 – 31 October 2022 (in holding over)	Portion of premises – clubrooms.	Sporting and social club including operation of licensed bar.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) Required to pay 25% of maintenance costs associated with the Oval.	
			East Adelaide Payneham Tennis Club Inc	1 May 2021 – 30 April 2041	Portion of premises – tennis courts.	Playing and practising of tennis and associated activities.	Peppercorn (\$1 if demanded) The Club is responsible for court resurfacing and general court maintenance.	
			As part of the lease a schedule of payments has been prepared to cover the Club's contribution to the upgrade of the courts project which was completed in 2021.					
14	Payneham Senior Citizens Centre	54-58 Coorara Avenue, Payneham South.	Payneham Senior Citizens Over 50s Club Inc	Ongoing Building was purpose built for the PSC with Federal Government funding on Council land.	Whole of premises.	Operation of senior citizens centre.	Not Applicable.	

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
15	Payneham Youth Centre	24 Turner St, Felixstow.	Payneham Youth Centre Coo-ee Club Incorporated & Minister for Education and Child Development Discussions are currently being undertaken with the State Government re future lease arrangements.	1 November 1978 – 30 October 2020 (in holding over).	Portion of premises – building.	Youth club activities and school use.	Nil Former City of Payneham and Minister for Education entered into an agreement to construct the Youth Centre building.
16	Richards Park	6-10 Osmond Terrace, Norwood.	Minister for Education and Child Development Margaret Ives Community Children's Centre Inc	1 July 2015 – 30 June 2025 Negotiations are currently being undertaken re a new lease.	Portion of premises Sublease – portion of premises as above.	Playground and outdoor recreation activities for use by children at Margaret Ives Community Children's Centre Incorporated.	Nil New lease will recommend payment of a lease fee.
17	St Peters Rotary Club Shed	46A Henry St, Stepney.	Rotary Club of St Peters	1 July 2002 – 30 June 2007 (in holding over).	Whole of premises.	Storage and related activities associated with the Lessee's fundraising activities.	\$2,250

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced

Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
18	St Peters Town Hall Complex	101 Payneham Road, St Peters.	Progressive Music Broadcasting Association Inc (Three D Radio Station)	7 December 2022 – 6 December 2027	Portion of premises – Unit 4.	Community radio station and other purposes including office administration, meetings and media libraries.	\$12,489
			Eastern Health Authority Incorporated	Commercial Tenancy 5 January 2025 – 4 January 2035	Portion of premises – Unit 3.	Administrative offices and other purposes including medical clinics, training facilities and resource centre.	\$124,150
19	Syd Jones Reserve	77-81 Coorara Ave, Firle.	Payneham Table Tennis Academy	Ongoing – in holding over. Preliminary discussions have been undertaken with the Academy. The Academy is considering options re suitability of premises due to the increases in membership.	Portion of premises – Building.	Playing and practising of table tennis.	\$798.72

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

#	PROPERTY	ADDRESS	LESSEE	TERM	LEASED LAND	PERMITTED USE	ANNUAL LEASE FEE
20	Trinity Gardens Soldiers' Memorial Reserve	Corner Hereford Ave, Albermarle Ave and Canterbury Ave, Trinity Gardens.	Trinity Gardens Soldiers Memorial Reserve Association Incorporated	1 July 2007 – 30 June 2017 (in holding over).	Whole of premises.	Playing tennis and lawn bowls and other approved purposes.	\$100
			Trinity Gardens Soldiers' Memorial Reserve Tennis Club Incorporated	November 2014 – 30 June 2033 As part of the lease a schedule of payments has been prepared to cover the Club's contribution to the upgrade of the courts project which was completed in 2014.	Sublease – Portion of premises – tennis courts and clubrooms.	Playing tennis and other approved purposes.	The Club is responsible for court resurfacing and general court maintenance.
			Trinity Gardens Bowling Club Incorporated	1 July 2007 – 29 June 2017 (in holding over). Discussions are currently being undertaken to determine the future of the Club.	Sublease – portion of premises – bowling green and clubrooms.	Playing lawn bowls and other approved purposes.	\$100

Notes:

Green = Negotiations not yet commenced
Blue = Negotiations in progress

13.9 VESTING OF PUBLIC ROAD - HEANES LANE, KENSINGTON

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8336 45496
FILE REFERENCE: qA2005
ATTACHMENTS: A - D

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present information to the Council regarding the next stage of the process to formally recognise Heanes Lane, Kensington as a Public Road pursuant to Section 208(1) of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

BACKGROUND

Heanes Lane, Kensington is comprised in Allotment 14 Deposited Plan 41630 in Certificate of Title Volume 5549 Folio 330 and forms part of Borthwick Park. Borthwick Park, Kensington (inclusive of Heanes Lane), totals an area of approximately 7,547m².

Heanes Lane, Kensington is a small section of road that provides vehicle access from Bridge Street to three (3) residential properties and general public access to Borthwick Park. Heanes Lane is located on Council-owned land which forms part of Borthwick Park however it is not formally classified as Public Road, although it is commonly known as 'Heanes Lane'.

Borthwick Park is a Council owned Reserve and is classified as Community Land under Section 193 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act).

A copy of a plan showing the location of Heanes Lane and Borthwick Park, is contained with **Attachment A**.

Records held at the Lands Titles Office do not recognise the existence of Heanes Lane and show the addresses for the two (2) rear properties accessed by Heanes Lane as 51A and 51B Bridge Street. However, these two (2) properties are listed as 1 and 2 Heanes Lane in the Council's Assessment Record.

Several photographs showing Heanes Lane are contained within **Attachment B**.

History of Heanes Lane

The former Town of Kensington & Norwood purchased the land comprising Heanes Lane in January 1995, in order to provide public access from Borthwick Park through to Bridge Street. This followed several years of negotiations with the developer who originally owned part of the land comprising 51 Bridge Street, Kensington and who created the two (2) rear residential properties at 51A and 51B Bridge Street and the allotment comprising Heanes Lane by way of a land division.

The developer was originally responsible for paving and maintaining the 'access-way' (that would later become Heanes Lane) to the Council's specifications in around November 1994, while the land still remained in the developer's ownership. The access-way also originally formed part of the adjacent residential properties to ensure it would be maintained by the private landowners using it into the future.

However, this strip of land was subsequently divided off and became its own separate allotment, which was then purchased by the Council. To this day, the adjacent residents of 51, 51A, 51B and 53 Bridge Street retain various rights-of-way over the Lane, for the purpose of accessing their respective properties from Bridge Street.

No formal maintenance obligations in respect of Heanes Lane are imposed on the adjacent owners, whether by way of rights-of-way, land management agreements or otherwise. The adjacent owners have, nevertheless, been maintaining the Lane to a degree over recent years. An enquiry from one of the residents in late 2018, regarding who was responsible for maintaining Heanes Lane (in particular, replacement of pavers and maintenance of stormwater infrastructure and kerbing) resulted in Council Staff looking into this matter to determine the status of this land.

As it is Council owned land, together with the adjacent Borthwick Park, as owner of the land, the Council is responsible for its ongoing maintenance and upkeep.

At its meeting held on 6 May 2019, the Council considered the vesting of Heanes Lane as a Public Road. On that occasion, the Council was advised that while Heanes Lane was not formally a Public Road, it is used as a road and for all intents and purposes functions as a road. The Council considered options of either retaining Heanes Lane as Community Land, or formally vesting Heanes Lane as a Public Road pursuant to Section 208(1) of the Act.

The advantage of vesting Heanes Lane as a Public Road, will ensure the Lane would be maintained by the Council and placed on the Council's Asset Register and Public Roads Register. The Council was also advised that a new Certificate of Title would be issued for Heanes Lane to indicate a separate use from Borthwick Park.

Previous Council Meetings

Following consideration of the matter, at its meeting held on 6 May 2019, the Council resolved the following:

- 1. That the Council commence the process to divide the land comprised in Certificate of Title Volume 5549 Folio 330, with the portion of land used as road to vest in the Council as public road, and the remainder of the land to remain vested in the Council in fee simple as Community Land.*
- 2. That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to prepare a plan of division and lodge an application to deposit the plan of division with the Lands Titles Office SA, along with preparation and lodgement of all other required documentation, consents and notices required to give effect the land division.*
- 3. That pursuant to Section 219 of the Local Government Act 1999, the Council endorses and assigns the name 'Heanes Lane' as the official name for the portion of land described as Allotment 14 Deposited Plan 41630 comprised in Certificate of Title Volume 5549 Folio 330 and used as road, once vested in the Council as public road.*
- 4. That the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to give public notice of the assignment of the above name in the Government Gazette and to notify the Registrar-General, Surveyor-General and Valuer-General as required by Section 219 of the Local Government Act 1999, and to take such other actions as are necessary to implement the new name of the public road.*

Following the Council's decision on 6 May 2019, the Plan of Division was prepared for the Land Division and the vesting of Heanes Lane as a Public Road. The Plan of Division was approved by the Lands Titles Office on 2 June 2020. However, Certificates of Titles have not yet been issued by the Registrar-General for Heanes Lane and Borthwick Park. The Plan of Division shows Borthwick Park as Allotment 140 in D123797 and Heanes Lane as Allotment 141 in D123797. The Certificates of Title have not yet been issued as during the process of preparing the Plan of Division a number of easements were identified.

A copy of the approved Plan of Division dated 2 June 2020 is contained within **Attachment C**.

As a result of the identification of the easements, the vesting of Heanes Lane to a Public Road was again considered at the Council meeting held on 6 April 2021. This item related to the Council preserving a number of the easements, pursuant to Section 208(3) of the Act, for sewerage, gas and electricity purposes.

At the Council meeting held on 6 April 2021, the Council resolved the following:

1. *That the Council resolves to preserve the following easements in RE 7840922 upon deposit of the Plan of Division vesting Heanes Lane in the Council as public road, pursuant to Section 208(3) of the Local Government Act 1999:*
 - *easement 'C' in D41630 for gas supply purposes;*
 - *easement 'C' in D41630 for the transmission of electricity by underground cable;*
 - *easement 'C' in D41630 for water supply purposes; and*
 - *easement 'C' in D41630 for sewerage purposes.*
2. *That the Council authorises the Chief Executive Officer to amend the Plan of Division contained within Attachment B to reflect the preservation of the abovementioned easements and to lodge an application to deposit the Plan of Division with the Land Titles Office SA, along with the preparation and lodgement of all other required documentation, consents and notices required to effect the land division.*

However, at the Council meetings held on 6 May 2019 and 6 April 2021, the Council did not consider amending its Parks & Reserves Community Land Management Plan (the Plan) which was adopted by the Council on 1 June 2020, as required by Section 198 of the Act. An amendment to the Plan is required because the use of Heanes Lane as a public road is not consistent with the use of Borthwick Park as a reserve under the Plan.

At its meeting held on 4 September 2023, the Council considered the process required to amend the Parks & Reserve Community Land Management Plan (the Plan) under Section 198(1) of the Act, including if the amendment to the Plan was likely to involve a significant impact or no impact to the community.

Community Land Management Plans, in general terms, provide for the use of Council owned Reserves and Parks, as well as other Council property. As required under Section 199 of the Act, the Council must manage Community Land in accordance with the approved Community Land Management Plan for the relevant land. Therefore, Borthwick Park must be managed in accordance with the Plan.

Therefore, to progress this matter and to proceed on the basis of amending the Plan pursuant to Section 198 of the Act, by excluding Allotment 141 in D123797 (Heanes Lane), the Council was advised that as the lodgement of the Plan of Division will officially change the use of Heanes Lane and sever Heanes Lane from Borthwick Park, community consultation was required to be undertaken as there is some impact to the community (at least for the residents of 51, 51A, 51B and 51C Bridge Street), in accordance with Section 198(2) of the Act.

Following consideration of the matter, the Council subsequently resolved the following:

1. *That the Council commence the process under Section 198(1) of the Local Government Act 1999 to amend the Parks and Reserves Community Land Management Plan for Borthwick Park, adopted by the Council on 1 June 2020, to sever Heanes Lane from Allotment 14 Deposited Plan 41630 comprised in Certificate of Title Volume 5549 Folio 330.*
2. *That the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to take all action necessary to facilitate the process under the Local Government Act 1999 (SA).*
3. *That public consultation will comprise a public notice of the 6 May 2019 decision placed in a newspaper circulating within the Council area and on the Council website, plus a formal notification sent to adjacent landowners at 51, 51A, 51B and 53 Bridge Street. The information provided will clearly state that Heanes Lane will be vested as a public road and access to properties will remain unchanged.*

Following the Council's decision as set out above, community consultation was undertaken and letters were forwarded to the adjacent property owners to advise of the Council's proposal to sever Heanes lane from the Borthwick Park Community Land Management Plan and inviting their comments regarding the proposal.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Outcome 1: Social Equity

Objective 1.2

A people-friendly, integrated and active transport and pedestrian network.

Strategies

1.22 *Provide safe and accessible movement for all people.*

1.23 *Work with other agencies to influence or provide improved and integrated public transport networks.*

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Once declared as public road, Heanes Lane will be incorporated in the Council's Asset Register and Public Roads Register and any future costs associated with the management and maintenance of the Lane will be in accordance with the Council's Whole-of-Life Asset Management Plans. There will also be minor legal costs associated with the legislative process for formally vesting Heanes Lane as a public road under Section 208(1) of the Act and costs associated with the process, including publication of the Notice in the South Australian Government Gazette.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

While Heanes Lane is not currently recognised as a public road, it is used as a road. It is anticipated that the formal recognition of Heanes Lane as a public road will not have any impact on the adjoining owners.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

The key purpose of this process is to rectify the legal and property status of Heanes Lane, Kensington, to reflect its actual usage as public road and to provide clarity regarding its ownership and maintenance into the future.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

Elected Members previously considered the matter at the Council meetings held on 6 May 2019, 6 April 2021 and 4 September 2023.

- **Community**

A letter dated 26 February 2024 was forwarded to the residents of Bridge Street Kensington regarding the proposal to declare Heanes Lane as a public road pursuant to Section 208(1) of the Act.

Community consultation was undertaken over a four (4) week period commencing on 26 February 2024 and concluding on 22 March 2024.

- **Staff**

The Council's Manager, City Assets and Manager, City Services have provided advice as required as part of this process.

- **Other Agencies**

The Lands Titles Office of SA will be involved in approving the vesting of the land comprising Heanes Lane in the Council as public road, and the issue of two (2) new Certificates of Title for the public road and the adjacent land comprising a portion of Borthwick Park.

Written notice to all relevant service authorities (including, eg, SA Water, South Australia Power Network and SA Police) will also be undertaken as part of this process.

Norman Waterhouse Lawyers has been assisting the Council with the process of vesting Heanes Lane as a road in accordance with the Act, including consideration of the owner of 51B Bridge Street's correspondence dated 22 March 2024.

DISCUSSION

Outcome of the Community Consultation

Community Consultation was undertaken for a four (4) week period in respect to the proposed amendment to the Plan. The consultation process was advertised via a notice in The Advertiser and the Government Gazette and on the Council's website.

In addition, on 26 February 2024, a letter was forwarded to the owners of 51, 51A, 51B and 53 Bridge Street, Kensington, advising of the Council's intention to amend the Community Land Management Plan and to declare Heanes Lane as a Public Road.

One (1) submission was received as part of the consultation process.

The submission was received from the owner of 51B Bridge Street, who has objected to the proposal to vest Heanes Lane as a Public Road due to concerns relating to the loss of the right-of-way over the land.

A copy of the submission dated 22 March 2024 is contained in **Attachment D**.

The owner of 51B Bridge Street has objected to the proposal to vest Heanes Lane as a Public Road on the basis of the following:

- Heanes Lane serves as a private access road for the surrounding properties and this ought to take priority to the use of Heanes Lane by the public;
- that the adjoining property owners (51, 51A, 51B and 53 Bridge Street, Kensington), have a registered right-of-way for access over Heanes Lane;
- converting Heanes Lane to a public road will extinguish the rights-of-way over Heanes Lane;
- Heanes Lane is narrow which does not support increased vehicular access; and
- Section 210 of the Act is not the relevant provision under the Act for converting Heanes Lane to a public road.

Response to the Submission

1. Heanes Lane is a Private Access Road

In respect to the comment that Heanes Lane is a private access road, this is not the case and has not been the case for many years. Heanes Lane is Community Land that is owned by the Council. This means that Heanes Lane is public land for the purposes of the Act.

2. Right-of-Way over Heanes Lane

Whilst the adjoining property owners enjoy private rights-of-way over Heanes Lane, this does not extend to the right to park vehicles in the laneway or otherwise obstruct the laneway as a thoroughfare to Borthwick Park by the public.

There is no intention to undertake any changes to the laneway. The existing conditions regarding parking will remain unchanged, however, this may need to be formalised once the lane becomes a Public Road.

3. Converting Heanes Lane to a Public Road will extinguish the Rights-of-Way over Heanes Lane

The conversion of Heanes Lane to a Public Road will result in the extinguishment of the private rights-of-way (which is a requirement of the Act), however the adjacent property owners will continue to have full access to Heanes Lane in the same manner as they do currently. This is no different to any property with a frontage to a Public Road.

4. Section 210 of the Act is not the relevant provision under the Act for converting Heanes Lane to a Public Road

This comment is correct insofar as Section 210 of the Act is not the relevant provision of the Act because Heanes Lane is not a private road.

However, for the purposes of clarification, the Council is not proposing to proceed under Section 210 of the Act. Rather, it is merely seeking to amend the Community Land Management Plan to exclude Heanes Lane and thereafter take steps to vest Heanes Lane in the Council as a Public Road pursuant to Section 208 of the Act.

If the Council makes the decision to sever Heanes Lane, Heanes Lane will still be classified as Community Land. The process to remove this classification is to lodge a Plan of Division with Lands Services SA, which will effectively revoke the land status assigned to Heanes Lane and formally vest Heanes Lane as a Public Road under the *Real Property Act 1886*.

If the Council determines to proceed with formalising the status of Heanes Lane, a response to the owner of 51B Bridge Street, which will address the concerns that have been raised, will be prepared.

OPTIONS

The following options are available to the Council in respect to this matter:

1. Retain the status quo with respect to Heanes Lane

Endorsing this option means that Heanes Lanes remains as is and is not severed from Borthwick Park. This option means the process to vest Heanes Lane as a Public Road will not proceed. The Lane will not be placed on the Council's Asset Register or Public Road Register and will therefore not be maintained by the Council.

2. Finalise the process to vest Heanes as a Public Road

Endorsing this option means that the Community Land Management Plan will be amended to sever Heanes Lane from Borthwick Park and the Application to Deposit D123797 will be lodged with the Lands Titles Office of SA to vest Heanes Lane in the Council as public road pursuant to Section 208 of the Act. This will involve the issuing of two (2) new Certificates of Title, one for Heanes Lane and the other for Borthwick Park.

For the reasons set out in this report, this is the recommended option.

CONCLUSION

The process of declaring Heanes Lane as a Public Road appropriately reflects the current use of Heanes Lane as a road as well as providing clarity on its ownership and on-going maintenance. In addition, it will allow the Council to incorporate Heanes Lane into its Assets Register and Public Road Register.

COMMENTS

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the status of the process to formally recognise Heanes Lane, Kensington as a public road pursuant to Section 208(1) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, be noted.
2. That the correspondence dated 22 March 2024 (**Attachment D**) in response to the community consultation undertaken by the Council to amend the Community Land Management Plan for Borthwick Park pursuant to Section 198(1) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, be received and noted.
3. That the Council approves the process to sever Heanes Lane from Borthwick Park by amending the Community Land Management Plan for Borthwick Park (Allotment 14 Deposited Plan 41630 in Certificate of Title Volume 5549 Folio 330) pursuant to Section 198(1) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, so that Heanes Lane can be vested as a Public Road under Section 208 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

Attachments – Item 13.9

Attachment A

**Vesting of Public Road
Heanes Lane, Kensington**



HEANES LANE, KENSINGTON



Attachment B


**Vesting of Public Road
Heanes Lane, Kensington**












Attachment C

**Vesting of Public Road
Heanes Lane, Kensington**



PURPOSE:	DIVISION	AREA NAME:	KENSINGTON	RE-APPROVED:	 D123797 SHEET 1 OF 3 71205_text_01_v05_Version_5
MAP REF:	6628/42/K, 6628/42/G	COUNCIL:	THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM AND ST. PETERS	02/06/2020	
LAST PLAN:		DEVELOPMENT NO:	155/D071/19/001/58436	DEPOSITED:	

AGENT DETAILS:	ALEXANDER & SYMONDS PTY LTD 1ST FLOOR 11 KING WILLIAM ST KENT TOWN SA 5067 PH: 81301666 FAX: 83620099	SURVEYORS CERTIFICATION:	I DAMIAN JOHN HOLLAND , a licensed surveyor do hereby certify - 1) That this plan has been made from surveys carried out by me or under my personal supervision and in accordance with the Survey Act 1992. 2) That the field work was completed on the 26th day of February 2020 1st day of June 2020 Damian Holland Licensed Surveyor
AGENT CODE:	ALSY		
REFERENCE:	A111319LTO(A)		

SUBJECT TITLE DETAILS:


PREFIX	VOLUME	FOLIO	OTHER	PARCEL	NUMBER	PLAN	NUMBER HUNDRED / IA / DIVISION	TOWN	REFERENCE NUMBER
CT	5549	330		ALLOTMENT(S)	14	D	41630 ADELAIDE		

OTHER TITLES AFFECTED: CT 5275/433 , CT 5275/434

EASEMENT DETAILS:

STATUS	LAND BURDENED	FORM	CATEGORY	IDENTIFIER	PURPOSE	IN FAVOUR OF	CREATION
EXTINGUISH	141 (HEANES LANE)	SHORT	EASEMENT(S)	C IN D41630	FOR GAS SUPPLY PURPOSES	CT 5275/433.CT 5275/434	RE 7840922
EXTINGUISH	141 (HEANES LANE)	SHORT	EASEMENT(S)	C IN D41630	FOR THE TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRICITY BY UNDERGROUND CABLE	CT 5275/433.CT 5275/434	RE 7840922
EXTINGUISH	141 (HEANES LANE)	SHORT	EASEMENT(S)	C IN D41630	FOR WATER SUPPLY PURPOSES	CT 5275/433.CT 5275/434	RE 7840922
EXTINGUISH	141 (HEANES LANE)	SHORT	EASEMENT(S)	C IN D41630	FOR SEWERAGE PURPOSES	CT 5275/433.CT 5275/434	RE 7840922
EXTINGUISH	141 (HEANES LANE)	SERVICE	EASEMENT(S)	F IN D41630	FOR SEWERAGE PURPOSES	SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WATER CORPORATION	223LG RPA
EXTINGUISH	141 (HEANES LANE)	LONG	EASEMENT(S)	C IN D41630		CT 5275/433. CT 5275/434	RE 7840922
EXISTING	140	SERVICE	EASEMENT(S)	B	FOR DRAINAGE PURPOSES	THE COUNCIL FOR THE AREA	223LG RPA
EXISTING		SHORT	FREE AND UNRESTRICTED RIGHT(S) OF WAY	D		140	

ANNOTATIONS: SECTION 90E OF THE REAL PROPERTY ACT 1886 APPLIES TO THIS PLAN



D123797

SHEET 2 OF 3

71205_text_01_v05_Version_5

NO OCCUPATION ON SURVEYED BOUNDARIES UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN


D123797

SHEET 3 OF 3

71205_pland_1_V01_Version_5



BEARING DATUM: MGA 2020 ZONE 54
DERIVATION: 6628/14979 - 6628/33558

TOTAL AREA:




REFERENCE MARKS


CNR	BEARING	FROM	DIST	PM NO
1	42°41'	PM FD	1.58	6628/33558
2	258°15'	PM FD	1.29	6628/14965
3	303°08'	MN FD	1.00	
4	348°16'	PM FD	1.29	6628/14979
5	221°54'	MP FD	0.83	




ENLARGEMENT A2



ENLARGEMENT C2
NOT TO SCALE



ENLARGEMENT B2
NOT TO SCALE



Alexander & Symonds Pty.Ltd.

11 KING WILLIAM STREET, KENT TOWN
P.O. BOX 1000 KENT TOWN 5071
Tel (08) 8130 1666 Fax (08) 8362 0099 A.B.N. 93 007 753 988

REFERENCE A111319LTO(A)

PAP 28/02/2020

Attachment D

**Vesting of Public Road
Heanes Lane, Kensington**





VILLENEUVE SMITH CHAMBERS
BARRISTERS

[REDACTED]

Ref: NP&SP01

22 March 2024

Ms Lisa Mara
General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
City of Norwood, Payneham & St. Peters
175 The Parade
Norwood SA 5067

By email

Dear Madam

Conversion of Heanes Lane, Kensington, into a Public Road

I am the owner of the property at [REDACTED] Heanes Lane ([REDACTED] Bridge Street). I refer to your letter of 29 February 2024 advising of the Council's intention to convert Heanes Lane into a public road. I wish to object to the proposal.

Practical Objections

Heanes Lane is part of what was originally a residential subdivision. It serves as a private access road for the properties surrounding it. One of those properties, Lot 14, was purchased by the Council and used as an extension to Borthwick Park. The fee simple in the access road is part of Lot 14 and, thus, strictly part of Borthwick Park. My three neighbours and I, as owners of the adjoining properties, have registered easements over Heanes Lane to permit pedestrian and vehicular access to our properties. The Council's rights as owner of the lane and the public's right to access the park are necessarily subordinate to our rights of access to our properties. In other words, the Council and the public must respect the lane's special and essential function for us and should not be able to "elbow us aside" in making use of the park.

Our right is indispensable to our properties. Heanes Lane is a back-lane not a road frontage. It is tiny, and it is only properly adapted to its current use, namely, allowing limited vehicular access to serve the adjoining properties. It is essential that the overriding right of the property owners – which is a right they have in common to access over every part the lane at all times – be preserved as it is, if the ordinary amenity of their properties is to be maintained.

Turning the lane into a public road will extinguish those rights. We shall be the only residents of Kensington whose visitors cannot park outside the house because the Council has decreed the space free for public traffic; or, if parking is to be allowed, then we must compete with a limitless number of non-resident park-goers bringing their cars into the lane.

To date there has been little problem with cars in Heanes Lane. That is because it is known to be a private road, but encouraging unlimited public vehicular access is not the right way to preserve its

[REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]
TEL: [REDACTED] • [REDACTED]

proper function. As you know, the Council has asked me repeatedly over the years to voluntarily surrender the easement that serves my property and I have always refused. The easement serves a vital function for the properties adjoining Heanes Lane and should not be destroyed for the sake of administrative convenience.

Legal Objections

In my view, s. 210 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, properly understood, does not permit the Council to covert Heanes Lane from a private road into a public road. It is clearly addressed to the case of private roads in private hands (which the private owner wishes to surrender to the Council); it does not deal with private roads (like Heanes Lane) that already belong to the Council as a result of land purchase by the Council.

In my view, the expensive and convoluted *road process* procedure under the *Roads (Opening and Closing Act) 1991* is the only lawful procedure for effecting a conversion. One of the conditions for approval is that the land be reasonably required as a public road. In my view, that is clearly not the case for Heanes Lane.

In either case, it is to be remembered that compensation is payable by Council to affected landowners who lose rights as result of the process.

I would be grateful if you would make my views known to the Council. I have not yet had an opportunity to outline my views to my neighbours. But I shall be seeking their concurrence in due course.

Yours faithfully,



TEL: 

13.10 CHURCH AVENUE, NORWOOD - ROAD PROCESS

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Governance
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4593
FILE REFERENCE: qA65051
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Council and to obtain the Council's endorsement to proceed with the finalisation of the outstanding matters in relation to the conversion of Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane, Norwood into Public Roads.

BACKGROUND

For a number of years, Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane, Norwood have been the subject of an ongoing process to ensure that the roads (as the roads exists in their current form), are under the ownership of the Council rather than being a mix of various land holdings of differing legal status. The key purpose of this process is to rectify the legal and property status of Church Avenue and vest Kingsborough Lane under the Council's ownership to reflect the actual usage as public roads and to formally recognise the Council as owner of both Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane.

A copy of the Preliminary Plan is contained in **Attachment A**.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

It is important from an ongoing risk management perspective to ensure clear ownership for Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
Not Applicable.
- **Community**
Not Applicable.
- **Staff**
Not Applicable.
- **Other Agencies**
Progressing this matter has been informed by legal advice provided by Norman Waterhouse Lawyers and Alexander Symonds Pty Ltd (Surveyors).

DISCUSSION

Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane are sealed roads that are used by the community and in practice these roads are maintained by the Council, however the legal ownership of the land is complex and therefore endeavours have been made since 2020, to convert the entirety of Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane, Norwood, to Public Road.

A staged approach to this process has been taken due to the complexity of the differing legal status of the relevant land holdings. This process is now in the final stages.

Through the process, it was identified that the northern end of Church Avenue (from the bend in the middle to The Parade) is owned by the Council, however the parcel of land in the centre of Church Avenue (at the bend), was a private Right-of- Way. This section of the road was converted to Public Road in 2021 under Section 210 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, which means that this section of the road is now under the Council's ownership.

Section 210 of the *Local Government Act 1999* was also used to convert the remainder of Church Avenue (from the Right-of-Way section through to William Street in the South) to Public Road. This was successfully completed in 2021.

In addition, in 2022, Kingsborough Lane, which joins the northern section of Church Avenue and which is a private laneway, was identified via the Council's *Private Laneways Policy* implementation process, as suitable for conversion to a Public Road pursuant to Section 210 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

In November 2023, it was identified that there would be issues with converting the remainder of Church Avenue (including a portion of Allotment 17 and Allotment 15 in DP798) to Public Road under either a Section 210 process or a land division. In particular, whilst Allotment 15 is arguably a road and could be converted using the provisions of Section 210, the adjoining Allotment 70 (contained in Certificate of Title 5872 Folio 781) is Council land designated as Reserve and therefore, cannot be merged as Public Road using this process. An alternative process involves converting this land using a land division process, however this was discounted as a viable option as this process requires all property owners to sign the application to deposit the plan, however certain sections are in the estate of long deceased persons.

It was therefore determined that it would be preferable to deal with the remaining small areas of land in the middle section under the provisions of Part 6 of the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991* with a portion to vest as public road and the balance to be amalgamated with the adjoining Council owned reserve (which gives effect to what is currently on the ground). This process does require Ministerial approval but is appropriate in the circumstances.

In addition, although significant progress had previously been made to convert Kingsborough Lane to a Public Road under Section 210 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, while investigating the conversion of Church Avenue, further anomalies were found with Kingsborough Lane which indicated that the preferred mechanism is to use the provisions of the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991* to also vest this land as Public Road. It is therefore logical to combine Kingsborough Lane with that of Church Avenue as part of one road opening process.

The plan contained in Attachment A to this report provides the Preliminary Plan prepared by Alexander Symonds Pty Ltd (Surveyors) which delineates the area to be opened as a road under the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991*. This is the first step in the Road Opening process under that legislation. This Preliminary Plan is an initial plan which is submitted to the Office of the Surveyor-General and is also available to affected land owners and interest holders who are identified as part of the road opening process.

The land identified on the Preliminary Plan by the numbers 30 and 31, is the land that will be opened as a road under the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991*.

Before a road process order can be made by the Council, as required under the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991*, the Council's *Parks and Reserves Community Land Management Plan (CLMP)* needs to be amended. In particular, to remove the portion of the land indicated on the Preliminary Plan by the number 30 as it currently forms part of Council reserve land (contained in Certificate of Title 5872 Folio 781 and marked 19 on the Preliminary Plan). The remainder of the land identified in number 30 (at its left corner) forms part of the adjoining private Allotment 17 and does not form part of the CLMP.

Given that the area to be removed from the CLMP is very minor and is already part of the sealed road (and therefore for all intents and purposes is a road), the Council is not required to engage in community consultation in amending the CLMP in accordance with Section 198(3) of the *Local Government Act 1999*. If the Council does resolve to amend the CLMP, the Council will still be required to give public notice of this amendment in accordance with Section 198(4) of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

Once the matter of the amendment to the CLMP has been resolved, the road process order can be progressed in accordance with the legislative requirements. This process will be undertaken by Alexander Symonds Pty Ltd on the Council's behalf.

Based on the Council approving the amendment to the CLMP and the requisite public notice being provided, Alexander Symonds will prepare a statement in the required form containing the names and addresses of those persons affected by the road process who can be identified by reasonable enquiry and such other information in relation to the subject land as required by the Surveyor-General then lodge these documents with the Surveyor-General.

OPTIONS

Not Applicable.

CONCLUSION

While this report seeks the Council's approval to remove a portion of land from the Council's *Parks and Reserves CLMP*, it is an important next step towards progressing rectification of the complex historic land ownership of Church Avenue and Kingsborough Lane.

There are no impacts from this process on the community as the land in question is already part of the sealed road network.

COMMENTS

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Council Parks and Reserves Community Land Management Plan be amended by removing from Certificate of Title Volume 5872 Folio 781, that portion of the land numbered "30" in Preliminary Plan No. 24/00, under Section 198(1) of the *Local Government Act 1999*.
2. Approval is granted to proceed with opening those portions numbered 30 and 31, in the said Preliminary Plan as Public Roads under the *Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991*.

Attachments – Item 13.10

Attachment A

Church Avenue, Norwood
Road Process




PRELIMINARY PLAN

24/00

PLAN UNDER THE ROADS (OPENING & CLOSING) ACT, 1991

TITLE REFERENCE FOR ROAD PC CT 164/158, PC CT 280/148, CT 6275/183

IRRIGATION AREA DIVISION
 HUNDRED ... ADELAIDE
 AREA ... NORWOOD
 COUNCIL ... CITY OF NORWOOD, PAYENHAM AND ST PETERS



STATEMENTS CONCERNING EASEMENTS ANNOTATIONS AND AMENDMENTS

ROADS TO BE OPENED NUMBERED 30 AND 31

AERIAL PHOTO SUPPLIED BY METROMAP. FLOWN 27/09/2024.


CERTIFIED CORRECT AS TO INTENT

DATED / /20 CITY OF NORWOOD, PAYENHAM AND ST PETERS



Alexander & Symonds Pty.Ltd.

11 KING WILLIAM STREET, KENT TOWN
 P.O. BOX 1000 KENT TOWN 5071
 Tel (08) 8130 1666 Fax (08) 8362 0099 A.B.N. 93 007 753 988

REFERENCE 22A2805 PP(A)
 RHF 11.07.2024



PARCEL	PLAN	TITLE
1	59/F139039	CT 5753/55
2	81/F254029	CT 6213/117
3	100/F253544	CT 6210/363
4	U1/S11544	CT 5048/370
5	U2/S11544	CT 5048/371
6	62/F139042	CT 5589/666
7	1/C22901	CT 5942/930
8	2/C22901	CT 5942/931
9	CP/C22901	CT 5942/934
10	3/C22901	CT 5942/932
11	4/C22901	CT 5942/933
12	63/F139043	CT 5796/880
13	105/D26935	CT 6284/607
14	103/F11348	CT 6289/324
15	24/D15764	CT 5274/389
16	23/D15764	CT 5251/339
17	82/F254029	CT 6213/117
18	67/F139047	CT 5817/449
19	70/F138950	CT 5872/781
20	13/D115390	CT 6191/9
21	10/D115390	CT 6191/6
22	11/D115390	CT 6191/7
23	15/D46749	CT 5402/658
24	14/D46749	CT 5402/657
25	17/D798	CT 280/148
26	72/F138951	CT 5723/610



13.11 ERA WATER – REQUEST TO INSTALL A BOOSTER PUMP

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: qA87866
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present to the Council, a request which has been received from ERA Water for ERA Water to instal a booster pump on Council owned land for approval.

BACKGROUND

ERA Water is a Regional Subsidiary which has been established pursuant to Section 43 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, for the primary purpose of implementing the Waterproofing Eastern Adelaide Project (the Scheme), which involves the establishment of wetland bio-filters, aquifer recharge and recovery, pipeline installations and water storage facilities. ERA Water manage the Scheme on behalf of the Constituent Councils and provide recycled stormwater for the irrigation of parks and reserves to Constituent Councils. The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, together with the City of Burnside and the Town of Walkerville make up the Constituent Councils of ERA Water.

ERA Water has written to the Council seeking the Council's approval to install a booster pump at Payneham Oval or Adey Reserve or an alternative location within the City to the ERA Water Network to enable connections of other sites as well as improving water pressure for existing sites.

A copy of the letter dated 27 March 2025 from Mr Jeff Tate, Independent Chair, ERA Water Board, is contained within **Attachment A**.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The ERA Water has lodged an application for funding as part of the Department Environment and Water's *Alternative Water Supply Efficiency Measure (AWSEM) Program*. The ERA Water Board has allocated funding as part of the 2024-2025 Budget to commence the preliminary design for the booster pump.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
Cr Grant Piggott is a member of the ERA Water Board.
- **Community**
Not Applicable.
- **Staff**
Nil
- **Other Agencies**
Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

In March 2024, the ERA Water Board resolved to seek approval from the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters to install a booster pump within the City in the section of the distribution network servicing the City of Burnside and the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

Increasing pressure and volume is a key aspect of improving the delivery of harvested stormwater for irrigation purposes in the network for existing sites and to ensure additional sites can be connected to the network.

ERA Water's consulting engineers, WGA, have identified Payneham Oval and Adey Reserve at Firlie as potential sites for the booster pump, recognising that there may also be other suitable sites in the City. A building, measuring approximately 3m by 3m, would be required to house the booster pump and associated pipe infrastructure and access to electricity will also be required.

As stated previously, ERA Water have applied for funding as part of the Department Environment and Water's *Alternative Water Supply Efficiency Measure (AWSEM) Program* (the Program). The Program grants aim to deliver water savings to the Murray-Darling Basin. The program is funded under the Australian Government [Resilient Rivers Water Infrastructure Program: State-led Water Recovery Program Arrangements](#).

The Program provides funding to invest in infrastructure that substitutes River Murray water used for open space irrigation and industry with stormwater, treated wastewater, and other alternative water sources.

As well as providing an environmental benefit to the River Murray by returning water entitlements under the Basin Plan, the program aims to deliver a wide range of benefits for urban areas.¹

ERA Water has therefore requested that the Council endorses the request to install a booster pump within the City and that ERA Water work with staff to identify a suitable location for the booster pump and associated infrastructure.

OPTIONS

The Council can choose not to support the request from ERA Water to install a booster pump within the City, however, there are no specific issues or activities which present a financial or risk management issue for the Council to take this course of action and, on the basis that the booster pump will improve water pressure and volume which will improve the delivery of harvested stormwater for irrigation purposes in the network for existing sites and to ensure additional sites can be connected to the network it is recommended that the Council approves the request.

¹ <https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/water-and-river-murray/projects-plans-and-security/water-projects/alternative-water-supplies-efficiency-measures-program-grants>

CONCLUSION

There are a number of opportunities that ERA Water are considering to ensure the future growth and financial performance of ERA Water and therefore any infrastructure required to ensure these objectives can be met should be supported.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Council advises ERA Water that it endorses the installation of a booster pump and associated infrastructure at a suitable location within the City.
2. That the Council notes that staff will work with ERA Water to identify a location within the City for the installation of the booster pump, which may include Payneham Oval or Adey Reserve or an alternative location within the City.

Attachments – Item 13.11

Attachment A

ERA Water Request to Install a Booster Pump





27 March 2025

Mr Mario Barone
CEO
City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters
175 The Parade
NORWOOD SA, 5067

Via email: MBarone@npsp.sa.gov.au

Dear Mr Barone

Re: Siting of Booster Pump

At a meeting of the Board of ERA Water this morning it was resolved that I write to you seeking support in relation to installation of a booster pump in the section of the distribution network servicing the City of Burnside and the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

Increasing pressure and volume is a key aspect of improving the delivery of harvested stormwater for irrigation purposes in the network for existing sites and also to allow for additional sites to be connected. A booster pump has been identified by ERA Water's consulting engineers WGA as infrastructure required to achieve the increases in pressure and volume.

Payneham Oval and Adey Reserve at Firle have been identified as potential sites for the pump, recognising that there may be other suitable sites in the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters. A building measuring approximately 3m by 3m would be required to house the pump and associated pipe infrastructure. Access to electricity is required for the pump.

ERA Water would like to work with you to pursue the potential siting of the pump.

I am available to provide any further information or clarification required.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeff Tate', is shown within a light blue rectangular box.

Jeff Tate
Independent Chair

13.12 PROPOSED BY-LAWS

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Governance
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4593
FILE REFERENCE: qA166868
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to present the proposed *City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters By-laws* to the Council for endorsement, for the purpose of undertaking public consultation.

BACKGROUND

Section 246 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act), provides the statutory power for the Council to make By-laws. The general power to make By-laws is provided to the Councils for the good rule and government of the area, and for the convenience, comfort and safety of its community. By-laws are designed to address specific issues within a Council's local area or community that are not covered by broader laws, providing Councils with the power to respond to local needs and maintain order.

Section 247 of the Act, sets out the principles applying to By-laws which are made by a council. By-laws must:

- (a) *be consistent with the objectives of the provision that authorises the by-law and accord with the provisions and general intent of the enabling Act; and*
- (b) *adopt a means of achieving those objectives that does not—*
 - i. unreasonably burden the community; or*
 - ii. make unusual or unexpected use of the power conferred by the enabling Act (having regard to the general intent of the Act); and*
- (c) *avoid restricting competition to any significant degree unless the council is satisfied that there is evidence that the benefits of the restriction to the community outweigh the costs of the restriction, and that the objectives of the By-law can only be reasonably achieved by the restriction; and*
- (d) *avoid unreasonable duplication or overlap with other statutory rules or legislation; and*
- (e) *avoid regulating a matter so as to contradict an express policy of the State that provides for the deregulation of the matter; and*
- (f) *avoid breaching principles of justice and fairness; and*
- (g) *be expressed plainly and in gender neutral language.*

Pursuant to the Act, the Council is required to review and remove or replace (as necessary) its By-laws every eight (8) years. The current 2018 By-laws are therefore due to be reviewed to ensure the By-laws can be made and submitted to the South Australian Parliament for consideration by the Legislative Review Committee of Parliament in the required time frame to enable the new By-laws taking effect from January 2026.

Kelley Jones Lawyers was engaged to commence the By-law review process. In addition to reviewing the current six (6) By-laws, a proposed Cats By-law for the Council's consideration has been prepared.

The proposed By-laws which have been prepared as follows:

- By-law 1 - Permits and Penalties;
- By-law 2 - Moveable Signs;
- By-law 3 - Roads;
- By-law 4 - Local Government Land;
- By-law 5 - Dogs;
- By-law 6 - Waste Management; and
- By-law 7 – Cats

A copy of the proposed By-laws is contained within **Attachment A**.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
An Information Briefing Session on the proposed By-laws was provided to Elected Members on Monday, 14 March 2025.
- **Community**
As required by the legislation, the community will be consulted and provided with the opportunity to comment on the proposed By-laws.
- **Staff**
Consultation on the proposed By-laws has taken place with relevant staff.
- **Other Agencies**
The *proposed By-law 3 – Local Government Land* will be referred to the Minister for Transport and the *proposed By-law 5 – Dogs* and *By-law 7 - Cats*, will be referred to the Dog & Cat Management Board, as required by the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*.

DISCUSSION

The *Local Government Act 1999*, *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995* and *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*, provide powers for the Council in relation to By-laws for certain circumstances.

In addition to the legislative principles applying to By-laws pursuant to Section 247 of the Act, Section 248 provides the rules that need to be adhered to in relation to By-laws.

These are that a By-law made by a council must not:

- (a) exceed the power conferred by the Act under which the by-law purports to be made; or
- (b) be inconsistent with this or another Act, or with the general law of the State; or
- (c) without clear and express authority in this or another Act—
 - (i) have retrospective effect; or
 - (ii) impose a tax; or
 - (iii) purport to shift the onus of proof to a person accused of an offence; or
 - (iv) provide for the further delegation of powers delegated under an Act; or
- (d) unreasonably interfere with rights established by law; or
- (e) unreasonably make rights dependent on administrative and not judicial decisions.

The Council's existing 2018 By-laws have been reviewed and amended where relevant. The changes are not material and ostensibly relate to consistency in language between the By-laws and updated legislative requirements.

The proposed Cats By-law is new and has been prepared to provide an introductory framework for the management of cats within the City. It was envisaged that following the 2024 review of the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995* in 2024, there would be changes made to that Act which would facilitate a consistent approach to cat management across the State beyond micro-chipping and desexing however, this has not occurred. It is therefore essentially up to each Council to determine if additional management requirements are warranted in each Council area (i.e., registrations, curfews etc.).

While Cats By-laws that have been introduced by some Councils seek to confine or place a curfew on cats, given the additional costs and complexities associated with enforcement of these requirements, this Council's proposed Cats By-law, aims to promote responsible cat ownership within the City. It is important to note that the registration requirement for cats, contained in the proposed By-law, can only be implemented via a resolution of the Council to do so. This could be done at the time the By-laws are made or at a later date. As stated above, as the Cats By-law is new, it is considered that a gradual approach for the new By-law is the preferred way for the Council to proceed.

In summary:

- *By-law 1 – Permits and Penalties* provides a By-law to create a permit system for Council By-laws, to fix maximum and continuing penalties for offences, and to clarify the construction of Council By-laws;
- *By-law 2 – Moveable Signs* provides a By-law to set standards for moveable signs on roads and to provide conditions for the placement of such signs for the purpose of protecting visual amenity and public safety in the Council's area;
- *By-law 3 – Roads* provides a By-law for the management, control and regulation of activities on roads and other land in the Council's area;
- *By-law 4 – Local Government Land* provides a By-law to manage and regulate the access to and use of Local Government land and certain public places;
- *By-law 5 – Dogs* provides a By-law to limit the number of dogs kept on premises and for the management and control of dogs in the Council's area;
- *By-law 6 – Waste Management* provides a By-law to regulate the removal of domestic waste, recyclables and green organic waste from premises in the Council's area; and
- *By-law 7 – Cats* provides a By-law to limit the number of cats that can be kept on premises and for the management and control of cats in the Council's area through managing nuisance cats and a potential registration process.

The next stage of the process is to enable the community to provide comments on the proposed By-laws through the community consultation process.

In accordance with the Act, a minimum period of 21 days will be provided for the community consultation process.

Following the consultation process, the Council must give reasonable consideration to a written or other acceptable submission made to the council on a proposed By-law.

Prior to considering the making of the By-laws, a certificate will be obtained from Ms Burke, as Council's legal practitioner for this matter, which certifies the By-law in accordance with Section 249(4) of the Act.

It is proposed that the Council will make the By-laws at the Council Meeting to be held on 7 July 2025. In accordance with Section 249(3) of the Act a By-law cannot be made unless:

- (a) *the by-law is made at a meeting of the council where at least two-thirds of the members of the council are present; and*
- (b) *the relevant resolution is supported by an absolute majority of members of the council.*

Once the Council makes the By-laws, the By-laws are then published in the *SA Government Gazette* and in a newspaper circulating with the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters. A copy of the By-laws is also required to be forwarded to the Legislative Review Committee of the South Australian Parliament.

OPTIONS

The Council is required to review the By-laws in accordance with the legislative requirements. While the Council is not required to have By-laws, they play an important role in providing a regulatory framework when the legislation is deficient.

The Council may choose not to introduce a Cat By-law however as the proposed Cats By-law provides an introductory framework that encourages responsible cat ownership, it is recommended to proceed to introduce this By-law and seek feedback through the community consultation process.

CONCLUSION

The review of the Council's By-laws ensures compliance with the *Local Government Act 1999* and ensures that the Council's By-laws are still relevant and required.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the proposed City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters By-laws (as contained within Attachment A of this report), be endorsed for the purposes of community consultation:
 - By-law 1 - Permits and Penalties;
 - By-law 2 - Moveable Signs;
 - By-law 3 - Roads;
 - By-law 4 - Local Government Land;
 - By-law 5 - Dogs;
 - By-law 6 - Waste Management; and
 - By-law 7 - Cats
2. The Council notes that following the conclusion of the community consultation process, a report will be prepared for the Council's consideration.

Attachments – Item 13.12

Attachment A

Proposed By-Laws





City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

PERMITS AND PENALTIES BY-LAW 2025

By-law No. 1 of 2025

A By-law to create a permit system for Council By-laws, to fix maximum and continuing penalties for offences, and to clarify the construction of Council By-laws.

Contents

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY2

1. Title.....2

2. Authorising Law.....2

3. Purpose.....2

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry.....2

5. Application2

6. Interpretation.....2

7. Construction of By-laws Generally.....3

PART 2 – PERMITS AND PENALTIES.....3

8. Permits.....3

9. Offences and Penalties4

10. Liability of Vehicles Owners and Expiation of Certain Offences.....4

11. Evidence5

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY**1. Title**

This By-law may be cited as the *Permits and Penalties By-law 2025* and is By-law No. 1 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising Law

This By-law is made under section 246 of the Act.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are to provide for the good rule and government of the Council area, and for the convenience, comfort and safety of its inhabitants by:

- 3.1 creating a permit system for Council By-laws;
- 3.2 providing for the enforcement of breaches of Council By-laws and fixing penalties; and
- 3.3 clarifying the construction of Council By-laws.

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry

4.1 The following By-laws previously made by the Council are revoked from the day on which this By-law comes into operation¹:

*By-law No. 1 – Permits and Penalties 2018.*²

4.2 This By-law will expire on 1 January 2033.³

Note-

- 1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted pursuant to section 249(5) of the Act.
- 2. Section 253 of the Act provides that the revocation of a By-law by another By-law that contains substantially the same provisions, does not affect certain resolutions such as those applying a By-law to a part or parts of the Council area.
- 3. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazetting of the By-law.

5. Application

This By-law applies throughout the Council's area.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears:

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 6.2 **Council** means the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters; and
- 6.3 **person** includes a natural person or a body corporate; and
- 6.4 **prescribed offence** means an offence against a by-law of the Council relating to the driving, parking or standing of vehicles;

- 6.5 **road** has the same meaning as in the Act, being a public or private street, road or thoroughfare to which public access is available on a continuous or substantially continuous basis to vehicles or pedestrians or both and includes:
- 6.5.1 a bridge, viaduct or subway; or
 - 6.5.2 an alley, laneway or walkway; and
- 6.6 **vehicle** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961* and includes:
- 6.6.1 a motor vehicle trailer and a tram;
 - 6.6.2 a bicycle;
 - 6.6.3 an animal-drawn vehicle, and an animal that is being ridden or drawing a vehicle;
 - 6.6.4 a combination; and
 - 6.6.5 a motorised wheelchair that can travel at over 10 kilometres per hour (on level ground), but does not include another kind of wheelchair, a train, or a wheeled recreational device or wheeled toy.

Note-

Section 12 of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021* provides that an expression used in this By-law has, unless the contrary intention appears, the same meaning as in the Act.

7. Construction of By-laws Generally

- 7.1 Every By-law of the Council is subject to any Act of Parliament and Regulations made thereunder.
- 7.2 In any By-law of the Council and unless the contrary intention appears, permission means permission granted by the Council (or its delegate) prior to the act, event or activity to which it relates and includes:
- 7.2.1 permission granted specifically to an applicant; or
 - 7.2.2 permission of general application granted by way of the Council adopting a policy of general application for that purpose.

PART 2 – PERMITS AND PENALTIES

8. Permits

- 8.1 Where a By-law requires that permission be obtained, any person seeking the grant of permission must submit a written application to the Council in the form (if any) and accompanied by the fee (if any) prescribed by the Council.
- 8.2 The Council (or such other person as may be authorised by the Council) may attach such conditions as it thinks fit to a grant of permission and may vary or revoke such conditions or impose new conditions by notice in writing to the person granted permission.

- 8.3 A person granted permission under a By-law must comply with every such condition. Failure to do so is an offence (to the extent that it gives rise to a contravention of a By-law).
- 8.4 The Council (or such other person authorised by the Council) may suspend or revoke a grant of permission under a By-law at any time by notice in writing to the person granted permission.

9. Offences and Penalties

- 9.1 A person who acts in contravention of any By-law of the Council is guilty of an offence and may be liable to pay:
- 9.1.1 the maximum penalty, being the maximum penalty referred to in the Act that may be fixed by a By-law for any breach of a By-law; or
- 9.1.2 subject to any resolution of the Council to the contrary, the expiation fee fixed by the Act for alleged offences against By-laws, being a fee equivalent to 25 per cent of the maximum penalty fixed for any breach of a By-law.
- 9.2 A person who commits a breach of a By-law of the Council of a continuing nature is guilty of an offence and, in addition to any other penalty that may be imposed, is liable to a further penalty for every day on which the offence continues, such penalty being the maximum amount referred to in the Act that may be fixed by a By-law for a breach of a By-law of a continuing nature.

Note-

The maximum penalty for a breach of a By-law is prescribed by section 246(3)(g) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 246(5) of the Act expiation fees may be fixed for alleged offences against By-laws either by a By-law or by resolution of the Council. However, an expiation fee fixed by the Council cannot exceed 25 per cent of the maximum penalty for the offence to which it relates.

10. Liability of Vehicles Owners and Expiation of Certain Offences

- 10.1 Without derogating from the liability of any other person, but subject to this clause 10, if a vehicle is involved in a prescribed offence, the owner of the vehicle is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty or expiation fee as is prescribed for the principal offence.
- 10.2 The owner and driver of a vehicle are not both liable through the operation of this paragraph to be convicted of an offence arising out of the same circumstances, and consequently conviction of the owner exonerates the driver and conversely, conviction of the driver exonerates the owner.
- 10.3 An expiation notice or expiation reminder notice given under the *Expiation of Offences Act 1996* to the owner of a vehicle for an alleged prescribed offence involving the vehicle must be accompanied by a notice inviting the owner, if they were not the driver at the time of the alleged prescribed offence, to provide the Council or officer specified in the notice, within the period specified in the notice, with a statutory declaration:
- 10.3.1 setting out the name and address of the driver; or

- 10.3.2 if they had transferred ownership of the vehicle to another prior to the time of the alleged offence and has complied with the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* in respect of the transfer - setting out details of the transfer (including the name and address of the transferee).
- 10.4 Before proceedings are commenced against the owner of a vehicle for a prescribed offence, the Informant must send the owner a notice:
- 10.4.1 setting out particulars of the alleged prescribed offence; and
- 10.4.2 inviting the owner, if they were not the driver at the time of the alleged prescribed offence, to provide the Informant, within 21 days of the date of the notice, with a statutory declaration setting out the matters referred to in subclause 10.3.
- 10.5 Subclause 10.4 does not apply to:
- 10.5.1 proceedings commenced where an owner has elected under the *Expiation of Offences Act 1996* to be prosecuted for the offence; or
- 10.5.2 proceedings commenced against an owner of a vehicle who has been named in a statutory declaration under this section as the driver of the vehicle.
- 10.6 Subject to subparagraph 10.7, in proceedings against the owner of a vehicle for an offence against this paragraph, it is a defence to prove:
- 10.6.1 that, in consequence of some unlawful act, the vehicle was not in the possession or control of the owner at the time of the alleged prescribed offence; or
- 10.6.2 that the owner provided the Informant with a statutory declaration in accordance with an invitation given pursuant to this clause 10
- 10.7 The defence in paragraph 10.6.2 does not apply if it is proved that the owner made the declaration knowing it to be false in a material particular.
- 10.8 If:
- 10.8.1 an expiation notice is given to a person named as the alleged driver in a statutory declaration under this paragraph; or
- 10.8.2 proceedings are commenced against a person named as the alleged driver in such a statutory declaration,
- the notice or summons, as the case may be, must be accompanied by a notice setting out particulars of the statutory declaration that named the person as the alleged driver.
- 10.9 The particulars of the statutory declaration provided to the person named as the alleged driver must not include the address of the person who provided the statutory declaration.

11. Evidence

In proceedings for a prescribed offence, an allegation in an Information that:

- 11.1 a specified place was a road or local government land; or

- 11.2 a specified vehicle was driven, parked or left standing in a specified place; or
- 11.3 a specified vehicle was parked or left standing for the purposes of soliciting business from a person or offering or exposing goods for sale; or
- 11.4 a specified place was not formed or otherwise set aside by the Council for the purposes of the driving, parking or standing of vehicles; or
- 11.5 a specified person was an authorised person; or
- 11.6 a specified provision was a condition of a specified permit granted under paragraph 5 of this by-law; or
- 11.7 a specified person was the owner or driver of a specified vehicle; or
- 11.8 a person named in a statutory declaration under clause 10 of this by-law for the prescribed offence to which the declaration relates was the driver of the vehicle at the time at which the alleged offence was committed; or
- 11.9 an owner or driver of a vehicle for a prescribed offence was given notice under clause 10 of this by-law on a specified day,

is proof of the matters so alleged in the absence of proof to the contrary.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on **[INSERT DATE 2025]** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Office



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

MOVEABLE SIGNS BY-LAW 2025

By-law No. 2 of 2025

A By-law to set standards for moveable signs on roads and to provide conditions for the placement of such signs for the purpose of protecting visual amenity and public safety in the Council's area.

Contents

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY 2

1. Title..... 2

2. Authorising Law..... 2

3. Purpose..... 2

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry..... 2

5. Application 2

6. Interpretation..... 2

PART 2 – MOVEABLE SIGNS 4

7. Construction and Design 4

8. Placement 5

9. Appearance 6

10. Banners..... 6

11. Restrictions 6

12. Exemptions..... 7

PART 3 – ENFORCEMENT 7

13. Removal of Moveable Signs 7

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY**1. Title**

This By-law may be cited as the *Moveable Signs By-law 2025* and is By-law No. 2 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising Law

This By-law is made under sections 226, 238, 239 and 246 of the Act.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are to set standards for moveable signs on roads:

- 3.1 to protect the comfort and safety of road users and members of the public;
- 3.2 to enhance the amenity of roads and surrounding parts of the Council area;
- 3.3 to prevent nuisances occurring on roads;
- 3.4 to prevent unreasonable interference with the use of a road; and
- 3.5 for the good rule and government of the Council area.

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry

4.1 The following By-laws previously made by the Council are revoked from the day on which this By-law comes into operation¹:

*By-Law No. 2 – Moveable Signs 2018.*²

4.2 This By-law will expire on 1 January 2033.³

Note-

1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted pursuant to section 249(5) of the Act.
2. Section 253 of the Act provides that the revocation of a By-law by another By-law that contains substantially the same provisions, does not affect certain resolutions such as those applying a By-law to a part or parts of the Council area.
3. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazettal of the By-law.

5. Application

- 5.1 This By-law operates subject to the Council's *Permits and Penalties By-law 2025*.
- 5.2 This By-law applies throughout the Council's area and is subject to the exemptions set out in clause 12.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears:

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;

- 6.2 **authorised person** means a person appointed as an authorised person pursuant to section 260 of the Act;
- 6.3 **banner** means a strip of cloth, plastic or other material hung up or attached to a pole, fence or other structure;
- 6.4 **business premises** means premises from which a business is being conducted;
- 6.5 **Council** means the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- 6.6 **footpath** area means:
- 6.6.1 that part of a road between the property boundary of the road and the edge of the carriageway on the same side as that boundary; or
- 6.6.2 a footway, lane or other place made or constructed for the use of pedestrians and not for the use of vehicles;
- 6.7 **Local Government land** has the same meaning as in the Act, being land owned by the Council or under the Council's care, control and management;
- 6.8 **moveable sign** has the same meaning as in the Act, being a moveable advertisement or sign but excludes a banner;
- 6.9 **road** has the same meaning as in the Act, being a public or private street, road or thoroughfare to which public access is available on a continuous or substantially continuous basis to vehicles or pedestrians or both and includes:
- 6.9.1 a bridge, viaduct or subway;
- 6.9.2 an alley, laneway or walkway; and
- 6.9.3 the footpath area.
- 6.10 **vehicle** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961* and includes:
- 6.10.1 a motor vehicle trailer and a tram;
- 6.10.2 a bicycle;
- 6.10.3 an animal-drawn vehicle, and an animal that is being ridden or drawing a vehicle;
- 6.10.4 a combination; and
- 6.10.5 a motorised wheelchair that can travel at over 10 kilometres per hour (on level ground), but does not include another kind of wheelchair, a train, or a wheeled recreational device or wheeled toy.

Note-

Section 12 of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021* provides that an expression used in this By-law has, unless the contrary intention appears, the same meaning as in the Acts under which the By-law was made.

PART 2 – MOVEABLE SIGNS**7. Construction and Design**

A moveable sign must:

- 7.1 be of a kind known as:
 - 7.1.1 an 'A' frame or sandwich board sign;
 - 7.1.2 an 'inverted 'T' sign;
 - 7.1.3 a 'tear drop' sign;
 - 7.1.4 a flat sign; or
 - 7.1.5 with the permission of the Council (including as may be set out in a Council policy of general application from time to time), be a sign of some other kind;
- 7.2 be designed, constructed and maintained in good quality and condition (in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person) so as not to present a hazard to any member of the public;
- 7.3 be of strong construction and sufficiently stable or, subject to this By-law, securely fixed in position so as to keep its position in any weather conditions;
- 7.4 not contain any sharp or jagged edges or corners;
- 7.5 not, in the opinion of an authorised person, be unsightly or offensive in appearance or content;
- 7.6 be constructed of timber, cloth, metal, plastic or plastic coated cardboard, or a mixture of such materials;
- 7.7 not exceed 1 metre in height or 0.6 metres in depth and width;
- 7.8 in the case of a 'tear drop' sign, not exceed 2.4 metres in height or 0.6 metres in depth and width;
- 7.9 in the case of an 'A' frame or sandwich board sign:
 - 7.9.1 be hinged or joined at the top; or
 - 7.9.2 be of such construction that its sides are securely fixed or locked in position when erected; and
 - 7.9.3 not have a base area in excess of 0.6 square metres; and
- 7.10 in the case of an inverted 'T' sign, not contain struts or members that run between the display area and the base of the sign.

8. Placement

A moveable sign must not be:

- 8.1 placed on any part of a road other than the footpath area;
- 8.2 placed on a footpath that is less than 2.5 metres wide;
- 8.3 placed on the sealed part of a footpath unless the sealed part is wide enough to contain the sign and still leave a clear thoroughfare (of sealed footpath area) of:
 - 8.3.1 in the case of moveable signs placed on The Parade, Norwood, at least 2 metres between the sign and the building line or, where there is no building, the adjoining property boundary; and
 - 8.3.2 in all other cases, at least 1.5 metres between the sign and the building line or, where there is no building, the adjoining property boundary;
- 8.4 placed other than on the kerb side of the footpath area (or, if there is no kerb, on the side closest to the carriageway) but must not be placed closer than 0.5 metres to the kerb;
- 8.5 tied, fixed, leaned against or attached to, or placed closer than 1 metre from another structure, object (including another moveable sign, bus shelter, or business merchandise display), tree, bush or plant;
- 8.6 placed on the sealed part of a footpath if there is an unsealed part on which the sign can be placed in accordance with this By-law;
- 8.7 placed on a footpath adjacent a loading zone, bus stop or taxi rank;
- 8.8 placed on a landscaped area, other than landscaping that comprises only lawn;
- 8.9 placed within 10 metres of an intersection of two or more roads;
- 8.10 placed on a designated parking area;
- 8.11 displayed during the hours of darkness unless it is in a clearly lit area and is clearly visible; or
- 8.12 placed on a median strip, traffic island, roundabout or any other traffic control device on a road;
- 8.13 be placed in such a position or in such circumstances that, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person:
 - 8.13.1 it compromises the safety of any person or places a person at risk of harm; or
 - 8.13.2 it obstructs or impedes (or would be likely to obstruct or impede) a vehicle door when opened, provided that the vehicle is parked lawfully on a road; or
 - 8.13.3 otherwise interfere with the reasonable movement of persons or vehicles using the footpath or road in the vicinity of where the moveable sign is placed.

9. Appearance

- 9.1 A moveable sign placed on the footpath area of a road must, in the opinion of an authorised person:
 - 9.2 be painted or otherwise detailed at a competent and professional manner;
 - 9.3 be of such design and contain such colours which are compatible with the architectural design of the premises adjacent to the sign, and which relate well to the town scope and overall amenity of the locality in which it is situated;
 - 9.4 not have balloons, flags, streamers or other things attached to it; and
 - 9.5 not rotate or contain flashing parts.

10. Banners

A person must not erect or display a banner on a building or structure on a road without the Council's permission.

Note-

A person must not erect or display a banner on a public road for a business purpose without a permit from the Council issued under section 222 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

11. Restrictions

- 11.1 A person must not, without the Council's permission:
 - 11.1.1 cause or allow more than one moveable sign for each business premises to be displayed on the footpath area of a road at any time;
 - 11.1.2 display a moveable sign on or attached to or adjacent to a vehicle that is parked on Local Government land or on a road primarily for the purpose of advertising or offering for sale a product (including the vehicle) or business to which the sign relates; or
 - 11.1.3 cause or allow a moveable sign to be placed on a road unless:
 - 11.1.3.1 it only displays material which advertises a business being conducted on premises adjacent to the moveable sign or the goods and services available from that business; and
 - 11.1.3.2 the business premises to which it relates is open to the public during such times as the sign is displayed.
- 11.2 If in the opinion of the Council a road is unsafe for a moveable sign to be displayed, the Council may by resolution prohibit or restrict the display of a moveable sign on that road on such conditions as the Council thinks fit.

12. Exemptions

- 12.1 Subclauses 7.6, 8.4, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 11.1 of this By-law do not apply to a moveable sign that:
- 12.1.1 advertises a garage sale taking place from residential premises but provided that no more than six (6) moveable signs are displayed at any one time in relation to the garage sale taking place at that residential premises; or
- 12.1.2 is a directional sign to an event run by an Incorporated Association, a community organisation or charitable body.
- 12.2 Subclause 11.1 of this By-law does not apply to a flat sign which only contains a newspaper headline and the name of a newspaper or magazine.
- 12.3 A requirement of this By-law will not apply where the Council has otherwise granted permission (including by way of adopting a policy for this purpose) for the moveable sign (or class of moveable sign) to be displayed contrary to that requirement.

Note-

This By-law does not apply to moveable signs placed and maintained on a road in accordance with section 226(3) of the Act, which includes:

- a sign placed pursuant to an authorisation under another Act;
- a sign designed to direct people to the open inspection of any land or building that is available for purchase or lease;
- certain signs (as set out in section 226(3) of the Act) related to a State or Commonwealth election; or
- of a prescribed class.

PART 3 – ENFORCEMENT

13. Removal of Moveable Signs

- 13.1 A person must immediately comply with the order of an authorised person to remove a moveable sign that is made pursuant to section 227(1) of the Act.

Note-

Pursuant to section 227(1) of the Act, an authorised person may order the owner of a moveable sign to remove the sign from the road if:

- the design, construction or positioning of a moveable Sign does not comply with a requirement of this By-law; or
- any other requirement of this By-law is not complied with; or
- the Moveable sign unreasonably restricts the use of the Road or endangers the safety of other persons.

- 13.2 The owner of or other person entitled to recover a moveable sign removed by an authorised person pursuant to section 227(2) of the Act, may be required to pay to the Council any reasonable costs incurred by the Council in removing, storing, and/or disposing of the moveable sign before being entitled to recover the moveable sign.
- 13.3 The owner of, or other person responsible for a moveable sign must remove or relocate the moveable sign at the request of an authorised person:
- 13.3.1 if, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person, and not withstanding compliance with this By-law, there is any hazard or obstruction or there is likely to be a hazard or obstruction arising out of the location of the moveable sign; or

- 13.3.2 for the purpose of community events, special events, parades, roadworks or in any other circumstances which, in the reasonable opinion of the authorised person, require relocation or removal of the moveable sign to protect public safety or to protect or enhance the amenity of a particular locality.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the Council of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on **[INSERT DATE 2025]** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Officer

Proposed



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

ROADS BY-LAW 2025

By-law No. 3 of 2025

A By-law for the management, control and regulation of activities on roads and other land in the Council's area.

Contents

PART 1– PRELIMINARY	2
1. Title.....	2
2. Authorising Law.....	2
3. Purpose.....	2
4. Commencement and Expiry	2
5. Application	2
6. Interpretation.....	3
PART 2 – USE OF ROADS.....	4
7. Activities Requiring Permission	4
PART 3 – ENFORCEMENT	6
8. Directions	6
9. Orders	6
10. Removal of Animals and Objects.....	6
PART 4 – MISCELLANEOUS.....	6
11. Exemptions.....	6

PART 1– PRELIMINARY**1. Title**

This By-law may be cited as the *Roads By-law 2025* and is By-law No. 3 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising Law

This By-law is made under sections 239 and 246 of the *Local Government Act 1999* and regulation 28 of the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2013*.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are to manage, control and regulate certain uses of roads in the Council area:

- 3.1 to protect the convenience, comfort and safety of road users and members of the public;
- 3.2 to prevent damage to buildings and structures on roads;
- 3.3 to prevent certain nuisances occurring on roads; and
- 3.4 for the good rule and government of the Council area.

4. Commencement and Expiry

4.1 The following By-laws previously made by the Council are revoked from the day on which this By-law comes into operation¹:

*By-law No. 3 – Roads 2018.*²

4.2 This By-law will expire on 1 January 2033.²

Note-

1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted: section 249(5) of the Act.
2. Section 253 of the Act provides that the revocation of a By-law by another By-law that contains substantially the same provisions, does not affect certain resolutions such as those applying a By-law to a part or parts of the Council area.
3. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazettal of the By-law.

5. Application

- 5.1 This By-law operates subject to the Council's *Permits and Penalties By-law 2025*.
- 5.2 Subject to subclause 5.3, this By-law applies throughout the Council's area.
- 5.3 Subclause 7.3.1 of this By-law applies throughout the Council's area except in such part or parts of the Council area as the Council may determine by resolution in accordance with section 246(3)(e) of the Act.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears:

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 6.2 **animal** includes birds, insects and poultry but does not include a dog;
- 6.3 **authorised person** is a person appointed by the Council as an authorised person under section 260 of the Act;
- 6.4 **Council** means City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- 6.5 **effective control** means a person exercising effective control of an animal either:
- 6.5.1 by means of a physical restraint; or
- 6.5.2 by command, the animal being in close proximity to the person and the person being able to see the animal at all times;
- 6.6 **emergency worker** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic (Road Rules - Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2014*;
- 6.7 **moveable sign** has the same meaning as in the Act;
- 6.8 **road** has the same meaning as in the Act being, a public or private street, road or thoroughfare to which public access is available on a continuous or substantially continuous basis to vehicles or pedestrians or both and includes:
- 6.8.1 a bridge, viaduct or subway; or
- 6.8.2 an alley, laneway or walkway; and
- 6.9 **vehicle** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961* and includes:
- 6.9.1 a motor vehicle trailer and a tram;
- 6.9.2 a bicycle;
- 6.9.3 an animal-drawn vehicle, and an animal that is being ridden or drawing a vehicle;
- 6.9.4 a combination; and
- 6.9.5 a motorised wheelchair that can travel at over 10 kilometres per hour (on level ground), but does not include another kind of wheelchair, a train, or a wheeled recreational device or wheeled toy.

Note-

Section 12 of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021* provides that an expression used in this By-law has, unless the contrary intention appears, the same meaning as in the Acts under which the By-law was made.

PART 2 – USE OF ROADS

7. Activities Requiring Permission

A person must not engage in or undertake any of the following activities on a road (or where otherwise indicated, on other land) without the permission of the Council.

7.1 Advertising

Display or cause to be displayed on a road or on a structure on a road, any poster, advertising or sign for the purpose of advertising goods or services or for any other purpose, other than a moveable sign that is displayed in accordance with the Council's *Moveable Signs By-law 2025*.

Note-

Moveable signs on roads are regulated by sections 226 and 227 of the Act and the Council's *Moveable Signs By-law 2025*.

Section 226(2a) of the Act prohibits the display of certain electoral advertising posters displayed in connection with a Local Government election.

Section 226A(1) of the Act prohibits the display of a designated electoral advertising poster on roads and road-related areas (including any structure, fixture or vegetation thereon).

7.2 Amplification

Use an amplifier or other device whether mechanical or electrical for the purpose of amplifying or magnifying sound, including for the broadcasting of announcements or advertisements.

7.3 Animals

7.3.1 Cause or allow an animal to stray onto, move over, or graze on a road except for on a road to which the Council has determined this subclause applies (if any).

7.3.2 Subject to clause 7.3.1:

7.3.2.1 lead, herd, exercise or cause or allow an animal to stray onto or move over any road unless the animal is under effective control; or

7.3.2.2 lead, herd or exercise an animal in such a manner as to cause a nuisance or endanger the safety of a person.

7.4 Obstructions

Erect, install, place or maintain or cause to be erected, installed, placed or maintained any structure, object or material of any kind so as to obstruct a road, footway, water-channel, or watercourse in a road.

7.5 Preaching and Canvassing

7.5.1 Preach, harangue, or canvass for religious or charitable purposes; or

7.5.2 Convey any religious or other message to any bystander, passerby or other person.

7.6 Public Exhibitions and Displays

- 7.6.1 Sing, busk, play a recording or use a music instrument, or perform similar activities;
- 7.6.2 Conduct, cause or hold a concert, festival, show, display, public gathering, circus, performance or a similar activity;
- 7.6.3 Erect a stage or structure for the purpose of conducting or holding a concert, festival, show, circus, performance or a similar activity; or
- 7.6.4 Cause any public exhibition or displays.

7.7 Soliciting

Ask for or receive or do anything to indicate a desire for a donation of money or any other thing.

7.8 Shared Transport Devices

- 7.8.1 Subject to the *Road Traffic Act 1961*:
 - 7.8.1.1 operate a share transport device scheme; or
 - 7.8.1.2 leave a share transport device on a road other than in accordance with any conditions determined by the Council (including as may be set out in a policy from time to time) that are published on the Council's website.
- 7.8.2 For the purposes of this subclause 7.8:
 - 7.8.2.1 **share transport device** means a bike, scooter or other mobility device that is available for hire (for fee or otherwise) in the Council's area by members of the public in connection with a share transport device scheme, including through the use of a special purpose smartphone application; and
 - 7.8.2.2 **share transport device scheme** means a scheme operated in the Council's area which involves share bikes, scooters (dockless or otherwise) or other mobility devices being made available for hire by any person for a fee or otherwise.

7.9 Repairs to Vehicles

Repair, wash, paint, panel beat or perform other work of any nature on or to any vehicle, except for running repairs in the case of a vehicle breakdown.

7.10 Rubbish Bins

Deposit in any Council bin on a road any rubbish:

- 7.10.1 emanating from a domestic, commercial or trade source; or
- 7.10.2 that is not rubbish of the type permitted to be placed in the bin, as indicated on signs on the bin or in its vicinity.

PART 3 – ENFORCEMENT

8. Directions

A person on a road who, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person is committing or has committed a breach of this By-law, must immediately comply with an order of the authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act, which may include an order to leave that part of the road.

9. Orders

If a person does not comply with an order of an authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act in respect of a breach of this By-law, the Council may seek to recover its costs of any action taken under section 262(3) of the Act from the person to whom the order was directed.

Note-

Section 262(1) of the Act states:

*If a person (the **offender**) engages in conduct that is a contravention of this Act or a By-law under this Act, an authorised person may order the offender-*

- a) if the conduct is still continuing – to stop the conduct; and*
- b) whether or not the conduct is still continuing – to take specified action to remedy the contravention*

Subsections (2) and (3) of section 262 also provide that it is an offence to fail to comply with an order and that if a person does not comply, the authorised person may take action reasonably required to have the order carried out.

For example, an authorised person may order a person to:

- cease busking on a road;
- remove an object or structure blocking a footpath; or
- remove advertising displayed on a structure on a road.

10. Removal of Animals and Objects

10.1 The Council (or its delegate) may, pursuant to section 234 of the Act, remove an animal or object that is on a road in breach of a By-law if the Council (or its delegate) reasonably believes that no person is in charge of the animal or object.

10.2 The Council may seek to recover from the owner of an object removed under subclause 10.1 the costs it incurs in removing that object.

PART 4 – MISCELLANEOUS

11. Exemptions

11.1 The restrictions in this By-law do not apply to any emergency worker, Police Officer, Council Officer or employee acting in the course and within the scope of that person's normal duties, or to a contractor while performing work for the Council and while acting under the supervision or in accordance with a direction of a Council Officer.

11.2 The Council may otherwise, by notice in writing, on application or on its own initiative, exempt a person (or a class of persons) from the operation of a specified provision of this By-law.

11.3 An exemption:

11.3.1 may be granted or refused at the discretion of the Council;

- 11.3.2 may operate indefinitely or for a period specified in the instrument of exemption; and
- 11.3.3 is subject to any conditions specified in the instrument of exemption.
- 11.4 The Council may, by notice in writing, vary, revoke or add a condition of an exemption.
- 11.5 The Council may, in its discretion, revoke an exemption for a contravention of a condition of the exemption, or for any other reason it thinks fit.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on **INSERT DATE 2025** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Officer

PROPOSED



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAND BY-LAW 2025

BY-LAW NO. 4 OF 2025

A By-law to manage and regulate the access to and use of Local Government land and certain public places.

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY 2

1. Title..... 2

2. Authorising Law..... 2

3. Purpose..... 2

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry..... 2

5. Application 2

6. Interpretation..... 3

PART 2 – ACCESS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAND 5

7. Access 5

8. Closed Lands 5

PART 3 – USE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAND 5

9. Activities Requiring Permission 5

10. Prohibited Activities 12

PART 4 – ENFORCEMENT 15

11. Directions 15

12. Orders 15

13. Removal of Animals and Objects..... 15

PART 5 – MISCELLANEOUS..... 15

14. Exemptions..... 15

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY**1. Title**

This By-law may be cited as the *Local Government Land By-law 2018* and is By-law No. 4 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising Law

This By-law is made under sections 238, 239 and 246 of the *Local Government Act 1999* and section 18A of the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are to regulate the access to and use of Local Government land and certain public places:

- 3.1 to prevent and mitigate nuisances;
- 3.2 to prevent damage to Local Government land;
- 3.3 to protect the convenience, comfort and safety of members of the public;
- 3.4 to enhance the amenity of the Council's area; and
- 3.5 for the good rule and government of the Council's area.

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry

4.1 The following By-laws previously made by the Council are revoked from the day on which this By-law comes into operation¹:

*By-law No. 4 – Local Government Land 2018.*²

4.2 This By-law will expire on 1 January 2033³

Note-

- 1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted pursuant to section 249(5) of the Act.
- 2. Section 253 of the Act provides that the revocation of a By-law by another By-law that contains substantially the same provisions, does not affect certain resolutions such as those applying a By-law to a part or parts of the Council area.
- 3. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazettal of the By-law.

5. Application

- 5.1 This By-law operates subject to the Council's *Permits and Penalties By-law 2025*.
- 5.2 Subject to subclauses 5.3 and 5.4, this By-law applies throughout the Council's area.
- 5.3 Subclauses 9.3, 9.9.1, 9.23.2, 9.23.3, 9.25.2, 9.34, 10.4 and 10.10 of this By-law only apply in such part or parts of the Council area as the Council may, by resolution direct in accordance with section 246(3)(e) of the Act.

- 5.4 Subclauses 9.5.1, 9.13.2.2, and 9.23.1 of this By-law applies throughout the Council's area except in such parts of the Council area as the Council may by resolution direct in accordance with section 246(3)(e) of the Act.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears:

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 6.2 **animal** includes birds and insects but does not include a dog unless otherwise stated;
- 6.3 **authorised person** is a person appointed by the Council as an authorised person under section 260 of the Act;
- 6.4 **boat** includes a raft, pontoon or personal watercraft or other similar device;
- 6.5 **camp** includes setting up a camp or causing:
- 6.5.1 a tent or other structure of calico, canvas, plastic or other similar material;
- 6.5.2 a swag or similar bedding; or
- 6.5.3 subject to the *Road Traffic Act 1961*, a caravan, motor home or other vehicle—
to remain on Local Government land or a road for the purpose of staying overnight, whether or not any person is in attendance or stays overnight therein;

Note-

To avoid doubt, setting up a calico, canvas, plastic or other tent, marquee or similar structure for recreation purposes to provide shade during daylight hours only (and not overnight) is not within the meaning of 'camp'.

- 6.6 **Council** means the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- 6.7 **effective control** means a person exercising effective control of an animal either:
- 6.7.1 by means of physical restraint; or
- 6.7.2 by command, the animal being in close proximity to the person and the person being able to see the animal at all times;
- 6.8 **electoral matter** has the same meaning as in the *Electoral Act 1985* provided that such electoral matter is not capable of causing physical damage or injury to any person within its immediate vicinity;
- 6.9 **emergency worker** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic (Road Rules – Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2014*;
- 6.10 **funeral ceremony** means a ceremony only (i.e. a memorial service) and does not include a burial;
- 6.11 **liquor** has the same meaning as in the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*;
- 6.12 **Local Government land** means land owned by the Council or under the Council's care, control and management (except roads);

- 6.13 **offensive** includes threatening, abusive, insulting or annoying behaviour and offend has a complementary meaning;
- 6.14 **open container** means a container that:
- 6.14.1 after the contents of the container have been sealed at the time of manufacture:
 - 6.14.1.1 being a bottle, it has had its cap, cork or top removed (whether or not it has since been replaced);
 - 6.14.1.2 being a can, it has been opened or punctured;
 - 6.14.1.3 being a cask, it has had its tap placed in a position to allow it to be used;
 - 6.14.1.4 being any other form of container, it has been opened, broken, punctured or manipulated in such a way as to allow access to its contents; or
 - 6.14.2 is a flask, glass, mug or other container able to contain liquid;
- 6.15 **personal watercraft** means a device that:
- 6.15.1 is propelled by a motor; and
 - 6.15.2 has a fully enclosed hull; and
 - 6.15.3 is designed not to retain water if capsized; and
 - 6.15.4 is designed to be operated by a person who sits astride, stands, or kneels on the device;
- and includes the device commonly referred to as a jet ski;
- 6.16 **recreation ground** means Local Government land commonly used for playing sports or games, or accommodating the spectators at any sport or game, and any area of land contiguous thereto and used in connection with it.
- 6.17 **road** has the same meaning as in the Act being, a public or private street, road or thoroughfare to which public access is available on a continuous or substantially continuous basis to vehicles or pedestrians or both and includes:
- 6.17.1 a bridge, viaduct or subway; or
 - 6.17.2 an alley, laneway or walkway; and
- 6.18 **special event** means an organised gathering of more than fifty (50) persons for any social, sporting or cultural purpose;
- 6.19 **tobacco product** has the same meaning as in the *Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997*;
- 6.20 **vehicle** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961* and includes:

- 6.20.1 a motor vehicle trailer and a tram;
 - 6.20.2 a bicycle;
 - 6.20.3 an animal-drawn vehicle, and an animal that is being ridden or drawing a vehicle;
 - 6.20.4 a combination; and
 - 6.20.5 a motorised wheelchair that can travel at over 10 kilometres per hour (on level ground), but does not include another kind of wheelchair, a train, or a wheeled recreational device or wheeled toy.
- 6.21 **waters** includes a body of water, including a pond, lake, river, creek or wetlands under the care, control and management of the Council; and
- 6.22 **wheeled recreational device** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

Note-

Section 12 of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021* provides that an expression used in a By-law has, unless the contrary intention appears, the same meaning as in the Acts under which the By-law was made.

PART 2 – ACCESS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAND**7. Access**

The Council may:

- 7.1 close or regulate or restrict access to, any part of Local Government land to the public for specified times and days; and
- 7.2 fix charges or fees payable for entry onto any part of Local Government land.

8. Closed Lands

A person must not, without permission, enter or remain on any Local Government land:

- 8.1 which has been closed, or in respect of which access by the public is regulated or restricted in accordance with subclause 7.1;
- 8.2 where entry fees or charges are payable, without paying those fees or charges; or
- 8.3 where the land has been enclosed by fences and/or walls and gates that have been closed and locked or, where a sign is displayed at or near the entrance of the land notifying that the land has been closed.

PART 3 – USE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAND**9. Activities Requiring Permission****Note-**

Pursuant to section 238(3) of the Act, if a Council makes a By-law about access to or use of a particular piece of Local Government land (under section 238), the Council should erect a sign in a prominent position on, or in the immediate vicinity of, the land to which the By-law applies.

A person must not, without the permission of the Council, do any of the following activities on Local Government land (or where indicated on a road).

9.1 Advertising

Display, paint or erect or cause to be displayed, painted or erected, (including on a structure, building or fixture on the land) any sign, advertising or hoarding for the purpose of commercial advertising or any other purpose.

9.2 Aircraft

Subject to the *Civil Aviation Act 1988*, land any aircraft (including a helicopter) on, or take off any aircraft from the land.

9.3 Alcohol

Consume, carry or be in possession or in charge of any liquor on Local Government land comprising parks or reserves to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.

9.4 Amplification

Use an amplifier or other mechanical or electrical device for the purpose of amplifying sound or broadcasting announcements.

9.5 Animals

9.5.1 Cause or allow an animal to stray onto, move over, graze or be left unattended on except on any Local Government land to which the Council has resolved this clause applies and provided that the animal or animals are under effective control.

9.5.2 Cause or allow an animal to enter, swim, bathe or remain in any waters thereon.

9.6 Annoyance

Do anything likely to offend or unreasonably interfere with any other person:

9.6.1 using that land; or

9.6.2 occupying nearby premises;

by making a noise or creating a disturbance.

9.7 Attachments

Subject to subclause 9.1, attach or cause to be attached, hang or fix anything to a tree, plant, equipment, fence, post, structure or fixture on Local Government land.

9.8 Bees

Place a hive of bees on such land, or allow it to remain thereon.

9.9 Boats

Subject to the provisions of the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993* and the *Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law*.

- 9.9.1 launch or retrieve a boat to or from any waters to which the Council has resolved that this subclause applies;
- 9.9.2 hire out a boat or otherwise use a boat for commercial purposes; or
- 9.9.3 moor a boat on any waters or to a pontoon attached to Local Government land to which the Council has determined this subclause applies.

9.10 Bridge Jumping

Jump or dive from a bridge on Local Government land.

9.11 Buildings

Use a building, or structure on Local Government land for a purpose other than for its intended purpose and otherwise in accordance with any conditions of use contained on signage in or on the building or structure.

9.12 Burials and Memorials

- 9.12.1 Bury, inter or spread the ashes of any human or animal remains, including the remains of a dog.
- 9.12.2 Erect any memorial.

9.13 Camping and Tents

On Local Government land or on a road:

- 9.13.1 subject to this subclause 9.13, erect a tent or other structure of calico, canvas, plastic or similar material as a place of habitation;
- 9.13.2 camp, sleep overnight or occupy any caravan or other vehicle for or in connection with undertaking camping activities (including but not limited to washing, cooking, sleeping) except:
 - 9.13.2.1 in a caravan park (the proprietor of which has been given permission to operate the caravan park on that land); or
 - 9.13.2.2 on any Local Government land or road to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies (and thereby designates as a camping area) and only then, in accordance with any conditions determined by the Council and displayed on any signage on or near the Local Government land or road.

9.14 Canvassing

Subject to subclause 14.2, convey any advertising, religious or other message to any bystander, passer-by or other person.

9.15 Defacing Property

Deface, remove, paint, spray, write upon, cut names, letters or make marks on any tree, rock, gate, fence, object, monument, building, sign, bridge or property of the Council.

9.16 Distribution

Subject to subclause 14.2 and the *Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016*, give out or distribute any book, leaflet or other printed matter to any bystander, passer-by or other person.

9.17 Donations

Ask for or receive or indicate a desire for a donation of money or any other thing.

9.18 Encroachment

Erect or cause to be erected or placed any fencing, post or other structures or any other items so as to encroach onto the land.

9.19 Entertainment and Busking

9.19.1 Sing, busk or play a recording or use a musical instrument for the apparent purpose of either entertaining others or receiving money.

9.19.2 Conduct or hold a concert, festival, show, public gathering, circus, meeting, performance or any other similar activity.

9.20 Fires

Subject to the *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005* light a fire except:

9.20.1 in a place provided by the Council for that purpose; or

9.20.2 in a portable barbeque, as long as the barbeque is used in an area that is clear of flammable material for a distance of at least four (4) metres.

9.21 Fireworks

Ignite, explode or use any fireworks.

9.22 Flora and Fauna

Subject to the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* and the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*:

9.22.1 plant, damage, pick, cut, disturb, interfere with or remove any plant, tree or flower thereon;

- 9.22.2 cause or allow an animal to stand or walk on or drive a vehicle over any flower bed or garden plot;
- 9.22.3 deposit, dig, damage, disturb, interfere with, clear or remove any soil, sand stone, wood, clay, gravel, pebbles, timber, bark or any part of the land;
- 9.22.4 take, interfere with, tease, harm or disturb any animal, bird or marine creature or the eggs or young of any animal, bird or marine creature;
- 9.22.5 pick, collect, take, interfere with or disturb any fruit, nuts, berries or native seeds;
- 9.22.6 disturb, interfere with or damage any burrow, nest or habitat of any native animal or bird;
- 9.22.7 use, possess or have control of any device for the purpose of killing or capturing any animal, bird or marine creature; or
- 9.22.8 collect or take any dead wood or timber or burn any timber or dead wood;

with the exception that subclauses 9.22.4 and 9.22.7 do not apply to lawful fishing activities.

9.23 **Games and Sport**

- 9.23.1 Participate in, promote or organise any organised competition or sports distinct from organised social play except on Local Government land to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.
- 9.23.2 On Local Government land to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies, play or practise any game which involves kicking, hitting or throwing a ball or other object .
- 9.23.3 Engage or participate in or conduct any organised group fitness activity or training on Local Government land to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.
- 9.23.4 Play or practice the game of golf on Local Government Land other than on a properly constructed golf course or practice fairway and in accordance with any conditions determined by the Council (or its delegate) that apply to such play or practice.

9.24 **Interference with Land**

Interfere with, alter or damage the land (including a building, structure or fixture located on the land) including:

- 9.24.1 altering the construction or arrangement of the land to permit or facilitate access from an adjacent property;
- 9.24.2 erecting or installing a structure in, on, across, under or over the land;

- 9.24.3 changing or interfering with the construction, arrangement or materials of the land;
- 9.24.4 planting a tree or other vegetation on the land, interfering with the vegetation on the land or removing vegetation from the land; or
- 9.24.5 otherwise use the land in a manner contrary to the purpose for which the land was designed to be used.

9.25 **Model Aircraft, Boats and Cars**

Subject to the *Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998*:

- 9.25.1 fly or operate a model or drone aircraft, boat or model or remote-control vehicle in a manner which may, as determined by an authorised person acting reasonably, cause or be likely to cause injury or discomfort to a person being on or in the vicinity of the land or detract from or be likely to detract from another person's lawful use of and enjoyment of the land; or
- 9.25.2 fly or operate a model or drone aircraft, boat or model or remote-control vehicle on any Local Government land to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.

9.26 **Overhanging Articles**

Suspend or hang an article or object from a building, verandah, pergola, post or other structure where it might, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person:

- 9.26.1 present a nuisance or danger to a person using the land; or
- 9.26.2 cause an unsightly condition.

9.27 **Preaching**

Preach, harangue or solicit for religious or other purposes.

9.28 **Recreation ground**

Use or occupy a recreation ground:

- 9.28.1 in such a manner as to damage or be likely to damage the surface of the recreation ground or infrastructure (above and under ground level);
- 9.28.2 in a manner contrary to the purpose for which the recreation ground was intended to be used or occupied; or
- 9.28.3 contrary to any directions of the Council made by resolution and indicated on a sign displayed adjacent to the recreation ground.

9.29 **Rubbish Dumps and Rubbish Bins**

- 9.29.1 Interfere with, remove or take away any rubbish that has been discarded at any rubbish dump on Local Government land.

- 9.29.2 Remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging) that has been discarded in a bin, or placed on Local Government land for collection by the Council (or its agent).

9.30 Shared Transport Devices

Subject to the *Road Traffic Act 1961*:

- 9.30.1 operate a share transport device scheme;
- 9.30.2 leave a share transport device on Local Government land other than in accordance with conditions determined by the Council (including as may be set out in a policy from time to time) that are published on the Council's website (if any).
- 9.30.3 For the purposes of this subclause 9.28:
- 9.30.3.1 **share transport device** means a bike, scooter or similar that is available for hire (for fee or otherwise) in the Council's area by members of the public in connection with a share transport device scheme, including through the use of a special purpose smartphone application; and
- 9.30.3.2 **share transport device** scheme means a scheme operated in the Council's area which involves share bikes, scooters (dockless or otherwise) being made available for hire by any person for a fee or otherwise.

9.31 Trading

- 9.31.1 Sell, buy, offer or display anything for sale or hire or lease any goods, merchandise, commodity, article or thing.
- 9.31.2 Carry on any business or promote or advertise the same.
- 9.31.3 Set up a van or other vehicle, stall, stand, table or other structure, tray, carpet or device for the apparent purpose of buying, selling, offering, displaying or exposing for sale or the hiring or leasing of any goods, merchandise, commodity, article, service or thing.

9.32 Vehicles

- 9.32.1 Drive or propel a vehicle on Local Government land except on land constructed and set aside by the Council for that purpose as indicated by signs on or in the vicinity of the land.
- 9.32.2 Promote, organise or take part in a race, test or trial of any kind in which vehicles take part, except on land properly constructed for that purpose as indicated by signage on the land.
- 9.32.3 Repair, wash, paint, panel beat or carry out any other work to a vehicle, except for running repairs in the case of a breakdown.

9.33 Weddings, Functions and Special Events

- 9.33.1 Hold, conduct or participate in a marriage ceremony, funeral ceremony or special event.
- 9.33.2 Erect a marquee, stage or structure for the purpose of holding or conducting a wedding, funeral ceremony or special event.
- 9.33.3 Hold or conduct any filming where the filming is for a commercial purpose.

9.34 Wheeled Recreational Devices

Subject to the *Road Traffic Act 1961*, ride or operate a wheeled recreational device on Local Government land to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.

10. Prohibited Activities

A person must not do any of the following activities on Local Government land:

10.1 Animals

- 10.1.1 Cause or allow any animal to enter, swim, bathe or remain in any waters to the inconvenience, annoyance or danger of any other person bathing or swimming;
- 10.1.2 Cause or allow an animal to damage a flowerbed, garden plot, tree, lawn or like thing or place; or
- 10.1.3 Lead, herd or exercise a horse in such manner as to cause a nuisance or endanger the safety of a person.

10.2 Annoyances

- 10.2.1 Annoy, or unreasonably interfere with any other person's use of Local Government land by making a noise or by creating a disturbance that has not been authorised by the Council.
- 10.2.2 Spit, urinate or defecate other than in toilet provided thereon.

10.3 Equipment

- 10.3.1 Use any item of equipment, facilities or property belonging to the Council:
 - 10.3.1.1 other than in the manner and for the purpose for which it was designed, constructed or intended to be used;
 - 10.3.1.2 where any nearby sign states the conditions of use, except in accordance with such conditions; or
 - 10.3.1.3 in such a manner as is likely to damage or destroy it.
- 10.3.2 Use an item of equipment, facilities or property belonging to the Council if that person is of or over the age indicated by a sign or notice as the age limit for using such equipment, facility or property.

10.4 Fishing

Fish in any waters to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.

10.5 Glass

Willfully break any glass, china or other brittle material.

10.6 Interference with Permitted Use

Interrupt or unreasonably interfere with any other person's use of Local Government land where the person is using the land in a manner permitted by the Council or in accordance with any permission that has been granted by the Council.

10.7 Nuisance

Behave in such an unreasonable manner as to cause discomfort, inconvenience, annoyance or offence to any other person including by using profane, indecent or obscene language.

10.8 Obstruction

Obstruct:

10.8.1 any path or track;

10.8.2 any door, entrance, stairway or aisle in any building; or

10.8.3 any gate or entrance to or on Local Government land.

10.9 Playing Games

Play or practise a game or sport or participate in any form of recreation or amusement:

10.9.1 which is likely, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person, to:

10.9.1.1 cause damage to the land or anything on it; or

10.9.1.2 to endanger the safety of any person; or

10.9.2 in any area where a sign indicates that the game, sport or amusement is prohibited.

10.10 Smoking

Subject to the *Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997*, smoke, hold or otherwise have control over an ignited tobacco product on any land to which the Council has resolved this subclause applies.

10.11 Solicitation

Subject to subclause 9.27, tout or solicit customers for the parking of vehicles or for any other purpose whatsoever.

10.12 Throwing Objects

Throw, roll, project or discharge a stone, substance or other missile, excluding sport and recreational equipment designed to be used in that way.

10.13 Toilets

In any public convenience on Local Government land (including showers, changerooms, toilets and hand washing facilities):

10.13.1 urinate other than in a urinal or pan or defecate other than in a pan set apart for that purpose;

10.13.2 deposit anything in a pan, urinal or drain which is likely to cause a blockage or damage to the facility, or any drain, pipe or property associated with the facility;

10.13.3 use the facilities for a purpose for which it was not designed or constructed; or

10.13.4 enter any gender specific public convenience except:

10.13.4.1 if the person is of the gender indicated on a sign or writing located on the public convenience;

10.13.4.2 where the person is:

(a) a vulnerable person; or

(b) a caregiver, parent or guardian and is providing assistance to a vulnerable person in that person's care; or

10.13.4.3 for the purpose of providing assistance to a person with a disability; or

10.13.4.4 where the person identifies as gender diverse and is using the public convenience of the gender that the person identifies with; or

10.13.4.5 in the case of a genuine emergency.

10.14 Waste

10.14.1 Deposit or leave thereon anything obnoxious or offensive.

10.14.2 Deposit any rubbish other than in receptacles provided by the Council for that purpose.

10.14.3 Deposit in any rubbish bin:

10.14.3.1 any trash or rubbish emanating from a domestic, trade or commercial source; or

10.14.3.2 any rubbish contrary to any information on signs on the bin or in its vicinity.

PART 4 – ENFORCEMENT

11. Directions

11.1 A person on Local Government land must comply with a reasonable direction from an authorised person relating to:

11.1.1 that person's use of the land;

11.1.2 that person's conduct and behaviour on the land;

11.1.3 that person's safety on the land; or

11.1.4 the safety and enjoyment of other persons on the land.

11.2 A person who, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person, is likely to commit or has committed, a breach of this By-law must immediately comply with an order of an authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act which may include an order to leave that part of Local Government land.

12. Orders

If a person fails to comply with an order of an authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act in respect of a breach of this By-law, the Council may seek to recover its costs of any action taken under section 262(3) of the Act from the person to whom the order was directed.

Note-

Section 262(1) of the Act states:

*If a person (the **offender**) engages in conduct that is a contravention of this Act or a By-law under this Act, an authorised person may order the offender-*

a) if the conduct is still continuing - to stop the conduct; and

b) whether or not the conduct is still continuing- to take specified action to remedy the contravention.

Subsections (2) and (3) of section 262 also provide that it is an offence to fail to comply with an order and that if a person does not comply, the authorised person may take action reasonably required to have the order carried out. For example, an authorised person may order a person to:

- cease smoking on Local Government land;
- remove an object or structure encroaching on Local Government land;
- dismantle and remove a structure erected on Local Government land without permission.

13. Removal of Animals and Objects

An authorised person may remove an animal or object that is on Local Government land in breach of a By-law if the authorised officer reasonably believes that no person is in charge of the animal or object.

PART 5 – MISCELLANEOUS

14. Exemptions

14.1 The restrictions in this By-law do not apply to any Police Officer, emergency worker, Council officer or Council employee acting in the course and within the scope of that person's normal duties, or to a contractor while performing work for the Council and while acting under the supervision or in accordance with a direction of a Council officer.

- 14.2 The restrictions in subclauses 9.14 and 9.16 of this By-law do not apply to electoral matter authorised by a candidate and which is:
- 14.2.1 related to a Commonwealth or State election and occurs during the period commencing on the issue of the writ or writs for the election and ending at the close of polls on polling day;
 - 14.2.2 related to an election under the Act or the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999* and occurs during the period commencing four weeks immediately before the date that has been set (either by or under either Act) for polling day and ending at the close of voting on polling day; or
 - 14.2.3 related to, and occurs during the course of and for the purpose of a referendum.
- 14.3 The Council may otherwise, by notice in writing, on application or on its own initiative, exempt a person (or a class of persons) from the operation of a specified provision of this By-law.
- 14.4 An exemption:
- 14.4.1 may be granted or refused at the discretion of the Council;
 - 14.4.2 may operate indefinitely or for a period specified in the instrument of exemption; and
 - 14.4.3 is subject to any conditions specified in the instrument of exemption.
- 14.5 The Council may, by notice in writing, vary, revoke or add a condition of an exemption.
- 14.6 The Council may, in its discretion, revoke an exemption for a contravention of a condition of the exemption, or for any other reason it thinks fit.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on the **[INSERT DATE 2025]** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Officer



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

DOGS BY-LAW 2025

By-law No. 5 OF 2025

A By-law to limit the number of dogs kept on premises and for the management and control of dogs in the Council's area.

Contents

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY	2
1. Title.....	2
2. Authorising Law.....	2
3. Purpose.....	2
4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry.....	2
5. Application	2
6. Interpretation.....	2
PART 2 – LIMITS ON DOG NUMBERS	4
7. Limits on Dog Numbers in Private Premises.....	4
PART 3 – DOG CONTROLS	4
8. Dog exercise areas	4
9. Dog on Leash Areas	4
10. Dog Prohibited Areas	5
11. Dog Faeces.....	5
12. Dog obedience classes	5
PART 4 – EXEMPTIONS	5
13. Council May Grant Exemptions	5
PART 5 – ENFORCEMENT	6
14. Orders	6

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY

1. Title

This By-law may be cited as the *Dogs By-law 2025* and is By-law No. 5 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising Law

This By-law is made under section 90(5) of the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*, sections 238 and 246 of the Act, and section 18A of the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are to control and manage dogs in the Council area:

- 3.1 to reduce the incidence of environmental nuisance caused by dogs;
- 3.2 to promote responsible dog ownership;
- 3.3 to protect the convenience, comfort and safety of members of the public; and
- 3.4 for the good rule and government of the Council's area.

4. Commencement, Revocation and Expiry

4.1 The following By-laws previously made by the Council are revoked from the day on which this By-law comes into operation¹:

*By-law No. 5 – Dogs 2018.*²

4.2 This By-law will expire on 1 January 2033.³

Note-

1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted: section 249(5) of the Act.
2. Section 253 of the Act provides that the revocation of a By-law by another By-law that contains substantially the same provisions, does not affect certain resolutions such as those applying a By-law to a part or parts of the Council area.
3. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazettal of the By-law.

5. Application

- 5.1 This By-law operates subject to the Council's *Permits and Penalties By-law 2025*.
- 5.2 Subject to subclause 5.3, this By-law applies throughout the Council's area.
- 5.3 Clauses 9 and 10.3 of this By-law only apply in such part or parts of the Council area as the Council may, by resolution direct in accordance with section 246(3)(e) of the Act.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears:

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;

- 6.2 **approved kennel establishment** means a building, structure, premises or area approved under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* for the keeping of dogs on a temporary or permanent basis;
- 6.3 **assistance dog** means a dog trained and used for the purpose of assisting a person who is wholly or partially disabled;
- 6.4 **children's playground** means an enclosed area in which there is equipment or other installed devices for the purpose of children's play (or within 3 metres of such devices if there is no enclosed area);
- 6.5 **Council** means City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- 6.6 **dog** (except for in subclause 7.1) has the same meaning as in the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*;
- 6.7 **effective control** means a person exercising effective control of a dog either:
- 6.7.1 by means of a physical restraint (as defined under the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*); or
- 6.7.2 by command, the dog being in close proximity to the person and the person being able to see the dog at all times;
- 6.8 **keep** includes the provision of food or shelter;
- 6.9 **park** has the same meaning as in the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*;
- 6.10 **premises** includes land, whether used or occupied for domestic or non-domestic purposes;
- 6.11 **public picnic or barbeque area** means an area in a public place at which fixed cooking facilities and/or dining equipment (including chairs and tables) are located.
- 6.12 **small dwelling** means a self-contained residence that is:
- 6.12.1 a residential flat building;
- 6.12.2 contained in a separate strata unit or community title;
- 6.12.3 on an allotment less than 400 square metres in area; or
- 6.12.4 without a secure yard of at least 100 square metres in area;
- 6.13 For the purposes of clause 9 of the By-law, a dog is under **effective control by means of a leash** if the dog is secured to a leash, chain or cord that does not exceed 2 metres in length and:
- 6.13.1 the leash, chain or cord is either tethered securely to a fixed object; or
- 6.13.2 held by a person capable of controlling the dog and preventing it from being a nuisance or a danger to other persons.

Note-

Section 12 of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021* provides that an expression used in this By-law has, unless the contrary intention appears, the same meaning as in the Acts under which the By-laws was made.

PART 2 – LIMITS ON DOG NUMBERS**7. Limits on Dog Numbers in Private Premises**

- 7.1 Subject to subclauses 7.3 and 7.5, a person must not, without the Council's permission, keep, or cause, suffer or permit to be kept:
- 7.1.1 more than one dog in a small dwelling; or
 - 7.1.2 more than two dogs on any premises other than a small dwelling; or
- 7.2 For the purposes of subclause 7.1, **dog** means a dog that is three (3) months of age or older or, a dog that has lost its juvenile teeth.
- 7.3 Subclause 7.1 does not apply to:
- 7.3.1 approved kennel establishments operating in accordance with all required approvals and consents; or
 - 7.3.2 any other business involving the keeping of dogs provided that the business is registered in accordance with the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995* and operating in accordance with all required approvals and consents.
- 7.4 The Council may require that premises that are the subject of an application for permission to keep additional dogs are inspected by an authorised person for the purpose of assessing the suitability of the premises for housing dogs.
- 7.5 No dog is to be kept on any premises where, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person, there is no secure or appropriate area where a dog may be effectively confined.

PART 3 – DOG CONTROLS**8. Dog exercise areas**

Subject to clauses 9 and 10 of this By-law, a person may enter a park in the Council area for the purpose of exercising a dog under his or her effective control.

Note –

If a person is exercising a dog in a park as permitted under this clause and the dog is not under effective control as that term is defined by the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*, this gives rise to a dog wandering at large offence under section 43(1) of the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*, for which the owner of, or person responsible for, the dog may be liable.

9. Dog on Leash Areas

A person must not, without the Council's permission, allow a dog under that person's control, charge or authority (except an assistance dog that is required to remain off-lead in order to fulfil its functions) to be or remain on any Local Government land or public place (including a park) to which the Council has determined this clause applies, unless the dog is under effective control by means of a leash.

10. Dog Prohibited Areas

A person must not allow a dog under that person's control, charge or authority (except an assistance dog) to enter or remain:

- 10.1 on any children's playground on Local Government land;
- 10.2 within 15 metres of a public picnic or barbeque area; or
- 10.3 on any other Local Government land or public place to which the Council has determined this subclause applies.

11. Dog Faeces

No person is to allow a dog under that person's control, charge or authority to be in a public place or on Local Government land unless that person has in their possession a bag or other suitable container for the collection and lawful disposal of any faeces that the dog may deposit (for the purpose of complying with their obligation under section 45A(6) of the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*).

12. Dog obedience classes

No person will, without prior permission or approval of the Council, conduct dog obedience training classes on Local Government land.

PART 4 – EXEMPTIONS**13. Council May Grant Exemptions**

- 13.1 The Council may, by notice in writing, on application or on its own initiative, exempt a person (or a class of persons) from the operation of a specified provision of this By-law.
- 13.2 An exemption:
 - 13.2.1 may be granted or refused at the discretion of the Council;
 - 13.2.2 may operate indefinitely or for a period specified in the instrument of exemption; and
 - 13.2.3 is subject to any conditions specified in the instrument of exemption.
- 13.3 The Council may, by notice in writing, vary, revoke or add a condition of an exemption.
- 13.4 The Council may, in its discretion, revoke an exemption for a contravention of a condition of the exemption, or for any other reason it thinks fit.

PART 5 – ENFORCEMENT**14. Orders**

- 14.1 If a person engages in conduct that is in contravention of this By-law, an authorised person may, pursuant to section 262 of the Act, order that person:
- 14.1.1 if the conduct is still continuing – to stop the conduct; and
- 14.1.2 whether or not the conduct is still continuing – to take specified action to remedy the contravention.
- 14.2 A person must comply with an order made by an authorised person pursuant to section 262 of the Act.
- 14.3 If a person does not comply with an order of an authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act, the authorised person may take action reasonably required to have the order carried out, and the Council may seek to recover its costs of any action so taken from the person to whom the order was directed.
- 14.4 An authorised person may not use force against a person.

Note-

For example, an authorised person may order a person to:

- cease keeping more than the permitted number of dogs on that person's premises; or
- remove a dog from a dog prohibited area.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on **INSERT DATE 2025** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Officer



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

WASTE MANAGEMENT BY-LAW 2025

By-law No. 6 of 2025

A By-law to regulate the removal of domestic waste, recyclables and green organic waste from premises in the Council's area.

CONTENTS

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY	2
1. Title.....	2
2. Authorising law	2
3. Purpose.....	2
4. Commencement, revocation and expiry	2
5. Application	2
6. Interpretation.....	3
PART 2 – REGULATION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	4
7. Rubbish and Waste Collection	4
8. Provide Containers	4
9. Waste collection service	4
10. Obligations of occupiers.....	4
11. Unlawful interference with waste	6
PART 3 – ENFORCEMENT	6
12. Orders	6
13. Exemptions.....	6

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY**1. Title**

This By-law may be cited as the *Waste Management By-law 2025* and is By-law No. 6 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising law

This By-law is made under sections 238, 239 and 246 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, and regulation 28(b) of the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2014*.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are:

- 3.1 to prevent and suppress nuisances associated with the storage and collection of domestic waste and other waste;
- 3.2 to prevent damage to Council property and land;
- 3.3 to outline the requirements for the use of Council's domestic kerbside waste collection service;
- 3.4 to protect the convenience, comfort and safety of members of the public;
- 3.5 to enhance the amenity of the Council area; and
- 3.6 for the good rule and government of the Council area.

4. Commencement, revocation and expiry

- 4.1 The following By-laws previously made by the Council are revoked from the day on which this By-law comes into operation¹:

*By-law No. 6 – Waste Management 2018.*²

- 4.2 This By-law will expire on 1 January 2033.³

Note-

1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted (section 249(5) of the Act).
2. Section 253 of the Act provides that the revocation of a By-law by another By-law that contains substantially the same provisions, does not affect certain resolutions such as those applying a By-law to a part or parts of the Council area.
3. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazettal of the By-law.

5. Application

- 5.1 This By-law operates subject to the Council's *Permits and Penalties By-law 2025*.
- 5.2 This By-law applies throughout the Council's area.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears:

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 6.2 **authorised person** means a person appointed by the Council as an authorised person pursuant to section 260 of the Act;
- 6.3 **Council** means the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- 6.4 **crossover** means the portion of a road (usually connected to a driveway on private property) that provides vehicular access to adjoining land;
- 6.5 **domestic waste** means any kind of domestic waste generated from residences including, but not limited to, broken crockery, clothing, material, broken and cooking glass items, hoses, polystyrene, ropes, and soft plastics, but excludes building materials, effluent, liquids, metal, rocks, soil, lead acid batteries, wood and any toxic waste or other waste specified by the Council and noted on its website;
- 6.6 **domestic waste container** means a container for the disposal of domestic waste to be collected by the Council that is approved by the Council;
- 6.7 **emergency worker** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic (Road Rules – Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2014*;
- 6.8 **green organics** means compostable waste, and includes food waste, garden organic waste, paper towel or other materials for which permission has been given by the Council;
- 6.9 **green organics container** means a container to be collected by the Council for the disposal of Green Organics and that is approved by the Council for this purpose;
- 6.10 **Hard Waste** means any internal or external domestic items such as (but not limited to) fridges, and mattresses but excludes any waste or other items as may be specified by the Council and noted on its website;
- 6.11 **occupier** has the same meaning as in the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 6.12 **premises** means premises to which the Council's domestic waste collection service is made available;
- 6.13 **recyclables** means waste that can be recycled including newspapers, magazines, clean paper and cardboard, clean plastic containers of a type specified by the Council, clean tins and cans, clean glass and clean milk and juice containers but excluding any item specified by the Council and noted on its website;
- 6.14 **recyclables container** means a container for the disposal of recyclables to be collected by the Council that is approved by the Council;

- 6.15 **road** has the same meaning as in the Act being, a public or private street, road or thoroughfare to which public access is available on a continuous or substantially continuous basis to vehicles or pedestrians or both and includes:
- 6.15.1 a bridge, viaduct or subway; or
- 6.15.2 an alley, laneway or walkway;
- 6.16 **waste** means domestic waste, recyclables, hard waste, green organics or any other item being disposed of as it is no longer required; and
- 6.17 **waste containers** means domestic waste containers, recyclables containers and green organics containers or any other container used to store waste.

PART 2 – REGULATION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

7. Rubbish and Waste Collection

A person must not leave waste on a road or public place for collection by the Council or its agents except in accordance with this By-law or otherwise with the permission of the Council.

8. Provide Containers

An occupier of premises must keep on his or her premises a domestic waste container and a recyclables container.

9. Waste collection service

An occupier of premises may put domestic waste, green organics and recyclables out for collection by the Council or its contractors provided that:

- 9.1 the domestic waste, green organics and recyclables are contained within a waste container designated for that type of waste and that is approved by the Council;
- 9.2 the number of waste containers placed out for collection does not exceed the number permitted by the Council; and
- 9.3 the domestic waste, green organics and recyclables are placed as required by the Council (including in any location specified by the Council and in accordance with this By-law) and stated on the Council's website or as otherwise notified to the occupier by the Council in writing.

10. Obligations of occupiers

Every occupier of premises must:

10.1 Domestic waste

not place, cause, suffer or permit any waste other than domestic waste to be in a domestic waste container;

10.2 Recyclables

not place, cause, suffer or permit waste other than recyclables to be in a recyclables

container;

10.3 **Green Organics**

not place, cause, suffer or permit waste other than green organics to be in a green organics container; and;

10.4 **Damage**

immediately arrange for the replacement or repair of a waste container kept on the premises if the same becomes damaged or worn to the extent that:

10.4.1 it is not robust or watertight;

10.4.2 it is unable to be moved on its wheels efficiently when empty or full;

10.4.3 the lid does not seal the container when closed; or

10.4.4 its efficiency or use is, in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person, otherwise impaired ;

10.5 **Keep container clean**

cause each waste container kept on the premises to be kept in a clean and sanitary condition, maintained in good order and repair and kept watertight at all times;

10.6 **Sealing of container**

cause each waste container to be continuously and securely covered or sealed except when waste is being deposited in or removed from the container;

10.7 **Collecting services**

facilitate the collection and removal of waste from the premises by ensuring all waste containers containing waste for collection by the Council or its contractors are placed on the road for collection:

10.7.1 on the day appointed by the Council for the collection of waste from those premises or after 4pm the night before (and not before this time); and

10.7.2 in a position:

10.7.2.1 adjacent to the kerb (not on the carriageway) so that the front of the bin faces the road; and

10.7.2.2 not under the overhanging branches of any trees; and

10.7.2.3 if placed on a crossover, only on the part of a crossover (where it abuts the carriageway) that is closest to the edge of the crossover and not in the centre of the crossover or in any other place or manner that may reasonably be considered (in the reasonable opinion of an authorised person) to create a restriction or a danger for other pedestrians or vehicular access to the crossover; and

10.7.2.4 as may otherwise be required by the Council (including in any location specified by the Council) and stated on the Council's website or as otherwise notified to the occupier by the Council in writing;

10.8 **Removal of container**

not, without a reasonable excuse (as determined by an authorised person acting reasonably), fail to remove all waste containers from the road on the same day as the collection of Waste has occurred;

10.9 **Waste**

not place any waste container on the road for collection by the Council its agents or contractors unless the waste container contains only the type of waste that is permitted to be disposed of in that waste container; and

10.10 **Hard waste**

not place any Hard Waste on the road for collection by the Council its agents or contractors other than in accordance with any directions issued by the Council and notified to the occupier in writing or specified on the Council's website.

11. **Unlawful interference with waste**

A person must not, without the Council's permission, take or interfere with any waste that has been left on a road for collection by the Council, its agents or contractors.

PART 3 – ENFORCEMENT

12. **Orders**

If a person fails to comply with an order of an authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act in respect of a breach of this By-law, the Council may seek to recover its costs of any action taken under section 262(3) of the Act from the person to whom the order was directed.

13. **Exemptions**

13.1 The restrictions in this By-law do not apply to a Police Officer, emergency worker, Council officer or Council employee acting in the course of and within the scope of that person's normal duties, or to a contractor while performing work for the Council and while acting under the supervision of a Council officer.

13.2 The Council may, by notice in writing, on application or on its own initiative, exempt a person (or a class of persons) from the operation of a specified provision of this By-law.

13.3 An exemption:

13.3.1 may be granted or refused at the discretion of the Council;

- 13.3.2 may operate indefinitely or for a period specified in the instrument of exemption; and
- 13.3.3 is subject to any conditions specified in the instrument of exemption.
- 13.4 The Council may, by notice in writing, vary, revoke or add a condition of an exemption.
- 13.5 The Council may, in its discretion, revoke an exemption for a contravention of a condition of the exemption, or for any other reason it thinks fit.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on the **[INSERT DATE 2025]** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Officer

Proposed



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

CITY OF NORWOOD PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

CATS BY-LAW 2025

By-law No. 7 of 2025

A By-law to limit the number of cats kept on premises and for the management and control of cats in the Council's area.

CONTENTS

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY	2
1. Title.....	2
2. Authorising Law.....	2
3. Purpose.....	2
4. Expiry	2
5. Application	2
6. Interpretation.....	2
PART 2 – LIMITS ON CAT NUMBERS	3
7. Limits on Cat Numbers in Private Premises	3
PART 3 – CAT CONTROLS	4
8. Cats not to be a nuisance	4
9. Registration of cats	4
PART 4 – EXEMPTIONS	5
10. Council May Grant Exemptions	5
PART 5 – ENFORCEMENT	5
11. Orders	5

PART 1 – PRELIMINARY

1. Title

This By-law may be cited as the *Cats By-law 2025* and is By-law No. 7 of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters.

2. Authorising Law

This By-law is made under section 90 of the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995* and section 246 of the Act.

3. Purpose

The objectives of this By-law are to control and manage cats in the Council area:

- 3.1 to promote responsible cat ownership;
- 3.2 to reduce the incidence of public and environmental nuisance caused by cats;
- 3.3 to protect the comfort and safety of members of the public; and
- 3.4 for the good rule and government of the Council area.

4. Expiry

- 4.1 This By-law commences in accordance with the Act¹ and will expire on 1 January 2033².

Note-

1. Generally, a By-law comes into operation 4 months after the day on which it is gazetted: section 249(5) of the Act.
2. Pursuant to section 251 of the Act, a By-law will expire on 1 January following the seventh anniversary of the gazettal of the By-law.

5. Application

- 5.1 This By-law operates subject to the Council's Permits and Penalties By-law 2025.
- 5.2 This By-law applies throughout the Council's area.

6. Interpretation

In this By-law, unless the contrary intention appears;

- 6.1 **Act** means the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 6.2 except for the purposes of clause 8, **cat** means an animal of the species *felis catus* which is three months of age, or has lost its juvenile canine teeth;
- 6.3 **Council** means the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- 6.4 **effective control by means of physical restraint** means:
 - 6.4.1 a person is exercising effective control of a cat by means of a cord or leash that does not exceed 2 metres in length restraining the cat; or
 - 6.4.2 a person has effectively secured the cat by placing it in a cage, vehicle or other object or structure.

- 6.5 **keep** includes the provision of food or shelter;
- 6.6 for the purposes of clause 8, a cat (or cats) causes a **nuisance** if it:
- 6.6.1 unreasonably interferes with the peace, comfort or convenience of a person, including but not limited to a cat(s) displaying aggressive nature or creating unpleasant noise or odour; or
- 6.6.2 damages or otherwise has an adverse impact upon native flora or fauna; or
- 6.6.3 acts in a manner that is injurious to a person's real or personal property; or
- 6.6.4 wanders onto land without the consent of the owner or occupier of the land; or
- 6.6.5 defecates or urinates on land without the consent of the owner or occupier of the land;
- 6.7 **owner** of a cat has the same meaning as in section 5 of *the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*;
- 6.8 **the person responsible for the control of a cat** has the same meaning as in section 6 of the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*;
- 6.9 **premises** includes any land, (whether used or occupied for domestic or non- domestic purposes), and any part thereof; and

Note-

Section 14 of the Acts Interpretation Act 1915 provides that an expression used in this By-law has, unless the contrary intention appears, the same meaning as in the Acts under which the By-law is made.

PART 2 – LIMITS ON CAT NUMBERS**7. Limits on Cat Numbers in Private Premises**

- 7.1 Subject to this clause 7, a person must not, without the Council's permission, keep or cause, suffer or permit to be kept more than two (2) cats on any premises.
- 7.2 Subclause 7.1 does not apply to:
- 7.2.1 premises comprising a business involving the keeping of cats provided that the business is operating in accordance with all required approvals and consents;
- 7.2.2 a person who is keeping more than two cats on premises that the person occupies at the time this By-law comes into effect provided that:
- 7.2.2.1 details as required by the Council of the cats that are kept on the premises at that time are provided to the Council within three (3) months of the commencement of this By-law;
- 7.2.2.2 all the cats being kept on the premises are desexed;
- 7.2.2.3 no insanitary condition is being caused (or, in the opinion of an authorised person, is likely to be caused) by the cats or the keeping of the cats on the premises;
- 7.2.2.4 no nuisance is being caused (or, in the opinion of an authorised person, is likely to be caused) by the cats or by the keeping of the cats on the premises; and

- 7.2.2.5 no additional cats are acquired or kept on the premises over and above those cats notified to the Council in accordance with subclause 7.2.2.1 after the By-law commences operation.
- 7.3 The Council may require that premises that are the subject of an application for permission to keep additional cats are inspected by an authorised person for the purpose of assessing the suitability of the premises for housing cats.
- 7.4 Permission under subclause 7.3 may be given if the Council is satisfied that:
- 7.4.1 no insanitary condition exists or is likely to arise on the premises as a result of the keeping of cats; and
- 7.4.2 a nuisance is not or is not likely to be caused to any neighbour as a result of the keeping of cats on the premises.

PART 3 – CAT CONTROLS

8. Cats not to be a nuisance

- 8.1 An owner or occupier of premises is guilty of an offence if a cat (or cats) kept or allowed to remain on the premises causes a nuisance.
- 8.2 Without limiting liability under subclause 8.1, the owner of or person responsible for the control of a cat is guilty of an offence under this By-law if the cat causes a nuisance.
- 8.3 For the purpose of this clause 8, **cat** means an animal of the species *felis catus* (of any age).

9. Registration of cats

- 9.1 The Council may resolve to adopt a registration scheme for cats.
- 9.2 Where the Council has resolved to adopt a registration scheme for cats, a person must not keep a cat in the Council's area for more than 14 days unless the cat is registered in accordance with this By-law.
- 9.3 An application for registration of a cat must:
- 9.3.1 be made to the Council in the manner and form prescribed by Council (if any); and
- 9.3.2 be accompanied by the fee (if any) prescribed by the Council; and
- 9.3.3 nominate a person of or over sixteen (16) years of age who consents to the cat being registered in his or her name; and
- 9.3.4 identify with reference to an address the premises at which the cat is kept; and
- 9.3.5 otherwise comply with any other requirements determined by the Council.
- 9.4 Registration under this By-law remains in force until 30 June next following the grant of registration and may be renewed from time to time for further periods of up to twelve (12) months.
- 9.5 Subclause 9.2 does not apply to premises comprising a business involving the keeping of cats provided that the business is operating in accordance with all required approvals and consents an approved cattery.

Note–

An approved cattery is an example of a business involving the keeping of cats.

- 9.6 The Council may, by resolution, revoke a resolution to adopt a registration scheme under subclause 9.1 should it see fit to do so.

PART 4 – EXEMPTIONS

10. Council May Grant Exemptions

- 10.1 The Council may, by notice in writing, on application or on its own initiative, exempt a person (or a class of persons) from the operation of a specified provision of this By-law.
- 10.2 An exemption:
- 10.2.1 may be granted or refused at the discretion of the Council;
 - 10.2.2 may operate indefinitely or for a period specified in the instrument of exemption; and
 - 10.2.3 is subject to any conditions specified in the instrument of exemption.
- 10.3 The Council may, by notice in writing, vary, revoke or add a condition of an exemption.
- 10.4 The Council may, in its discretion, revoke an exemption for a contravention of a condition of the exemption, or for any other reason it thinks fit.

PART 5 – ENFORCEMENT

11. Orders

- 11.1 If a person engages in conduct that is in contravention of this By-law, an authorised person may, pursuant to section 262 of the Act, order that person:
- 11.1.1 if the conduct is still continuing – to stop the conduct; and
 - 11.1.2 whether or not the conduct is still continuing – to take specified action to remedy the contravention.
- 11.2 A person must comply with an order made by an authorised person pursuant to section 262 of the Act.
- 11.3 If a person does not comply with an order of an authorised person made pursuant to section 262 of the Act, the authorised person may take action reasonably required to have the order carried out, and the Council may seek to recover its costs of any action so taken from the person to whom the order was directed.
- 11.4 An authorised person may not use force against a person.

Note-

For example, an authorised person may order a person to:

- cease keeping more than the permitted number of dogs on that person's premises; or
- remove a dog from a dog prohibited area.

This By-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters held on the **INSERT DATE 2025** by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
MARIO BARONE
Chief Executive Officer

PROPOSED

13.13 REPRESENTATION REVIEW – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION & FINAL REPORT

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Governance
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4593
FILE REFERENCE: qA170713
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present to the Council the final *City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters Representation Report* (the Representation Report) for the purposes of making a submission to the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia, in accordance with the requirements of Section 12 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act).

BACKGROUND

As Elected Members are aware, the Council is required to conduct a review of its representation (Representation Review), at least once in each '*relevant period*' in accordance with Chapter 3 (Constitution of Councils), Part 1 (Creation, structuring and restructuring of councils), Division 2 (Powers of Councils and representation reviews) of the Act.

As prescribed by Regulation 4 of the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2013* and as determined by the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia, the '*relevant period*' for the Council's Representation Review is April 2024 - April 2025.

The Council's preferred structure, including the number of Councillors, number and distribution of Wards and the names of these Wards, forms the basis for the Representation Report. The Representation Report summarises the review process undertaken by the Council, the key issues considered and the consultation undertaken with the community.

The Electoral Commissioner will determine whether the requirements of Section 12 of the Act have been satisfied and then certify the structure prior to gazettal.

Any new structure will take effect at the next Local Government Election to be held in November 2026.

The final Representation Report is contained in **Attachment A**.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

This matter has been considered at various Information Briefing Sessions (29 April 2024, 22 May 2024 and 12 August 2024) and Council Meetings (5 February 2024, 5 August 2024, 2 September 2024 and 8 October 2024).

- **Community**

Community consultation has been undertaken in accordance with Section 12(7) of the Act and the Council's Community Consultation Policy.

- **Staff**

Not Applicable.

- **Other Agencies**

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

At its meeting held on 5 August 2024, the Council determined by resolution, its preferred structure which provides for a Mayor and eleven (11) Councillors with four (4) Wards with Wards 1,3, and 4 each being represented by three (3) Councillors and the proposed Ward 2 being represented by two (2) Councillors.

At its meeting held on 8 October 2024, the Council noted the draft *Representation Report* which was prepared on the basis of the Council's preferred structure and also determined by resolution its preferred Ward names as follows:

- Ward 1 – Payneham / Felixstow Ward
- Ward 2 – St Peters / Kent Town Ward
- Ward 3 – Trinity / Maylands Ward
- Ward 4 – Kensington / Norwood Ward

The Council endorsed the draft *Representation Report* for consultation which was undertaken from Monday, 21 October 2024 to Friday, 15 November 2024. In accordance with the requirements of Section 12(7) of the Act, the process for the consultation was based on the Council's Community Consultation Policy.

Since the Council undertook its last Representation Review in 2017, the Act has significantly changed the way that a Representation Review is to be conducted and separate changes to the Act reduced the display requirements for Council documents. In accordance with the legislative requirements and the Council's Community Consultation Policy, an advertisement was placed in The Advertiser and in the Council's Latest News section of the Council's website and for viewing at the Norwood Town Hall.

There was one (1) submission received during the consultation period. This submission supported the preferred structure proposed by the Council.

As Elected Members will recall, at the conclusion of the consultation period it was identified that The Advertiser Notice had not been published on the date that was requested by staff and as that is the trigger date for the required three (3) weeks consultation period, the required duration of consultation was not met.

A new consultation period therefore commenced on 6 January 2025 and concluded on 31 January 2025. In accordance with the legislative requirements and the Council's *Community Consultation Policy*, an advertisement was placed in The Advertiser and in the Council's Latest News section of the Council's website and for viewing at the Norwood Town Hall. In addition, posters were put up in the Council's Libraries. There were no further submissions received during this second consultation period.

Chapter 5 of the draft *Representation Report* summarises the consultation undertaken.

The draft *Representation Report* also summarises the process of the review and sets out how the proposal that has been endorsed by the Council, has been considered in accordance with the legislative requirements. Section 12(6) of the Act requires that the draft *Representation Report* must include:

- an examination of the advantages and disadvantages of various structure options that are available to the Council and in particular, examines a reduction in the number of Elected Members and whether the division of the Local Government Area into Wards should be retained or abolished; and
- the proposed structure that the Council considers should be in place based on an analysis of how the proposal relates to the principles in Section 26(1)(c) and the matters referred to in Section 33 of the Act (which are summarised below).

The principles of Section 26(1)(c) of the Act are summarised below:

- Resources available to local communities should be used as economically as possible while recognising the desirability of avoiding divisions within a community.
- Proposed changes to the Council's structure should, wherever practicable, benefit ratepayers.
- The Council should have a sufficient resource base to fulfill functions fairly, effectively and efficiently, and offer a reasonable range of services on an efficient, flexible, equitable and responsive basis.
- Council should facilitate effective planning and sustainable development within its area, and the protection of the environment.
- Council should have a structure that reflects communities of interest of an economic, recreational, social, regional or other kind and be consistent with community structures, values, expectations and aspirations.
- Ensure local communities can participate effectively in decisions about local matters.
- Residents should receive adequate and fair representation, while over-representation in comparison with Councils of a comparable size and type should be avoided.

Section 33 of the Act relates to *Ward Quotas* which is the number of electors within a Ward, divided by the number of Ward Councillors. The '*elector ratio*' for a Local Government Area is the total number of electors divided by the number of Councillors (the Mayor is excluded from this calculation). Section 33(2) of the Act requires that any proposal which relates to the formation or alteration of Wards must observe the principle that the number of electors represented by a Councillor must not vary from the Ward quota by more than +/- 10%.

Section 33(1) provides the following matters which must also be considered in the preparation of a proposal that relates to Wards:

- the desirability of reflecting communities of interest of an economic, social, regional or other kind;
- the population of the area, and of each ward affected or envisaged by the proposal;
- the topography of the area, and of each ward affected or envisaged by the proposal;
- the feasibility of communication between electors affected by the proposal and their elected representatives;
- the nature of substantial demographic changes that may occur in the foreseeable future; and
- the need to ensure adequate and fair representation while at the same time avoiding over-representation in comparison to other councils of a similar size and type (at least in the longer term).

OPTIONS

The Council can resolve not to endorse the Representation Report for submission to the Electoral Commissioner. This would result in the Representation Review process recommencing and would be completed within the timeframe stipulated by the Electoral Commission.

This is not the recommended option. In this respect, the process that has been undertaken has taken into account all of the relevant issues and has considered all of the relevant options.

CONCLUSION

The Council's Representation Review has been undertaken in accordance with the legislative requirements.

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

1. That taking into consideration the representation review process and the community consultation that has been undertaken, the following structure of the Council be endorsed:
 - the Council comprise a Mayor and eleven (11) Ward Councillors; and
 - the Council area be divided into four (4) Wards with:
 - Ward 1 to be named Payneham / Felixstow Ward and to be represented by three (3) Councillors;
 - Ward 2 to be named St Peters / Kent Town Ward and to be represented by two (2) Councillors;
 - Ward 3 to be named Trinity / Maylands Ward and to be represented by three (3) Councillors; and
 - Ward 4 to be named Kensington / Norwood Ward and to be represented by three (3) Councillors.
2. That pursuant to Section 12(11a) and 12(12) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Council endorses the draft *City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters Representation Report*, contained in Attachment A, for submission to the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia, noting the required appendices will be included prior to the submission of the report.

Attachments – Item 13.13

Attachment A

Representation Review Community Consultation & Final Report





Final Representation Report

to the Electoral Commissioner

2024 - 2025

(Section 12(12) of the *Local Government Act 1999*)



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

Copyright

No part of this document may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means without the prior written consent of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters or C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd.

Table of Contents

- 1. INTRODUCTION 1**
- 2. BACKGROUND 2**
- 3. PROPOSAL 5**
- 4. REVIEW PROCESS 7**
- 5. PUBLIC CONSULTATION 10**
- 6. PROPOSAL RATIONALE 12**
 - 6.1 Composition and Structure of Council 12
 - 6.1.1 Principal Member..... 12
 - 6.1.2 Number of Councillors..... 12
 - 6.1.3 Wards/No Wards 13
 - 6.1.4 Proposed Ward Structure 14
 - 6.1.5 Area Councillors (in addition to Ward Councillors) 15
 - 6.1.6 Ward Identification/Titles 15
 - 6.2 Local Government Act 1999..... **16**
 - 6.2.1 Quota..... 16
 - 6.2.2 Communities of Interest..... 16
 - 6.2.3 Population and Demographic Trends..... 16
 - 6.2.4 Topography..... 17
 - 6.2.5 Communication 18
- 7. CONCLUSION 19**

1. Introduction

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 12 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act), the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has undertaken a review of all aspects of its composition and structure so as to determine whether the community would benefit from any alterations thereto. It is the intent of Council that the arrangement which it now proposes will formally come into effect at the next scheduled Local Government Election in November 2026.

Section 12(4) of the Act states: *"A review may relate to a specific aspect of the composition of the council, or of the wards of the council, or may relate to those matters generally – but a council must ensure that all aspects of the composition of the council, and the issue of the division, or potential division, of the area of the council into wards, are comprehensively reviewed under this section at least once in each relevant period that is prescribed by the regulations"*.

In keeping with the aforementioned requirements of the Act, the key issues considered during the course of the review included:

- whether the number of Elected Members should be reduced or increased;
- whether the Council area should continue to be divided into wards, or whether wards should be abolished;
- potential future ward structures, including the names/titles of the proposed wards and the level of ward representation; and
- the need for Area Councillors in addition to Ward Councillors (under a ward structure).


This report is presented for consideration in accordance with the provisions of Section 12(12) of the Act. It provides details pertaining to the review process; the public consultation undertaken by the Council (and all documents relevant thereto); the proposal which the Council intends to carry into effect; and the rationale behind the Council's decisions.

2. Background

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters covers approximately 15.1km²; and had an estimated resident population of 39,312 as at 30 June 2023. According to the Electoral Commission SA, there were 26,079 eligible electors within the Council area as at 31 January 2025, this equating to an elector ratio of 1:2,006.

The Council area is currently divided into six (6) wards, as described hereinafter and depicted on Map 1. One ward (Maylands/Trinity) is represented by three (3) Ward Councillors, and each of the remaining five (5) wards are represented by two (2) Ward Councillors. The Mayor is the fourteenth and Principal Member of the Council. This arrangement formally came into effect at the Local Government Elections in November 2018.

Map 1: Current Ward Structure



The existing wards are described as follows.

- St Peters Ward comprises the suburbs of Joslin, St Peters and College Park.
- Torrens Ward comprises the suburbs of Felixstow, Marden and Royston Park.
- Payneham Ward comprises the suburbs of Payneham and Glynde, and parts of the suburbs of Firle and Payneham South.
- Maylands/Trinity Ward comprises the suburbs of the Stepney, Maylands, Evandale, St Morris and Trinity Gardens, and parts of the suburbs of Firle and Payneham South.
- West Norwood/Kent Town Ward comprises the suburbs of Hackney and Kent Town, and part of the suburb of Norwood.
- Kensington/East Norwood Ward comprises the suburbs of Kensington, Marryatville and Heathpool, and part of the suburb of Norwood.

The distribution of electors between the existing wards is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Elector Numbers and Ratios for the Existing Wards.

Ward	Crs	H of A Roll	Council Roll	Electors	Ratio	% Variance
St Peters	2	3,807	0	3,807	1:1,904	- 5.11
Torrens	2	4,276	4	4,280	1:2,140	+6.68
Payneham	2	3,895	4	3,899	1:1,950	- 2.82
Maylands/Trinity	3	5,975	3	5,978	1:1,994	- 0.67
West Norwood/Kent Town	2	4,269	10	4,278	1:2,139	+6.63
Kensington/East Norwood	2	3,829	8	3,837	1:1,919	- 4.37
Total	13	26,050	29	26,079		
Average					1:2,006	

Source: Electoral Commission SA, 31st January 2025

Whilst the elector ratios in each of the existing wards still lay within the specified quota tolerance limits, the existing composition of the Council is at odds with the “members cap” specified under Section 11A of the Act (refer 6.1.2 Number of Councillors, page 12).

The Council commenced its review on 29 April 2024 with an initial briefing of the Elected Members on matters relevant to the review. A subsequent Information Briefing session was conducted on 22 May 2024 at which time the Elected Members further discussed matters relevant to the review; and considered a Discussion Paper which provided further information, including potential ward structure options. Key issues of discussion included:

- the “member cap” specified under Section 11A of the Act;
- the continued division of the Council area into wards, as opposed to the abolition of wards;
- the number of Elected Members required to provide adequate and fair representation;

- the provisions of Sections 26(1)(c) and 33 of the Act, in particular the requirement to avoid over-representation in comparison with Councils of a similar size and type; and
- the anticipated population growth over coming years, and the likely impacts thereof upon elector representation across the Council area.

At its meeting on the 5th August 2024 Council identified the preferred (in principle) option in respect to its future composition and ward structure.

Public consultation was undertaken during the period Monday, 21 October 2024 to Friday, 15 November 2024; and then again during the period Monday, 6 January 2025 to Friday, 31 January 2025.

The review process concluded on Monday, 7 April 2025, at which time the Council resolved to amend its elector representation arrangements, as outlined herein.

3. Proposal

Having duly considered all relevant provisions of the Act and considerable information pertaining to the primary issues pertaining to the review, the Council proposes the following in respect to its future composition and structure.

- The Principal Member of Council will be a Mayor elected by the community (as per the requirements of Section 51 of the Act).
- The future elected body of the Council will comprise the Mayor and eleven (11) ward Councillors.
- The Council area will be divided into four (4) wards, as depicted in Map 2 and described hereinafter.

Ward 1: Comprising the suburbs of Marden, Felixstow, Royston Park, Payneham and Glynde.

Ward 2: Comprising the suburbs of Joslin, St Peters, College Park, Hackney and Kent Town.

Ward 3: Comprising the suburbs of Firle, Payneham South, Evandale, Stepney, Maylands, Trinity Gardens and St Morris.

Ward 4: Comprising the suburbs of Norwood, Kensington, Marryatville and Heathpool.

- The proposed wards be identified as Payneham/Felixstow Ward (Ward 1); St Peters/Kent Town Ward (Ward 2); Trinity/Maylands Ward (Ward 3); and Kensington/Norwood Ward (Ward 4).
- Proposed Wards 1, 3 and 4 (i.e. proposed Payneham/Felixstow Ward, Trinity/Maylands Ward and Kensington/Norwood Ward) will each be represented by three (3) Ward Councillors, whilst proposed Ward 2 (St Peters/Kent Town Ward) is to be represented by two (2) Ward Councillors.


The distribution of electors between the proposed wards is detailed in Table 2, and the reasons for Council's decisions, together with an analysis of compliance with the relevant provisions and requirements of the Act, are provided hereinafter.

Table 2: Elector distribution between proposed wards.

Ward	Councillors	Electors	Ratio	% Variance
Ward 1	3	7,205	1:2,402	+3.56
Ward 2	2	4,958	1:2,479	+6.89
Ward 3	3	6,672	1:2,224	- 4.10
Ward 4	3	6,676	1:2,225	- 4.05
Total	11	25,511		
Average			1:2,319	

Source: Electoral Commission SA, 31st January 2025
 NB This data does not include Silent Electors (568)

Map 2: Proposed Ward Structure



4. Review Process

The following is a chronology of the review process undertaken by the Council.

Date	Event
9 February 2024	C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd was appointed to assist Council with the conduct of the review.
29 April 2024	C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd conducted an Information Briefing session with the Elected Members of the Council and discussed the key issues of the review, as outlined in the Information Paper. Refer Information Paper – Appendix A.
22 May 2024	C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd conducted an Information Briefing session with the Elected Members of the Council based on a circulated Discussion Paper. Refer Discussion Paper – Appendix B.
5 August 2024	The Council resolved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to receive and note a Supplementary Discussion Paper dated July 2024; • that Option A (4 Wards, 11 Councillors) be endorsed as the structure to be included in the Representation Report. Refer Supplementary Discussion Paper – Appendix C; Agenda Item and Minutes – Appendix D.
8 October 2024	The Council resolved that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward 1 be identified as Payneham/Felixstow Ward; • Ward 2 be identified as St Peters/Kent Town Ward; • Ward 3 be identified as Trinity/Maylands Ward; • Ward 4 be identified as Kensington/Norwood Ward; and • the draft Representation Report be endorsed for the purpose of undertaking community consultation. Refer Representation Report – Appendix E; Council Agenda and Minutes – Appendix F; Community Consultation Policy – Appendix G.

Date	Event
21 October 2024	<p>An article pertaining to the review was placed in the Council's digital online magazine 'Look East'.</p> <p>Refer copy of article – Appendix H.</p>
21 October 2024	<p>Information pertaining to the review was provided via the Council's social media (Facebook).</p> <p>Refer copy of social media post – Appendix I.</p>
21 October 2024	<p>Information pertaining to the review was provided on the Council's website home page and consultation page.</p> <p>Refer copy of website page – Appendix J.</p>
7 November 2024	<p>A public notice was published in "The Advertiser" newspaper advising that the review was being undertaken and seeking written submissions by Friday, 15 November 2025.</p> <p>Refer copy of notice – Appendix K.</p>
15 November 2024	<p>At the close of the initial public consultation stage, one (1) written submission had been received by Council.</p> <p>Refer copy of submission - Appendix L.</p>
6 January 2025	<p>A public notice was published in "The Advertiser" newspaper advising that the review was being undertaken and seeking written submissions by Friday, 31 January 2025.</p> <p>Refer copy of notice – Appendix M.</p>
6 January 2025	<p>An article pertaining to the review was placed on Council's digital online magazine 'Look East'.</p> <p>Refer copy of article – Appendix N.</p>
6 January 2025	<p>Information pertaining to the review was provided via Council's social media (Facebook).</p> <p>Refer copy of social media post – Appendix O.</p>
6 January 2025	<p>Information pertaining to the review was provided on Council's website home page and consultation page.</p> <p>Refer copy of website page – Appendix P.</p>

Date	Event
October 2024 – December 2024 and January 2025	A copy of the Representation Report was available for viewing at the Norwood Town Hall Customer Centre and at the St Peters, Payneham and Norwood Library.
31 January 2025	At the close of the additional public consultation stage, no written submissions had been received by the Council.
7 April 2025	<p>The Council resolved to amend its elector representation arrangements as follows:</p> <p>[resolution of the Council to be inserted after the Council Meeting and prior to submission to the Electoral Commissioner.</p> <p>The Agenda item and Minutes will be included as Appendix Q. after the Council Meeting being held on 7 April 2025].</p>

5. Public Consultation

Public consultation was held in two (2) stages during the review process due to an oversight by The Advertiser newspaper. The first consultation process was held from Monday, 21 October 2024 to Friday, 15 November 2024. The second stage of consultation occurred between Monday, 6 January and Friday, 31 January 2025. The consultation period and consultation process were undertaken in accordance with the provisions of Section 12(7) of the Act and the Council's Community Consultation Policy.

The public consultation process incorporated the following.

- Publishing of a public notice in The Advertiser newspaper on Thursday, 7 November 2024 (despite Council requesting to have the notice placed on Monday, 21 October 2024).
- A post on Council's social media channels communicating commencement of community engagement and feedback options on Monday, 21 October 2024.
- A notice on Council's website page on Monday, 21 October 2024.
- An article pertaining to the review in the Council's digital online magazine 'Look East' on 21 October 2024.
- A post on the Council's social media channels communicating commencement of community engagement and feedback options on Monday, 6 January 2025.
- A notice on Council's website page on Monday, 6 January 2025.
- An article pertaining to the review in the Council's digital online magazine 'Look East' on 6 January 2025.
- Publishing of a public notice in The Advertiser newspaper on Monday, 6 January 2025.
- A copy of the Representation Report being available for viewing at the Norwood Town Hall Customer Centre and at the St Peters, Payneham and Norwood Library.

At the expiration of the initial public consultation period on Friday, 15 November 2024, the Council had received one (1) written submission. The second round of public consultation did not generate any responses.

In summary, the respondent agreed with the proposed reduction to eleven (11) Councillors, as it is consistent with similar (and larger) metropolitan Councils; and indicated that:

- the proposed ward structure should be manageable for the Elected Members;
- given the number of apartment developments underway and/or planned in Kent Town, and the likely resultant increase in population over the next 2-3 years, the proposed ward structure may need to be revisited at the next scheduled review;
- the composition of the proposed wards is logical;

- the proposed ward boundaries align with main roads and, as such, should maintain the existing communities of interest in the smaller suburbs such as Kent Town and Hackney; and
- support for the name "Kent Town" being retained as part of the title/name of a proposed ward.

A copy of the submission received is provided in Appendix L.

The submission was formally considered by the Council at a meeting convened on 7 April 2025.

6. Proposal Rationale

6.1 Composition and Structure of Council

6.1.1 Principal Member

The Principal Member of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has always been a Mayor who has been elected by the community.

The Council is aware that Section 51(1) of the Act requires the Principal Member of the Council to be either elected as a representative of the area as a whole or appointed (by the Governor under circumstances prescribed under Section 10 of the Act); and is to have the title of Mayor.

6.1.2 Number of Councillors

Council has comprised the Mayor and thirteen (13) Ward Councillors since the Local Government election in 2010.

Section 11A of the Act specifies that a Council must not be comprised of more than thirteen (13) members, including the Mayor. However, the Act also allows a Council to seek an "exemption certificate" from the Electoral Commissioner if it desires to retain more than the specified maximum number of Elected Members.

The Council proposal to reduce the number of Elected Members to twelve (12), being the Mayor and eleven (11) Ward Councillors, is in keeping with the requirement and intent of the Act.

When determining its preferred future composition, the Council also considered the following.

- Section 12(6)(a)(i) of the Act specifically required the Council to examine the question of whether the number of Elected Members should be reduced. The Act is silent on the issue of a potential increase in the number of Elected Members.
- Whilst Ward Councillors are elected to provide representation of (and assistance to) the constituents within their wards, they also act in the best interest of the whole community within the Council area (including over 13,200 or more residents who are not enrolled to vote but have the same day-to-day concerns and issues which confront the eligible electors throughout the Council area). As the demands and needs of the whole of the local community directly impact upon the workloads of the Elected Members, the greater the number of Elected Members the greater the lines of communication between Council and the community, and the greater the likelihood that the Elected Members will be capable of providing an adequate service to the local community.

- It is anticipated that the population of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters will grow in the foreseeable future as a consequence of urban infill and redevelopment (refer 6.23 Population and Demographic Trends, page 17). Whilst it is difficult to quantify the future population growth with any certainty at this time, the anticipated increase in the population of the Council area over the next eight (8) years (i.e. the next scheduled representation review) will obviously result in greater elector numbers, higher elector ratios and greater demands being placed upon the Elected Members (both individually and as a collective body). A reduction in the number of Elected Members at this time will afford the Council the opportunity to re-assess its composition in the future, knowing that there will be some flexibility in regard to the "member cap".
- There must be sufficient Elected Members to manage the day-to-day affairs of the Council; provide adequate and readily available lines of communication between the Council and the community; and ensure that the potential for diversity in the Elected Member's skill sets, experience and backgrounds is maintained.

In addition, Sections 26(1)(c) and 33(1) of the Act seek to ensure adequate and fair representation while at the same time avoiding over-representation in comparison to other councils of a similar size and type (at least in the longer term).

The comparison of representation arrangements between the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters and the other metropolitan councils is not necessarily a straightforward exercise, given that no councils are identical in terms of their size (elector numbers and/or area), character, population, topography or communities of interest.

Table 3 provides (for comparison purposes) the elector data, elector ratios, and the size/area of the metropolitan councils in comparison to the Council's proposed future composition. It is considered that the data indicates that the proposed future composition and representation arrangements of the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters will compare favourably with the elector representation arrangements of the other metropolitan councils which are of a similar size (in terms of elector numbers).

Table 3: Elector Representation Comparison – Metropolitan Councils

Council	Councillors	Electors	Elector Ratio
Walkerville (3.57 km ²)	8	5,841	1: 730
Prospect (7.81 km ²)	8	15,217	1:1,902
Gawler (41.10km ²)	10	20,667	1:2,067
Unley (14.29 km ²)	12	28,048	1:2,337
Norwood Payneham & St Peters (15.1 km²)	11	26,079	1:2,371
Holdfast Bay (13.72 km ²)	12	28,835	1:2,403
Adelaide Hills (795.1 km ²)	12	30,886	1:2,574
Burnside (27.53 km ²)	12	32,508	1:2,709
West Torrens (37.07 km ²)	14	43,290	1:3,092
Adelaide (15.57 km ²)	9	30,597	1:3,400
Campbelltown (24.35 km ²)	10	37,336	1:3,734
Mitcham (75.55 km ²)	12	49,896	1:4,158
Port Adelaide/Enfield (97.0 km ²)	17	90,918	1:5,348
Charles Sturt (52.14 km ²)	16	91,087	1:5,693
Marion (55.5km ²)	12	68,627	1:5,719
Playford (344.9 km ²)	12	73,966	1:6,164
Tea Tree Gully (95.2 km ²)	12	74,756	1:6,230
Salisbury (158.1 km ²)	14	98,609	1:7,044
Onkaparinga (518.4 km ²)	12	134,557	1:11,213

Source: Electoral Commission SA, 31st January 2025

The Council believes that it is important to reach a balance between adhering to the intent of the Act (in regard to the future number of Elected Members) and providing fair and adequate representation to, and of, the local community. Ultimately, the Council believes that the proposed future composition of the Mayor and eleven (11) Ward Councillors will meet both objectives of the Act at this time.

6.1.3 Wards/No Wards

The Council area has been divided into wards since it was established in November 1997.

Currently two (2) of the nineteen (19) metropolitan Councils (i.e. the Towns of Gawler and Walkerville) have no wards, as do thirty-five (35) of the forty-nine (49) regional councils.

The Council acknowledges that the “no ward” alternative could benefit the smaller of the metropolitan councils; affords electors the opportunity to vote for all of the vacant positions on the Council; automatically absorbs fluctuations in elector numbers; allows for the most supported candidates from across the Council area to be elected; and supposedly enables the Elected Members to be free of parochial ward attitudes. Notwithstanding this, the Council is concerned that the “no ward” alternative:

- does not guarantee direct representation of all communities within the Council area;

- may make it easier for single interest candidates and/or groups to gain support (than does the existing ward based system);
- has the potential to make the task and expense of contesting "council-wide" elections difficult and excessive; and
- has the potential to increase the cost of conducting elections and supplementary elections, given that under the "no ward" structure all contested elections must be conducted on a council- wide basis.

On the other hand, the Council believes that a ward structure:

- guarantees a level of direct representation of all localities and communities within the Council area;
- ensures local interests and/or issues are not overlooked in favour of the bigger "city-wide" picture; and
- provides recognizable lines of communication with the Council through the Ward Councillors.

It is also considered that Ward Councillors can have empathy for, and an affiliation with, the constituents and communities within their ward; and deliberate and make decisions on the basis of achieving the best outcome for their ward and the whole of the Council area (as would be the role of an Area Councillor under the "no ward" alternative). Further, the community knows and accepts the division of the Council area into wards, and the structure and level of representation that it provides. As such, the retention of a ward structure will likely be perceived as an indication of stability within the Council and Local Government in general.

The Council is also aware that there was no call for the abolition of wards during the public consultation stage of the review process.

Given the aforementioned, the Council supports the on-going division of the Council area into wards.

6.1.4 Proposed Ward Structure

During the course of the review, the Council considered numerous ward structures based on ten (10), eleven (11), twelve (12) and thirteen (13) Councillors.

The Council favours the proposed ward structure because it:

- is relatively simple in configuration;
- complies with the "member cap" specified under Section 11A of the Act;
- is reasonably well balanced in terms of the distribution of electors between the proposed wards, and the resulting ward elector ratios;
- exhibits ward elector ratios which lay well within the specified quota tolerance limits (and are therefore capable of sustaining reasonable future fluctuations in elector numbers);

- has relatively consistent and higher levels of representation within the proposed wards which should provide the electors/residents located therein with fervent and direct representation;
- will provide sufficient opportunities for aspiring candidates to Council (and the individual wards);
- will provide a level of ward representation which will ensure continued representation within a ward under circumstances whereby a Ward Councillor or Councillors are absent or unavailable;
- should maintain reasonable and manageable workloads for the Ward Councillors;
- proposes wards which are not large in area and, as such, should provide an environment wherein close relationships between Ward Councillors and their constituents can still be fostered, and Ward Councillors can be more familiar with the issues and/or concerns within their ward.

Given all of the aforementioned, it is considered that the Council's proposal to introduce a new, four (4) ward structure is rational and justifiable.

6.1.5 Area Councillors (in addition to Ward Councillors)

The Council is aware that Section 52(2) requires that a Councillor will (depending on how the council is constituted) be elected by the electors for the area, as a representative of the area as a whole (whether or not the area is divided into wards); or if the area is divided into wards, be elected by the electors of a particular ward, as a representative of the ward.

The Council is aware that only one (1) Council in South Australia (i.e. the City of Adelaide) has two (2) tiers of representation (i.e. Area Councillors in addition to Ward Councillors); but considers that this form of Elected Member representation affords few advantages. Under a ward structure area Councillors hold no greater status than a Ward Councillor; have no greater responsibilities than a Ward Councillor; nor need comply with any extraordinary or additional eligibility requirements. In addition, Ward Councillors generally consider themselves to represent not only the ward in which they were elected, but also the Council area as a whole.

For these reasons it is considered that the introduction of Area Councillors (under a ward structure) would be unwarranted; unnecessary; and potentially a costly additional tier of representation.

6.1.6 Ward Identification/Titles

The Council has opted to identify the proposed wards as follows:

- Ward 1: Payneham/Felixstow Ward
- Ward 2: St Peters/Kent Town Ward
- Ward 3: Trinity/Maylands Ward
- Ward 4: Kensington/Norwood Ward

These proposed ward names/titles are not dissimilar to the names/titles that have been utilised in regard to the various Council ward structures since the Council was established in 1997. As such, the continued use thereof should be acceptable to the local community.

It should also be noted that:

- the one (1) submission received during the public consultation stage of the review was in favour of the retention of “Kent Town” in the identification of one of the proposed wards; and
- the Council considered alternative means of ward identification during the review (e.g. generic names such as north, south, west and central and/or names of parks or locations like Torrens, Linde, Koster and Parade) but ultimately determined to retain names known to the community.

6.2 Local Government Act 1999

Throughout the course of the review, specific attention was paid to the provisions of Sections 26 and 33 of the Act. Brief comments pertaining to the Council’s findings and opinions, as they relate to the relevant principles and/or matters, are provided hereinafter.

6.2.1 Quota

The Council is aware that Section 33(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999* states:

“A proposal that relates to the formation or alteration of wards of a council must also observe the principle that the number of electors represented by a councillor must not, as at the relevant date (assuming that the proposal were in operation), vary from the ward quota by more than 10 per cent...”

As indicated in Table 2 (page 5), the elector ratios in each of the proposed wards lay comfortably within the specified quota tolerance limits.

6.2.2 Communities of Interest

The Council is aware that Sections 26(1) and 33 of the Act speak of the desirability of reflecting communities of interest of an economic, social, regional or other kind.

“Communities of interest” have previously been defined “as aspects of the physical, economic and social systems which are central to the interactions of communities in their living environment”, and are generally identified by considering factors relevant thereto, including neighbourhood communities; history and heritage communities; sporting facilities; community support services; recreation and leisure communities; retail and shopping centres; work communities; industrial and economic development clusters; and environmental and geographic interests.

The Council area covers approximately 15.1 km² and incorporates twenty-one (21) suburbs (or part suburbs). The Council is keen to ensure that, where possible, identified “communities of interest” are maintained in their entirety within the boundaries of a ward, taking into account the features of the landscape; the location of, and connection between, the various communities; and the distribution of the electors. In order to achieve this, the Council proposes a ward structure wherein all suburbs are maintained in their entirety within a proposed ward.

6.2.3 Population and Demographic Trends

Further residential development and urban renewal (and therefore population growth) is expected across the Council area in the future.

The following information provided some insight into the demographic trends that have occurred over recent years, and the extent of the anticipated future population increase. This information was taken into account by the Council when developing/identifying its proposed future ward structure.

Data sourced from Electoral Commission SA indicates that the number of electors within the Council area increased at varying rates during the period November 2010 – January 2024. Overall, during the cited period the number of enrolled electors increased by 1,370 or 5.54%.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (Local Area (SA2 and LGA), Population Projections for South Australia, 2021 – 2041, published March 2024) indicates that the population of the Council area is anticipated (medium series) to increase by 6,284 people or 16.6% (i.e. 37,823 to 44,107) during the period 2021 – 2041.

Data provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (refer 3218.0 Regional Population Growth, Australia) indicates that the estimated population of the Council area has generally increased from year to year during the period 2001 – 2023; and overall increased by 5,766 people or 17.19% during the specified period (i.e. 33,546 to 39,312). The same data indicates that the population increased by 2,316 people or 6.27% during the recent five-year period 2018 – 2023 (i.e. 36,996 to 39,312).

Australian Bureau of Statistics "Quick Stats" indicate that the estimated population of the Council area increased by 5,215 people or 16.16% over the period 2001 – 2021 (i.e. 32,272 to 37,487).

According to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters "community profile", the estimated resident population of the Council area increased by 1,402 people or 4.01% (i.e. 34,967 to 36,369) during the period 2006 – 2015; and then increased by a further 2,943 people or 8.01% (i.e. 36,369 to 39,312) during the period 2015 – 2023. Overall, this equates to an increase of 4,345 people or 12.43% over the period 2006 – 2023.

Continued infill development is expected throughout the Council area, however, growth opportunities are limited due to heritage and other constraints.

Further medium to high rise residential development is likely to occur (on an ad hoc basis) along the arterial roads which radiate out of the Adelaide CBD (e.g. Kensington Road, The Parade, Payneham Road, Magill Road, North Terrace and Rundle Street) and on Dequetteville Terrace.

Residential development of a significant size and scale (i.e. apartment buildings) is most likely to occur in and about the suburbs of Norwood, Kent Town and perhaps Stepney.

6.2.4 Topography

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters is a long-existing, developed inner eastern municipality which covers an area of approximately 15.1 km².

The terrain generally slopes from the east and south to the west and north-west, towards the River Torrens which forms one boundary of the City; and four creeks traverse the Council area from east to west. In addition, the urban form of the Council area is diverse, ranging from reasonably homogenous residential areas to commercial and mixed-use precincts. There is also a significant area of open space in the River Torrens Linear Park.

It is considered that the proposed future ward structure is a relatively simple and efficient division of the Council area which, in the main, befits and accommodates the existing pattern of development and topographical features of the Council area. Further, the Council believes that the topography of the Council area should have little or no physical impact upon the proposed future ward structure, given that the proposed ward boundaries align with long-established suburb boundaries, thereby ensuring that entire “communities of interest” (suburbs) are maintained within a proposed ward.

6.2.5 Communication

The Council believes that the Mayor and eleven (11) Ward Councillors can provide adequate lines of communication between the Elected Members of the Council and the community, taking into consideration the anticipated future growth in elector numbers; the small size of the Council area; the nature and density of the urban development within the Council area; and the continual advancements being made in regard to telecommunications and information technology.

7. Conclusion

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has completed a review of its composition and structure, as required by the provisions of Section 12 of the Act. The review, which was conducted in accordance with the specified process outlined within the Act and Council's Community Engagement Policy, specifically addressed the matters detailed under Sections 26 and 33 of the Act.

The review, culminated in the Council resolving that:

[resolution of the Council to be inserted after the Council Meeting on 7 April 2025]

This report is referred to the Electoral Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of Section 12(12) of the Act, and certification is hereby sought so as to enable the Council's proposal, as detailed herein, to come into effect at the next Local Government Elections (November 2026).

Should you require any additional information or wish to discuss the review, please contact the Council's Manager, Governance on telephone 8366 4555 or via email: jmcfear@npsp.sa.gov.au.

Mario Barone PSM
Chief Executive Officer

13.14 REVIEW OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: qA65013
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to present information to the Council regarding a review of the Confidential Items which has been undertaken.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act), Council (and Committee) meetings are open to the public and attendance is encouraged and welcomed.

There are, however, times where the Council (or a Committee), believes it is necessary in the broader community interest, to exclude the public from the discussion of a particular matter in accordance with Section 90(3) of the Act.

The public will only be excluded when the need for confidentiality outweighs the principle of open decision making.

In addition to the above, the Act requires the Council to specify the duration of the order (ie determine a suitable period for which the item will remain confidential), and either impose a “release” date or event which will trigger the release of the item or a period after which the Council will review the order and determine if in fact the item should remain confidential.

In accordance with the Act, a review of the Council’s Confidential Items as at 30 June 2023, has been undertaken. A summary of all Confidential Items is set out in the Register of Confidential Items which details the date of the order, the grounds upon which the order was made and whether or not the document has become public by virtue of the resolution.

A review of the Audit & Risk Committee’s Confidential Items has also been undertaken and a separate register for this Committee’s Confidential Items has been prepared.

A copy of the Register of Confidential Items is contained within **Attachment A**.

A copy of the Audit & Risk Committee Register of Confidential Items is contained within **Attachment B**.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

Council Confidential Items

A review of the Confidential Items as at 31 December 2024, has been undertaken.

The Council’s last review of the Confidential Items was conducted in August 2024 for the period ending 30 June 2024. A total of 8 items have been considered by the Council “in camera” since that time (up 31 December 2024) and these items have been included in the Register of Confidential Items.

In accordance with the process endorsed by the Council in August 2024, all Confidential Orders relating to Tenders have been extended by a further two (2) year period which means that all items relating to Tenders will remain confidential for a total period of seven (7) years.

A seven (7) year time frame has been determined, as this is a standard period of time for the retention of financial records according to the benchmark determined by both the Australian Taxation Office and the Australian Securities and Investments Commission.

There will be no further extensions in terms of the Confidential Order for these matters and the items will be automatically released at the conclusion of the seven (7) year period.

Nineteen (19) items are no longer confidential by virtue of the Council's original resolution which specified a time and/or an event to trigger the release of the item. The details of these items are contained in Attachment A.

There are three (3) items that require the Council's consideration. These items will be considered as part of a separate Confidential report.

Audit & Risk Committee Confidential Items

A review of the Audit & Risk Committee Confidential Items as at 31 December 2024 has also been undertaken.

Two (2) items are no longer confidential by virtue of the Council's original resolution which specified a time and/or an event to trigger the release of the item. The details of these items are contained in Attachment B.

There are no other confidential items which require the Council's consideration.

OPTIONS

The annual review in accordance with Section 91(9) of the Act is simply an administrative review. This does not mean that every confidentiality order needs to be remade. The only orders that need to be remade are those where the existing order is due to expire and the documents have been assessed against the relevant ground contained in Section 90(3) and determined to be required to remain confidential.

This report, therefore, is presented to the Council for information purposes only.

CONCLUSION

The review of the Council's (and Committee), confidentiality orders ensures compliance with the legislative requirements as set out in Sections 90 and 91 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

COMMENTS

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.

Attachments – Item 13.14

Attachment A

Review of Confidential Items





Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
2018 - 2019							
1. Council 2/7/18	14.1	Tender Selection – Annual Pruning and Removal of Council Trees	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2026
2. Council 2/7/18	14.2	Tender Selection Report - Capital Works Brick Paved Footpath Reconstruction 2018-2019	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2026
3. Council 22/8/18	3.1	Extinguishment of Easement & Re-Alignment of Stormwater Pipe – Joslin	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2026
4. Council 12/9/18	4.2	Tender Selection Report - New Clubrooms & Members Facilities at Norwood Oval - Demolition Package	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	September 2026
6. Council 3/12/18	14.1	Written Notice of Motion – Purchase of Land	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
7. Council 4/3/19	14.1	Tender – Supply and Implementation of an Electronic Document and Records Management Solution	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report confidential.	March 2026

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
8. Council 17/4/19	3.1	Tender – Norwood Oval Main Works Package for the new Clubrooms & Members Facilities	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report confidential.	April 2026
9. Council 6/5/19	14.1	East Waste Recycling Contract	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	May 2026
2019 - 2020							
10. Council 1/7/19	14.1	Tender Selection Report – Capital Works Construction of Bluestone & Concrete Kerbing – 2019-2020	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2026
11. Council 1/7/19	14.3	Review of 2018-2019 Confidential Items	Section 90(2) and (3)(g)	Release	5 years		Released
12. Council 5/8/19	14.1	Appointment of Independent Member to the Audit Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	5 years	The report and attachments to be kept confidential. Minutes released following the announcement of the appointment of the Independent Member.	Released

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
13. Council 8/10/19	14.1	Establishment of the CEO's Performance Review Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	5 years	The report and attachments to be kept confidential. Minutes released following the appointments to the Committee.	Released
14. Council 13/11/19	3B.1	Tender Selection Report - Syd Jones Reserve Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2026
15. Council 2/12/19	14.1	Tender Selection Report – Redevelopment of East Adelaide Payneham Tennis Courts 2019-2020	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	December 2026
16. Council 20/1/2020	14.1	East Waste – Appointment of Independent Chairperson	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	5 years	The report and attachments be kept confidential for a period not exceeding five (5) years. Minutes released following the announcement of the appointment.	Released

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
17. Council 3/2/2020	14.1	Tender Selection Report - River Torrens Linear Park Maintenance	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2027
18. Council 3/2/2020	14.2	Tender Selection Report - Linde Reserve Apron Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2027
19. Council 3/2/2020	14.3	Tender Selection Report - Little Wakefield Street & Chapel Street Streetscape Projects	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2027
20. Council 3/2/2020	14.4	Tender Selection Report - Trinity Valley Stormwater Drainage Design Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2027
21. Council 2/3/2020	14.1	Tender Selection Report - Street and Footpath Sweeping Program	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2027
22. Council 2/3/2020	14.2	Tender Selection Report - Line Marking Services	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2027

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
23. Council 2/3/2020	14.3	Tender Selection Report - Beulah Road Bicycle Boulevard Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2027
24. Council 2/3/2020	14.4	Norwood Oval Redevelopment Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2027
25. Council 6/4/2020	14.1	Purchase of Property	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
26. Council 22/4/2020	3.1	Tender Selection Report – Payneham Oval Unisex Changerooms	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2027
27. Council 6/5/2020	14.1	Purchase of Property	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
28. Council 1/6/2020	14.1	ERA Water- Appointment of Independent Chair	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	June 2025
29. Council 17/6/2020	4.1	Norwood Oval: Sir ET Smith Stand Structural Remediation Works	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	June 2027

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
2020 - 2021							
30. Council 6/7/2020	14.2	Tender Selection Report – Home Support Program	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2027
31. Council 6/7/2020	14.3	ERA Water Audit Committee - Appointment of Independent Member	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2025
32. Council 3/8/2020	14.1	Flood Mitigation Works - 27 Stannington Avenue, Heathpool	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2027
33. Council 3/8/2020	14.2	Eastern Health Authority (EHA) Audit Committee – Appointment of Members	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2025
34. Council 3/8/2020	14.3	Eastern Region Alliance (ERA) Water – Appointment of Independent Chairperson	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2025
35. Council 3/8/2020	14.4	Tender Selection Report – Road Resealing 2020-2021	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2027

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
36. Council 3/8/2020	14.5	Tender Selection Report – Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre Main Pool – Stage 2 Refurbishment Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2027
37. Council 3/8/2020	14.6	Purchase of Property	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Until the matter is finalised			When the matter is finalised
38. Council 7/9/2020	14.1	Tender Selection Report - Redevelopment of Buttery Reserve Tennis Courts	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	September 2027
39. Council 7/9/2020	14.2	Review of Confidential Item - Purchase of Property	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
40. Council 7/9/2020	14.3	Review of Confidential Item - Tender Selection Report – Redevelopment of East Adelaide Payneham Tennis Courts 2019-2020	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	September 2027
41. Council 6/10/2020	14.2	Trinity Gardens Bowling	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)		Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
42. Council 2/11/20	14.1	Appointments to the Norwood Parade Precinct Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2025

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
43. Council 7/12/20	14.2	Tender Selection Report – Kent Town Streetscape Upgrades	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	December 2027
44. Council 7/12/20	14.3	Tender Selection Report - Third Creek Drainage – Stage 2-B Henry Street to Bridge Road	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension		December 2027
45. Council 7/12/20	14.4	Eastern Region Alliance (ERA) Water – Appointment of Independent Chairperson	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	December 2025
46. Council 18/1/21	14.1	Langman Grove Road Reconstruction Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	January 2026
47. Council 18/1/21	14.2	49 George Street, Norwood	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	January 2026
48. Council 18/1/21	14.4	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		January 2026
49. Council 1/2/21	14.1	Marian Road Roundabout & Drainage Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2028

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
50. Council 1/2/21	14.2	Tender Selection Report - Second Creek Outlet Gross Pollutant Trap (GPT) & River Torrens Linear Park Shared Path Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2028
51. Council 1/3/21	14.1	Council Related Matter - Questions With Notice	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	Reviewed by the Council 7 August 2023 – resolved to retain in confidence until August 2028		August 2028
2021 - 2022							
52. Council 5/7/21	14.1	Tender Selection Report – Construction of Brick Paved Footpaths 2021-2022	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2028
53. Council 5/7/21	14.2	49 George Street, Norwood – Further Expressions of Interest & Draft Lease	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2026
54. Council 5/7/21	14.3	Eastern Region Alliance (ERA) Water Board – Appointment of Independent Chairperson	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2026

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

	Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
55.	Council 5/7/21	14.4	Questions With Notice – Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		July 2026
56.	Council 2/8/21	14.1	Residual & Hard Waste Disposal Contract	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2028
57.	Council 2/8/21	14.2	Questions with Notice – Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		August 2026
58.	Council 6/9/21	14.1	Review of Confidential Item - Trinity Gardens Bowling Club	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)		Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
59.	Council 6/9/21	14.2	Review of Confidential Item - Third Creek Stormwater Drainage Upgrade - Stage 2B Henry Street	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension		September 2028
60.	Council 6/9/21	14.3	Notice of Motion - Purchase of Property	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence until the matter is finalised			When the matter is finalised
61.	Council 6/9/21	14.4	East Waste Kerbside Recycling Material	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	September 2028

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
62. Council 5/10/21	14.1	Notice of Motion - Code Amendment Inter-War Heritage Housing	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Release	Until the matter is released for the purpose of public consultation.	Consultation has been undertaken.	Released
63. Council 5/10/21	14.2	Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	October 2026
64. Council 5/10/21	14.3	Trans-Tasman Energy Group - Public Lighting Dispute	Section 90(2) and (3)(h) and (i)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
65. Council 26/10/21	2.1	Tender Selection Report - Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre Redevelopment - Design Consultants	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	October 2028
66. Council 26/10/21	2.2	Tender Selection Report - Implementation of The Parade Masterplan and George Street Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	October 2028
67. Council 1/11/21	14.1	Tender Selection Report - Seventh Avenue Flood Mitigation Upgrade Project - Stage 1	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2028

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
68. Council 1/11/21	14.2	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised
69. Council 6/12/21	14.1	Tender Selection Report - Seventh Avenue Flood Mitigation Upgrade Project - Stage 1	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	December 2028
70. Council 6/12/21	14.2	Draft Inter-War Housing Heritage Code Amendment	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Release	Until the matter is released for the purpose of public consultation.	Consultation has been undertaken.	Released
71. Council 6/12/21	14.4	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(h)	Retain in confidence	Until either the matter is finalised or the release of the report and Minutes is necessary to enable the matter to be enacted.		
72. Council 6/12/21	14.5	East Waste - Green Organics	Section 90(2) and (3)(h)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		When the matter is finalised

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

	Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
73.	Council 17/1/22	14.1	Re-appointment of Members to the ERA Water Audit Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	January 2027
74.	Council 17/1/22	14.2	East Waste - Re-appointment of Independent Chairperson	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	January 2027
75.	Council 7/2/22	14.1	Tender Selection Report - St Peters Street Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2029
76.	Council 7/2/22	14.2	Tender Selection Report - Borthwick Park Creek Improvements Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2029
77.	Council 7/3/22	14.1	Council Assessment Panel - Specialist External Member appointments	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2027
78.	Council 7/3/22	14.2	Heritage Protection Opportunities	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is released for the purpose of public consultation.		

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
79. Council 7/3/22	14.3	Chief Executive Officer's Vehicle and Long Service Leave Arrangements	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		February 2027
80. Council 4/4/22	14.1	Tender Selection Report - Norwood Townhall Air Conditioning Upgrade	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	April 2029
81. Council 4/4/22	14.2	Trinity Valley Drainage Upgrade - Preliminary Design Update	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence until the matter is finalised			When the matter is finalised.
82. Council 4/4/22	14.3	East Waste Agreement for the Collection and Processing of Mattresses and Ensembles	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	June 2028
83. Council 4/4/22	14.4	Appointment to the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	April 2027
84. Council 2/5/22	14.1	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until either the matter is finalised or the release of the report and Minutes is necessary to enable the matter to be enacted.		

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
85. Council 6/6/22	14.2	East Waste Recycling Contract – Commitment of Recycling Tonnes	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	June 2027
86. Council 21/6/22	3.2	East Waste – New Member Council Proposal and Charter Review	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	June 2027
2022 - 2023							
87. Council 4/7/22	14.1	Tender Selection Report – Construction of Bluestone and Concrete Kerbing 2022-2023	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2027
88. Council 4/7/22	14.2	Intersection of Portrush Road and Magill Road	Section 90(2) and (3)(g)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2027
89. Council 4/7/22	14.4	East Waste – Recycling Contract Update	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2027
90. Council 1/8/22	14.2	Staff Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	Reviewed by the Council 7 August 2023 – resolved to retain in confidence until August 2028		August 2028

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
91. Council 1/8/22	14.3	Elected Member Personal Explanation	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	Reviewed by the Council 7 August 2023 – resolved to retain in confidence until August 2028		August 2028
92. Council 22/8/22	3.1	Tender Selection Report – Battams Road Linear Park Bank Erosion Remediation Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2029
93. Council 5/9/22	14.2	East Waste Recycling Contract – Commitment of Recycling Tonnes	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	September 2027
94. Council 4/10/22	14.2	Code of Conduct Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a) and (3)(h)	Retain in confidence	5 years		October 2027
95. Council 7/11/22	14.1	River Torrens Linear Park Shared Path Enhancement Project Stage 1 Deed of Settlement and Release (the Deed) between the Council and Aspect Studios Pty Ltd and Lucid Projects (Australia) Pty Ltd	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2027

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
96. Council 5/12/22	14.2	Tender Selection Report for the Construction of the Dunstan Adventure Playground Redevelopment	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	December 2029
97. Council 5/12/22	14.6	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Release	12 months		December 2025
98. Council 16/1/23	14.1	Lease Agreement – 64 Nelson Street, Stepney – Women's Community Centre SA Incorporated	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	Until a new Lease is entered into		Released
99. Council 16/1/23	14.2	Request by Prince Alfred College for the Council to facilitate Land Acquisition	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	Until the process commences		
100. Council 16/1/23	14.3	Potential Disposal of Lot 13 Holton Court, Joslin by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport	Section 90(2) and (3)(j)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		
101. Council 6/2/23	14.1	Tender Selection Report – River Torrens Linear Park Shared Path Enhancement Project (Stage 2)	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2030
102. Council 6/2/23	14.2	Appointments to the Norwood Parade Precinct Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	February 2028

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
103. Council 6/2/23	14.4	Norwood Concert Hall – Invoicing and Administration	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		February 2028
104. Council 6/3/23	14.1	Lease Agreement – 64 Nelson Street, Stepney – Women's Community Centre SA Incorporated	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	Until a new Lease is entered into		Released
105. Council 6/3/23	14.2	52 Sydenham Road, Norwood - Establishment of Access over Council Owned Land	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	Until the notice of the amendment to the Community Land Management Plan is published		
106. Council 22/3/23	3.1	Audit & Risk Committee – Appointment of Independent Members	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2028
107. Council 22/3/23	3.2	Appointments to the Business & Economic Development Advisory Committee	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2028
108. Council 22/3/23	3.3	Review of the St Peters Child Care Centre & Pre-School	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		March 2028

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
109. Council 3/4/23	14.1	Tender Selection Report - Burchell Reserve Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	April 2030
110. Council 3/4/23	14.2	Tender Selection Report - Cruickshank Reserve Facility Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	April 2030
111. Council 1/5/23	14.1	Execution of Council Seal - Land Management Agreement	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	Until such time that the LMA Deed is noted on Certificate of Title		
112. Council 1/5/23	14.2	Trans Tasman Energy Group Pty Ltd - Public Lighting Dispute	Section 90(2) and (3)(h) and (3)(i)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		
113. Council 5/6/23	14.1	Heritage Protection Opportunities	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Retain in confidence	Until the proposed amendment is released for the purpose of public consultation		

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
2023 - 2024							
114. Council 3/7/23	14.1	Tender Selection Report – Road Resealing 2023-2026	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	July 2030
115. Council 7/8/23	14.1	Draft Inter-War Housing Heritage Code Amendment	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Release	Until the proposed amendment is released for the purpose of public consultation		Released
116. Council 7/8/23	14.2	Tender Selection Report – Trinity Valley Stormwater Drainage Upgrade Stages 2 & 3	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	August 2030
117. Council 4/9/23	14.1	Vesting Of Public Road – Heanes Lane, Kensington	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	September 2028
118. Council 9/10/23	3.1	Norwood Oval Electrical Transformer Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Release	12 months		Released
119. Council 9/10/23	3.2	Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre Re-development Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Release	12 months		Released

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
120. Council 6/11/23	14.2	Trans-Tasman Energy Group Pty Ltd - Public Lighting dispute	Section 90(2) and (3)(h) and (3)(i)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised		
121. Council 6/11/23	14.4	Annual Report in accordance with the Chief Executive Officer's Contract of Employment	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	12 months		Released
122. Council 6/11/23	14.5	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	12 months		November 2025
123. Council 4/12/23	14.2	George Street Upgrade Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(i)	Release	12 months		Released
124. Council 11/12/23	4.3	Tender Selection Report – Payneham Memorial Swimming Centre Redevelopment Project	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2030
125. Council 22/1/24	14.1	Proposal To Initiate A Code Amendment - Historic Areas - Norwood And Kent Town	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Retain in confidence	Until the proposed amendment is released for the purpose of public consultation		
126. Council 22/1/24	14.3	ERA Water Independent Review – Request from the Town of Walkerville	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Release	12 months		Released

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
127. Council 5/2/24	14.1	City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters Representation Review	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Release	12 months	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential	Released
128. Council 5/2/24	14.2	CEO Contract of Employment – Long Service Leave	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years		February 2029
129. Council 2/4/24	14.1	Draft Inter-War Housing Heritage Code Amendment	Section 90(2) and (3)(m)	Release	Until the proposed amendment is released for the purpose of public consultation	Consultation has been undertaken.	Released
130. Council 2/4/24	14.2	Council Assessment Panel – Appointment of Members	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential	April 2029
131. Council 8/4/24	3.1	Draft Adelaide Parklands Management Strategy – Towards 2036	Section 90(2) and (3)(j)	Release	12 months		April 2025
132. Council 6/5/24	14.1	Council Land	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Until the process under the Roads Opening and Closing Act 1991 has commenced			
133. Council 6/5/24	14.2	Council Land Glynde	Section 90(2) and (3)(b)	Retain in confidence	12 months		May 2025

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
134. Council 6/5/24	14.3	Chief Executive Officer's Key Performance Indicators	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	12 months		May 2025
2024 - 2025							
135. Council 5/8/24	14.1	Tender Selection Report – Construction of Brick Paved Footpaths 2024-2027	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2031
136. Council 5/8/24	14.2	Trinity Valley Stormwater Drainage Upgrade – Stage 1 Update	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	Until the matter is finalised.		
137. Council 5/8/24	14.3	Review Of Confidential Items – Tender Selection Reports	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Release			Released
138. Council 8/10/24	14.1	Chief Executive Officer's 2024 Performance Review Report	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	12 months		October 2025
139. Council 4/11/24	14.1	Chief Executive Officer's Remuneration Review	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	12 months	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2025
140. Council 2/12/24	14.1	Municipal Solid Waste Disposal and Processing Tender	Section 90(2) and (3)(d)	Retain in confidence	For a further 2 years – no further extension	Minutes Released. Report to be kept confidential.	December 2031

Council Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Reviewed/ Released
141. Council 2/12/24	14.2	2025 Australia Day Award Nominations	Section 90(2) and (3)(o)			Until the presentation of the Awards on 26 January 2025	Released
142. Council 2/12/24	14.3	Staff Related Matter – Staff Recruitment	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	12 months		December 2025

Blue – To be determined

Red = Released by Virtue of the Resolution

Green = in accordance with the Council's decision on 5 August 2024 the Confidentiality Order is not to be extended as the Order has been in place for a 7+ year period

Attachment B

Review of Confidential Items



Audit & Risk Committee Confidential Items Register as at 31 December 2024

Meeting & Date	Item	Subject	Grounds for Confidentiality	Outcome of Review (Retained in Confidence/Released)	Period to be Retained in Confidence	Comments	To be Released	
2023								
1.	27/3/23	8.1	Tender Evaluation – External Financial Audit Service	Section 90(2) and (3)(k)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minute Released. Report to be kept confidential.	March 2028
2.	15/5/23	7.1	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)(b)	Retain in confidence	5 years	Minute Released. Report to be kept confidential.	May 2028
3.	1/11/23	7.1	Service Review Project – Electronic Records Management System	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Released	12 months		November 2024
4.	1/11/23	7.2	Internal Audit – Human Resources	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Released	12 months		November 2024
2024								
5.	20/5/24	7.1	Council Related Matter	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)(b)	Retain in confidence	5 years		May 2029
6.	18/11/24	2.1	Review of Library Services	Section 90(2) and (3)(a)	Retain in confidence	2 years	Minute and Attachment A Released. Report to be kept confidential.	November 2026

14. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
Nil

15. OTHER BUSINESS
(Of an urgent nature only)

16. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

16.1 REVIEW OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS – EXTENSION OF CONFIDENTIALITY ORDER

RECOMMENDATION 1

That pursuant to Section 90(2) and (3) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Council orders that the public, with the exception of the Council staff present, be excluded from the meeting on the basis that the Council will receive, discuss and consider:

- (g) matters that must be considered in confidence in order to ensure that the Council does not breach any duty of confidence;

and the Council is satisfied that, the principle that the meeting should be conducted in a place open to the public, has been outweighed by the need to keep the consideration of the information confidential.

16.2 STAFF RELATED MATTER

RECOMMENDATION 1

That pursuant to Section 90(2) and (3) of the *Local Government Act 1999* the Council orders that the public, with the exception of the Council staff present, be excluded from the meeting on the basis that the Council will receive, discuss and consider:

- (a) information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person (living or dead).

and the Council is satisfied that, the principle that the meeting should be conducted in a place open to the public, has been outweighed by the need to keep the receipt/discussion/consideration of the information confidential.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Under Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* the Council orders that the report, discussion and minutes be kept confidential for a period not exceeding 12 months, after which time the order will be reviewed.

17. CLOSURE