

Council Meeting Minutes

2 October 2018

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
Facsimile 8332 6338
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

1.	KAURNA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
2.	OPENING PRAYER	1
3.	CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2018	1
4.	MAYOR'S COMMUNICATION.....	1
5.	DELEGATES COMMUNICATION	2
6.	QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.....	2
7.	QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE	2
7.1	QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – PARKING IN THE VICINITY OF ST PETERS COLLEGE - SUBMITTED BY CR EVONNE MOORE	3
8.	DEPUTATIONS	4
9.	PETITIONS.....	4
10.	WRITTEN NOTICES OF MOTION	4
11.	STAFF REPORTS	4
	Section 1 – Strategy & Policy.....	5
11.1	MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES – QUEENSLAND BOX TREES	6
	Section 2 – Corporate & Finance.....	21
11.2	MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – AUGUST 2018.....	22
	Section 3 – Governance & General.....	24
11.3	REPORTS OUTSTANDING	25
11.4	ELECTION FOR THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA	26
11.5	ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA GREATER ADELAIDE REGION ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS.....	28
11.6	LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY - ELECTION FOR THE POSITIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES.....	31
12.	ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE MINUTES.....	33
13.	OTHER BUSINESS	34
14.	CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS	34
15.	CLOSURE.....	34

VENUE Council Chambers, Norwood Town Hall

HOUR 7.00pm

PRESENT

Council Members Mayor Robert Bria
Cr Lucy Marcuccitti
Cr Connie Granozio
Cr Kevin Shepherdson
Cr Mike Stock
Cr Carlo Dottore
Cr Kevin Duke
Cr Evonne Moore
Cr John Frogley
Cr Garry Knoblauch
Cr John Minney
Cr Sue Whittington
Cr Paul Wormald (entered the meeting at 7.04pm)

Staff Mario Barone (Chief Executive Officer)
Carlos Buzzetti (General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment)
Lisa Mara (General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs)
Sharon Perkins (General Manager, Corporate Services)
Matthew Cole (City Arborist)
Marina Fischetti (Executive Assistant, Urban Services)

APOLOGIES Cr Christel Mex

ABSENT Nil

1. KAURNA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

2. OPENING PRAYER

The Opening Prayer was read by Cr Sue Whittington.

3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2018

Cr Whittington moved that the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on 12 September 2018 be taken as read and confirmed. Seconded by Cr Minney and carried.

4. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATION

Monday, 3 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Presided over a Council Meeting, Council Chamber, Norwood Town Hall.
Wednesday, 5 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Attended an Information Session: Roles and Responsibilities of Elected Members during the Local Government Election Period and Caretaker period, Mayor's Parlour, Norwood Town Hall.
Wednesday, 5 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Attended an Information Session: Draft Kent Town Urban Design Framework and Public Realm Manual, Mayor's Parlour, Norwood Town Hall.
Friday, 7 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Attended the Adelaide Blue Eagles Soccer Club Trophy Presentation Night, Adelaide Blue Eagles Soccer Club, Marden.

Saturday, 8 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bowled the first Bowl at the Trinity Gardens Bowling Club 'Open Day', Trinity Gardens Bowling Club, Trinity Gardens.
Sunday, 9 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended the Norwood versus Woodville West Torrens football match, Adelaide Oval.
Monday, 10 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended a Workshop: Flood Plain Mapping, Mayor's Parlour, Norwood Town Hall.
Wednesday, 12 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presided over a Special Council meeting, Council Chamber, Norwood Town Hall.
Tuesday, 18 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended the ERA Water Pricing Workshop, Town of Walkerville Council offices, Walkerville.
Tuesday, 18 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended a meeting with the General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs and Events Officers, Mayor's Parlour, Norwood Town Hall, Norwood.
Tuesday, 18 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended the Annual State Primary School's 'Festival of Music', Festival Centre, Adelaide.
Wednesday, 19 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chaired an Eastern Region Alliance (ERA) Mayors and Chief Executive Officers meeting, Mayor's Parlour, Norwood Town Hall.
Sunday, 23 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended the 2018 SANFL Grand Final pre-match function followed by the football match between Norwood and North Adelaide, Adelaide Oval.
Thursday, 27 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended the Order of Australia Association (SA) Reception for recipients of the 2018 Queen's Birthday Honours, Payneham Library & Community Complex, Felixstow.
Sunday, 30 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walked in the procession from the Church of the Annunciation, Hectorville to St Francis of Assisi Church, Newton for the Madonna di Montevergine Feast Day Mass.
Monday, 1 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended the 50th Anniversary celebration for the Quaker Op Shop, Kensington Road, Norwood.

5. DELEGATES COMMUNICATION

- Cr Knoblauch advised that on Monday 24 September 2018, he attended the Marden Senior College Governing Council's monthly meeting.
- Cr Minney advised that he had attended various meetings of the ERA Water Board.

6. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Nil

7. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE

**7.1 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – PARKING IN THE VICINITY OF ST PETERS COLLEGE -
SUBMITTED BY CR EVONNE MOORE**

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: S/00474 S/02798
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

BACKGROUND

Cr Evonne Moore has submitted the following Questions with Notice:

1. In the new “pick up” and “drop off” zones near St Peters College with time limits of 8-9 am and 3-4 pm respectively, is there unlimited parking outside these times?
2. Where residents:
 - (a) cannot have tradesmen come to their property because they cannot find a nearby street park and/or
 - (b) cannot back out of their driveways to go to work in the morning due to hundreds of cars carrying students coming down their street;

would Council giving a resident household a “resident permit” for street parking on request be consistent with Council’s current parking policy?
3. If no to (4) herein, why not?
4. How often are the 2 hour street parking restrictions policed in Pembroke Street College Park on average?
5. Would regular weekly policing of these time restrictions on parking around schools in our council area more than pay for itself through increased parking fines?

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF QUESTIONS

With growing traffic volumes around schools, some residents living next to them feel that their quality of life is declining due to vehicular traffic congestion and loss of their and their visitors’ ability to park near their homes, to have tradesmen attend their houses and to safely exit their properties to go to work in the morning. I have spoken with some of these residents who feel that Council does not care about them. I have been alarmed to learn that some residents in Pembroke Street feel that the traffic congestion from St Peters College has become worse since the “drop off/pick up” zones were installed by Council.

I appreciate that Council is now in a caretaker mode due to the Council elections.

I also understand that as a candidate in this election I cannot ask for staff resources to be expended to help my election.

What I am concerned about is Council’s reputation in the electorate and the despair of some residents that the school traffic congestion problems in their street are becoming worse instead of being managed better.

I ask that the answers to the above questions be provided by staff over the next two months. I understand the Caretaker period concludes when the final declaration has been made by the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia (around 16 November 2018).

**RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONS
PREPARED BY GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNANCE & COMMUNITY AFFAIRS**

A response to the questions set out above will be provided at the Council meeting to be held in December 2018.

8. **DEPUTATIONS**
Nil

9. **PETITIONS**
Nil

10. **WRITTEN NOTICES OF MOTION**
Nil

11. **STAFF REPORTS**

Section 1 – Strategy & Policy

Reports

11.1 MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES – QUEENSLAND BOX TREES

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Urban Services
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4523
FILE REFERENCE: S/0004 S/1240
ATTACHMENTS: A - K

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with information in response to two (2) Notices of Motion which were considered by the Council at its meeting held on 6 August 2018.

BACKGROUND

As Elected Members will recall, at its meeting held on 6 August 2018, the Council considered two (2) Notices of Motion associated with Queensland Box street trees and the consequent impacts from a pedestrian safety perspective of seed pods accumulating on footpaths.

Following consideration of both Notices of Motion, the Council resolved the following:

That a report be prepared for the Council meeting to be held in October 2018 on options for addressing the hazards associated with Queensland Box trees growing on Council footpaths in locations near Residential Aged Care Facilities.”

That Council Staff prepare a report and present this to Council as soon as possible on the introduction of a regular (possibly bi-annual) footpath sweeping program in streets containing Queensland Box Trees in our City.

As the two (2) resolutions are similar in nature, it is considered prudent to combine the two into one report.

Prior to determining a strategy to address the issues which have been raised in the two (2) Notices of Motion, it is worthwhile re-visiting the previous decisions which have been made by the Council on this issue.

In response to a petition in December 2005, the Council resolved the following:

1. *That the petition be received.*
2. *That the convenor of the petition be thanked for bringing the petitioners' views to the attention of the Council and be advised of the Council's resolution with regard to this matter.*
3. *That the matter be deferred pending further investigation into the options and a report, which will incorporate the following items:*
 - *the extent of the problem;*
 - *an analysis of the risks;*
 - *the various options available to address the risks; and*
 - *the costs associated with the various options.*

Subsequently, at its meeting held on 3 April 2006, the Council considered a report which provided information regarding the levels of risks associated with Queensland Box street trees and to identify and explore options to satisfactorily manage the hazard.

Following consideration of the matter at that meeting, the Council resolved the following:

1. *That upon completion, the information held in the Street Tree Inventory be analysed to map Queensland Box street tree populations and quantify the work required to reduce or eliminate hazardous situations involving Queensland Box street trees.*
2. *That the Street Tree Inventory data be used to better target the Council's footpath sweeping operations to where the sweeping will be of most benefit in reducing the hazard presented by nuts shed from Queensland Box street trees.*
3. *That the results of the footpath sweeping arrangements be monitored.*
4. *That following analysis of the results, if the need to increase the frequency of footpath sweeping is identified as being required, the additional resources required will be referred to the Council for consideration.*
5. *That the Street Tree Inventory data be used to consult with the relevant stakeholders, to identify specific, hazardous situations involving Queensland Box street trees and prioritise work required to reduce or eliminate the hazard.*
6. *That the Council acknowledges the concern of some of our elderly residents in respect to Queensland Box trees.*
7. *That the Council progressively removes and replaces Queensland Box trees along footpaths throughout the City over a twenty-five (25) year period, with priority being given to those areas where there are concentrations of elderly residents (ie. retirement villages).*

The Council also resolved that the anticipated costs for the 25 year program be investigated and that the estimates be incorporated into the 2006-2007 Budget for consideration.

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2006 are contained in **Attachment A**.

At its meeting held on 1 May 2006, the Council considered a Notice of Motion which rescinded the resolution which was made by the Council at its meeting held on 3 April 2006 and replaced it with the following Motion:

That the resolution of Council on 3 April 2006, be rescinded and substituted with the following motion:

1. *That upon completion, the information held in the Street Tree Inventory be analysed to map Queensland Box street tree populations and quantify the work required to reduce or eliminate hazardous situations involving Queensland Box street trees.*
2. *That the Street Tree Inventory data be used to better target the Council's footpath sweeping operations to where the sweeping will be of most benefit in reducing the hazard presented by nuts shed from Queensland Box street trees.*
3. *That the results of the footpath sweeping arrangements be monitored.*
4. *That following analysis of the results, if the need to increase the frequency of footpath sweeping is identified as being required, the additional resources required will be referred to the Council for consideration.*
5. *That the Street Tree Inventory data be used to consult with the relevant stakeholders, to identify specific, hazardous situations involving Queensland Box street trees and prioritise work required to reduce or eliminate the hazard.*

6. *That the Council acknowledges the concern of some of our elderly residents in respect to Queensland Box trees.*
7. *That prioritised work of a minor nature is actioned as soon as is practical, drawing on existing operational street tree maintenance budget allocations.*
8. *That prioritised work, which is likely to require significant resources, be subject to the Council's normal budget process.*

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 May 2006 are contained in **Attachment B**.

At its meeting held on 5 June 2006, the Council considered a Notice of Motion and resolved the following:

That Council seek a legal opinion regarding Council's risk management position and Council's possible exposure to compensation claims with respect to Queensland Box street trees following the motion passed in Item 9.3 of the meeting of Council held on 1 May 2006 and specifically in respect to the report provided by the Council's arborist in the agenda for the Council meeting held on 3 April 2006.

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2006 are contained in **Attachment C**.

Following this decision, legal advice was obtained and presented to the Council at its meeting held on 4 September 2006.

A copy of the legal advice is contained in **Attachment D**.

In short, the legal advice which was provided to the Council, concluded that the recommendations which were contained in the report considered by the Council at its meeting held on 3 April 2006 (and which were subsequently adopted by the Council at its meeting held on 1 May 2006) "*are a reasonable response to the risk and an adequate strategy to limit exposure to compensation claims*". The legal advice also recommended an immediate risk assessment of high risk areas throughout the City, to assess the adequacy of the eight (8) week footpath sweeping program, liaise (negotiate) with the footpath sweeping contractors with a view to increasing the sweeping program in appropriate areas and ensure that the contractors keep adequate records of the sweeping regime.

At its meeting held on 6 November 2006, the Council considered a Notice of Motion and resolved the following:

"The Council supports the motion that Staff investigate and prepare a Report on the Street and Footpath Sweeping Program with the view of varying the seasonal frequency to better target the actual need in areas of predominant tree species with varying leaf litter characteristics, with emphasis on the widespread Queensland Box Trees."

A copy of the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2006 are contained in **Attachment E**.

At its meeting held on 5 March 2007, the Council considered a report on the outcome of a review of the Council's Footpath Sweeping Program.

Following consideration of the matter at that meeting the Council resolved the following:

1. *That Footpath Sweeping Program, as set out in Table 1 below, be adopted.*

TABLE 1 – New Footpath Sweeping Program

Footpath sweeping frequency	Suburbs or sections
4-weekly	All main roads All bus routes Felixstow Firle Glynde Marden (east of Lower Portrush Road) Norwood Payneham (east of Portrush Road) Payneham South St Morris Trinity Gardens
8-weekly	Heathpool Joslin Kensington Kent Town Marden (west of Lower Portrush Road) Marryatville Payneham (west of Portrush Road) Royston Park St Peters (east of Winchester Street)
12-weekly	College Park Evandale Hackney Maylands St Peters (west of Winchester Street) Stepney
1 – 2 weekly (under the autumn leaf program)	Streets containing predominantly Plane and Celtis Trees during the leaf fall season.
1 – 2 weekly	Streets containing predominantly White and Red Cedar trees during the seed fall season.
Additional proactive and responsive sweeping (within allocated funding limits)	Higher risk areas during the most prolific period of the Queensland Box nut fall season. Other isolated areas as required to address unique tree species. Responsive sweeping as required to address problem areas not sufficiently covered by the base schedule.

2. *That the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to negotiate with the Council's current footpath sweeping contractors to amend the current contract to achieve the adopted Footpath Sweeping Program.*
3. *That a further report be presented to the Council, outlining the outcome of the negotiations with the Council's Footpath Sweeping contractors.*
4. *That the cost of the adopted footpath sweeping program be presented to the Council, for confirmation, as part of the 2007-08 Budget.*

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2007 are contained in **Attachment F**.

At its meeting held on 4 June 2007, the Council considered a report on the cost of the Footpath Sweeping Program as set out in Table 1 of the Council's resolution made at its meeting held on 5 March 2007 and the outcome of the negotiations regarding the revised Footpath Sweeping Program.

Following consideration of this matter the Council resolved the following:

1. *That the Council approves a variation to the current City-wide footpath sweeping contract to increase the contract sum to \$138,190.20 (excluding GST) per year from 1 July 2007.*
2. *That the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to undertake any administrative action required to effect the variation.*
3. *That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal any contracts and/or documents associated with this matter.*

It should be noted that the contract sum of \$138,190, did not include additional sweeping in areas containing predominantly White Cedar trees during the "berry drop" season and other 'ad hoc' special footpath sweeping requirements during the year. The budget adopted by the Council for the Footpath Sweeping Program for the 2007-2008 financial year was \$170,000.

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 June 2007 are contained in **Attachment G**.

At a Special Council meeting held on 17 April 2012, the Council resolved "*in principle*" to reduce the total Street and Footpath Sweeping Program by \$312,000. This reduction was confirmed by a resolution of the Council made at its meeting held on 2 July 2012, when the 2012-2013 Budget was adopted.

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2012 are contained in **Attachment H**.

In order to accommodate the reduction in the funds allocated for the total Street and Footpath Sweeping Program, the Footpath Sweeping Program was totally discontinued from 28 February 2013 (i.e. footpaths were no longer swept). The Program at that time was based on the frequencies as shown in Table 1, which was adopted by the Council at its meeting held on 5 March 2007.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Outcomes and Objectives of the Council's ***City Plan 2030 - Shaping Our Future*** are provided below:

Outcome 1: Social Equity

A connected, accessible and pedestrian-friendly community

Objectives:

2. A people-friendly, integrated, sustainable and active transport network.
 - 2.2 Provide safe and accessible movement for people of all abilities.

Outcome 4: Environmental Sustainability

A leader in environmental sustainability.

Objectives:

3. Sustainable and attractive streetscapes and open spaces.
 - 3.1 Improve the amenity and safety of streetscapes for pedestrians and cyclists, including provision for shade in summer.
 - 3.4 Protect, diversify and increase the existing tree stock.

One of the targets within this section of the *CityPlan 2030*, is to plant an additional 300 trees in streets and in public places by 2020, in order to increase the total number of street trees by 1.3% on the 2016 level.

For the period 1997 to 2017, the Council's tree canopy for both street trees and reserves increased from 30% to 34%.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

As Elected Members are aware, currently there are no funds available in the Budget to undertake a Footpath Sweeping Program.

The costs associated with the various options presented in this report are set out in the Discussion section of this report.

In respect to the cost of the options, it should be noted that any works associated with sweeping footpaths, will be an operating expense.

Any works associated with the removal and replacement of the Queensland Box trees can be treated as capital expenditure.

The rationale for this is based on the fact that trees are considered to be an asset and whilst a depreciation value cannot be placed against them, they serve the community over a long period of time, at least twenty (20) to twenty five years (25).

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

The impact of removing healthy, functional street trees must be balanced against the impact of providing elderly, frail and disabled residents and indeed pedestrians generally, with a safer environment in which to live.

Based upon complaints and concerns which have been raised by citizens, it is clear that there is a view in some sections of the community, that the seed pods produced by Queensland Box trees pose a potential hazard to pedestrians.

Debris on footpaths, especially the pods from the Queensland Box trees can cause accidents and injury. At the same time, Queensland Box trees require a low level of maintenance, are easy to prune, are slow growing, drought tolerant and generally not susceptible to pest and disease.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The Council's *CityPlan 2030*, acknowledges that the Council's street trees and streetscapes are highly valued and treasured assets within the City. Clearly, the removal of healthy, functional street trees for reasons of risk management will have negative environmental and aesthetic impacts. The impacts may be mitigated by replacing trees which are removed; with semi-advanced specimens of an appropriate species. At the same time, the Council's *CityPlan 2030* acknowledges the safety of pedestrians by providing safe and accessible movement for people of all abilities.

Hence, the dilemma in dealing with this important issue.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Should the Council resolve to introduce a revised Footpath Sweeping Program, then this service will be outsourced to a contractor.

Similarly, if the Council resolves to remove some or all of the Queensland Box street trees, then these works will be outsourced.

The implementation and management of both decisions will be undertaken by Council staff.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Legal advice which has been received and considered by the Council regarding the management of street trees, concluded that the recommendations which were contained in the report considered by the Council at its meeting held on 3 April 2006 (and which were subsequently resolved by the Council at its meeting held on 1 May 2006), are a reasonable response to the risk and an adequate strategy to limit exposure to compensation claims. The legal advice also made recommendation for an immediate risk assessment of high risk areas throughout the City to assess the adequacy of the eight (8) week cycle associated with the footpath sweeping program and to liaise with the footpath sweeping contractors with a view to increasing the sweeping program in appropriate areas.

Since that time and following the adoption of the Footpath Sweeping Program adopted by the Council at its meeting held on 5 March 2007, the Council has since resolved not to sweep all footpaths throughout the City. This resolution of the Council at its meeting held on 2 July 2007 increases the risk for the Council against claims made by persons against the Council for slipping on a footpath due to the debris falling from the Council's street trees.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
As set out in this report, the Council has considered several reports on this issue over a number of years.
- **Community**
If the Council resolves to remove any of the Queensland Box street trees, then appropriate consultation is required to be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Consultation Policy and Section 232 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.
- **Staff**
Manager, City Services
Acting Manager, City Assets
City Arborist
Works Coordinator, Parks and Gardens
- **Other Agencies**
Not Applicable

DISCUSSION

This section of the report summarises the extent of the issues associated with Queensland Box street trees, the number and locations of Queensland Box street trees, the level of risk presented and the strategies which are available for the Council to address the issue.

1. Queensland Box Trees

As Elected Members are aware, the legal advice which has been received, has acknowledged that there are risks associated with Queensland Box trees when planted as street trees. In particular, the propensity of Queensland Box trees to shed large volumes of semi-spherical seed capsules on to footpaths and the potential hazard that is created.

The behaviour of Queensland Box trees is thought to be largely due to Adelaide's drier climate when compared to the Queensland Box's natural rainforest habitat. The lack of water and other rainforest conditions causes the Queensland Box trees to assume that there is a drought and natural mechanisms trigger the production of copious amounts of seed pods which in turn has the potential to create trip hazards and in particular for the frail and elderly. Therefore, the risk can increase significantly when Queensland Box trees grow in proximity to the homes of elderly citizens – including aged accommodation.

In light of these issues, the Council resolved some time ago, that Queensland Box trees will no longer be used as a street tree and that when an existing Queensland Box tree is justifiably removed due to disease, defect or unmanageable risk, its replacement will be of an alternate, more appropriate species.

Notwithstanding this, Queensland Box trees make up a quarter of the Council's total street tree population. That is, approximately 4,525 street trees from a total of approximately 22,000.

Sound environmental, aesthetic and social reasons encourage the Council to continue to plant street trees within roadside verges whenever possible. Naturally, if the Queensland Box trees are removed, a suitable replacement species will be used. Therefore, it is important to note that although the particular issues surrounding the shedding of seed pods may not be typical of all species, all trees growing in urbanised environments will carry a certain level of risk. This is inevitable.

Unfortunately, from a risk management perspective, many of the Queensland Box trees exist in suburbs which have a generally older demographic profile and this tends to compound the risk of trip injury due to seed pods being shed onto the footpath and the fact that these pods are shed all year round.

Based upon previous assessments which have been undertaken, it has been determined that the spatial location of Queensland Box trees are distributed most densely within the suburbs of the former Payneham Local Government Area and throughout the suburbs of Norwood and Kent Town. There are also isolated sections in Evandale, St Peters, Kensington and Marryatville.

At its meeting held on 5 March 2007, the Council was advised that:

In order to determine areas of highest risk, locations of schools, shopping centres, and known aged care homes and retirement villages of significant size, were overlaid on the distribution map. A copy of the overlay is available for review and will be provided at the Council meeting. It was considered that these places attract the greatest concentration of foot traffic and contain the most vulnerable members of the community in the highest concentrations (ie: the frail aged). Most aged care and retirement facilities are located in the north-eastern parts of the City and in the suburbs of Norwood. Interestingly, Queensland Box trees are prominent in these same areas. Parts of the City with scarce existence of Queensland Box, such as Stepney, St Peters, College Park, and Maylands, have a lower concentration of aged care and retirement facilities.

Profile.id, a demographics analysis tool which correlates the results of previous censuses conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, indicates that suburbs in which Queensland Box trees are prominent, also contain higher concentrations of aged residents than other areas.

Council staff have assessed the locations where Queensland Box street trees are planted adjacent to known aged care and retirement villages as being in the high risk category, with schools, bus routes and major shopping strips being in the medium risk category and all other streets where they are planted in the City in locations considered lower risk.

A copy of the tables containing a summary of this assessment is contained in **Attachment I**. The assessment also includes the estimated costs to remove and replace Queensland Box street trees and also include the cost to sweep the footpaths on which they are planted, at various frequencies.

A map showing the streets where Queensland Box street trees are planted in the higher risk areas is also shown in **Attachment I**.

2. Previous Decisions

At its meeting held on 3 April 2006, the Council resolved to review the Footpath Sweeping Program and at the same time, progressively remove and replace all Queensland Box trees throughout the City over a twenty-five (25) year period, with priority being given to those areas where there are a concentration of elderly citizens (i.e. retirement villages).

At its meeting held 1 May 2006, the Council resolved to rescind this decision.

As a result, a revised Footpath Sweeping Program was considered by the Council at its meeting held on 5 March 2007. The revised program which was presented and adopted by the Council at that meeting, included sweeping footpaths which included Queensland Box trees in streets which contained known aged care facilities and retirement villages, streets with bus routes and high pedestrian areas such as adjacent major shopping precincts. These streets were swept on a four (4) weekly cycle. At the same meeting, the Council resolved to sweep footpaths in other Council locations which contained Queensland Box trees on an eight (8) weekly cycle. These streets were categorised at a medium risk level.

At its meeting held on 17 April 2012, the Council resolved “in principle” to reduce the total Street and Footpath Sweeping Program by \$312,000. This decision was confirmed by a resolution of the Council at its meeting held on 2 July 2012, when the Budget was adopted. In order to accommodate the reductions in the Budget, the Footpath Sweeping was discontinued from 28 February 2013.

The only footpath sweeping program that currently exists is that associated with the sweeping of roads in the City with blowers in streets where there are vehicles parked on a continuous and frequent basis.

As such, the Council does not have any formal program (ie. reactive or responsive) in place to deal with the issues which are caused by Queensland Box street trees. Legal advice which was received and considered by the Council at its meeting held on 4 September 2006, advised that whilst the recommendations contained in the report considered by the Council at its meeting held on 3 April 2006 (and rescinded by the Council at its meeting held on 1 May 2006) “*are a reasonable response to the risk and an adequate strategy to limit exposure to compensation claims*”. The legal advice also made recommendations to the Council to undertake an immediate risk assessment of high risk areas throughout the City and to assess the adequacy of the eight (8) week program. This assessment, together with the revised program was considered by the Council at its meeting held on 5 March 2007.

3. Current Footpath Sweeping Practices

Whilst the Footpath Sweeping Program has been discontinued, some footpaths are swept in conjunction with the Council's Road Sweeping Program.

In this respect, at its meeting held on 1 July 2013, the Council considered a report regarding a review which was undertaken of the Council's Street Sweeping Program. Following consideration of the matter, the Council resolved to sweep roads and footpaths where vehicles are parked on a frequent basis three (3) times during the summer with the aid of blowers and streets which contain Eucalyptus and White Cedar trees. Under these circumstances, some of the streets included in these programs contain Queensland Box trees.

An analysis of the lengths associated with the sweeping of those streets identified in **Attachment J** has been considered in determining the costs for any future strategies in dealing with this issue.

A map showing the location of streets with heavily parked vehicles and where sweeping takes place in autumn and summer is contained in **Attachment K**.

The major reason for including a sweeping program (for a limited duration) for streets containing White Cedar trees, is to address the potential slip hazard which is posed by the seeds which are shed during the summer months. This is undertaken as part of the Road Sweeping Program with the use of blowers.

As Queensland Box trees shed pods all year round, it is difficult and costly to facilitate such a program. Council staff attend to locations based on complaints. However, this is a reactive response.

If the Council wishes to be more responsive, other strategies need to be considered.

Similarly, streets are swept with the aid of blowers once a month in Beulah Road, Queen Street, William Street, George Street and Edward Street in Norwood, at the beginning of each month between September and April. That is, one (1) sweep per month. These streets contain Queensland Box street trees for a portion of the total length of the street and experience major pedestrian activity. The length of these streets are also contained in **Attachment I**.

4. Complaints Received

The number of footpath sweeping complaints which are received and the total number received associated with the dropping of seed pods from trees for the period 2013 to 2018 inclusive, are shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1 – COMPLAINTS RECEIVED FOR THE PERIOD 2013-2018

Year	Footpath Sweeping Complaints	Seed Pod Complaints	Percentage	Period
2013	40	12	30.00%	May to December
2014	47	17	36.17%	January to December
2015	74	21	28.38%	January to December
2016	100	29	29.00%	January to December
2017	133	27	20.30%	January to December
2018	48	5	10.42%	January to Date

Whilst the complaints which are received do not distinguish the tree species, based upon experience it would be fair to say that the majority of these issues are associated with Queensland Box street trees. The major reasons for this assumption is the fact that Queensland Box street trees shed the pods all year round and that there is no formal program to sweep these footpaths.

The largest number of complaints occurred during the drier years, particularly in 2016 and 2017.

OPTIONS

The options available to the Council to address this issue are:

1. Immediate removal and replacement of all Queensland Box street trees

This option is not considered appropriate as it would involve the removal of some 4,425 street trees. Clearly such an approach would have a significant impact on the City's streetscapes and is not considered to be a satisfactory outcome. The initial cost of removing and replacing approximately 4,425 street trees is likely to be in the vicinity of \$3.36M (approximately \$745 per tree), in addition to substantial initial maintenance costs.

Option 1 is not supported from an aboricultural and cost perspective.

2. Progressively remove and replace all Queensland Box street trees

As with Option 1, this option is not considered appropriate. Even if the estimated cost of \$3.36m to undertake the work is spread over a number of years (for example 25 years as previously resolved by the Council), this will cost some \$134,000 per year.

3. The Identification of specific locations and the removal and replacement of those trees in these locations

Based upon the Council's Street Tree Inventory, there are approximately 691 Queensland Box street trees adjacent to known aged care facilities and retirement villages. The total cost to remove and replace these trees is approximately \$514,104. These trees can be removed and replaced at one time or over a period of time. The trees adjacent these locations present the greatest trip hazards.

Similarly, it has identified that approximately 692 Queensland Box street trees are located adjacent to high pedestrian use areas such as schools, regular stopping routes and bus routes. These areas fall into the medium risk category. The estimated cost to remove and replace these trees is \$514,840. Again, these trees can be removed and replaced in one (1) year or over a period of time.

This option addresses the immediate and most significant risk areas. If progressed through the removal and immediate replacement with advanced tree specimens, the impact on the respective streetscapes will be a short term.

4. Identify Queensland Box street trees in specific locations that are considered to be unhealthy or badly shaped and replace these trees

This option involves assessing the existing Queensland Box street trees and identifying those trees with poor health or having an unbalanced shape following vegetation clearance by SAPN and prioritising their removal and replacement.

This option will not address the problem immediately, however it provides a good longer term strategy and can be undertaken in tandem with Option 3.

5. Reintroduce the Footpath Sweeping Program

This option will require identifying those streets with Queensland Box street trees and putting in place a footpath sweeping regime that will assist in minimising the risks associated with the dropping of seed pods on the footpaths.

At present, footpaths are not swept, as the Council has resolved to discontinue the Footpath Sweeping Program from its operations. However, there are certain locations where streets and footpaths are swept and these are contained in **Attachment J**.

The risk management approach associated with the introduction of a Footpath Sweeping Program would include:

- identifying streets where Queensland Box street trees are planted;
- identifying the location of areas in the City which contain known aged care and retirement villages of significant size and hospitals (or similar);
- identifying the location of schools, bus routes and major pedestrian routes associated with shopping precincts;
- overlaying the information obtained above to determine areas of greatest risk; and
- determine the best frequency of sweeping to address the removal of the seed pods.

This exercise has been undertaken by staff and it has been determined that:

- There are approximately 41km of footpaths where Queensland Box street trees have been planted on the footpaths adjacent known aged care homes and retirement villages. A list of these locations by street is contained in **Attachment I**. These footpaths present the higher risk locations.

A map showing these footpaths is also included as **Attachment I**.

- There are approximately 46km of footpaths with Queensland Box street trees which form part of a bus route, school route and major pedestrian routes associated with major shopping precincts. These footpaths present a medium risk. A list of these locations by streets is contained in **Attachment I**.
- There are approximately 189km of footpaths with Queensland Box street trees. These footpaths present the lower risk for the Council. These streets are also shown in **Attachment I**.

It should be noted that there are risks issues associated from the dropping of seed pods from Queensland Box street trees, however, in some locations the risk is higher and hence the terminology used is higher and lower, rather than the highest and the lowest.

If the Council resolves to reintroduce a Footpath Sweeping Program, then in respect to the higher risk footpaths which have been identified, it is recommended to sweep these footpaths on a minimum four (4) weekly cycle, those footpaths with a medium risk on an eight (8) weekly cycle and those with the lower risk on a twelve (12) weekly cycle.

A combination of a more targeted Footpath Sweeping Program and the removal of Queensland Box street trees in selected locations is the preferred option from an environmental, risk management and cost perspective in specific locations.

6. Re-design of footpaths

Alternative pavement treatments such as rubberised bitumen may offer more resistance to slipping than block paved footpaths; however alternative surface treatments tend to be expensive and seldom complement existing pavement surfaces, resulting in a 'patchwork appearance'.

This option can be used in isolated locations, however, it is generally found to be cost prohibitive and is not considered suitable for widespread application.

7. Do nothing

The Council can continue to adopt a reactive complaint-based approach associated with Queensland Box trees.

This option is likely to increase the Council's exposure to liability and is not the preferred option from a risk management perspective.

SUMMARY

As mentioned throughout this report, there is a risk associated with seed pods dropping on footpaths.

Legal advice which has been received and considered by the Council and advice which has been received from the Local Government Association's Mutual Liability Scheme, requires the Council to demonstrate that it has identified the extent of the problem and has established systems and programs to deal with the issue and satisfactorily mitigate levels of risk.

Based upon an assessment of the options which have been presented in this report, removal of all the Queensland Box street trees throughout the City, either immediately or over a period of time, is considered to be an over-reaction. Notwithstanding this, the removal of all Queensland Box street trees and replacement with a more suitable specie over a period of time, can still be considered.

The Council has discontinued its Footpath Sweeping Program, except in those streets which contain Queensland Box street trees in locations where vehicles are frequently and continuously parked.

Table 2 below, summarises the various risk categories associated with Queensland Box street trees planted throughout the City, the cost to sweep these footpaths at various frequencies and the costs to replace the Queensland Box street trees associated with the categories of risk. The risks have been categorised as higher, medium and lower risk.

The figures shown in Table 2 for the various sweeping frequencies, have taken into account the sweeping of those streets where Queensland Box street trees are planted in streets which experienced parked vehicles on a frequent and continuous basis.

The higher risk areas are considered to be those locations where dense coverage of Queensland Box street trees exist in close proximity to known aged care facilities, retirement villages and hospitals.

Medium risk streets contain Queensland Box street trees adjacent to schools, bus routes and major shopping centres.

All other streets throughout the City which have Queensland Box street trees have been categorised as having the lower risk.

TABLE 2: VARIOUS OPTIONS & COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH STRATEGIES REGARDING QUEENSLAND BOX STREET TREES THROUGHOUT THE CITY

Risk	No. of QB Street Trees	Km of Footpath (km)	4 Weekly Cycle \$	8 Weekly Cycle \$	12 Weekly Cycle \$	Cost to Remove & Replace QB Street Trees \$
Higher Risk	691	27	55,522	27,614	18,409	514,104
Medium Risk	692	36	73,752	36,568	24,347	514,848
Lower Risk	3,141	148	420,260	210,130	140,086	2,457,432

Note: QB = Queensland Box street trees

From the options which have been considered and presented in this report and based on the cost estimates shown in Table 2, it is recommended that:

1. All Queensland Box street trees which are located in streets which have been identified in the higher risk category, be considered for removal and immediate replacement with a suitable specie. This can be undertaken in one (1) year or over a number of years. It is recommended that this be considered as part of the 2019-2020 Budget.
2. A Footpath Sweeping Program be introduced to sweep streets in the higher risk category on a minimum four (4) weekly cycle.
3. A Footpath Sweeping Program be introduced for those locations which are categorised at the medium risk on an eight (8) weekly cycle and those categorised at the lower risk on a twelve (12) weekly cycle.

The reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

- The removal and replacement of trees on the higher risk category account for less than 15% (or 692) of the Queensland Box street trees which are located within the City.
- It provides a strategic, responsible and sensible way forward to address an identified risk, which the Council must address.

In respect to the removal and replacement of the Queensland Box street trees associated with the higher risk areas (that is areas adjacent to known aged care and retirement villages), it is recommended that the removal of these trees be staged over at least a two (2) year period (total 691 trees). This represents just over a hundred (350) Queensland Box trees a year to be removed and replaced with a suitable specie.

All newly planted street trees are watered, fertilised and maintained for three (3) years following each planting. As such, to remove, replace and maintain all of the Queensland Box street trees associated with the higher risk areas, will require additional resources which also needs to be factored into the total cost.

CONCLUSION

The hazards associated with Queensland Box street trees are acknowledged as is the environmental and aesthetic contributions made by the City's streetscapes by Queensland Box trees.

Clearly, the Council must strike a balance between managing the risks associated with this particular tree species and the benefits which are derived from them.

Currently, there is no effective management strategy in place to deal with the risk issues associated with the dropping of seed pods from Queensland Box street trees on to the Council's footpaths (ie. the Council does not have a strategy to effectively manage the risk). Most councils with Queensland Box street trees have similar problems and issues to deal with.

Effective management of the situation may require the Council progressing more than one management strategy.

Doing nothing is not an option as both the legal advice which has been received by the Council and advice received from the Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme (LGAMLS) requires the Council to demonstrate that it has identified the extent of the problem and has established systems or processes to deal with the issue and satisfactorily mitigate levels of risk.

COMMENTS

Sound risk management requires that once a hazard has been identified, the likelihood and potential consequences of an incident associated with the hazard must be considered and if required, appropriate action undertaken to mitigate the risk within a reasonable time.

The challenge for the Council in this instance, is to balance the effective management of risk against amenity, environmental considerations and the impact of removing healthy street trees potentially resulting in negative influences on property values and the potential psychological and social affect.

The Council has previously resolved to review, implement and discontinue a Footpath Sweeping Program. This Program placed an emphasis on the issues surrounding Queensland Box street trees. This report has presented the Council with a number of options, all which involve either progressively removing selected Queensland Box street trees or reintroducing a targeted Footpath Sweeping Program for those locations where Queensland Box street trees provided the greatest risk, or a combination.

The recommended option has been devised using a risk management approach in a way which addresses a higher level of service where the risk is greatest.

CARETAKER PROVISIONS

As Elected Members are aware, Section 91A of the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999* (the Act), prohibits the Council from making certain "designated decisions" during an election period.

The Key Principles which apply to this Section of the Act are that:

- the day-to-day business of the Council continues efficiently during the Election Period;
- the incumbent Council does not inappropriately make decisions that will be binding on the incoming Council; and
- the Council is committed to the conduct of efficient, equitable and accountable Local Government elections within its area.

A *Major Policy Decision*, defined as a *Designated Decision*, includes any decision by the Council to:

- spend unbudgeted monies; and /or
- endorse a new policy.

Section 91A (5) of the Act stipules that “a designated decision made by a council in contravention of this section or the Caretaker Policy of the council is invalid.”

The consequent strategies and actions associated with responding to this issue are deemed to constitute a *Major Policy Decision* on the basis that, in the event the Council did endorse the recommendations as set out within this report, the Council would essentially be adopting a new “policy” in respect to the management of Queensland Box trees and would bind the new Council to not only this policy position but also to the consideration of funding for the implementation of the policy.

This matter therefore would result in the Council making a decision which the Council cannot make during the Local Government Elections Caretaker Period.

It is therefore recommended that the Council defers consideration of this matter until after the conclusion of the Local Government Elections Caretaker Period, which will be at the final declaration of the 2018 Local Government Election (ie approximately 16 November 2018).

Notwithstanding this, given the level of expenditure which is required to implement the various options (including a policy decision to introduce a Footpath Sweeping Program) which are contained in the report, it is considered both appropriate and prudent to consider allocation of the required funding (should the Council choose to pursue the options contained in this report) as part of the 2019–2020 Budget.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the report be received and noted.
 2. That in accordance with the provisions of the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999* and Council’s *Local Government Elections Caretaker Policy*, this matter be deferred for consideration at a future Council meeting, following the 2018 Local Government Elections.
-

Cr Wormald entered the meeting at 7.04pm.
Cr Wormald left the meeting at 7.05pm.
Cr Wormald returned to the meeting at 7.06pm.

Cr Duke moved:

1. *That the report be received and noted.*
2. *That in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 and Council’s Local Government Elections Caretaker Policy, this matter be deferred for consideration at the March 2019 Council meeting.*

Seconded by Cr Whittington and carried unanimously.

Section 2 – Corporate & Finance
Reports

11.2 MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – AUGUST 2018

REPORT AUTHOR: Financial Services Manager
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Corporate Services
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4585
FILE REFERENCE: S/00697
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with information regarding its financial performance for the year ended August 2018.

BACKGROUND

Section 59 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act), requires the Council to keep its resource allocation, expenditure and activities and the efficiency and effectiveness of its service delivery, under review. To assist the Council in complying with these legislative requirements and the principles of good corporate financial governance, the Council is provided with monthly financial reports detailing its financial performance compared to its Budget.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS AND POLICIES

Nil

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Financial sustainability is as a high priority for the Council. The Council adopted a Budget which forecasts an Operating Surplus of \$1.430 million for the 2018-2019 Financial Year.

For the period ended August 2018, the Council's Operating Surplus is \$0.147 million against a budgeted Operating Deficit of \$0.128 million, resulting in a favourable variance of \$0.276 million.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Nil

SOCIAL ISSUES

Nil

CULTURAL ISSUES

Nil

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Nil

RESOURCE ISSUES

Nil

RISK MANAGEMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
Not Applicable
- **Community**
Not Applicable.
- **Staff**
Responsible Officers and General Managers.
- **Other Agencies**
Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

For the period ended August 2018, the Council's Operating Surplus is \$0.147 million against a budgeted Operating Deficit of \$0.128 million, resulting in a favourable variance of \$0.276 million. The variance is consistent with the reported variance for July 2018 and as previously advised it is not uncommon to have variances to budget due to expenditure timings at the beginning of the Financial Year.

The First Budget update will be undertaken during October 2018, with the focus of the review being on the timing of the anticipated monthly spend for the remainder of the Financial Year.

The Monthly Financial report is contained in **Attachment A**.

OPTIONS

Nil

CONCLUSION

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That the Monthly Financial Report – August 2018, be received and noted.

Cr Minney moved:

That the Monthly Financial Report – August 2018, be received and noted.

Seconded by Cr Frogley.

Cr Wormald left the meeting at 7.25pm.

The motion was put and was carried.

Section 3 – Governance & General Reports

11.3 REPORTS OUTSTANDING

REPORT AUTHOR: Chief Executive Officer
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 83664520
FILE REFERENCE: Nil
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

As part of the Organisation's management system, a Reports Outstanding List will be prepared on a monthly basis. The purpose of the List is to keep track of any reports that have been requested and the status of those reports.

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

BACKGROUND

Nil

DISCUSSION

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.

Cr Minney moved:

That the report be received and noted.

Seconded by Cr Marcuccitti and carried unanimously.

11.4 ELECTION FOR THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: S/03561
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the postal ballot required to be undertaken for the position of President of the Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA) and determine the Council's preferred candidate for the position.

BACKGROUND

In July 2018, the LGA called for nominations for the position of President of the LGA.

The LGA has now forwarded correspondence to the Council advising that the LGA has received five (5) nominations for the position of President of the Local Government Association (LGA).

Pursuant to Rule 18 of the LGA Constitution, the LGA is required to conduct a postal ballot to determine the successful candidate for the position.

RELEVANT POLICIES & STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

The role of the President of the LGA is to:

- provide leadership to the LGA Board of Directors;
- chair meetings of the LGA Board of Directors;
- preside at meetings of the LGA (ie Ordinary Meetings, Annual General Meetings; etc);
- to act as the principal spokesperson of the LGA; and
- represent the LGA externally to government, stakeholders, etc.

An annual allowance is payable in relation to the position of President.

The term of office of the President is two (2) years.

The current LGA Constitution and the new LGA *Constitution and Rules* also stipulate a long standing protocol that the position of President alternates between metropolitan councils (now referred to as GAROC), and rural councils (now referred to as SAROC), every two (2) years.

As the previous President, Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg was from a metropolitan council (ie the City of Onkaparinga), nominees were sought from eligible rural councils.

The five (5) nominees for the Position, in the order as set out on the Ballot Paper, are:

- Mayor Samuel (Sam) Telfer, District Council of Tumby Bay;
- Mayor David (Dave) Burgess, Mid Murray Council;
- Mayor Erika Vickery OAM, Naracoorte Lucindale Council;
- Mayor Ann Ferguson OAM, Mount Barker District Council; and
- Mayor Keith Parkes, Alexandrina Council.

A copy of the Ballot Paper and Candidate Information for each Candidate is contained within **Attachment A**.

In accordance with the LGA Constitution, the Council must determine its preferred Candidate by marking the Ballot Paper with a cross, ie “X”, in the square opposite the name of the Candidate the Council wishes to elect.

Three (3) of the five (5) Candidates have written to the Council seeking the Council’s support of their nomination for the position of President of the LGA:

- Mayor Erika Vickery OAM, Naracoorte Lucindale Council;
- Mayor Ann Ferguson OAM, Mount Barker District Council; and
- Mayor David (Dave) Burgess.

A copy of the correspondence received, as listed above, is contained within **Attachment B**.

The Ballot Paper must be forwarded to the Local Government Association to be received by the Returning Officer no later than 5.00pm on Thursday 18 October 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council determines the following candidate for the position of President of the Local Government Association of South Australia:

- -----
-

Cr Minney moved:

The Council determines the following candidate for the position of President of the Local Government Association of South Australia:

- *Mayor David (Dave) Burgess.*

Seconded by Cr Marcuccitti and lost.

Cr Whittington moved:

The Council determines the following candidate for the position of President of the Local Government Association of South Australia:

- *Mayor Samuel (Sam) Telfer.*

Seconded by Cr Granozio and carried.

11.5 ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA GREATER ADELAIDE REGION ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: S/03561
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to advise the Council of the postal ballot required to be undertaken in order to determine the membership of the Local Government Association of South Australia Greater Adelaide Region Organisation of Councils (the GAROC).

BACKGROUND

In July 2018, the Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA), forwarded correspondence to the Council inviting nominations for appointment of Members to the newly formulated Greater Region of Adelaide Organisation of Councils (GAROC), which is represented by the following councils:

- Adelaide Hills Council;
- City of Burnside;
- Campbelltown City Council;
- City of Charles Sturt;
- Town of Gawler;
- City of Holdfast Bay;
- City of Marion;
- City of Mitcham;
- City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;
- City of Onkaparinga;
- City of Playford;
- City of Port Adelaide Enfield;
- City of Prospect;
- City of Salisbury;
- City of Tea Tree Gully;
- City of Unley;
- Town of Walkerville; and
- City of West Torrens.

Subsequently, at its meeting held on 13 August 2018, the Council nominated Cr Christel Mex for appointment to the GAROC.

RELEVANT POLICIES & STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

The role of the GAROC is to provide regional advocacy, policy initiation and review, leadership, engagement and capacity building in the region(s).

At the close of nominations the LGA received a total of thirteen (13) nominations from councils for the eight (8) positions. In accordance with the Terms of Reference for the GAROC an election now needs to be conducted to determine the successful candidates to be appointed to the GAROC. The eight (8) nominees with the highest number of votes (ie "first past the post"), will be appointed to the GAROC.

The counting of the votes will take place at Local Government House on 19 October 2018. The term of the GAROC members will commence at the conclusion of the 2018 LGA Annual General Meeting which will be held on Friday 26 October 2018.

The Council must determine by resolution which eight (8) candidates it wishes to elect and the voting must be recorded on the Ballot Paper. The Ballot Paper must be returned to the LGA by 18 October 2018.

The nominees, as they appear on the Ballot Paper are as follows:

- Councillor Christel Mex (City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters);
- Councillor Grant Piggot (City of Burnside);
- Mayor Gillian Aldridge (City of Salisbury);
- Mayor Kevin Knight (City of Tea Tree Gully);
- Councillor Rosalina (Mikki) Bouchee (City of Holdfast Bay);
- Councillor Janet Byram (Deputy Mayor, City of Marion);
- Mayor Karen Redman (Town of Gawler);
- Mayor John Trainer (City of West Torrens);
- Councillor Jan-Claire Wisdom (Deputy Mayor, Adelaide Hills Council);
- Councillor Neville Grigg (Campbelltown City Council);
- Mayor David O'Loughlin (City of Prospect);
- Councillor Don Palmer (City of Unley); and
- Councillor Arthur Mangos (City of West Torrens).

A copy of the Ballot Paper and the Candidate Information for each Candidate is contained within **Attachment A**.

Councillor Neville Grigg, Campbelltown City Council, has written to the Council seeking the Council's support of their nomination.

A copy of the letter dated 17 September 2018, which has been forwarded to the Council by Councillor Neville Grigg is contained within **Attachment B**.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council determines the following candidates in order of preference for appointment to the Greater Region of Adelaide Organisation of Councils:

1. -----
 2. -----
 3. -----
 4. -----
 5. -----
 6. -----
 7. -----
 8. -----
-

Cr Stock moved:

The Council determines the following candidates in order of preference for appointment to the Greater Region of Adelaide Organisation of Councils:

- 1. Cr Christel Mex;*
- 2. Mayor Kevin Knight;*
- 3. Mayor Karen Redman;*
- 4. Mayor Gillian Aldridge;*
- 5. Cr Arthur Mangos;*
- 6. Mayor David O'Loughlin;*
- 7. Mayor John Trainer; and*
- 8. Cr Grant Piggot.*

Seconded by Cr Minney and carried unanimously.

11.6 LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY - ELECTION FOR THE POSITIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: S/3457
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to advise the Council of the election process and candidates, who have nominated for election to the positions of Representative Members of the Board of Trustees of the Local Government Finance Authority.

Local Government Finance Authority Board

In July 2018, the Local Government Finance Authority (LGFA) called for nominations from Councils to fill the two (2) Representative Member positions of the Board of Trustees of the Local Government Finance Authority Board.

The current Representative Board Members are Ms Annette Martin (City of Charles Sturt) and Cr John Frogley (City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters).

At its meeting held on 1 August 2018, Cr John Frogley advised the Council that he was not seeking re-appointment as a Representative Member of the Board of Trustees of the Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia.

The LGFA has received nine (9) nominations for the two (2) Representative Member positions on the Board. An election will now be conducted, by postal ballot, to determine the positions.

The nine (9) nominees for the two (2) positions are (in the order as appears on the ballot paper):

- Mr Colin Davies, Chief Executive Officer, The Flinders Ranges Council;
- Mr Paul Duka, Director Corporate Services, Wattle Range Council;
- Cr Paul Field, City of Tea Tree Gully;
- Cr Karen Hockley, City of Mitcham;
- Mr Tony Lines, General Manager, City Services, City of Marion;
- Ms Annette Martin, Manager Financial Services, City of Charles Sturt;
- Mr Steve Mathewson, Director, Services, City of Adelaide;
- Cr John Sanderson, City of Mitcham; and
- Mr Michael Sedgman, Chief Executive Officer, Rural City of Murray Bridge.

The Ballot Paper has now been received along with information on the nine (9) candidates. A copy of the Ballot Paper and Candidate information is contained within **Attachment A**.

Letters of support have also been forwarded to the Council seeking the Council's support from the following Councils:

- City of Charles Sturt; and
- Rural City of Murray Bridge.

A copy of the letters as set out above are contained within **Attachment B**.

In order to comply with the Rules of the Authority, the casting vote of the Council must be conducted as follows:

1. The voting must be on the official ballot paper; and
2. The Council, must by resolution, determine which candidates (being not more than two (2)) they wish to vote for.

All votes are to be forwarded to the Returning Officer by Friday 12 October 2018.

RELEVANT POLICIES & STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Not Applicable.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council determines:

1. _____; and
2. _____

as its preferred candidates for the Representative Members for the Board of Trustees of the Local Government Finance Authority.

Cr Frogley moved:

Cr Wormald returned to the meeting at 7.49pm.

That the Council determines:

1. *Ms Annette Martin Manager (Financial Services, City of Charles Sturt); and*
2. *Cr Karen Hockley (City of Mitcham).*

as its preferred candidates for the Representative Members for the Board of Trustees of the Local Government Finance Authority.

Seconded by Cr Minney and carried unanimously.

12. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

REPORT AUTHOR: General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4549
FILE REFERENCE: Not Applicable
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to present to the Council the Minutes of the following Committee Meetings for the Council's consideration and adoption of the recommendations contained within the Minutes:

- Norwood Parade Precinct Committee – (25 September 2018)
(A copy of the Minutes of the Norwood Parade Precinct Committee meeting is contained within **Attachment A**)

ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

- **Norwood Parade Precinct Committee**

Cr Marcuccitti moved that the minutes of the meeting of the Norwood Parade Precinct Committee held on 25 September 2018, be received and that the resolutions set out therein as recommendations to the Council are adopted as decisions of the Council. Seconded by Cr Granozio and carried.

13. OTHER BUSINESS
Nil

14. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS
Nil

15. CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 7.51pm.

Mayor Robert Bria

Minutes Confirmed on _____
(date)