



BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF MEETING

To: **Members**

Cr Mark Osterstock, Presiding Member

Cr Nathan Daniell

Cr Leith Mudge

Cr Kirsty Parkin

Notice is given pursuant to the provisions under Section 87 of the *Local Government Act 1999* that the next meeting of the Boundary Change Committee will be held on:

Tuesday 30 May 2023

6.30pm

Summit Community Centre, Norton Summit

A copy of the Agenda for this meeting is supplied under Section 87 of the Act.

Committee meetings are open to the public and members of the community are welcome to attend. Public notice of the Agenda for this meeting is supplied under Section 88 of the Act.

David Waters
Chief Executive Officer



BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE

AGENDA FOR MEETING

Tuesday 30 May 2023

6.30pm

Summit Community Centre, Norton Summit

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. COMMENCEMENT

1.1. Acknowledgement of Country

Council acknowledges that we meet on the traditional lands and waters of the Peramangk and Kaurna people. We pay our respects to Elders past, present and emerging as the Custodians of this ancient and beautiful land. Together we will care for this country for the generations to come.

2. APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

- 2.1. Apology
Apologies were received from
- 2.2. Leave of Absence
- 2.3. Absent

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Boundary Change Committee – 25 August 2022

That the minutes of the Boundary Change Committee meeting held on 25 August 2022 as supplied, be confirmed as an accurate record of the proceedings of that meeting.

4. PRESIDING MEMBER'S OPENING REMARKS

5. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

The Boundary Change Committee operates in accordance with the relevant sections of the *Local Government Act 1999*, and its Terms of Reference (attached).

6. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

7. PUBLIC FORUM (10 minutes)

8. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

- 8.1. Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change Proposal – Cr Mark Osterstock
- 8.2. Community Engagement – Cr Mark Osterstock

9. OFFICER REPORTS – DECISION ITEMS

- 9.1. Correspondence with the Local Government Boundaries Commission

The Boundary Change Committee resolves that the report be received and noted.

10. DISCUSSION ITEMS (the Presiding Member will suspend meeting procedure for the purposes of a discussion)

- Service Levels and Expectations (e.g.: verge maintenance)
- Infrastructure
- Community Council Meetings bringing Council to the community by potentially holding Council meetings closer to the communities of interest e.g.: Rostrevor, Norton Summit)

11. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

12. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

13. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Nil

14. NEXT MEETING

The next Boundary Change Committee meeting will be held on , from at the Summit Community Centre, Norton Summit.

15. CLOSE MEETING

ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL

Boundary Change Committee



TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. ESTABLISHMENT

- 1.1 The Boundary Change Committee (the 'Committee') of Council is established under Section 41 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the 'Act').
- 1.2 The Committee does not have executive powers or authority to implement actions in areas which management has responsibility.
- 1.3 The Committee and its Members do not have any delegations except as provided for in this Terms of Reference.

2. ROLE

- 2.1 The role of the Committee is to assist Council to fulfil its role and functions by providing advice regarding the operation and implications of Chapter 3 – Constitution of councils, Part 2 – Reform proposals of the Act associated with the Campbelltown City Council Woodforde/Rostrevor boundary change proposal.

3. SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS

- 3.1 Within the context of the role of the Committee, its specific functions are:
 - 3.1.1 To review and provide advice to Council regarding any correspondence or reports produced by the South Australian Boundaries Commission (the 'Boundaries Commission');
 - 3.1.2 To oversee and provide advice to Council on:
 - 3.1.2.1 the development of submissions to the Boundaries Commission or its associated parties;
 - 3.1.2.2 the development of communications strategies to the affected residents and ratepayers;
 - 3.1.2.3 risk and risk management associated with any potential boundary change;
 - 3.1.2.4 financial and other budgetary considerations associated with any potential boundary change; and
 - 3.1.2.5 other matters as the Committee may determine
 - 3.1.3 To seek legal and/or other professional advice to enable the Committee to discharge its role and functions within the limits of its applicable financial delegation.

4. OTHER MATTERS

- 4.1 The Committee shall:

- 4.1.1 Have access to reasonable resources in order to carry out its duties, recognising the constraints within Council's Budget.
 - 4.1.2 Be provided with appropriate and timely training, both in the form of an induction programme for new committee members and on an ongoing basis for all committee members.
 - 4.1.3 Have delegated financial responsibility as resolved by Council in Resolution 179/22 and any subsequent resolutions. Any procurement activity resulting from the Committee's use of its delegation will be undertaken by the Administration. For clarity, individual Committee Members do not have any authority to commit Council funds.
 - 4.1.4 At least once in each full term, review its own performance and these Terms of Reference to ensure it is operating at maximum effectiveness and recommend changes it considers necessary to the Council for approval.
 - 4.1.5 Upon being provided notification by the Boundaries Commission and/or the Minister for Local Government that the Campbelltown City Council Woodforde/Rostrevor boundary change proposal has either been withdrawn or will not be proceeding in a timely manner, the Committee will provide advice to the Council on the continuance of the Committee.
- 4.2 The Principal Member of Council will be the principal spokesperson for the Committee and for all matters associated with the Campbelltown City Council Woodforde /Rostrevor boundary change proposal. Consistent with clause 4.1 of the *Council Member Conduct Policy*, the Principal Member may delegate this role to another Council Member or Officer on agreed terms.
- 4.3 Where information is required to be provided to the Boundaries Commission or an associated party in a timeframe that does not reasonably allow:
- 4.3.1 the Committee to make a recommendation to Council, the Committee has the delegation to approve the provision of the requested information directly to the requesting party. A report will be provided to the next meeting of Council on the exercise of this delegation; or
 - 4.3.2 the Committee to meet to consider the requested information, the Committee Presiding Member has the delegation, following consultation with the Mayor (or the Deputy Mayor if the Mayor is the Presiding Member) and CEO, to approve the provision of the requested information directly to the requesting party. A report will be provided to the next meeting of the Committee on the exercise of this delegation.

5. MEMBERSHIP

- 5.1 The Committee will comprise five (5) members as follows:
- 5.1.1 The Deputy Mayor of the Council; and
 - 5.1.2 Four (4) Council Members.
- 5.2 All members of the Committee will be appointed by the Council for a period of three (3) years but will expire at each periodic local government election.

- 5.3 It is desirable for the Council Members to be appointed to the Committee to have a sound understanding of provisions of Chapter 3, Part 2 of the Act and the Campbelltown City Council Woodforde/Rostrevor boundary change proposal.
- 5.4 In considering appointments to the Committee, Council should give consideration to the diversity of the membership.
- 5.5 Members of the Committee are eligible for reappointment at the expiration of their term of office.
- 5.6 The Committee may be assisted by independent advisors that the Committee may determine from time to time.

6. PRESIDING MEMBER

- 6.1 The Council will appoint the Presiding Member of the Committee.
- 6.2 The Council authorises the Committee to determine if there will be a Deputy Presiding Member of the Committee and, if so, authorises the Committee to make the appointment to that position for a term determined by the Committee.
- 6.3 If the Presiding Member of the Committee is absent from a meeting the Deputy Presiding Member (if such position exists) will preside at that meeting. If there is no position of Deputy Presiding Member, or both the Presiding Member and the Deputy Presiding Member of the Committee are absent from a meeting of the Committee, then a member of the Committee chosen from those present will preside at the meeting until the Presiding Member (or Deputy Presiding Member, if relevant) is present.
- 6.4 The role of the Presiding Member includes:
 - 6.4.1 overseeing and facilitating the conduct of meetings in accordance with the Act and the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* (the Regulations); and
 - 6.4.2 Ensuring all Committee members have an opportunity to participate in discussions in an open and encouraging manner.

7. SITTING FEES

- 7.1 No additional allowance will be paid to the Members of the Committee over and above the allowance already received by Council Members in accordance with the determination of the Remuneration Tribunal.

8. REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

- 8.1 For the purposes of Section 41(8) of the Act, the Committee's reporting and accountability requirements are:
 - 8.1.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Panel will be provided to all Committee members as soon as practicable after the meeting and, in accordance with the Act, to all Council members within five (5) days after the meeting. Minutes shall be presented to Council at the next Ordinary Council Meeting.

- 8.1.2 All resolutions of the Committee, including recording the names of those present will be minuted and the minutes will otherwise comply with the requirements of the Regulations.
- 8.1.3 Agendas and Reports of the Committee forwarded to the Committee will also be forwarded to Council members for their information prior to the Committee meeting, having regard for any confidentiality provisions that may apply.
- 8.1.4 The minutes of each Committee meeting will be included in the agenda papers of the next ordinary meeting of the Council;
- 8.1.5 Agenda, Reports and Minutes will be made available to the public consistent with legislative requirements.
- 8.1.6 The Presiding Member will attend a meeting of the Council at least once per annum to present a report on the activities of the Committee;
- 8.1.7 The Committee shall make whatever recommendations to the Council it deems appropriate on any area within these terms of reference where in its view action or improvement is needed; and
- 8.1.8 The Presiding Member may attend a Council meeting at any time that the Presiding Member sees fit to discuss any issue or concern relating to the Committee's functions. Depending on the nature of the matter, this may be held in confidence in accordance with Section 90 of the Act and staff may be requested to withdraw from the meeting.
- 8.1.9 The Committee shall report to Council on an as-needs basis or upon Council's request with a summary of its activities.

9. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Where a member of the committee has a conflict of interest in a matter before the Committee, the member must act in accordance with the requirements of section 73 and 75 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

10. QUORUM

A quorum for a meeting of the Committee will be three (3) members. No business can be transacted at a meeting of the Committee unless a quorum is present.

11. MEETING PROCEDURE

- 11.1 The meeting procedure for the Committee is as set out in the Act, Parts 1, 3 and 4 of the Regulations. Insofar as the Act, the Regulations, or these Terms of Reference do not prescribe the procedure to be observed in relation to the conduct of a meeting of the Committee, the Committee may determine its own procedure.
- 11.2 In accordance with Section 90(7a) of the Act, one or more Committee members may participate in the meeting by telephone or other electronic means provided that members of the public can hear the discussion between all Committee members.
- 11.3 Only members of the Committee are entitled to vote in Committee meetings. Unless otherwise required by the Act not to vote, each member must vote on every matter that is before the Committee for decision.

- 11.4 All decisions of the Committee shall be made on the basis of a majority decision of the Members present and in the event of a tied vote the matter be referred to the Council for decision.
- 11.5 Council Employees may attend any meeting as observers, to provide advice and/or be responsible for preparing papers for the Committee.
- 11.6 The Committee can request and/or engage other persons or organisations to make presentations and/or provide advice and/or respond to questions.
- 11.7 The Committee does not enjoy the delegation of any powers, functions and duties of the Council. All decisions of the Committee will, therefore, constitute recommendations to the Council.

12. SECRETARIAL RESOURCES

- 12.1 The Chief Executive Officer shall provide sufficient administrative resources to the Committee to enable it to adequately carry out its functions.

13. FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

- 13.1 The Committee shall meet at least four times a year at appropriate times and places as determined by the Committee. A special meeting of the Committee may be called in accordance with the Act.
- 13.2 If after considering advice from the CEO or delegate, the Presiding Member of the Committee is authorised to cancel the respective Committee meeting, if it is clear that there is no business to transact for that designated meeting.

14. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

- 14.1 Notice of the meetings of the Committee will be given in accordance with Sections 87 and 88 of the Act. Accordingly, notice will be given:

- 14.1.1 To members of the Committee by email or as otherwise agreed by Committee members; and

- 14.1.2 To the public as soon as practicable after the time that notice of the meeting is given to members by causing a copy of the notice and agenda to be displayed at the Council's principle office and on the Council's website.

14.2 PUBLIC ACCESS TO MEETINGS & DOCUMENTS

- 14.3 Members of the public are able to attend all meetings of the Committee, unless prohibited by resolution of the Committee under the confidentiality provisions of Section 90 of the Act.
- 14.4 Members of the public have access to all documents relating to the Committee unless prohibited by resolution of the Committee under the confidentiality provisions of Section 91 of the Act.

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
THURSDAY 25 AUGUST 2022
63 MT BARKER ROAD STIRLING**

In Attendance

Presiding Member: Cr Nathan Daniell

Members:

Cr Ian Bailey	
Cr Kirsty Parkin	
Cr John Kemp	
Cr Mark Osterstock	

In Attendance:

Andrew Aitken	Chief Executive Officer
Terry Crackett	Director Corporate Services
Ashley Curtis	A/Director Infrastructure & Operations
Lachlan Miller	Executive Manager Governance & Performance

1. COMMENCEMENT

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm.

1.1. Acknowledgement of Country

Council acknowledges that we meet on the traditional lands and waters of the Peramangk and Kaurna people. We pay our respects to Elders past, present and emerging as the Custodians of this ancient and beautiful land. Together we will care for this country for the generations to come.

2. APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

2.1 Apology

Nil

2.2 Leave of Absence

Nil

2.3 Absent

Nil

Presiding Member _____ ...

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
THURSDAY 25 AUGUST 2022
63 MT BARKER ROAD STIRLING**

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

3.1 Boundary Change Committee

Nil

4. PRESIDING MEMBER'S OPENING COMMENTS

The Chair welcomed Members and the gallery to the inaugural Boundary Change Committee meeting which has the important role of assisting and providing advice to Council in relation to the Woodforde/Rostrevor Boundary Change Proposal. He thanked Cr Osterstock for moving of the motion in Council that gave rise to this Committee.

The Chair advised that there are many facets to the Boundary Change Proposal and Council's potential actions and that these are best decided at the appropriate time and circumstances. For this inaugural meeting there is one key business item being the response to the Boundaries Commission's Inquiry Plan and this will be the main focus for the evening.

5. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

The Boundary Change Committee operates in accordance with the relevant sections of the *Local Government Act 1999*, and its Terms of Reference.

6. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Nil

Presiding Member _____ ...

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
THURSDAY 25 AUGUST 2022
63 MT BARKER ROAD STIRLING**

7. OFFICER REPORTS – DECISION ITEMS

7.1 Boundaries Commission Inquiry Submission

Moved Cr John Kemp
S/- Cr Kirsty Parkin

BCC1/22

The Boundary Change Committee resolves:

1. That the report be received and noted
2. To approve the draft Inquiry Brief Submission, as contained in Appendix 4, for lodgement with the Commission in accordance with clause 4.3.1 of the Committee's Terms of Reference and to delegate to the Chief Executive Officer to make to make any formatting, nomenclature, or other minor changes to the draft Submission prior to its lodgement.
3. To note that the final Inquiry Brief Submission will be incorporated into correspondence from the Adelaide Hills Council Mayor to the Boundaries Commission Chair for the purposes of lodgement.

Carried Unanimously

8. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

8.1 Update to Affected Residents re Boundary Change Proposal

Moved Cr Nathan Daniell
S/- Cr Mark Osterstock

BCC2/22

That the Boundary Change Committee requests that the Mayor gives consideration to providing an update to our affected residents on Campbelltown City Council's (CCC) boundary change proposal. This update could include but not be limited to:

- Our unwavering commitment to ensure their desire to remain part of the Adelaide Hills Council is strongly represented throughout every stage of the inquiry process.
- The Boundary Commission's recent decision determining that an inquiry into the Proposal may proceed.
- That this inquiry will be subject to CCC agreeing to fund the inquiry, which will not be considered until after the conclusion of the 2022 periodic local government elections.
- The formation of our Boundary Change Committee which will provide additional oversight and advice on CCC's proposal.

Carried Unanimously

Presiding Member _____ ...

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
THURSDAY 25 AUGUST 2022
63 MT BARKER ROAD STIRLING**

9. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Nil

10. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Nil

11. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Boundary Change Committee will be will be a Special Meeting called in accordance with the provisions of s87 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

12. CLOSE MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.51pm.

Presiding Member _____ ...

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday 30 May 2023
AGENDA BUSINESS ITEM**

Item: 8.1 Motion on Notice

Originating from: Cr Mark Osterstock

Subject: Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change Proposal

1. MOTION

1. That the Committee recommends to Council that the CEO engage a suitably qualified person to forensically examine the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) boundary change proposal that was submitted to the Boundary Change Commission (and CCC's subsequent submissions), with a view to identifying the proposal's weaknesses (critical flaws), errors, omissions, and factual inaccuracies.
 2. That once this examination has been completed that a report be presented to the Committee for consideration.
-

2. BACKGROUND

Nil

3. OFFICER'S RESPONSE – Lachlan Miller, Executive Manager Governance & Performance

➤ **Strategic Management Plan/Functional Strategy/Council Policy Alignment**

Strategic Plan 2020-24 – A brighter future

Goal 5 A Progressive ORGANISATION

Objective O4 We actively represent our community

Priority O4.3 Advocate to, and exert influence with, our stakeholders on behalf of our community to promote the needs and ambitions of the region

Priority O4.4 Explore council boundary reform options that best serve the community.

Objective O5 We are accountable, informed, and make decisions in the best interests of the whole community

Priority O5.1 Enhance governance structures and systems to prudently adapt to changing circumstances and meet our legislative obligations

➤ **Legal Implications**

Council boundary reform provisions are contained within Chapter 3 - Constitution of councils, Part 2 – Reform proposals of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the “Act”). The current iteration of these provisions came into effect on 1 January 2019.

Collectively these provisions establish the LGBC as the body that receives, assesses and makes recommendations to the Minister for Local Government on proposals developed in accordance with principles set out in the Act and procedures developed by the Commission.

There are two categories of proposal: Administrative Proposals (these are minor boundary adjustments to correct anomalies and to facilitate a development that has been granted authorisation under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*) and General Proposals (which are all proposals that are not Administrative Proposals - in practice these are for the more substantial council boundary changes and amalgamations). Proposals can be initiated by one of more councils, the public, the Minister or either House of Parliament.

In accordance with s27(2) of the Act, the LGBC has prepared and published a series of guidelines for the purposes of processing reform proposals.

As this report deals with a General Proposal submitted by a council, subsequent information will focus on the processes associated with this form of proposal only.

The following is a brief overview of the General Proposal process as contained in the Commission’s guidelines:

Stage 1 *Submission by the initiating council containing brief overview of the reform proposal*

- The LGBC reviews the submission and if it considers it has merit it will advise the initiating council that they can refer a Stage 2 proposal to the LGBC.

Stage 2 *Detailed submission by the initiating council addressing the 12 principles set out in s26 and the additional requirements of the application guidelines*

- The LGBC reviews the proposal against the principles and guidelines and will advise the initiating council:
 - That the proposal lacks merit (and will not be continued in its current form); or
 - That additional information is required to establish merit; or
 - The proposal has merit.
- Where the LGBC determines that a proposal has merit it will advise the initiating council that the LGBC intends to (independently) inquire into the proposal, the initiating council will be provided with an estimate of the cost of the independent inquiry and will need to resolve to process (and fund the inquiry).

Stage 3 *Inquiry by LGBC-appointed investigators into the merits of the proposal*

- The investigators will assess the proposal against the s26 principles, financial and resource implications, extent of community support, employment implications, etc.

- Affected councils are able to make submissions to the investigators and to provide information to assist inquiry, as requested.

Stage 4 *The LGBC prepares a reform Proposal Report and this is provided to the Minister and is published on the Commission's website*

- The Minister may request consideration of suggestions for report resubmission, if resubmitted the revised report is also a public document
- If the Minister accepts the recommendations, it is sent to the Governor for proclamation and comes into effect

➤ **Risk Management Implications**

Examining the veracity of the CCC boundary reform proposal could assist in mitigating the risk of:

Realignment of Council boundaries bordering Campbelltown City Council leading to financial, resource allocation, social and representation changes

Inherent Risk	Residual Risk	Target Risk
Extreme (5C)	High (4C)	Medium

➤ **Financial and Resource Implications**

At its 26 July 2022 meeting, Council considered a Motion on Notice regarding the establishment of the Boundary Change Committee and resolved (179/22) in part:

2.3 A budget allocation of \$10,000 (exclusive of GST), will be made to enable the Committee to seek external advice in order to assist the Committee in fulfilling its objectives.

Should the Motion on Notice for a suitably qualified person to be engaged to forensically examine the Stage 2 proposal be successfully recommended to Council, as per resolution 179/22, there will likely be sufficient funds allocated to undertake the said examination.

The resource implications are that, given other priorities, it is unlikely that an internal resource would have the capacity to undertake the examination and therefore an external resource would need to be procured and managed. This work would likely impact on the progress of other key priorities in the Governance & Performance Department given current and foreseeable resource levels.

To be clear and, as distinct from the above, the potential outcomes of the boundary reform proposal could have significant financial and resource implications.

➤ **Customer Service and Community/Cultural Implications**

There are minimal community implications associated with the Motion on Notice.

To be clear and, as distinct from the above, the potential outcomes of the boundary reform proposal could have significant community implications.

➤ **Sustainability Implications**

There are no direct sustainability implications from this report however there may be financial sustainability implications from a boundary change.

➤ **Engagement/Consultation conducted in the development of the report**

There was no direct consultation in the development of this report.

4. ANALYSIS

Background

On 1 January 2019, new provisions in the *Local Government Act 1999* regarding boundary reform came into effect (Chapter 3, Part 2). The provisions fundamentally changed the way boundary reform proposals would be managed.

Two of the key changes were as follows:

- The Local Government Boundaries Commission (LGBC) was established to oversee boundary change proposals undertaken under Part 2; and
- Boundary reform proposals could be initiated by one council without the consent of a neighbouring 'affected' council.

At its 22 January 2019 meeting, the CCC resolved to submit a Stage 1 proposal to the LGBC. The submission was for the boundary between CCC and AHC to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

CCC Boundary Reform Proposal Stages and Timeframes

The CCC proposal has progressed through each of the boundary reform stages (see Legal Implications below for a description of the key stages of the boundary reform process).

Unfortunately, the legislated process does not enable the 'affected' council to have any formal role in the process until a proposal has progressed to the Inquiry (investigation) stage other than the LGBC notifying the council on the progression of the proposal through the process stages. Notwithstanding this lack of formal 'status', AHC has been very active in communicating with the LGBC regarding the CCC proposal.

As such it should be noted that there have been many other actions and interactions in relation to the proposal between AHC, CCC and LGBC however the table below only deals with milestones related to the stages of the process.

Appendix 1 of this report provides the formal proposals (Stage 1, Stage 2 and Supplementary Information to Stage 2) while broader documentation associated with communications between AHC and LGBC is in Appendix 1 of Item 8.1.

19 Feb 2019	CCC lodges its Stage 1 proposal with the LGBC
21 Mar 2019	LGBC considers the CCC Stage proposal at its meeting and determines that CCC may refer a Stage 2 proposal to the LGBC
6 Apr 2022	CCC resolves to proceed with the submission of a Stage 2 proposal and advises LGBC of such on 14 April 2022
14 Apr 2022	CCC lodges Stage 2 proposal with LGBC
18 May 2022	LGBC considers the CCC Stage 2 proposal at its meeting
6 Jun 2022	LGBC advises CCC that before the Commission considers whether to inquire (Stage 3) into the proposal CCC needs to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further information about the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal; and • clear cadastral and topographic maps of the subject areas clearly displaying the proposed boundary alignment The further information was to be provided by 20 June 2022.
28 Jun 2022	CCC lodges its Supplementary information to the Stage 2 proposal
20 Jul 2022	LGBC consider CCC Supplementary information to the Stage 2 proposal at its meeting and determines that the proposal progress to the Inquiry (Stage 3) phase
29 Jul 2022	LGBC advises AHC and CCC that it has determined that the Stage 2 proposal meets the requirements of the applicable LGBC Guideline and s26 of the Act and that an Inquiry into the proposal may proceed. Further, LGBC invites AHC and CCC to provide comment on the draft Inquiry Plan (which set out the matters that the independent investigator(s) will examine in assessing the proposal against the provisions of s26)
26 Aug 2022	AHC provides extensive feedback on the draft Inquiry Plan
18 Oct 2022	LGBC provides AHC and CCC with the final Inquiry Plan (accepting all AHC's feedback). Further LGBC advises that it would seek cost estimate from suitable consultants for the inquiry based on the Inquiry Plan and that once the estimates were known these would be provided to CCC post-2022 LG election. The inquiry would only proceed if CCC provides clear direction to do so including accepting to fund the inquiry costs.
27 Jan 2023	AHC requests status update from LGBC regarding inquiry
14 Feb 2023	LGBC advises AHC that a cost estimate has not yet been determined and therefore it has not been provided to CCC for decision
24 May 2023	LGBC advises AHC that a cost estimate has not yet been finalised and therefore has not been provided to CCC for decision

Stage 2 Proposal

The proposal document itself (**Appendix 1**) is 342 pages however this mostly consists of appendices with the actual body of the proposal being 39 pages. Within the body it addresses the principles contained in s26 in what could arguably be described as being vague and nebulous in manner and significantly lacking in robustness and substance for a matter with such a significant implication.

The appendices which form the bulk of the document ironically contain the AHC Community Survey and the CCC Community Survey results which both demonstrate that the majority of respondents (affected residents) do not support the proposal. Concerningly, the body of the proposal (at section 6) refers to the two survey results but does not, in any reasonable manner, acknowledge the views of the residents and analyse the implications of this opposition to the veracity of their proposal and the fundamental claim that the 'community of interest' would be better served being part of CCC.

On 15 July 2022, Mayor Wisdom wrote to LGBC (**Appendix 2**) highlighting a significant number of deficiencies in the Stage 2 proposal. The LGBC advised receipt of the correspondence and an undertaking for the correspondence to be tabled to the LGBC at its upcoming meeting on 20 July 2022. As per the table above, the 20 July 2022 meeting was when the LGBC determined that the proposal progress to the Inquiry phase.

The LGBC's letter of 29 July 2022 advising that the proposal would proceed to the Inquiry stage did not reference the 15 July 2022 correspondence or provide any commentary on the numerous deficiencies identified in that correspondence.

Motion to forensically examine the Stage 2 Proposal

The motion to forensically examine the Stage 2 proposal '*with a view to identifying the proposals weaknesses (critical flaws), errors, omissions, and factual inaccuracies*' is entirely reasonable in concept.

The LGBC's apparent reluctance to require any depth of information, provision of evidence or substance for justification has resulted in proposal documents that a forensic examination would likely conclude are manifestly inadequate but not necessarily containing errors or factual inaccuracies.

Notwithstanding the results of any forensic examination, the LGBC's seeming ambivalence to the proposal deficiencies, even when they are highlighted, would suggest that the proposed examination report would not be heeded, particularly in light of the LGBC having already progressed the proposal to the Inquiry stage. Rather, the report may at best provide Adelaide Hills Council with some areas to focus on when making its own case against the proposal when (and if) the opportunity arises in a Stage 3 Inquiry.

Further, should the Inquiry proceed, AHC will likely need to engage specialist advice to assist with preparing responses to some of the areas contained in the Inquiry Plan (see 18 October 2022 LGBC letter in Appendix 1 in Item 8.1).

5. APPENDICES

- (1) Compilation of Campbelltown City Council Stage 1, Stage 2 and Supplementary information to Stage 2 proposals
- (2) AHC - Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal - 15 July 2022

Appendix 1

*Compilation of Campbelltown City Council Stage 1, Stage 2
and Supplementary information to Stage 2 proposals*



Enq: Lyn Townsend
Ph: 8366 9234

19 February 2019

Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001

Email: boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Dear Sir /Madam

Boundary Realignment Proposal

I wish to advise that at its meeting held on Tuesday 22 January 2019 Council considered a report in relation to a boundary realignment proposal and resolved as follows:

Stage 1

Council (Campbelltown Council) would like to submit a general proposal to the Commission to consider a boundary realignment between it and Adelaide Hills Council.

The relevant area (proposed boundary realignment) is shown in blue on the attached map.

Council considers that boundary realignment is the most appropriate option as it will assist in increased operational capacity, efficient and cost effective delivery of services, effective planning and development, accessibility, and adequate and fair representation for both Council areas. In addition it will consolidate and formalise a seemingly existing local community and community of interest. Council strongly believes that it will enhance the capacity of both Councils to deliver results to local communities in a more strategic and effective way.

The objects of the Act (Local Government Act 1999) as stated in Section 3 of the Act have been considered as part of this proposal, and Council believes that the proposal strongly aligns With the Objects of the Act. In particular the following sections of part 3 are pertinent to this proposal:

- (b) to encourage the participation of local communities in the affairs of local government and to provide local communities, through their councils, with sufficient autonomy to manage the local affairs of their area;



Council believes that the residents in the relevant area more closely align with the Campbelltown Council area than the Adelaide Hills Council area. Preliminary discussions initiated by residents from the area have indicated that they feel like they live and either work or play in the Campbelltown Council area and access services provided by Campbelltown Council. Some of them already participate in Council's community engagement as many decisions that Council make directly affect them. The boundary realignment would potentially formalise an existing 'local community' and enable residents to formally participate in Council decision making, and increase civic pride.

- (e) to improve the capacity of the local government system to plan for, develop and manage local areas and to enhance the capacity of councils to act within their local areas as participants in the Australian system of representative government.

The residents in the relevant area are closely aligned to Council, and as previously stated the realignment would formalise this situation. Council recognises that there is some uniqueness contained within the relevant area and as such would plan to have a separate policy area in Council's Development Plan for the relevant parts within this area.

- (f) to encourage local government to provide appropriate services and facilities to meet the present and future needs of local communities

Efficient and relevant service delivery, and provision of facilities is a key component to the realignment proposal. Residents in the relevant area use and associate with services and facilities within the Council area. It makes sense for both Councils from an efficient cost effective service delivery perspective, for residents within the relevant area to be serviced by that Council. Generally residents within the relevant area avail themselves to Campbelltown's services on a regular basis, and potentially shop, recreate, and educate in the Campbelltown area.


Council has also closely considered the Section 26 Principles that the Commission is required to have regard to in making boundary reform decisions. Council is confident that the proposed boundary alignment meets the Section 26 Principles and is well positioned to formally reply to each principle in Stage 2 of the proposal, and demonstrate how the proposed realignment meets each of these principles.

If you have any queries, please contact me on the above number. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully



Paul Di Iulio
Chief Executive Officer





CAMPBELLTOWN
CITY COUNCIL

Office of the Mayor

14 April 2022

Mr Rob Donaldson
Chair Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001

Dear Mr Donaldson

City of Campbelltown Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

I am pleased to advise that on 6 April 2021 Council unanimously resolved to proceed with a submission of a Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal Submission with the following resolution:

‘That Council receive the report and:

1. note the outcomes of the consultation undertaken by McGregor Tan and the associated report
2. note the outcomes of the consultation undertaken with the City of Campbelltown residents and ratepayers
3. request Staff to prepare a Stage 2 Submission to the Boundaries Commission with respect to the boundary realignment between Campbelltown Council and Adelaide Hills Council.’

A copy of Council’s Stage 2 Submission is attached and a link to the soft copy is provided below:

The proposal has been prepared in accordance with the Council Boundary Change Proposals Guideline No. 3 ‘Submitting a General Proposal to the Commission’. The proposal also includes consultation results from both Councils.

Should the Commission require any further information, or wish to discuss any component of the proposal, I can be contacted on 0438 375 0868 or mayor@campbelltown.sa.gov.au. Council's Chief Executive Officer, Mr Paul Di Iulio, is also available and can be contacted on 0418 856 085 or pdiulio@campbelltown.sa.gov.au.


I would like to thank the Commission for their support in considering this matter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Whittaker'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long vertical stroke extending downwards from the 'J'.

Jill Whittaker
Mayor

City of Campbelltown BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL



APRIL 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1.OVERVIEW	5
2.HISTORY	8
2.1 Royal Commissions	8
2.2 Historic connection between the two areas	10
2.3 Recent History	11
3.KEY CONSIDERATIONS.....	12
3.1 Overview	12
3.2 Community of Interest	12
3.2.1 Perceptual.....	13
3.2.2 Functional.....	14
3.2.3 Political	16
3.3 The Context of Change	18
3.4 Morialta Resident's Association (MRA)	18
3.5 The Current Context.....	20
3.6 Adelaide Hills – Strategic Boundary Review	21
4.PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGE.....	22
4.1 Objects of the Act	24
4.2 Role and Function	26
4.3 Section 26 Principles	28
5.FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	36
5.1 Rates Revenue	36
5.2 Financial Sustainability	37
6.CONSULTATION	38
7.SUMMARY.....	39
8.APPENDICES	41
Appendix 1 History	41
Appendix 2(a) MRA Publication November 2019	53
Appendix 2(b) MRA Publication November 2020	63
Appendix 3 Adelaide Hills Boundary Review Report	73
Appendix 4 Efficiency & Economy Review	173
Appendix 5 Long Term Financial Plan.....	207
Appendix 6 Adelaide Hills Survey.....	215
Appendix 7 Adelaide Hills Survey Outcomes Report	225
Appendix 8 McGregor Tan Survey.....	263
Appendix 9 Campbelltown Boundary Reform Information Brochure.....	273
Appendix 10 McGregor Tan Survey Outcomes Report	283
Appendix 11 Campbelltown Survey.....	329
Appendix 12 Campbelltown Survey Outcomes Report to Council	333

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Campbelltown (Campbelltown City Council) appreciates the opportunity to submit a Stage 2 General proposal for consideration by the Local Government Boundaries Commission under Chapter 3, Part 2 of the Local Government Act 1999 (the Act).

The new legislation provides Campbelltown with the opportunity to formally explore a boundary realignment between itself and Adelaide Hills (Adelaide Hills Council) that has been discussed for many years.

This proposal explores the proposed boundary realignment and argues that it aligns with the Objectives and Principles of the Act. In addition the proposal highlights the following in support of the proposed realignment:

- Strong communities of interest
- Economy and efficiency gains for both Councils
- The physical attributes and location of the proposed realignment area align with those of a metropolitan Council in character
- Better management of assets between the proposed realignment area and Campbelltown
- Ability for Adelaide Hills residents from the proposed realignment area to influence and shape the services that they currently enjoy
- Formalising existing relationships and the sense of belonging the majority of residents of the proposed realignment area have with the Campbelltown area
- Formalising the strong relationship that exists between Rostrevor College and Campbelltown

Campbelltown believes there is a strong case for boundary realignment between itself and Adelaide Hills, and that it would provide a good model for future Boundary realignments. Campbelltown would like to thank the Boundaries Commission for the opportunity to proceed to a Stage 2 Proposal and looks forward to working with the Boundaries Commission should the Commission resolve to further investigate this proposal.

1. OVERVIEW

Campbelltown is a metropolitan Council bordering the foothills. It was established on 2 March 1868 when the District Council of Campbelltown was proclaimed. The City is named after Charles James Fox Campbell, a prominent early pastoralist whose original home Lochend, has been faithfully restored and listed on the Register of the National Estate. The District became a town with a Municipal Office on 1 January 1946 and was proclaimed a City on 6 May 1960 after having reached a population of more than 15,000.

Campbelltown is located approximately 8 kilometres to the north east of Adelaide City and is approximately 2,436 hectares. Located on Kaurna land, the Council area is in the fortunate position of being bounded by both the River and the Hills and these features are much loved by its Community. The area has a strong cultural, market garden and agricultural history and much of this is captured in the book 'From the River to the Hills' written by Elizabeth Warburton to celebrate Council's Jubilee Year.

Campbelltown incorporates the suburbs of Athelstone, Campbelltown, Hectorville, Magill (part) Newton, Paradise, Rostrevor (part) and Tranmere. Our neighbouring Councils are City of Burnside, City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, City of Port Adelaide Enfield, City of Tea Tree Gully, and Adelaide Hills Council.



Figure 1: Map showing the Campbelltown City Council Boundaries

Today Campbelltown is a thriving metropolitan Council with the following vision and mission:

Vision: 'A safe, sustainable, vibrant Community'

Mission: 'The Community is the centre of everything we do'.

Campbelltown has a proud history which it celebrates, and is home to a strong multicultural community.

The current Strategic Plan has five Goals:

1. Supporting our Community
2. Greening our City,
3. Enhancing our Assets
4. Planning for our Future, and
5. Leading our People.

The Strategic Plan is underpinned by the following foundation principles:

- We are committed to responding effectively to our Declaration of a Climate Emergency in November 2019. Our priorities and actions will be informed by our Climate Solutions Strategy and guided by an Advisory Committee of experts.
- We will strive to meet the needs of all members of our Community, balancing current and future needs with financial and environmental sustainability.
- We will support the Community and businesses to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic emergency. In line with Council's Strategic Plan 2024, we will continue to provide support and solutions to assist businesses, organisations, clubs, groups, residents and ratepayers with issues impacting their finances and wellbeing.
- We have considered the requirements of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 in preparation of Themes and Focus Areas for this Plan based on known factors at the time of preparation
- We will continue to maintain strong financial management and sustainability.

Campbelltown is seeking to realign its boundary in accordance with Chapter 3, Part 2 of the Local Government Act 1999 and seeks, through the submission of this Stage 2 General Proposal, consideration of the matter by the Commission (Boundaries Commission).

Campbelltown's proposed boundary realignment focusses on:

- Formalising the existing (and future) Community of interest, which currently extends beyond its existing eastern boundary
- Ensuring that people who are part of the Campbelltown Community are able to have a say in shaping their community
- Ensuring that people who are part of the Campbelltown Community can be appropriately represented in decision making processes
- Planning for future growth of the proposed realignment area whilst minimising the impact on infrastructure

This proposal seeks the inclusion of the remaining part of the suburb of Rostrevor, and the suburb of Woodforde. Council is seeking to achieve the best possible outcome for the residents in these areas, as well as to effect a logical boundary adjustment that will also benefit Adelaide Hills and free up resources to deliver services in the hills area. As such, Council is flexible on the exact boundary realignment and is open to discussion with the Commission about a greater (or lesser) area being included should the Commission determine that a different boundary realignment is appropriate.

2. HISTORY

The issue of boundary realignment between Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills has been discussed for many years. A detailed history is attached in Appendix 1 and the key points are provided below:

Originally, there was one East Torrens Council formed in 1853 comprised of East Torrens, Campbelltown, Payneham, Kensington and part of Burnside Councils. The residents of Woodforde and part of Rostrevor are currently part of Adelaide Hills as a consequence of a council amalgamation process in 1999 which saw East Torrens Council merged into the newly formed Adelaide Hills.

Upper Rostrevor (or Rostrevor Park) is still known as 'Morialta' to this day, in acknowledgement of its historical connections with the surrounding area. The beautiful Morialta Conservation Park as it is known today, which sits in the Adelaide Hills area, is generally seen as a part of Campbelltown by Campbelltown residents and visitors alike. Interestingly, approximately 40% of the volunteers who work in the park as part of the Friends of Black Hill and Morialta come from Campbelltown, with only 10% coming from Adelaide Hills.

2.1 Royal Commissions

A Royal Commission in 1973-74 recommended that Woodforde and Rostrevor should be part of Campbelltown, and at the time, the East Torrens Council argued for no change at all, as did residents of Skye and Morialta. Nonetheless, the residents of Morialta requested that Campbelltown provide a library on Montacute road for their benefit. Campbelltown in 1976 did build a library, on Montacute Road.

Campbelltown Mayor Herb Reid made the point in the Royal Commission, that out of respect for East Torrens Council and despite noting the services used by residents of Woodforde and Rostrevor in Campbelltown, they would not seek to change the boundary.

The questioning by the Royal Commissioners (Commissioners) of witnesses focussed on a community of interest about matters such as the use of libraries, schooling, sports clubs, swimming pools, churches, banking, shopping.

The Commissioners found that:

"We have indicated that as a matter of general principle the boundary of a council on the plains should include the area up to the top of the Hills Face Zone. We believe there is considerable community of interest between these areas and those to the west and we therefore recommend that the eastern boundary of the Corporation of the City of Campbelltown be extended into the District Council of East Torrens." ^{iv}

The 1974 Royal Commission also noted a common theme from community responses in the 1933 Royal Commission into council Boundaries that:

“In practically every instance before us they had only one alternative, for they were simply asked to choose between the known – the existing boundaries – and the unknown.”

“Retention of boundaries was invariably put by a strong proponent of the existing position... rarely did any discussion of alternatives take place. It is hardly surprising therefore that ratepayers would opt for the boundaries that have at least one advantage – that they are known.”

The Commissioners also noted, “Many councils operate free from the various problems of servicing their complete community in the full knowledge that the neighbouring council or councils are doing so. An amalgamation in such a case might mean that one group of ratepayers would commence paying their due contributions whilst another group would receive some just relief.”

Further, “Those councils who adopt a selfish attitude to such a situation are unlikely to change voluntarily” and also that a change in boundaries might result in “a loss of status for members”.

Importantly, the Commissioners noted, “If a significant number of the inhabitants of a council area are required to cross a council boundary to meet many of their needs because those needs cannot be met within their council area, then the boundary is wrong.”

The Commissioners also talked about the wishes of the people and noted that:

- “.... those who are currently escaping their local government responsibilities (financially and otherwise) will oppose any change particularly as their local council will have taken steps to notify them of all the contrary arguments”.
- “The wishes of the people is often framed without reference to the issues involved.”
- The “retention of boundaries was invariably put by a strong proponent of an existing position....rarely did any discussion of alternatives take place”

The Commissioners addressed the issue of Community of Interest in some detail and concluded that “the application of the principle of Community of Interest must generally result in fewer and larger areas.” They considered that a Community of Interest of people were “economic, social, regional or otherwise”, “the distance between centres and other parts of an area”, “the physical features of a locality” and “employment, banks, schools, shopping, religious, recreational and transport”.

The Commissioners also made the following key observations:

- “In regard to polls it is difficult to ensure that both sides of the issue are fully and fairly put and that the question is not clouded by local, parochial and side issues.”
- “.it is difficult to see how an informed vote on such a complicated question can be obtained.”
- “There is a considerable tendency in local government for boundaries to remain unchanged long after they have ceased to be appropriate” and that “Inappropriate boundaries can impede the development of local government.”
- “there are cases in which one local government authority has to take its roadmaking equipment through the territory of another local government authority to reach some part of its own territory, and there are cases in which roadmaking equipment has to be taken for long distances to service a small community which could be more readily serviced from the depot of an adjoining local government authority.”

This last observation describes the situation in Woodforde and Upper Rostrevor well, where it seems obvious that, purely due to proximity, Campbelltown are better placed to serve that area. Campbelltown’s depot is within 6 minutes of the proposed areas.

2.2 Historic connection between the two areas

Over the years, there has been a strong connection between the two areas. This was created because of the way that land was bought and sold, and the large parcels of land used to create the Morialta Conservation Park and the township of Woodforde.

In 1982, The MRA asked well known Campbelltown historian, Elizabeth Warburton, who wrote “From the River to the Hills” for Campbelltown to produce a book “The Making of Morialta”.

Elizabeth Warburton outlined the close linkages in settlement days between the families now living in those areas linked to Morialta and Woodforde and towards Black Hill as a district.

In reading this history, the problems created by having a council boundary along Stradbroke Road with East Torrens were evident in the 1980’s with transport and road issues mentioned as problems including the distances old people had to travel from the Rostrevor Park proposed realignment area to the East Torrens Council (ETC) area.

Warburton, who served on ETC argued fiercely for the retention of the East Torrens Council and against the amalgamation, which swallowed up ETC in 1999 into the newly created Adelaide Hills. This was a response to the SA Local Government Royal Commission 1974 into boundaries, which recommended that the top area of Rostrevor covered by the MRA be included in Campbelltown.

The book outlines some of the problems and proposed solutions to the issue of flooding created by large downpours in the catchment area and the potential impact on housing further downstream in the Campbelltown area.

2.3 Recent History

More recently, there were wholesale changes made to Council boundaries with a reduction of councils in South Australia in 1999. In the lead up to that change, Campbelltown indicated its willingness to discuss “integration of those residential areas of [the East Torrens Council] district immediately adjoining the City” on 3 October 1995.

However, East Torrens Council wished to remain as an entire entity in the new structure and did not pursue further consultation with Campbelltown despite the integration of Skye and Teringie into Burnside Council.

Nevertheless, Woodforde residents held a meeting on 3 February 1997 attended by 60 residents and requested that the subject of joining with an eastern suburbs council be considered within 6 months of the new council and boundaries being formed. This did not occur.

New legislation to assist with Boundary Reform came into effect in January 2019. Campbelltown put in a submission under the new legislation in February 2019 because of the long-standing issues of a Community of interest between itself and the areas of Woodforde, Hamilton Hill and Upper Rostrevor.

The Boundaries Reform Commission agreed that Campbelltown could move to Stage 2 of this process in June 2019. Subsequent to that, Adelaide Hills experienced the devastating bushfires in December 2019/January 2020 and out of respect and concern for Adelaide Hills residents Campbelltown did not pursue the boundary realignment during that period. Soon after came the COVID-19 pandemic, which again put a hold on this process and consultation with Adelaide Hills residents. Once the pandemic landscape had settled, Campbelltown recommenced their efforts in relation to the proposal.

3. KEY CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Overview

Campbelltown believes it is logical that the proposed realignment area is included as part of Campbelltown. The close proximity and location of the proposed realignment area means that Campbelltown will be able to easily service the area in an efficient and economic manner, and the residents of the area will be much closer to the administrative heart of their Council. The residents will also be a formal part of the community that they already participate in and enjoy, and access services and facilities.

Importantly, Campbelltown considers that there is a strong community of interest between the proposed realignment area and Campbelltown particularly due to their close proximity in comparison to Adelaide Hills. This community of interest, which is explored below, exists throughout the proposed realignment area, but may be particularly important in the new development of Hamilton Hill. Current and future residents of Hamilton Hill have no historic relationship with Adelaide Hills would more naturally turn to Campbelltown for daily services and recreation.

3.2 Community of Interest

A Community of interest (Coi) can be described as a network of people who share the same interests, knowledge and understanding of a given subject, and who take part to exchange thoughts and ideas about their common interest. There are many elements that can contribute to a Coi. Some are tangible and easily measured, others are difficult to measure or substantiate.

The concept of Coi is a factor that is consistently discussed in relation to local government boundaries. Many of the arguments put forward in previous proposals to the South Australian Local Government Advisory Commission, the body previously responsible for investigating proposals for boundary change, have concentrated on this concept. It is an important concept; it has however been interpreted and applied in different ways.

The most recent and relevant work on this concept is a discussion paper prepared by Helen Fuller for the SA Department of Local Government (now the Office of Local Government) in 1989, and released by the Local Government Services Bureau in 1991. This discussion paper explored the concept of Coi as it applies to Local Government Boundaries.

The paper proposes a working definition of Coi that applies to a group of residents having one or more of the following three dimensions:

1. *Perceptual*: a sense of belonging to an area or locality that can be clearly defined
2. *Functional*: the ability to meet with reasonable economy the community's requirements for comprehensive physical and human services, and

3. *Political*: the ability of the elected body to represent the interests and reconcile the conflict of all of its members.

3.2.1 Perceptual

This dimension looks at people's perceptions of the identity of the area to which they feel like they belong. A Coi exists 'where people feel an affinity or compatibility with the area and the people who live there.' It is a sense of belonging to an area that can be clearly defined.

The suburb of Rostrevor is largely in Campbelltown with a smaller part in Adelaide Hills. The suburb of Woodforde, which includes the new subdivision of Hamilton Hill, lies solely in Adelaide Hills. It is argued, that residents from both suburbs, would have an affinity with Campbelltown and a sense of belonging in many cases. With the proposed realignment area being considered metropolitan, and in some cases divided by local streets, it is fair to say that most Campbelltown residents, and perhaps others, would naturally consider Rostrevor and Rostrevor College part of Campbelltown ie they would not know that these areas are part of Adelaide Hills. Looking at a map, and the distinction between the clear hills area of Adelaide Hills and these pockets of metropolitan housing bordering Campbelltown, supports this view.

For example, in Rostrevor, Arcoona Avenue is a residential street that separates the two Council areas. Properties on the north side of the street are in Campbelltown, and properties on the south side of the street are in Adelaide Hills. The boundary between Council areas aligns with the north kerb, which means that Campbelltown only maintains the footpath and kerb on its side, whilst the entire road is the responsibility of Adelaide Hills. This is an obvious anomaly where two Councils collect garbage, maintain infrastructure, provide information to, and service residents. A small pothole for example, would require a truck to drive at least 30 minutes from the Adelaide Hills Depot to be fixed. This work could be easily and efficiently undertaken by a Campbelltown truck operating in the local area. One side of the street and one group of residents would receive information about local events and happenings in Campbelltown, and the other side of the street and that group of residents would receive information about events and happenings in Adelaide Hills, which are at least 30 minutes away from them by car. In practice, Campbelltown provides information to residents on both sides of the street, under the assumption that these residents engage in their local area in Campbelltown on a day-to-day basis.

The newly developed area of Hamilton Hill, in Woodforde, sits at the base of the hills and is a high-density housing metropolitan development that has strong linkages to Campbelltown. It does not align with, or look like, any other area in the Adelaide Hills. Again, a local road divides the two Council areas, with residential housing on both sides. Again, we have both councils collecting garbage, maintaining infrastructure, providing information and servicing residents. With the Adelaide Hills Depot located 22km and approximately 30 minutes away, it is obviously far more effective for Campbelltown to service this area from both an economic and efficiency perspective. It is argued that the majority of, if not all, residents within this

development would look to Campbelltown for delivery of services, and would certainly shop, play and recreate in the Campbelltown area, rather than the Adelaide Hills area.

Campbelltown also has a long history and a strong relationship with Rostrevor College, which seemingly unusually, sits in Adelaide Hills, despite the fact that it is surrounded by metropolitan housing. This is an obvious anomaly, and a fact that is largely unrecognised or known by the general population, with people generally assuming that the College sits in the Campbelltown area.

While not formally within Campbelltown, given the proximity of Rostrevor College, and the number of students attending the College who live within the Campbelltown area, Campbelltown has always included the College as though it was part of Campbelltown.

Examples of Campbelltown's connection with Rostrevor College include:

- Student representative appointed to Campbelltown's Youth Advisory Committee
- Immunisations provided to some students at Rostrevor College by Eastern Health Authority (funded by Campbelltown)
- Australian Day Young Citizen of the Year Nominees
- NAIDOC Award recipients
- Personal Achievement Grants provided to College Students
- Included in consultations with Schools in the area
- Students performing at Citizenship ceremonies
- Participated in Youth Talent nights
- Council's Chief Executive Officer is a former Board Member of Rostrevor College
- Provided footpaths opposite the school to assist with pedestrian traffic
- Discussed and consulted regarding pedestrian crossings at the school
- Committed to constructing a requested footpath in front of the school (on the Adelaide Hills side of the boundary) if the boundary realignment proceeds
- Discussed a potential joint venture between Campbelltown and the College on the College site

3.2.2 Functional

This dimension looks at the existing functional relationships between people living in the area. It looks at local activity patterns; where people go to shop, attend school and church, church, play sport and socialise. 'The measure of a strong Coi is that of the vast majority of people going towards a common centre for services, and having common memberships of sports clubs, parishes and other community organisations.'

The discussion paper suggests that the regular activity patterns of communities have implications for the provision of, and maintenance of, facilities and amenities provided by Local Government, even though the general public are not aware that Councils are the providers of those services.

The provision of services such as roads, footpaths, street lighting, traffic control, libraries, parks, etc are all enjoyed by members of any Council area; it makes sense though that people who use these services regularly both contribute to the cost of these services, as well as have the ability to influence and shape the delivery of these (future) services. Users and beneficiaries of planning decisions and infrastructure outcomes should also be making an appropriate contribution with respect to both upfront delivery and ongoing maintenance. This is particularly relevant for the new Hamilton Hill development, which is having a significant impact on Campbelltown traffic management and stormwater management.

The existing and planned areas located on the immediate northern periphery of Campbelltown, namely Rostrevor and Woodforde, form a natural extension to Campbelltown. Due to their location, these communities do and/or will rely upon the services and infrastructure provided by Campbelltown. It makes sense for one Council to manage these areas.

Older people in the Campbelltown area have access to community buses, door-to-door transport services, transport to medical appointments, and social programs. Commonwealth Home Support Program (CHSP) services are government funded and restricted by Council boundaries. Older people in the proposed realignment area are unable to access these much-needed services from Campbelltown. It is an extreme anomaly that a resident located just outside Campbelltown, even across the road from a Campbelltown resident, who needs to go, for example, to see a Doctor two streets away, cannot access Campbelltown transport. Even if Adelaide Hills did provide this service, it makes sense from both an economic and efficiency perspective that Campbelltown should provide this service. Local people, attending local services, can be more easily managed by the closest Council.

The question of functional Coi was somewhat tested in the survey undertaken by McGregor Tan on behalf of Campbelltown. Whilst the response to this survey was relatively low, which may indicate complacency about this issue, results indicated the following with respect to Adelaide Hills resident's activity in the Campbelltown area:

- 92% shop in supermarkets, specialty shops, or purchase dine in or takeaway
- 73% visit local parks and playgrounds
- 59% attend medical/specialist appointments
- 58% visit the Campbelltown Library
- 57% attend events such as Moonlight Markets, Tour Down Under, Movie Screenings, Christmas Parade, Christmas Carols etc
- 53% attend Community Events such as fetes and festivals
- 52% visit Thorndon Park, use the outdoor exercise equipment, attend walking groups

Campbelltown acknowledge that use and involvement in any of the above is not restricted by Council boundary; in fact, Campbelltown warmly welcomes and encourages visitors to the area. The above figures do however show a strong Coi, and a strong affinity with the area. It would also be beneficial to Campbelltown and these Adelaide Hills residents for them to be able to influence and shape the services and facilities that they use and enjoy.

In addition, a number of Adelaide Hills residents are members of the Campbelltown Library and the ARC. Conversely, a number of Campbelltown residents are Members of the Friends of Black Hill and Morialta group, which again shows strong Coi.

One traditional measure of the functional dimension is distance. Obviously, with increased transport and communication options available today, distance is less of an issue than it used to be in the past, however distance to the centre of Communities, and the Council administration building, is still considered important. If Adelaide Hills residents need to attend Council offices for some reason, it makes logical sense for them to attend the Campbelltown office located five minutes away by car, rather than the Adelaide Hills office that is a 30-minute trip. It is also clear from the survey that Adelaide Hills residents do much of their day-to-day activity in the Campbelltown area rather than the Adelaide Hills area.

The discussion paper states that there is 'significant evidence to suggest that both the functional and perceptual communities of interest have shifted to such an extent that they no longer coincide with the established municipal boundaries, many of which were arbitrarily determined up to a hundred years ago'. This is evident with the boundary in question, as the communities of interests have spilled over into the adjoining council area, particularly with the establishment of the new Hamilton Hill Development. It is unlikely today that a boundary would be drawn between Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills in these metropolitan areas of Woodforde and Rostrevor.

As climate change policies become imbedded in council practice the shorter travel distances being undertaken by Campbelltown staff to provide services in the affected area will have a positive environmental impact by reducing the emissions that are currently being generated.

3.2.3 Political

This dimension is integral to Local Government and refers to the role of Local Government to be the voice of local opinion. That voice should represent the views of the people who use and/or contribute to facilities and services provided by the Council. It is important that constituents trust that their views are being represented, or that they can participate in decision making if they choose to do so.

There are two issues here: the ability of Adelaide Hills residents to participate in decision making, and the ability of the Campbelltown Elected body to represent the residents currently within the Adelaide Hills in the proposed realignment area.

Currently Adelaide Hills residents who use Campbelltown facilities and services have no say in shaping these facilities and service. They have no say in Council's budget and they cannot participate as Community Members of Council's important Section 41 Advisory Committees. Welcoming these Adelaide Hills residents as part of the Campbelltown community would enable them to participate in all democratic decision

making processes and consultations, help shape the future of their local area, and join S41 Committees as Community Members should they wish to.

From an Elector Representation Perspective, Campbelltown consists of 5 wards with 10 Elected Members servicing the entire area. The most recent electoral data provided to the Electoral Commission as at 31 August 2021 provides the following representation data:

Ward	# of Councillors	House of Assembly Roll	Council Roll	Total Electors	Ratio
Hectorville	2	7,914	13	7,927	1:3,963
Gorge	2	7,223	3	7,226	1:3,613
Newton	2	6,995	16	7,011	1:3,505
River	2	7,346	4	7,350	1:3,675
Woodforde	2	6,860	4	6,864	1:3,432
Total	10			36,378	
Average					1:3,637

Figure 2 – Campbelltown Current Elector Representation by ward

As can be seen from the data above, the addition of an estimated 915 residents to Woodforde ward would be manageable. The current ward structure could be retained because the elector ratio (i.e. the average number of electors represented by a councillor) in all of the existing wards lay within the specified 10% quota tolerance limit prescribed under Section 33(2) of the Act. This is represented in the table below, which shows the data with the additional 915 Electors from Woodforde included:

Ward	# of Councillors	House of Assembly Roll	Council Roll	Total Electors	Ratio
Hectorville	2	7,914	13	7,927	1:3,963
Gorge	2	7,223	3	7,226	1:3,613
Newton	2	6,995	16	7,011	1:3,505
River	2	7,346	4	7,350	1:3,675
Woodforde	2	7,775	4	7,779	1:3,889
Total	10			37,293	
Average					1:3,729

Figure 3 – Campbelltown Elector Representation by ward with 915 Adelaide Hills Electors included

Campbelltown strongly believes that it can foster a sense of belonging and identity through its ability to connect with and represent a diverse community. There is no concern that Adelaide Hills residents will not feel represented or supported because of the representation processes built into Campbelltown's ward structure and the existence of ward Councillors.

3.3 The Context of Change

The New South Wales Boundaries Commission (1974) stated:

“The prime reason for local government boundaries is to define a convenient area of land for administrative purposes so that a council’s office will be sensibly located for the convenience of the public and where it can most effectively, efficiently and economically carry out its functions and services to the Community”

The South Australian Royal commission report of 1974 also noted a common theme noted in the 1933 Royal Commission that it is easier for ratepayers to stick with boundaries that are known, rather than to support a change. This obviously also ties in to the psychology of change where it is widely known that people often resist change, as the known is often a more comfortable option. This doesn’t mean that the known is necessarily a better option; what it can mean though is that the proposed change is dismissed without due consideration. The saying ‘Better the devil you know’ is also relevant here, picking up the fact that people can be averse to change, even if they are not entirely happy with their current situation. Change can cause anxiety for some people, and it is easy to feed this anxiety or concern, with fearmongering or stories that are not 100% factual.

When it comes to boundary reform people often interpret change to the status quo as threatening or a takeover. This is definitely, and unfortunately, how this boundary reform proposal has been marketed to Adelaide Hills residents by the MRA, and subsequently in the media. This has attracted a lot of negative media attention to the proposal and undermined its positive intent.

3.4 Morialta Resident’s Association (MRA)

The MRA are a small passionate group of local residents living in the Adelaide Hills part of Rostrevor. The MRA is strongly opposed to the proposed boundary realignment and they have been very vocal about this throughout the process.

The MRA speak on issues affecting ratepayers in the Adelaide Hills Council section of Rostrevor, adjoining the Morialta Park. The MRA have produced two publications (attached in Appendix 2a and 2b) that explain their position to the Adelaide Hills Residents.

The part of Rostrevor that member of the MRA reside in is a beautiful part of the suburb and the MRA is committed to protecting and preserving this special and natural environment.

Campbelltown’s understanding is that there are two main reasons for this strong opposition to the proposed boundary realignment:

- The Environment: strong concern that Campbelltown will not preserve and protect the natural environment

- Development: There is a strong concern that Campbelltown will redevelop the area with high-density housing, largely with the aim of increasing rate revenue.

It is also fair to say that a high level of mistrust and skepticism of Campbelltown has been evident throughout this process.

Campbelltown appreciates the passion that Members of the MRA has for their area and preserving its natural beauty. Campbelltown has exactly the same passion for that area and has absolutely no intention of redeveloping that unique and very special part of Rostrevor. Campbelltown has attempted to confirm this position with the MRA and the residents in the relevant Adelaide Hills area several times. In fact, Campbelltown has also moved unanimously the following Council motion, which confirms Council's position:

"That Council reaffirms its commitment to maintaining the current development controls contained in the Adelaide Hills Council Development Plan for the areas of Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill should there be a boundary realignment which brings these areas into Campbelltown Council"

Both Campbelltown and the MRA agree on the fact that the State Government is responsible for planning law within the state, and that each Council can lobby and/or influence these laws through their Development Plan Amendments (DPA).

Campbelltown successfully lobbied the State Government for significant change in their most recent DPA which saw an increase in block size for various forms of residential development and in particular residential flat buildings.

Recently the Rostrevor area south of Stradbroke Road and Arcoona Avenue, and the Morialta locality south of Morialta Road, has been zoned as a Hills Neighbourhood Zone by the State Government as part of phase 3 of implementation of the Planning and Design Code.

<p>Campbelltown agrees that this is the correct zoning for this area and commits to maintaining this zoning. Council believes that the provisions of this zone and relevant overlays will retain the wide frontages, large allotments and low densities, which currently characterise this unique locality.</p>

In addition Campbelltown has indicated that it would be happy to support renaming the Rostrevor part of the proposed realignment area 'Morialta' to further support and preserve its distinct and unique character. There is an existing example of this in Campbelltown, being Poets Corner in Tranmere, where the planning policy in that area is separate and distinct to the rest of Tranmere, and indeed the rest of Campbelltown, and sees the protection of allotment sizes and minimum frontage widths as well as restrictions on built form.

In addition, in-fill development in the affected area would impact negatively on Campbelltown with impact on stormwater, parking and traffic issues. It is against council's best interest.

3.5 The Current Context

The recent announcement of the new \$84 million high school at Rostrevor (located in the Campbelltown area) further supports the Coi in this area. The proposed boundaries for the new school includes the suburb of Rostrevor, as well as slices of Woodforde. The inclusion of Woodforde and the entirety of Rostrevor, support the fact that these suburbs are integrated into the area and exist as part of the Coi. Interestingly throughout the consultation, some residents from the proposed realignment area were concerned about school zoning should they change Councils so this zoning announcement will alleviate their concerns. It also reinforces that the Coi aligns with the zoning by the Education Department.

The development of Hamilton Hill, as previously discussed, creates great opportunity to further strengthen the Coi. With a large number of young families, and couples in this area it is logical that they would look to the nearby services, facilities, sports groups, schools, playgrounds, and recreational opportunities that are offered in Campbelltown, rather than drive 30 minutes to enjoy these in Adelaide Hills This is supported in the results of the McGregor Tan survey, which showed that:

- 67% of respondents who have lived in the Adelaide Hills for less than a year consider that being incorporated in Campbelltown would have a positive impact on their family
- 50% of respondents from Woodforde consider that being incorporated in Campbelltown would have a positive impact on their family
- Residents of Woodforde will more likely support the proposal compared to residents of the Adelaide Hills part of Rostrevor

Also with respect to the development of Hamilton Hill, Campbelltown considers that having this area within the Campbelltown area would enable better overall management of Creek and the stormwater catchments, environmental and social (flooding) impacts. In addition, traffic management and parking issues would be better managed by one Council who could make decisions in the best interests for the residents on both sides of Glen Stuart Road (the road that divides Hamilton Hill and Campbelltown).

The intersection of Magill and St Bernards Road, which also receives large amounts of traffic from Rostrevor College and particularly Hamilton Hill, has been investigated as part of a future stage for the new Magill Road streetscape upgrade, a partnership project between Campbelltown and Burnside Councils. As with Moules and St Bernards Roads, Magill Road is a State road and requires Department support for any intersection modifications. This matter is further complicated as treatment along Glen Stuart Road needs to be considered and this would be significantly easier if this key road was solely managed by Campbelltown.

3.6 Adelaide Hills – Strategic Boundary Review

In September 2020 Adelaide Hills received the results of an independent desktop study in to the opportunities for potential realignment of their boundaries. Notably with respect to Campbelltown the report states the following with respect to the suburbs of Rostrevor and Woodforde:

Rostrevor

- The residential development within the part of the suburb of Rostrevor which lies within the Adelaide Hills Council is broadly consistent with the residential development of the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide, albeit that it remains at a low density compared with the more recent medium density subdivisions across the region.
- This part of the suburb of Rostrevor is physically separated from the communities of the Adelaide Hills Council to the east by the western foothills of the Mount Lofty Ranges.
- Given the above, it is reasonable to expect that the residents of the subject part of Rostrevor utilise the shops, services and facilities located in, metropolitan Adelaide to the west on a day-to-day basis.
- Access to the east is likely primarily gained via Montacute Road in the north and/or Norton Summit Road in the south.
- The boundaries of the proposal presented in the initial submission to the Local Government Boundaries Commission by the Campbelltown City Council are not clear, and appear to dissect existing properties. A more detailed description of the proposed boundary should be requested to enable further informed consideration.

Woodforde

- The residents of Woodforde would likely utilise the shops, services and facilities located in metropolitan Adelaide to the west on a day-to-day basis. Access to the east is likely primarily gained via Norton Summit Road.
- Under the proposal by the Campbelltown City Council, the suburb/locality of Woodforde will be divided between two Councils, leaving a large area of hilly natural landscape (Morialta Conservation Park) within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The Campbelltown City Council proposal does not include the existing residential properties within the suburb of Teringie which are located immediately to the south of the suburb/locality of Woodforde and adjacent the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide.

The report also noted the Adelaide Hills survey results. The full report is attached in Appendix 3.

4. PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGE

The area proposed to be included in Campbelltown (the proposed realignment area) is shown in blue below and is approximately 111 hectares in size and is bounded by the foothills to the east of Campbelltown and Norton Summit Road to the south.




Figure 4 – Map showing Subject Area in Adelaide Hills

At its closest point, the land is only 2.5 km away from the Administration Office of Campbelltown, and it is 22 km away from the Administration Office of Adelaide Hills. The map below shows the distance between the 2 Council Administration Buildings and highlights the proposed realignment area.




Figure 5 – Map showing distance between Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills Administration Offices

In accordance with Guideline No.3 'Submitting a General Proposal to the Commission', the discussion paper will now address the items that the Commission will have regard to in assessing this submission.

4.1 Objects of the Act

Section 3 of the Act (Local Government Act 1999) provides the following as Objects of the Act:

- (a) to promote the continuance of a system of local government in South Australia under which elected local government bodies are constituted for the better governance of the State in a manner that is consistent with the provisions of Part 2A of the Constitution Act 1934; and
- (b) to encourage the participation of local communities in the affairs of local government and to provide local communities, through their councils, with sufficient autonomy to manage the local affairs of their area; and
- (c) to provide a legislative framework for an effective, efficient and accountable system of local government in South Australia; and
- (d) to ensure the accountability of councils to the community; and
- (e) to improve the capacity of the local government system to plan for, develop and manage local areas and to enhance the capacity of councils to act within their local areas as participants in the Australian system of representative government; and
- (f) to encourage local government to provide appropriate services and facilities to meet the present and future needs of local communities and to provide for appropriate financial contributions by ratepayers to those services and facilities; and
- (g) to encourage local government to manage the natural and built environment in an ecologically sustainable manner; and
- (h) to define the powers of local government and the roles of council members and officials.

Campbelltown is comfortable that the boundary realignment proposal is consistent with all of these Objects of the Act. The proposal will provide more congruent governance of the proposed realignment area and Campbelltown combined, and will continue to support, and enhance, an efficient and accountable system of local government.

Parts (b), (e), (f) and (g) are particularly relevant to this proposal. Including the area of interest in Campbelltown will enhance the strong Coi that exists and enable the local community to participate in the decision making of, and influence service provision of its local government. Campbelltown will be able to better plan for appropriate storm water, infrastructure, and environmental solutions, as well as manage climate change concerns if the proposed realignment area is combined with Campbelltown. The area is of such close proximity that it has a significant impact on Campbelltown services and infrastructure and including this area in future planning

will create a better outcome for Campbelltown and the proposed realignment area. Campbelltown will be able to plan for appropriate services and facilities to meet the present and future needs of local communities and to provide for appropriate financial contributions by ratepayers to those services and facilities.

An issue that arises in talking to Adelaide Hills Residents is the lack of footpaths in the proposed realignment area. Campbelltown has a policy that at least one side of every street will have a footpath so this issue will certainly be addressed as a result of the proposed boundary realignment.

4.2 Role and Function

The principal role of Council, defined in Section 6 of the Act is to provide for the government and management of its area at the local level and, in particular

- (a) to act as a representative, informed and responsible decision-maker in the interests of its community; and
- (b) to provide and co-ordinate various public services and facilities and to develop its community and resources in a socially just and ecologically sustainable manner; and
- (c) to encourage and develop initiatives within its community for improving the quality of life of the community; and
- (d) to represent the interests of its community to the wider community; and
- (e) to exercise, perform and discharge the powers, functions and duties of local government under this and other Acts in relation to the area for which it is constituted.

The Campbelltown proposal is strongly underpinned by these roles. Campbelltown believes that incorporation of the proposed realignment area will result in public services and facilities that are delivered in a socially just, economic, efficient and sustainable manner. Campbelltown will remain a strong representative for its entire Community; some residents in the proposed realignment area have expressed their desire to be incorporated in to Campbelltown, which was also a driver for this proposal.

Section 7 of the Act provides a comprehensive list of functions to include:

- (a) to plan at the local and regional level for the development and future requirements of its area;
- (b) to provide services and facilities that benefit its area, its ratepayers and residents, and visitors to its area;
- (ba) to determine the appropriate financial contribution to be made by ratepayers to the resources of the council;
- (c) to provide for the welfare, well-being and interests of individuals and groups within its community;
- (d) to take measures to protect its area from natural and other hazards and to mitigate the effects of such hazards;
- (e) to manage, develop, protect, restore, enhance and conserve the environment in an ecologically sustainable manner, and to improve amenity;
- (f) to provide infrastructure for its community and for development within its area (including infrastructure that helps to protect any part of the local or broader community from any hazard or other event, or that assists in the management of any area);

- (g) to promote its area and to provide an attractive climate and locations for the development of business, commerce, industry and tourism
- (h) to establish or support organisations or programs that benefit people in its area or local government generally;
- (i) to manage and, if appropriate, develop, public areas vested in, or occupied by, the council;
- (j) to manage, improve and develop resources available to the council;
- (k) to undertake other functions and activities conferred by or under an Act.

Campbelltown is confident that this proposal will enable it to continue to deliver all of the above functions. Inclusion of the proposed realignment area will enhance fulfilment of all of these functions as it will be able to officially provide service to these Adelaide Hills residents (including formalising some existing arrangements) as well as formally engage with, and involve these residents and ratepayers in decision making about these functions. Campbelltown is very confident that the inclusion of the proposed realignment area will not adversely affect its ability to fulfil any of these functions.

4.3 Section 26 Principles

Campbelltown provides the following information in respect to how the proposed boundary change meets the principles of S26(1)(c) of the Local Government Act 1999.

1. The resources available to local communities should be used as economically as possible while recognizing the desirability of avoiding significant divisions within a community

Campbelltown is confident that the inclusion of the proposed area will increase efficiencies for residents in that area and for both Councils.

Service delivery efficiencies will be achieved as one Council will be responsible for this Coi, rather than two Councils servicing their respective areas independently. It is common sense that due to the proximity of the location Campbelltown are best placed to service the area. Campbelltown maintenance teams can quickly and efficiently get to the proposed realignment area, which will provide economic efficiencies for both Councils. Residents should experience quicker response times, and Adelaide Hills should experience reduced travel times and associate expenses, which will benefit their maintenance budget as well as enhance their climate change solution with reduced emissions. Campbelltown has capacity to service this area without impact to our existing community.

The proposed boundary realignment will provide Campbelltown the opportunity to enable greater integration in the areas of infrastructure assets including creek water flows, stormwater management, waste services, and maintenance activities, social infrastructure, open space, which the subject communities already rely upon.

Consolidation of local government administrative services for this area will generate efficiencies and economies of scale that will assist in reducing the cost of such services for both Councils. This may result in reductions in rates for both the existing Campbelltown community and the ratepayers in the proposed realignment area.

2. Proposed changes should, wherever practicable, benefit ratepayers

The immediate benefit to Adelaide Hills ratepayers in the proposed realignment area will be a reduction in rates payable. The table below provides some comparisons of rates payable for different capital valuations within each Council (based on 2020 capital valuations and using 2021 adopted rates in \$). Modelling shows that 97.4% of rateable properties in the nominated Adelaide Hills area will receive a reduction in rates. The increase in rates starts to apply for properties valued at approximately \$1,125,000, of which there are 16. Council will consider providing rate relief to those properties subject to an increase. This can be done through several means including a rate cap, discretionary rebate, or a commitment that no property in the proposed realignment area will pay more rates in Campbelltown than they would have in Adelaide Hills, for example, for the first 5 years.

Capital Value*	Adelaide Hills			Campbelltown			Saving/Increase Rates
	Rates	RLL	Total	Rates	RLL	Total	
185,000	\$1,152.80	\$16.65	\$1,169.45	\$1,002.00	\$17.75	\$1,019.75	\$150.80
300,000	\$1,459.40	\$27.90	\$1,487.30	\$1,002.00	\$29.75	\$1,031.75	\$457.40
570,000	\$2,097.20	\$51.30	\$2,148.50	\$1,756.15	\$54.70	\$1,810.85	\$341.05
750,000	\$2,538.75	\$67.50	\$2,606.25	\$2,310.75	\$71.95	\$2,382.70	\$228.00
880,000	\$2,857.60	\$79.20	\$2,936.80	\$2,711.25	\$84.45	\$2,795.70	\$146.35
1,125,000	\$3,458.60	\$101.25	\$3,559.85	\$3,466.10	\$107.95	\$3,574.05	\$7.50

*Capital Values are 2020 values, Rates and RLL calculations use 2021 adopted rates in \$ for both Councils

**RLL is the Regional Landscape Levy collected by Council on behalf of, and provided directly to, the State Government

Figure 6 - Rates Levied in Adelaide Hills and Campbelltown and applicable savings in rates if levied in Campbelltown

In addition, Campbelltown offers a general rate cap on principal place of residences whereas Adelaide Hills does not offer this. The general rate cap at Campbelltown is set at twice the general rate increase for the relevant year. For example, in 2021/2022 the general rate increase at Campbelltown was 1.9% which meant the general rate cap was 3.8%.

Campbelltown are confident that Adelaide Hills residents will receive equivalent or better service provision from Campbelltown (partly due to the proximity and location).

The formal inclusion of this area within Campbelltown will enable these Adelaide Hills residents to have a strong voice within the community (by having appropriate representation in local decision making) and enable them to influence and shape the services that they currently enjoy. It will also enable them to financially contribute towards the services and infrastructure utilised and enjoyed by the community. This will benefit the entire Coi as it will provide greater equity for current Campbelltown rate payers who have been servicing a Coi which includes the Adelaide Hills area.

3. A Council should have a sufficient resource base to fulfil its functions fairly, effectively and efficiently

Campbelltown is confident that the proposed inclusion of the proposed realignment area will not materially impact Council's ability to deliver infrastructure and services to the current Campbelltown community or the new larger community. If anything, the generation of economies of scale will deliver more efficient and effective service outcomes for both Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills.

Campbelltown has a demonstrated history of using its resource base efficiently and effectively. The provision of services to Walkerville and Prospect Councils, as well as Council's innovative involvement in the implementation of NBN in Gawler and Tea Tree Gully Council areas are excellent examples of Campbelltown's ability to redirect resources for the greater good, without affecting fair, effective and efficient service delivery.

4. A council should offer its community a reasonable range of services delivered on an efficient, flexible, equitable and responsive basis

Campbelltown takes great pride and invests heavily in servicing and representing its community. Campbelltown is responsive to its community needs and balances community demand with financial prudence and intergenerational equity.

Council is extremely responsive to residents regarding their local issues. Examples include responding to safety concerns and implementing speed reductions, or installing appropriate traffic control devices and signage, footpath repairs and improved street and park lighting. Council considers all requests for improved facilities, new services or improvements to existing services, and residents are kept informed of progress and outcomes. Council is also responsive to local business requests and works with them to find solution to parking and planning issues, and to increase economic activity within the area. Due to the close proximity to the Campbelltown Office and Depot, it is easier for residents to ask for services in person if they prefer to do that rather than relying on phone, internet or through apps.

Campbelltown runs a very efficient operation and conducts regular Economy and Efficiency reviews, which compare performance between years, and also provide a benchmark against similar size Councils. The most recent review conducted by BRM Holdich in 2017 and benchmarked against the Cities of Burnside, Holdfast Bay, Norwood Payneham & St Peters, Prospect and Unley provided the following results:

Operating Revenue

- Lowest Revenue per Capita
- Lowest Total Revenue per rateable property

Rate Revenue

- Lowest Total Rate Revenue per Capita
- Lowest Total Rate Revenue per rateable property
- Lowest Total Rate Revenue per residential property
- Lowest Total Rate Revenue per non-residential property

Operating Expenditure

- Lowest per Capita
- Lowest per rateable property
- Fourth highest per FTE

Employees

- Lowest employee costs as % of operating expenditure
- Lowest average employee cost per FTE
- Lowest FTEs per 1,000 residents
- Highest number of rateable properties per FTE (adjusted)

The full review is attached in Appendix 4.

Campbelltown has a long history of working with neighbouring Councils and regional subsidiaries to achieve economical, efficient, equitable and responsive delivery of services. Campbelltown is an active member of the following organisations:

- Eastern Region Alliance (ERA) – 6 eastern region Councils working collaboratively across all functions
- Eastern Health Authority (EHA) – subsidiary providing public health service
- Eastwaste – subsidiary providing waste and recycling services
- Walkerville – provision of Depot Services to the Town of Walkerville
- Prospect – provision of Depot Services to the City of Prospect
- Walkerville – provision of Risk Management Services to Town of Walkerville over many years
- Resilient East composed of Eastern Region Councils and Adelaide City Council looking for common environmental issues, actions and solutions.
- Propel SA which provides business supports to three ERA council businesses including home based businesses.

5. A council should facilitate effective planning and development within an area, and be constituted with respect to an area that can be promoted on a coherent basis

Campbelltown would welcome the opportunity to facilitate effective planning and development within the proposed realignment area, particularly the current development of Hamilton Hill. This development has a direct impact on the Campbelltown area that it borders, with respect to traffic management, storm water management, and road infrastructure. A consolidated approach to this area should result in better outcome for both Council areas.

Incorporation of the proposed realignment area will enable a planned approach which will result in greater integration in the areas of hard infrastructure, social infrastructure, open space, connectivity and walking and cycling trails, which will be created and enhanced in line with community needs, and take future needs of the area in to account.

6. A council should be in a position to facilitate sustainable development, the protection of the environment and the integration of land use schemes

Campbelltown has a strong focus on protection of the environment and sustainable development. Campbelltown has declared a Climate Change Emergency, has a Climate Solutions Strategy, established a Climate Solutions Advisory Committee with independent expert members, and allocated \$250,000 per annum (cumulative) to support climate solution initiatives.

Council strongly advocates for better development in its area where it can through representation on Resilient East as well as initiating capacity building forums and workshops on sustainable development for staff, industry and community to help improve development in our area. It also provides representation for sustainability improvements in the Planning Code Reforms as well as the most recent National Construction Code review.

Council has undertaken canopy and heat mapping and developed tree mapping software to manage its urban forest, including significant and regulated trees which will help to inform an Urban Forest Strategy which will be developed in early 2022. Council is also developing a community tree register to help encourage and assist residents to better manage and protect significant trees as much as possible on private land.

Council is progressively installing and trialling new approaches to Water Sensitive Urban design and is a member of Water Sensitive SA.

7. A council should reflect communities of interest of an economic, recreational, social, regional or other kind, and be consistent with community structures, values, expectations and aspiration

Campbelltown considers that strong communities of interest exist between Campbelltown and the proposed realignment area. This matter has been discussed in part 3 of this report.

Campbelltown has a Section 41 Economic Development Advisory Committee who provide strategic advice on economic development and employment growth opportunities in Campbelltown. Campbelltown supports local business and economic development within the area by holding events such as the Pizza Festival, Moonlight Markets, and managing the very successful Food Trail.

Campbelltown is proud to support over 250 volunteers who donate their time to support community programs and there is a high level of active participation from a very engaged community in Service Clubs, Community Groups, Community Gardens, Arts groups and the like.

8. A council should incorporate or promote an accessible centre (or centres) for local administration and services

The Campbelltown administration office, library and depot (which incorporates waste drop off facilities) are located centrally within the Campbelltown area and within 2.5 km from the boundary of the proposed realignment area.

The office (Council Administration Building), located at 172 Montacute Rd, Rostrevor provides a full suite of regular local government customer service functions including general enquiries, planning and development advice, enquiries and processing, payments of rates, fees and expiations, and other council services. In addition the CHSP (Commonwealth Home Support Function) is delivered from the office which includes community transport, social programs, workshops, chair yoga, information sessions and bus trips for older residents. Volunteers also regularly commence work from the office, and all Council and Committee Meetings are held here.

The Campbelltown Function Centre is located at the rear of the office site and is a hub of activity for things such as CHSP programs, concerts, band practice, over 50's club, meetings, workshops, etc.

The Campbelltown Library offers the traditional library services and also wriggle and giggle, a maker space, a youth area, a toy library, digital literacy workshops, a local history room etc. The redevelopment of the facility in 2010 has led to increased usage and value for users.

The Campbelltown Depot, located at 6 Newton Rd, Campbelltown offers a FREE self-service household TV, computer and chemical drop off facility where residents can drop off unwanted TVs, computers, printers, chemicals, paints, oils, gas cylinders, batteries etc to manage local environmental and waste hazards.

The ARC Campbelltown is conveniently located at 531 Lower North East Road, Campbelltown. This very successful facility has a 25 metre lap pool, a leisure pool, a children's water play area, a gym and group fitness rooms, 5 multi-use basketball courts, 5 squash courts, a café, crèche, function rooms and meeting rooms. The ARC runs a sought after learn to swim program, and is home to many state, national and international competitions of various sports.

Campbelltown also has several excellent, inclusive sporting facilities in the area including Campbelltown Memorial Oval, Steve Woodcock Sports Centre, Max Amber Sportsfield, Daly Oval and several tennis and netball courts. Campbelltown is well known for its beautiful Thorndon Park, located at Paradise which is a great recreation space for families and groups, the Moonlight Markets, Christmas Carols and other events. Thorndon Park, along with other parks in the area also has accessible play equipment, and particularly a changing places facility. Campbelltown has several other highly maintained, inclusive and well used parks and reserves within its area and a number of highly sensitive biodiversity areas (eg Wadmore Park/ Pulyonna Wirra and Black Hill). Marchant Community Centre is another much loved facility offering various activities for residents with its key tenant being University of the Third Age.

All of these facilities are easily accessible and very close to the proposed realignment area. Many are already being well used and loved by the residents from that area.

9. The importance within the scheme of local government to ensure that local communities within large council areas can participate effectively in decisions about local matters

This principle is partly addressed in the response to number 10 below.

Campbelltown has several Section 41 Committees which mandates and values Community Member representation. The residents and ratepayers from the proposed realignment area would not only be eligible to stand for Council, they would also be very welcome and eligible to apply for membership of the following advisory Committees at the relevant time:

- Active Ageing
- Audit & Governance
- Climate Solutions

- Disability Access & Inclusion
- Economic Development
- Reconciliation
- Service Clubs
- Strategic Planning and Development
- Youth Advisory Committee

In addition the residents in the proposed realignment area would be able to participate in community consultation about local matters. This would mean that the residents could inform and help shape the services that they use and access. Campbelltown also holds a regular series of Neighbourhood Barbecues where local residents are invited along to enjoy a healthy meal, mix with their neighbours, and talk to Elected Members and staff about local issues.

10. Residents should receive adequate and fair representation within the local government system, while over representation in comparison with councils of a similar size and type should be avoided (at least in the longer term)

As explained in section 3.2.3, Campbelltown is currently divided in to 5 wards, with 10 Elected Members servicing the entire area. The most recent representation review (2016) provides the following data:

Ward	Councillors	House of Assembly Roll	Council Roll	Electors	Ratio	% Variance
Hectorville	2	7,290	12	7,302	1:3,561	+ 6.0
Gorge	2	7,013	10	7,023	1:3,512	+ 1.9
Newton	2	6,502	40	6,542	1:3,271	- 5.0
River	2	7,045	11	7,056	1:3,528	+ 2.4
Woodforde	2	6,513	9	6,522	1:3,261	- 5.3
Total	10	34,363	82	34,445		
Average					1:3,445	

Figure 7 - Campbelltown Representation Review Elector Ratios 2016

The tables provided in section 3.2.3 of this report provide current elector figures and ratios, as well as what these figures look like with an estimated number of Woodforde Electors included. As stated in that section of the report, the current ward structure can be retained because the elector ratio in all of the existing wards lay within the specified 10% quota tolerance limit prescribed under Section 33(2) of the Act.

In addition, Campbelltown's total average representation quota is below the state average of 1:1,763, which means it is well placed to ensure that residents receive adequate and fair representation. The addition of residents from the proposed realignment area would have no material impact on the quota and as such, Campbelltown is confident that those residents would receive adequate representation and would be able to participate effectively in local matters.

11. A scheme that provides for the performance of functions and delivery of services in relation to 2 or more councils (for example, a scheme for regional governance) may improve councils' capacity to deliver services on a regional basis and therefore offer a viable and appropriate alternative to structural change

Campbelltown has a demonstrated history of collaborating and working in partnership with other bodies and/or Councils. Current partnerships and collaborations include:

- Eastern Region Alliance (ERA) – 6 eastern region Councils working collaboratively across all functions
- Eastern Health Authority (EHA) – subsidiary providing public health service
- Eastwaste – subsidiary providing waste and recycling services
- Walkerville – provision of Depot Services to the Town of Walkerville
- Prospect – provision of Depot Services to the City of Prospect
- Walkerville – provision of Risk Management Services to Town of Walkerville over many years
- Resilient East composed of Eastern Region Councils and Adelaide City Council looking for common environmental issues, actions and solutions.
- Propel SA which provides business supports to three ERA council businesses including home based businesses.

Given the size of the proposed realignment area Campbelltown considers a sensible approach would be to incorporate that area in to the Campbelltown area. Campbelltown strongly believes this would provide economies and efficiencies for both Councils, and strong service delivery for all residents.

If a boundary realignment did not proceed, service delivery by Campbelltown to the proposed realignment area could be considered on a fee for service basis. This would assist Adelaide Hills with potential cost savings and provision of prompt service. It would not however resolve such issues as older people being unable to access CHSP services (including transport) in Campbelltown due to the funding arrangements being driven by Council boundaries.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Exact financial implications of this proposal are at this stage unknown. Campbelltown has requested the relevant data from Adelaide Hills on several occasions for use to prepare a thorough financial analysis. On the last request, Adelaide Hills advised that they would provide Campbelltown with a quote to prepare and provide the information. Campbelltown currently freely shares available information with other Councils, including Adelaide Hills. As such Campbelltown did not request a quote from Adelaide Hills.

Campbelltown have obtained June 2020 capital valuation data from a government source and have used these valuations to undertake rates modelling. These valuations would have been used for the 2020/2021 rating/financial year. Modelling has been undertaken using both the 2020/2021 and the 2021/2022 rates in the dollar for both Councils, and both years tell a similar story. Using 2021/2022 rates in the dollar, modelling indicates that Adelaide Hills would forego approximately \$1.42m in rates revenue (Adelaide Hills estimate this to be \$1.5m), and Campbelltown will gain approximately \$1.24m in rates revenue.

Rates are only one part of the financial equation, and whilst the modelling shows that Campbelltown will receive additional rates income, and Adelaide Hills will lose rates income, Campbelltown has no information on the ongoing costs associated with the proposed realignment area, if the boundary realignment proceeds. This includes servicing costs as well as, and importantly, asset management costs. Obviously Adelaide Hills will see a decrease in expenditure, and Campbelltown will experience an increase in expenditure; both day to day operating expenditure as well as capital expenditure, for example, the expectation is that Adelaide Hills residents will request footpaths.

Unfortunately no asset data has been obtained either, and as such no financial analysis has been undertaken by Campbelltown about the impact to either Council from an infrastructure asset management and maintenance perspective, nor the impact of depreciation of relevant assets. This is important information that would be able to be obtained from Adelaide Hills by the Commission if they decide to proceed to investigation. Campbelltown would need to understand the condition of the assets in the proposed realignment area, and the financial impact and asset management implications of maintaining these assets have. This information would be important to Council's decision if the Commission did in fact support the proposed realignment.

5.1 Rates Revenue

Campbelltown acknowledges that the loss of rate income may have an impact on Adelaide Hills; the extent of the impact will be the potential net loss to Adelaide Hills ie rates income net of reduction in expenditure. If there is a significant net loss to Adelaide Hills, this suggests that the area subject to the proposed realignment is strongly subsidising the rest of the Adelaide Hills area, Campbelltown is very willing to negotiate a transition phase for the transfer of this income, to lessen the impact on Adelaide Hills and provide them with time to strengthen their long term financial plans to accommodate the net loss. This may take the form of a percentage of rates income coming across to Campbelltown for say a 4 year period, or it may be a different model. It might be that the boundary realignment coincides with the 2026

Local Government Elections. Campbelltown is happy to work with Adelaide Hills and the Commission on a suitable transition model, if the Commission decides that this proposal is worth pursuing.

5.2 Financial Sustainability

Campbelltown Council is in a strong financial position with no debt and strong cash and investment balances. The LTFP (Appendix 5) clearly shows that Campbelltown is financially sustainable in its own right, and additional rates income is by no means the driver for this proposal. This is also why obtaining the asset data and understanding the long term impact on Campbelltown's LTFP and Strategic plans is an important piece of information.

Prior to the impact of COVID-19, Campbelltown was consistently projecting operating surpluses over the life of its LTFP in place at the time. This Plan included no borrowings and a healthy cash and investment balance to support future asset renewals as per its adopted Asset Management Plan. In 2020/2021, Council resolved to set a 0% rate increase, which meant that no ratepayers paid more than the amount levied in 2019/2020. This, along with various financial relief options provided to ratepayers, community groups, businesses and sporting clubs resulted in Council recording operating deficits in the earlier years of the subsequently adopted Plan. Due to Council's strong level of cash and investments, it was able to provide this financial support to the community without the need to borrow.

The update to the LTFP following the adoption of the 2021/2022 budget projects operating deficits in 2022/2023 and 2024/2025.

6. CONSULTATION

Campbelltown believes that the best outcome from both an engagement and information provision perspective and to gain a fully informed opinion from residents of the proposed realignment area, should have been for Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills to consult the Communities in partnership. Campbelltown proposed to Adelaide Hills that the two Councils work together during this process, and hold joint public meetings, and formally consult jointly. Unfortunately Adelaide Hills did not accede to this request and held their own public meeting on an evening and time that coincided with the regular Campbelltown Council Meeting, and subsequently consulted separately (Appendix 6) with residents from the proposed realignment area making broad assumptions about Campbelltown in a negative comparison of services. The results of that consultation are attached in Appendix 7.

Campbelltown subsequently engaged independent firm McGregor Tan to write and undertake a survey of Adelaide Hills residents from the proposed realignment area. The survey is attached (Appendix 8). Campbelltown also provided a brochure to Adelaide Hills residents which detailed features of the area. Campbelltown made a decision not to compare services or service levels between the two councils, but rather to highlight the services that Campbelltown offer. The reason behind this decision was to provide information to Adelaide Hills residents that they may not be aware of, and information that may be relevant to their opinion on whether they would like to be part of Campbelltown or remain part of Adelaide Hills. It was also considered important from an integrity perspective to not provide comment about Adelaide Hills services as Campbelltown was attempting to reduce the conflict that had arisen through this process, and also produce a factual document that was not subject to ambiguity. The proposed realignment is not about which Council provides better services, both Councils have a high standard of service delivery and arguably meet the needs of their respective communities. There may be different services offered in each Council, however this comparison was not the topic of the brochure or the survey. This brochure was delivered to all households within the proposed realignment area prior to the survey being delivered. The brochure is attached (Appendix 9).

All survey responses were sent directly to McGregor Tan, either electronically or by hard copy. Council had no involvement in receiving survey responses. McGregor Tan provided individual identifiers to each property, to ensure the integrity of the survey. The full report on the survey outcomes provided by McGregor Tan is attached (Appendix 10). Key features of the report are summarised below.

Campbelltown also conducted a simple survey (Appendix 11) of its own residents asking if they supported in principle the boundary realignment proposal. Campbelltown residents were in strong support of the realignment; the results of this survey are attached (Appendix 12).

7. SUMMARY

Campbelltown has developed this proposal and submission with the strong belief that a boundary realignment between Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills is logical, sensible, and practical. Campbelltown believes that the Community of interest that exists, and outlined in this proposal, should be formalised and managed under one Council boundary. This will ensure appropriate representation, community connection, community development, and asset management in an efficient, practical and financially sustainable manner.

Campbelltown acknowledges that this Proposal will have financial impacts to Adelaide Hills. The exact financial impacts are untested. The estimated loss of rates revenue to Adelaide Hills would be offset by a reduction in services delivered by Adelaide Hills.

Campbelltown thinks that a boundary realignment would provide a more efficient and equitable situation for both Councils and their residents. Campbelltown would welcome the opportunity for the Boundaries Commission to undertake an independent investigation with respect to its existing Local Government Area boundaries.

8. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 History

1. HISTORY

The residents of Woodforde and part of Rostrevor are currently part of AHC as a consequence of a council amalgamation process in 1999 which saw East Torrens Council merged into the newly formed AHC.

Originally, there was one East Torrens Council formed in 1853 comprised of East Torrens, Campbelltown, Payneham, Kensington and part of Burnside Councils. East Torrens was proud of being the second Council to be formed in SA until its demise in 1999, although its boundaries had altered several times over the intervening years.

CCC has a long history of stable boundaries after starting out as a part of East Torrens Council. It became the District Council of Campbelltown with its current boundaries in 1868, with one small addition in 1895, as a result of a request from East Torrens Council.

After this time there were many Chairpersons and councillors on both Councils who lived and worked over the boundaries. The mutual support of the early settlers in trade, education, and worship is evident in places such as the historic graveyard of St George's Anglican Church, Magill.

Upper Rostrevor (or Rostrevor Park) is still known as 'Morialta' to this day, in acknowledgement of its historical connections with the surrounding area. Much of the history of this area is directly associated with the Walters family; both Samuel Walters and Alfred Walters were District Councillors of Campbelltown during the separation from Payneham in 1867, and Alfred Walters was the first Chairman of the District Council of Campbelltown. CCC's Mayor 2006-2018, Mayor Simon Brewer (2006-2018) grew up and was educated in Upper Rostrevor (Rostrevor Park).

The early colonial settlers formed common purpose and there were many people in those early days who operated in the CCC area and in the area known as Morialta and Woodforde. This was because of the way that land was bought and sold and the large parcels of land used to create the Morialta Conservation Park and the township of Woodforde.

Morialta Falls was originally called Glen Stuart Falls, after Charles William Stuart, who owned it. In 1837, Stuart owned a property called No.1 Station near where Gurners Reserve, Rostrevor, is situated today in CCC. In 1840, he purchased another property, known as Glen Stuart under Black Hill, near the corner of Montacute and Maryvale Roads, Athelstone. Then in June 1841, he purchased the majority of what is now the Morialta Conservation Park and named it Glen Stuart Falls.

Most of Stuart's 100-acre property, Glen Stuart on the Moriatta, was purchased by Price Maurice, formerly of Fourth Creek, Hectorville. In the 1870s, it was variously known as Glen Stuart Estate or Fourth Creek Estate, and at its peak, it encompassed over 3,031 acres stretching from Stradbroke Road into the Morialta Gorge, including the whole of Upper Rostrevor.

The Fourth Creek Estate was in turn, purchased by John Smith Reid of Rostrevor Hall (now Rostrevor College) in 1901, and became part of the sprawling Rostrevor Estate. John Smith Reid subdivided Rostrevor and gave part of Morialta to the State Government as a National Pleasure Resort in 1913.¹

The beautiful Morialta Conservation Park as it is known today, which sits in the AHC area, is generally seen as a part of CCC by CCC residents and visitors alike. Interestingly, approximately 40% of the volunteers who work in the park as part of the Friends of Black Hill and Morialta come from CCC, with only 10% coming from AHC. The other 50% of volunteers come from outside both Council areas.

On the south side of Rostrevor Estate, was Woodforde Estate, owned by John Hallett and Captain John Finlay Duff, who leased the land to Samuel East. Captain Duff established the Village of Woodforde between Church Street and Magill Road, Magill, on part of the 720-acre Woodforde Estate. He then purchased an additional 300 acres of adjoining land on the CCC side of Magill, including South Stradbroke and Finchley, increasing the estate to over 1,020 acres.

Part of the old Woodforde Estate was sold to the State Government for the establishment of the Magill Orphanage/Reformatory in 1869. This has now been developed as Hamilton Hill Estate. Woodforde House is located in CCC as a state heritage listed building and was the original centre of the Woodforde Estate. Hamilton Hill is located in the AHC area. Another part of the same government-owned land on the CCC side of Glen Stuart Road was used for the establishment of the Magill Old Folks' Home in 1917.

The Magill Brick Company, on Norton Summit Road, Woodforde, was established in about 1912, because of the local need for over a million bricks to build the Magill Old Folks' Home. The interconnection showed a true community of interest.

The iconic Woodforde Estate left its legacy in local place names, such as the State Heritage listed Woodforde House near the Tower Hotel (formerly the Woodforde Arms), Woodforde Road and Woodforde Ward, all of which are located in CCC. These are traces of the Village of Woodforde, the first subdivision of the Woodforde Estate in 1842.

1.1 Royal Commissions

In the 1930's a Royal Commission recommended that the districts of Norton Summit and Echunga should be added to the East Torrens Council. The East Torrens Council became part of an amalgamated AHC formed in 1997 as a result of the legislative impetus for councils to be amalgamated. At that time the rates base was small for that council with a population of 5,000. The council itself did not wish to be

¹ South Australia. National Parks and Wildlife. [n.d.] Morialta Conservation Park. Park Brochure.

broken up and CCC was interested in Upper Rostrevor and Woodforde if an amalgamation was to occur.

A Royal Commission in 1973-74 recommended that Woodforde and Rostrevor should be part of CCC, and indeed the East Torrens Council argued for no change at all, as did residents of Skye and Morialta. Nonetheless, the residents of Morialta requested that CCC provide a library on Montacute road for their benefit. CCC in 1976 did build a library, on Montacute Road.

CCC Mayor Herb Reid made the point in the Royal Commission, that out of respect for East Torrens Council and despite noting the services used by residents of Woodforde and Rostrevor in CCC, they would not seek to change the boundary.

The questioning by the Commissioners of witnesses focussed on a community of interest about matters such as the use of libraries, schooling, sports clubs, swimming pools, churches, banking, shopping.

The Commissioners found that:

“We have heard considerable evidence concerning the suburbs of Woodforde and land adjacent to Rostrevor presently within the District Council of East Torrens. We have indicated that as a matter of general principle the boundary of a council on the plains should include the area up to the top of the Hills Face Zone. We believe there is considerable community of interest between these areas and those to the west and we therefore recommend that the eastern boundary of the Corporation of the City of Campbelltown be extended into the District Council of East Torrens.

Since we make a similar recommendation with regard to the City of Burnside, the boundary between the new areas ought to be the Old Norton Summit Road extending generally easterly from Magill to the top of the Hills Face Zone.”²

The latter recommendation was enacted in a 1999 change to council boundaries when the suburbs of Skye and Teringie were included in Burnside Council.

The 1974 Royal Commission also noted on a common theme commented on in the 1933 Royal Commission into council Boundaries that:

“In practically every instance before us they had only one alternative, for they were simply asked to choose between the known – the existing boundaries – and the unknown.”

“Retention of boundaries was invariably put by a strong proponent of the existing position... rarely did any discussion of alternatives take place. It

² South Australia (1974) First report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Adelaide: Government Printer

is hardly surprising therefore that ratepayers would opt for the boundaries that have at least one advantage – that they are known.”³

Mayor Reid in response to a question stated, “Geographically those sections in the East Torrens area are connected virtually with Campbelltown.” “I think we could supply all services except please them.” He also stated that “despite other factors, both geographic and service wise might appear to suggest that there would be advantages in these areas being incorporated into Campbelltown.”

Stanley Richards of the MRA (Morialta Residents Association) gave evidence as to why Upper Rostrevor should not be part of Campbelltown. When asked about using Campbelltown’s services he agreed that the residents may well use Campbelltown for services and stated, “The little area that we are in – yes- we would have to go out of our way to get into East Torrens – but this we feel is no problem”. He felt that if they moved into Campbelltown they would be swallowed up although he also provided evidence of Campbelltown working constructively with residents of these areas to mitigate their concerns.

The areas outlined as Community of interest at that time were

- Weed and pest control
- Drainage
- Water catchment
- Recreation facilities
- Firefighting and prevention
- Hills Face Zone
- Garbage Collection
- Volunteers

Cr Lancelot Anderson of East Torrens Council noted that “East Torrens bracketed into Metropolitan Planning Area because of closeness to Metropolitan Adelaide.” The population of Woodforde at that time was 345. He stated that he believed that a library built on Montacute Rd may be convenient.

In its final report, the Royal Commission noted that “if boundary changes could be made voluntarily, this commission would accept that such voluntary change is the best method. We point out, however, that this principle of self-determination in the matter of council boundaries is a new concept and one we always believed would be difficult to achieve; we now know that on a state-wide basis, it is impossible to achieve.”

Further the “The Commission’s recommended areas were based primarily on principles relating to community of interest but taking into account all other factors as well”.

³ South Australia (1974) First report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Adelaide: Government Printer

“Another difficulty with regard to voluntary change is that it is only in rare circumstances that one council can change its boundaries without another council being involved. Thus even if the majority of councils in the State wish to alter boundaries, in most cases they cannot do so.” The fact that the State Government changed the legislation in 2019 so that a single council can initiate a boundary change bears out this observation.

The Royal Commissioners also noted, “Many councils operate free from the various problems of servicing their complete community in the full knowledge that the neighbouring council or councils are doing so. An amalgamation in such a case might mean that one group of ratepayers would commence paying their due contributions whilst another group would receive some just relief.”

Further, “Those councils who adopt a selfish attitude to such a situation are unlikely to change voluntarily” and also that a change in boundaries might result in “a loss of status for members”.

Importantly, the Commissioners noted, “If a significant number of the inhabitants of a council area are required to cross a council boundary to meet many of their needs because those needs cannot be met within their council area, then the boundary is wrong.”

The Royal Commissioners also talked about the wishes of the people. If people “would have the matter decided based on the ‘wishes of the people’, our first question to their proposition would be ‘which people?’ It must be obvious that those who are currently escaping their local government responsibilities (financially and otherwise) will oppose any change particularly as their local council will have taken steps to notify them of all the contrary arguments”.

“The wishes of the people is often framed without reference to the issues involved.”

The “retention of boundaries was invariably put by a strong proponent of an existing position....rarely did any discussion of alternatives take place”.

“In regard to polls it is difficult to ensure that both sides of the issue are fully and fairly put and that the question is not clouded by local, parochial and side issues.”

The Commissioners noted that “..it is difficult to see how an informed vote on such a complicated question can be obtained.”

The Commissioners addressed the issue of Community of Interest in some detail including going to some length to define what it meant and referring back to Gifford’s “The Australian Local Government Dictionary”. They concluded that “the application of the principle of Community of Interest must generally result in fewer and larger areas.” They considered that a Community of Interest of people were “economic, social, regional or otherwise”, “the distance between centres and other parts of an area”, “the physical features of a locality” and “employment, banks, schools, shopping, religious, recreational and transport”.

They also noted somewhat wryly that “There is a considerable tendency in local government for boundaries to remain unchanged long after they have ceased to be appropriate” and that “Inappropriate boundaries can impede the development of local government.”

The Commissioners also noted that “there are cases in which one local government authority has to take its roadmaking equipment through the territory of another local government authority to reach some part of its own territory, and there are cases in which roadmaking equipment has to be taken for long distances to service a small community which could be more readily serviced from the depot of an adjoining local government authority.” This observation describes the situation in Woodforde and Upper Rostrevor well, where it seems obvious that, purely due to proximity, CCC are better placed to serve that area.

1.2 Historic connection between the two areas

Over the years, there has been a strong level of connection between the two areas. This was created because of the way that land was bought and sold, and the large parcels of land used to create the Morialta Conservation Park and the township of Woodforde.

In 1982, The MRA asked well known Campbelltown historian, Elizabeth Warburton, who wrote “From the River to the Hills” for CCC to produce a book “The Making of Morialta”.

Elizabeth Warburton outlined the close linkages in settlement days between the families now living in those areas linked to Morialta and Woodforde and towards Black Hill as a district. The Bullock team well known in the area as run by Charley “Chummy” Austin, was based in Athelstone but used to perform tasks for all of the local residents.

Warburton described the rural lifestyle and the development of local industries and the drive to make the whole of the area prosperous. She also described the establishment of the East Torrens, Burnside, Payneham and Campbelltown Councils as housing divisions creating new populations.

In reading this history, the problems created by having a council boundary along Stradbroke Road with East Torrens were evident in the 1980’s with transport and road issues mentioned as problems including the distances old people had to travel from the Rostrevor Park subject area to the East Torrens Council area.

The MRA itself has opposed subdivision from its earliest days despite the development that has occurred in its neighbourhood as land became increasingly scarce. The love of environment has also been a major feature of the MRA. The Association deserves credit for the way it has worked to expand this delightful feature of Morialta Reserve, which Campbelltown residents enjoy as well and consider part of the CCC area due to its metropolitan location and close proximity.

The MRA’s interest in the area of Black Hill and downstream Campbelltown shows that it has taken a real interest and influence in the wider Campbelltown area. There is no doubt that some of the views within the book are coloured by Elizabeth Warburton’s term as a Councillor on East Torrens Council and her passion in the book is evident. She argued fiercely for the retention of the East Torrens Council and against the amalgamation, which swallowed up East Torrens Council in 1999 into the newly created AHC. This was a local response to the SA Local Government Royal Commission 1974 into boundaries, which recommended that the top area of Rostrevor covered by the MRA be included in CCC.


The book outlines some of the problems and proposed solutions to the issue of flooding created by large downpours in the catchment area and the potential impact on housing further downstream in the CCC area.

1.3 Recent History

More recently, there were wholesale changes made to Council boundaries with a reduction of councils in South Australia in 1999. In the lead up to that change, CCC indicated its willingness to discuss “integration of those residential areas of [the East Torrens Council] district immediately adjoining the City”⁴ on 3 October 1995.

However, East Torrens Council wished to remain as an entire entity in the new structure and did not pursue further consultation with CCC despite the integration of Skye and Teringie into Burnside Council.

Nevertheless, Woodforde residents held a meeting on 3 February 1997 attended by 60 residents and requested that the subject of joining with an eastern suburbs council be considered within 6 months of the new council and boundaries being formed. The motion below was passed but the review did not occur.



New legislation to assist with Boundary Reform came into effect in January 2019 and CCC put in a submission under the new legislation in February 2019 because of the long-standing issues of a Community of Interest between itself and the areas of Woodforde, Hamilton Hill and Upper Rostrevor.

The Boundaries Reform Commission agreed that CCC could move to Stage 2 of this process in June 2019. Subsequent to that, AHC experienced the devastating bushfires in December 2019/January 2020 and out of respect and concern for AHC residents CCC did not pursue the boundary realignment during that period. Soon after came the COVID-19 pandemic, which again put a hold on this process and the consultation with AHC residents. Once the pandemic landscape had settled, CCC recommenced their efforts in relation to the proposal.

⁴ City of Campbelltown (1995) Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Tuesday 3 October 1995. Tabled correspondence. Item 6

References

East, R. (1972). *A South Australian colonist of 1836 and his descendants: the East family*. Melbourne: Gardner Printing & Publishing.

Matthews, P. (1986). *South Australia: the civic record 1836-1986*. Adelaide: Wakefield Press. Moore, P. L. (1975). *Pride of the hills: the story of Rostrevor House*. Adelaide: Lynton

South Australia. (1974). *First report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas*.

Warburton, E. (1976). *Old Stradbroke*. Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House. Warburton, E. (1982). *The making of Morialta: from farm to suburb*. Adelaide: Morialta

Warburton, E. (1986). *From the river to the hills: Campbelltown 150 years*. Adelaide: City of

https://www.parks.sa.gov.au/find-a-park/Browse_by_region/Adelaide_Hills/morialta-conservation-park

Appendix 2(a) MRA Publications November 2019

Hands Off!

Say NO

To Council boundary realignment

November 2019



Take your pick. Woodforde and Morialta's quiet, semi-rural ambience is in stark contrast to Campbelltown's intensive, often ugly infill.

Campbelltown Council takeover threatens our area

Campbelltown Council's push to takeover Woodforde and the Morialta area of Rostrevor has sparked a spirited backlash from concerned residents.

The first information session on the issue, run by the Adelaide Hills Council in September, drew a large crowd of concerned residents from both Woodforde and the Morialta area.

The overwhelming sentiment of residents who spoke or posed questions during that session was against the proposed annexation, which Campbelltown Council is putting to the Boundary Commission.

It claims that Adelaide Hills

ratepayers are using its services and infrastructure without paying.

The Campbelltown Council also says that some Adelaide Hills ratepayers have told the Council in the past that they wished to "join their community" – but it won't indicate how many.

Campbelltown is continuing to develop its case to the Commission and will run its own community consultation sessions in due course.

Meanwhile, Adelaide Hills Council is currently surveying its Woodforde and Morialta residents.

Please take the time to complete the survey form which you will receive in

the post and return it to the Council, making your position clear.

It is vital that residents speak up strongly and clearly during this process – before it's too late.

Campbelltown has already urged its ratepayers outside of Woodforde and Morialta to raise their voices during the consultation process, even though they will not be personally affected by the review.

But your voice, as an Adelaide Hills resident and ratepayer who is actually impacted by any change, should be the only one that carries any real weight.

**Say
NO**

To Council boundary realignment



Quiet, tree-lined streets of Woodforde, with elevated views out to the city and Gulf – perfect targets for infill and still more development.

Rates claimed as a reason to switch

Lower rates have been suggested as one of the justifications for a move to Campbelltown – but what's the real story?

Promoting the boundaries push in a letter recently distributed to all Woodforde and Morialta residents, Campbelltown Mayor Jill Whittaker claimed that her Council had "the lowest average rates in the metropolitan area."

But what does "lowest average rate" mean exactly?

Does it have something to do with property valuations in Campbelltown

Council? Or is it based on the average house prices?

Perhaps it is the average of residential, commercial, industrial, primary production etc.

As with many other statements made by either Campbelltown Council or its Mayor on this issue, specifics are lacking.

It is the residential rate in the dollar that actually counts – that's what is applied to your home's valuation and determines your annual rates bill.

A quick check of neighbouring councils in fact reveals that, apart from

Tea Tree Gully Council, Campbelltown has – by a considerable margin – the highest residential rate in the dollar of adjoining metropolitan councils:

Campbelltown	.003005037
Port Adelaide Enfield	.00248
Walkerville	.0022738
Norwood Payneham	.00223830
Burnside	.00216000

On this basis, perhaps we should be asking Burnside Council if they would like to take us over, as it has the cheapest rate in the dollar!

Slightly cheaper – but it's not worth the risk

Annual rates 2019/20		Valuation	
Adelaide Hills		\$700,000	\$850,000
Rate in the \$	0.002469	\$1,728.30	\$2,098.65
Fixed charge		\$662.00	\$662.00
NRM levy	0.00009805	\$68.64	\$83.34
Total rates		\$2,458.94	\$2,843.99
Campbelltown		\$700,000	\$850,000
Rate in the \$	0.00305037	\$2,135.26	\$2,592.81
NRM levy	0.00009805	\$68.64	\$83.34
Total rates		\$2,203.89	\$2,676.16
Current saving		\$255.04	\$167.84
Per week		\$4.90	\$3.23

Campbelltown's annual rates are currently nominally cheaper than Adelaide Hills' but analysis shows that the saving is only marginal, and reduces and eventually zeros out as the assessed rateable value of your property increases.

Adelaide Hills' basic rate in the dollar is actually lower but it also applies an additional fixed charge to all residential ratepayers, currently \$662 a year.

AHC staff told the recent September public information session at Rostrevor College that the mean rateable valuation in Woodforde / Morialta was \$700,000 – which would mean an average \$220 a year saving – and that will reduce as assessed property values rise over time.

That's the price of a cup of coffee per week. Is that sort of saving worth it for the real risks to the amenity, character and heritage of our area?



• Graph from the Campbelltown City Council Strategic Plan, page 19

Campbelltown Council hooked on a stream of development dollars

Campbelltown Council is set to approve more than 1,100 new dwellings in the next 10 years.

How will this affect your area? Campbelltown's own economic planning documents provide some alarming clues.

With 2,105 persons per sq. km, Campbelltown has one of the highest population densities among South Australian LGAs. It is expected that Campbelltown will experience strong population growth out to 2031 at a compound average growth rate of 1.1%

- From the 2020 Campbelltown City Council Economic Development Plan, page 12

The economic driver of demand growth and expenditure will come from population growth, residential infill, attracting tourists and others to the area.

- From the 2020 Campbelltown City Council Economic Development Plan, page 22

Economic development in general has historically been and is currently driven by residential development and property tax (rates) revenue. High population density increases demand for services, public spaces and public transport. The large number of businesses servicing the local resident population in Campbelltown is consistent with increasing residential density. Increased density in housing and mixed-use developments will further support this.

- From the 2020 Campbelltown City Council Economic Development Plan, page 14

The Council area is principally a residential area that has only a small amount of greenfield space available for future development. Consequently the majority of development likely to occur within the council area during the Plan period is anticipated to be residential infill development . . .

- From the Campbelltown City Council Strategic Plan, page 19

Campbelltown has run out of greenfield sites and is keen to expand into low-density areas in Rostrevor and Woodforde.


Whatever guarantees the Campbelltown City Council makes need to be measured against that Council's objective of ongoing population growth and property development.

Adelaide Hills Council has an abundance of greenfield sites and can therefore meet growth targets without recourse to infill and high-density housing.

AHC policies are not dependent on compromising the quality of life of residents.

Which would you rather have for your street?





Adelaide Hills ratepayers who may, or may not, borrow from the State Government-supported Campbelltown library, are an insignificant part of total borrowers and it is fanciful to suggest that they would add anything to the cost of running the library.

Residents branded freeloaders to justify boundary change

Woodforde and Morialta residents are being labelled freeloaders as Campbelltown Council seeks to justify its claim on our area.

Adelaide Hills ratepayers are alleged to be using services they don't pay for and have no right to.

This, together with the suggestion that some have in the past "expressed a desire" to be part of Campbelltown, are the two major issues used by that Council to explain why it has approached the Boundaries Commission for the review.

Earlier this year Campbelltown Mayor Jill Whittaker told the Press that her Council was "subsidising" Adelaide Hills residents who used Campbelltown's libraries, sporting clubs and roads.

And former Mayor Simon Brewer, who continues to lobby strongly for the takeover, is pushing the same argument to justify realignment.

"At present you are providing the residents of this land-locked area roads, playing fields, meeting spaces, library and many other services for

which they pay nothing," he has told Campbelltown residents and ratepayers. "That is unfair. It is not like any other boundary situation that I am aware of."

All of these claims will have to be backed up with credible supporting data if Campbelltown, also a 'land-locked area' whose residents use the roads, playing fields, meeting spaces, and libraries of other council areas, is to progress its submission through the next stage of the Boundaries Commission's process.

Libraries part of a Statewide network



Some AHC residents may well use the Campbelltown library. Many are also known to use the State Library in the City of Adelaide and the Burnside Library.

If a Hills ratepayer happens to borrow a book, does this create a need for Campbelltown to hire another librarian? Or do borrowers actually simply present their books at the self-

checkout barcode scanner?

Council libraries, wherever they're located, are part of a Statewide network and receive significant State funding, to an average of about 25%.

In 2018, for example, Campbelltown received a Library Operating Subsidy of \$166,000 and a Library Materials Grant of \$181,000 (refer to Council's 2018 Annual Report). The total the

previous year was \$310,000.

How many AHC residents are recorded as regular Campbelltown library borrowers? And if some are, they are using the Statewide One Card public library network, which means borrowers could just as well be reading books drawn from the Kimba, Marion, Snowtown or Norwood libraries as those from Campbelltown.

So what are they offering?

What does Campbelltown City Council offer that Adelaide Hills doesn't?

Rubbish collection

The same East Waste contractors would continue to pick up our household waste and green bins.

One 'at call' hard waste collection would still be offered to each residence per financial year. This free service is currently provided by East Waste on behalf of both Adelaide Hills Council and Campbelltown.

Roads

The same low-traffic-volume internal roads would continue to be maintained at minimal and similar cost to whichever Council controls the area.

Home support program

Both Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills offer a range of services for frail older people and younger people with a disability.

These programs are jointly funded by the Australian Government Department of Health and the



Government of South Australia Department for Communities and Social Inclusion.

And modest fees apply, whichever Council area you're in.

eWaste drop-off facility

A great service – but it is funded by the State Government's Green Industries SA, just as the AHC facility and others all around the metro area are similarly State-financed.

Parks, reserves and ovals

These are available all over Adelaide. Who hasn't visited Wigley Reserve at Glenelg or Victoria Park in the City?

Black Hill and Morialta Conservation

Parks are listed by Campbelltown as attractions in their district. They're actually both in the AHC area – but that's irrelevant, as they're both State-owned and funded.

Sports & recreation

Rostrevor and Campbelltown tennis clubs, for example, are doubtless fine organisations but these sporting groups all offer memberships to the general public and, quite reasonably, charge annual fees.

Being a Campbelltown Council ratepayer doesn't provide free membership or access.

Meeting rooms and halls

Campbelltown's venues are for hire to the public and have their costs listed in the Schedule of Fees & Charges.

Campbelltown's Function Centre, for example, is commercially promoted as "a sensational venue, perfect for weddings, engagements, special birthdays, christenings, conferences, meetings and more." In other words, it's open for business at a price and available to anyone from anywhere who is prepared to pay.

"They use our roads" Well no we don't, actually

Virtually all of the major exits from Woodforde and the Morialta area of Rostrevor are State Government roads or jointly maintained by both Councils.

Is it an issue for Campbelltown when residents of Woodforde / Morialta, or even their own ratepayers, travel to the city, traversing Norwood-Payneham-Saint Peters? Or head for the Hills via Burnside? Or go to work in the City?

Are the Campbelltown residents, or those from anywhere in the metro area, who daily tread our footpaths or drive our roads to access the Morialta Conservation Park, somehow seen as freeloaders?

The *"they use our services"* line is now a standard argument from Councils looking to grab some of the neighbours' territory.

It was trotted out by Marion Council in its recent push for a slice of Onkaparinga and then by Holdfast Bay looking to annex a chunk of Marion.

In fact, the Holdfast Bay Mayor even justified that Council's claim for part of Marion's area by saying "they're zoned to our schools, they use our beaches."

Give us a break – State Government or privately-funded schools and beaches which are Crown Land for the public use of all!





Our view

That part of Rostrevor called 'Morialta' doesn't look the way it does by accident. The MRA was set up 50 years ago to enhance its bush-like, semi-rural character and to protect it from those that would, for a quick buck, turn the place into a concrete jungle. We have also acted to protect the Morialta Conservation Park. Over the years the MRA and its members have, among other things, fought off multiple developers (including a recent attempted large-scale threat); under-grounded our power lines; inspired the purchase of parts of the Morialta Conservation Park to save it; and secured 16 hectares of land for the Park. This rates and revenue-driven foray by the Campbelltown City Council – and that's all it is – is just the latest in a long line of battles we have had to fight. The CCC has money on its mind. We have the preservation of a unique part of Adelaide on ours. Woodforde residents have seen first-hand what 'development' can look like, with many houses in 'Hamilton Hill' no more than about 5 metres (or 3 or 4 steps) wide.

Together, we can all protect both Woodforde and Morialta – but everyone has to make their individual voice heard – loud and clear!

*Published by:
Morialta Residents' Association
info@morialtaresidents.net
www.morialtaresidents.net
facebook.com/morialtaresidents/*

Takeover bid is clutching at straws

A report presented to Campbelltown Council by its General Manager Corporate & Community Services, earlier this year, arguing the case for a Boundaries Review, made some remarkable assumptions.

"It is quite likely that residents in this area associate more with communities of interest within the City of Campbelltown than Adelaide Hills Council, and Campbelltown Council is already providing considerable services to residents in the boundary realignment area."

"Quite likely?" What objective measure can Campbelltown provide to back this assertion?

"Considerable?" This implies costly, time and resource-consuming services. How is this quantified?

Which services and facilities? And how does their use by an unspecified number of Adelaide Hills residents impact on Campbelltown's costs or inconvenience anyone?

"Socially, Council would be able to provide residents in this area access to social services (eg Council's Youth Advisory Committee or Community Home Support Programs) that currently can't be provided due to the Council boundaries. Staff are aware that this causes issues for some residents in the area as public transport links to the Hills are limited and the distance is a barrier for participation."

Which residents of Woodforde/Morialta have the Campbelltown Council identified as being reliant on public transport to get to Stirling or Woodside to access Community Home Support Programs? How many? How often?

And surely the point of Home Support is that it takes place in the home?

Adelaide Hills offers precisely the same service and it is already used by some of our residents.

The push is on for our rates revenue



Campbelltown, like any Council, wants people from outside its area to help support local businesses.

Attracting tourists and others is seen as one of Campbelltown's main economic drivers, according to its own 2020 Economic Development Plan.

Woodforde and Morialta residents already provide plenty of economic input into the area's businesses.

But we don't affect Campbelltown's costs in any meaningful way.

The level of incremental spending incurred by Campbelltown Council

as a result of our residents would be so immeasurably small that, for all practical purposes, it could or should be, considered to be zero.

Shopping at Woolies or patronising the Rostrevor Pizza Bar do not constitute use of Campbelltown services – they're private enterprises which welcome our business, just as those in Burnside, Norwood or Adelaide do.

Campbelltown is already a major beneficiary of our spending. We're not freeloaders.



Campbelltown has been at the centre of a State Government-led push to higher density living.

Aggressive infill the big fear

Campbelltown's long history of intense urban infill and the risk that it will be repeated in Woodforde and Morialta, are the major concerns for local residents.

Campbelltown has sought to reassure residents that it would adopt the existing planning requirements contained in the Adelaide Hills Council's Development Plan, should its takeover be successful.

However, it knows that both the Adelaide Hills Development Plan and its own will be replaced by the State Government's new Planning & Design Code in July 2020 – in the end, it won't be up to Councils at all.

While the new Code is being fine-tuned and is still open to public comment, there is no certainty that the State Government will take on board the submissions of either the public or Councils when it comes to preserving existing controls on residential building site areas, frontages and infill.

In the meantime we need strong persuasive voices lobbying on our behalf to protect the character and amenity of our area.

How confident can you be that Campbelltown would argue as

strongly as AHC for the preservation of our current planning protections and would it demonstrate the same resolve as Adelaide Hills has in the face of any renewed and determined push by developers?

Adelaide Hills Council has a proven track record of standing up to unreasonable development in our area, notwithstanding the fact that it's objections, together with those of Campbelltown, to the scale and intensity of the McNally / Hamilton Hill development were steam-rolled over by the former State government.

Standing up to developers

For example, developers' attempts to have the Hills Face Zone boundary shifted and a large scale residential development permitted within the Morialta section of Rostrevor and in the Hills Face Zone, via a proposed privately-funded Development Plan Amendment, were roundly rejected by the Adelaide Hills Council in 2016.

This reflected the intense opposition



of residents to both substantial development at odds with the AHC Development Plan and to the requested by-passing of long-term State Government regulations governing the Hills Face Zone.

AHC ruled that the privately-funded DPA not be proceeded with. How might that attempt by developers have fared if it had been Campbelltown Council making the decision?

We have seen developments (e.g. Porter Terrace) in the Campbelltown area that were allowed to proceed on areas even smaller than their own development guidelines permitted at the time.

Regarding development issues more broadly, had the old East Torrens Council area passed to the control of Campbelltown rather than to the AHC when it was disbanded and amalgamated back in 1997, Woodforde and Morialta are more than likely to have suffered 20 years of on-going erosion of their hard-won amenity and planning protections.



To Council boundary realignment



Woodforde and Morialta have their own distinct character – in stark contrast to most of Campbelltown.

No, we're not just another concrete jungle

"You are a metropolitan area, not rural, and you use our services."

That's the view of Campbelltown Council and its Mayor Jill Whittaker.

"If you were part of Campbelltown you could take part in community consultation and influence community

decisions. You could join committees such as active ageing or economic development," she says.

But it is the semi-rural feel of our area, not its "metropolitan nature", which attracted us here in the first place.

It is the "metropolitan" aspect of the

densely-built, in-filled, traffic-clogged, over-parked, treeless residential streets of much of the Campbelltown area which we have deliberately avoided by choosing to live in Woodforde and Morialta.

Say no to boundary realignment.

Tell them what you think – before it's too late

Residents concerned about the change of Council boundaries need to speak up now.

Let your Adelaide Hills Councillors, your State Member of Parliament and Campbelltown know how you feel.

Adelaide Hills

mail@ahc.sa.gov.au
PO Box 44
Woodside SA 5244
8408 0400

Mayor
Jan-Claire Wisdom
0405 136 278
jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au

Nathan Daniell
(deputy Mayor))
0400 341 082
ndaniell@ahc.sa.gov.au

Ranges Ward councillors
Kirrilee Boyd
0405 505 684
kboyd@ahc.sa.gov.au

Kirsty Parkin
0422 758 126
kparkin@ahc.sa.gov.au

Ian Bailey
0427 005 792
ibailey@ahc.sa.gov.au

John Kemp
0419 856 042
jkemp@ahc.sa.gov.au

Leith Mudge
0414 716 903
lmudge@ahc.sa.gov.au

Mark Osterstock
0407 619 282
mosterstock@ahc.sa.gov.au

Your local MP

John Gardner MP
(State seat of Morialta)
163 St Bernards Rd,
Rostrevor SA 5073
8365 4224
morialta@parliament.
sa.gov.au

Campbelltown

boundary@campbelltown.
sa.gov.au
PO Box 1,
Campbelltown SA 5074
8366 9222

Mayor
Jill Whittaker
8366 9239 (Mayor's Office)
0438 375 868
mayor@campbelltown.
sa.gov.au

**Say
NO**

To Council boundary realignment

Hands Off!

Say NO

To Council boundary realignment

November 2020



Chalk and cheese. Separated by just 1.5 km but a world apart. Streetscapes in the Adelaide Hills Council's Morialta/Rostrevor and Campbelltown's Newton.

Campbelltown's land claim a threat to our neighbourhood

Campbelltown Council is surveying residents of Woodforde and Morialta/Rostrevor, asking us to agree to be annexed from the Adelaide Hills and to risk everything we value.

It has dismissed last year's AHC survey of residents – in which you voted and which recorded overwhelming opposition to the move – as unreliable and potentially biased.

It is now banking on its claimed "shared history, community values" and marginally lower rates to be enough to convince you there is nothing to fear from rampant development.

It is touting its "proximity to services" as a plus, when we all know that local shops, businesses, waste and recycling services are all freely available to us, which ever Council we are in.

You have to decide whether a few dollars off your rates bill for the next year or two is worth the risk of relying on a Council which has a long history of supporting insensitive development.

You have been surveyed once before by the AHC. Campbelltown has ignored that.

How you now respond to their own survey is vital. Say No!

**Say
NO**

To Council boundary realignment

A sign of things to come ?

How much longer will this wildlife warning need to be in place on what is now the boundary between serene, spacious Woodforde and its new cheek-by-jowl neighbour, Hamilton Hill? We're still graced by daily visits from koalas, echidnas and the occasional 'roo.

And we want to keep it that way. Taking a punt on Campbelltown Council standing up for our hard-won community environment is not a wager we're willing to make.



Campbelltown's own residents join the social media backlash

It's not just the residents of Woodforde and Morialta who are fearful of what could happen to our areas.

Campbelltown's own residents are increasingly fighting back and making their feelings known about the development which is ruining their neighbourhoods.

These comments are among dozens on development-related posts on the *Love Campbelltown* Facebook page.

They are in response to the relentless clearing, subdivision and construction of so-called townhouses, squeezed onto sites de-nuded of valuable trees and gardens.

Campbelltown seeks to deflect this sort of criticism from its own ratepayers by pointing to its "triumph" in having the minimum lot size in its Development Plan increased from 150 to 250 square metres,

following community backlash. Of course, the State Government's planning controls dictate much of this appalling development. But 250 sq metres a victory?

Councils can resist all of this on behalf of their rate-paying residents.

Do you want to roll the dice? Is this the Council you want standing up to protect your street's amenity?

The two storey excrement now towers over my back yard and blocks all view of black hill. I used to love my beautiful Athelstone. Now it feels like I live in brompton, but with less bus services.

Like Reply 1 y · Edited

Campbelltown council calls it progress, I call it greed. What they are doing to campbelltown is disgusting, I wonder if any councillors have these two storey building blocks around them.

Like Reply 15 m

Also I should take a before and after shot of my back yard, previously trees and koalas and hills. Now I stare at 5 new monstrosity's which are so glary, I have to have my blinds half down. Nothing can sell infill to me.

Like Reply 1 y

Can't stop it. My neighbour has 9! Backyards adjoining her house. All in the name of progress. Hears everything and has them looking down in her. If we have to have the new houses then I want better looking streets instead of the rubbish streets, gutters and half pavements. We have to walk on the streets in hectorville as only half pavements.

Like Reply 12 m · Edited

We are planning to move out the area as street parking is making it impossible to get around now. So many houses without adequate off street parking. Stupid planning pandering to the agenda of greedy developers.

Like Reply 1 y

Campbelltown's planning pledge no guarantee of infill protection

Campbelltown Council's promise to adopt the same planning protections as we currently enjoy under the Adelaide Hills Council is of little comfort to residents who fear rampant development could blight both Woodforde and Morialta.

The proposed structure and provisions of the new SA Planning & Design Code mean that all current council development assessment functions will pass to a single, Statewide authority when it comes into force some time next year.

The Code's currently-proposed protections, specifications and overlays for our area very closely mirror those of the Adelaide Hills Council's Development Plan.

But we also know the Code is still being fine-tuned – no final decision will now be made until some time later in 2021, the new Minister for Planning having bowed to widespread public pressure not to rush the unpopular "reforms".

Campbelltown can make a "no change" promise but residents need to be aware that Councils – and anyone, any developer with an interest in land in SA – will still be able to commence a "Code Amendment" under the new system at any time.

Any developer will still be free to approach a Council to undertake a Code Amendment on their behalf. And any Council will then be free to



Protecting our patch. The Hills Face Zone development proposed for the Morialta section of Rostrevor in 2016 which was rejected by the Adelaide Hills Council.

itself be the proponent and to recover any costs from the developer.

While such a proposal needs the go-ahead of the State Planning Commission and the Minister, the opportunity definitely exists.

This is much the same as the current system's Privately-funded Development Plan Amendment provisions – a process with which local residents here have had intimate dealings.

Developers' attempts to have the Hills Face Zone boundary shifted and a large scale residential development permitted within the Morialta section

of Rostrevor and within the Hills Face Zone, via a proposed Privately-funded Development Plan Amendment, didn't get past first base in 2016. They were roundly rejected by the AHC at the urging of local residents.

How might that attempt by developers have fared if it had been Campbelltown Council making the decision?

And what are the chances of such a proposal being relaunched under the control of a new Council?

That's the multi-million dollar question we're not prepared to take a punt on.

Concrete jungle remains a viable threat

Residents' concerns about ugly infill are not unfounded, as Campbelltown Council suggests.

Yes, the current Campbelltown Council has said it will support the same planning requirements that protect us now.

But that's no long-term guarantee that future councillors will not support a Code Amendment

proposed by developers tempted by the size of our blocks and our proximity to the Mordialta Park.

Adelaide Hills, on the other hand, has a record of protecting this area.

Campbelltown's long history of intense urban infill, which pre-dated State-mandated planning requirements, leaves residents of the target areas wary of how that

Council would act once it had control.

Simply offering to leave things as they are is not itself a persuasive reason to convince us to want to leave a Council which has served us well and has a long-demonstrated and reliable record of protecting our interests.



This says it all, really!

Directly opposite the main gate to one of SA's natural gems – Morialta Park. Intensely stacked "townhouse" boxes, surrounded by an ugly colourbond fence, welcome visitors to the priceless park over the road, which, for the time-being, is still in the Adelaide Hills Council suburb of Woodforde. But there's not even a requirement from Campbelltown Council for a sensitive screening of local native vegetation to be planted along its side of Morialta Road in front of this eyesore's fence. There's plenty of room on the Campbelltown Council-owned verge – but it apparently hasn't occurred to anyone there to respect this natural heritage.

Rates 'saving' may not be as generous as you think

Woodforde and Morialta residents could easily be misled into expecting a bigger rates "discount" than they would actually receive from a move to Campbelltown.

A personalised letter to ratepayers, distributed by CCC Mayor Jill Whittaker in late October, provided the rates bill we would each have received for 2020-21, based on this year's property valuations, had we already been a part of Campbelltown.

But the figure didn't include the Regional Landscape levy, which ranges from about \$65 to \$90 a year, depending on your property valuation.

The levy (previously known as the NRM levy) is paid by all ratepayers across SA and is added to all Council rates bills.

If you compare the dollar figure quoted in your letter from CCC to the bottom-line amount payable on your last bill you received from the AHC – which is the obvious thing to do – you'll need to deduct the levy figure if you want an accurate comparison.

It adds up to a saving of just \$2 to \$5 a week, depending on your property valuation.

Adelaide Hills Council firmly against boundary claim

Campbelltown Mayor Whittaker's recent personal letter to residents suggests that the idea of Woodforde and Morialta becoming part of Campbelltown was first floated in 1997, when the old East Torrens Council was disbanded.

But there's mention of the fact that this proposal was strenuously resisted by residents of both areas at the time.

And it claimed that more recently "the previous AHC initiated discussions with CCC in 2017-18 to consider a formal boundary realignment and,

quite separate to this, AHC in 2019 launched a study into all its boundaries regarding possible changes."

The AHC has never initiated or sought a formal realignment, as claimed.

Informal discussions did occur between the former AHC Mayor and his Campbelltown counterpart of the time. But the elected members, the actual AHC, have never considered asking for a change of boundaries.

In fact, the full Adelaide Hills Council has twice formally asked

Campbelltown to withdraw its claim – and has been twice refused.

Adelaide Hills shares boundaries with nine other Councils – the most in SA – and a considered strategic review of its position is nothing more than prudent, forward business planning.

It certainly doesn't suggest that AHC wants to be rid of our areas – the opposite is clearly the case, given AHC's very publicly and frequently stated opposition.

This is all about Campbelltown's territorial ambitions.

Slightly cheaper rates pushed as the big drawcard for switching sides

Campbelltown is using its marginally lower rates as lure to encourage a “yes” vote for boundary realignment.

The CCC was given a complete data set from Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, detailing the full names and addresses of all owners and the current valuation record for each property in Morialta and Woodforde.

Armed with the Valuer-General’s latest capital value for each property, it could then not only make a precise calculation of the extent of its potential rates bonanza – it could also write directly to you with a tailored letter, aiming to persuade you to agree to annexation from the Adelaide Hills.

Campbelltown is making much of the fact that its rates were not increased for this financial year, while the Adelaide Hills increased its rates by an average 2.95 percent, reflecting the financial burden resulting from the bushfires.

But despite this, the difference in rates for the average Woodforde or Morialta property still doesn’t amount to more than the price of a cup of coffee per week.

On this year’s rates, most residents could expect an annual bill from about \$170 to \$260 lower with a move to Campbelltown – a potential saving of

Annual rates 2020/21		Your property valuation		
Adelaide Hills		\$700,000	\$850,000	\$950,000
Rate in the \$	0.002453	\$1,717.10	\$2,085.05	\$2,330.35
Fixed charge		\$682.00	\$682.00	\$682.00
Regional Landscape Levy	0.00009288	\$65.02	\$78.95	\$88.24
Total rates		\$2,464.12	\$2,846.00	\$3,100.59
Campbelltown		\$700,000	\$850,000	\$950,000
Rate in the \$	0.00304791	\$2,133.54	\$2,590.72	\$2,895.51
Regional Landscape Levy	0.00009587	\$67.11	\$81.49	\$91.08
Total rates		\$2,200.65	\$2,672.21	\$2,986.59
Current saving per year		\$263.47	\$173.78	\$113.99
Current saving per week		\$5.07	\$3.34	\$2.19

... but is the ‘saving’ really worth the risk?



somewhere between \$2 and \$5 a week.

AHC records show that the average rateable valuation in Woodforde/Morialta is \$700,000 – which would mean an average \$263 a year saving based on current figures.

And that will reduce in future years as assessed property values inevitably rise.

We will all have to weigh that small saving in annual rates against the risks inherent in switching from a Council with a proven track record in defending the amenity of our area to one which promises to change nothing but which has a long history of intense development and infill.

Rates ‘discount’ declines as property valuations rise

Campbelltown’s annual rates are currently nominally cheaper than Adelaide Hills’ but analysis shows that the saving is only marginal.

It reduces and eventually zeros out as the assessed rateable value of your property increases.

This is because of the effect of the AHC’s annual fixed charge.

Adelaide Hills’ basic rate in the dollar is actually lower

But it also applies an additional fixed charge to all residential ratepayers, currently \$682 a year.

The fixed charge becomes less significant as a proportion of the total bill as the rateable value rises.

Campbelltown applies a general rate – the same rate in the dollar is applied, whether it is residential, commercial or light industrial or where it is located.

**Say
NO**

To Council boundary realignment



Our view

Campbelltown projects itself as “the caring community” and tells us its boundary takeover bid is “all about belonging.”

Having ignored the results of AHC survey, Campbelltown clearly doesn't care about the heart-felt objections of the majority of residents who have already expressed their view.

And it can hardly be “all about belonging” when hundreds of residents have resoundingly said they don't want to belong to a Council like Campbelltown.

We're told we share strong common interests and a common history, dating back to before Campbelltown was a separate Council and still part of the old, original East Torrens.

But when they split more than 150 years ago, these communities clearly went different ways.

While Campbelltown has for decades demonstrated a voracious appetite for development, the AHC umbrella protected and helped preserve what we all now value so highly and fear losing.

Campbelltown claims boundary reform has been actively discussed for more than 20 years. Why only go for it now – as the revenue stream from the new Hamilton Hill development kicks in?

But it is just all about ‘belonging’ after all – who our \$1.5m in rates will belong to.


Published by:

Morialta Residents' Association

info@morialtaresidents.net

www.morialtaresidents.net

facebook.com/morialtaresidents/



Campbelltown's land grab ignores Teringie

If Campbelltown Council is not just chasing a rates windfall and is acting out of concern for “isolated” residents allegedly remote from Adelaide Hills Council services, why isn't it claiming the adjoining suburb of Teringie as well?

A straight line continued along the eastern side of the proposed territorial grab would include hundreds of residential properties in Teringie.

Why is this not attractive to Campbelltown?

Its proposed boundary adjustment would still leave a “stranded” peninsula of Adelaide Hills responsibility between Teringie's northern border with Hamilton Hill / Woodforde and the Burnside Council's boundary running along the southern side of Magill Road and Old Norton Summit Road.

By excluding Teringie, the argument that Campbelltown is aiming to relieve the Adelaide Hills Council of the need to service an area so “remote” from

Stirling is shown to be hollow.

Don't these people in Teringie, who live only a hundred metres or so further south, also share the same claimed “community of interest and values” with Campbelltown that we are all supposed to feel?

Is it OK for them to have to ‘struggle’ up to Stirling on a bus to get aged care services or join a youth committee or have a coffee with the Mayor?

Perhaps Campbelltown believes the isolated residents of Teringie should be rescued by the Burnside Council.

But Burnside's council offices and library are twice as far from Teringie as Campbelltown's.

There are 148 privately-owned properties within the lower, residential zone of Teringie and 203 in the Hills face zone sector, a total of 351.

Campbelltown has drawn its cherry-picking line along the New Norton Summit road because that's enough to capture the glittering new rates prize – Hamilton Hill.

Another survey demanded as Campbelltown eyes our rates

Campbelltown Council is pursuing its boundary takeover campaign, despite the overwhelming “no” vote of surveyed ratepayers and having been asked twice by the Adelaide Hills Council to withdraw its application.

The Adelaide Hills Council surveyed residents of Woodforde and Morialta/Rostrevor late last year.

The results released in January 2020 showed that 65% of respondents opposed the change – but they have been dismissed by Campbelltown as irrelevant and probably biased.


That Council’s decision to proceed was on a motion on notice from Campbelltown Mayor, Jill Whittaker, published in its September 1 meeting agenda.

The motion’s rationale sought to discredit the Adelaide Hills Council’s survey and its results, by claiming it had a “disappointingly” strong emphasis on the differences between planning laws for the two areas, compared rural blocks with metropolitan block sizes and that respondents were probably confused and unaware of the new Planning & Design Code’s effect on standardising planning procedures across Councils and scrapping individual development plans.

Get the message?



The Advertiser



A reader survey conducted by The Advertiser earlier this year returned a remarkably similar percentage breakdown to the AHC's, confirming overwhelming opposition to the proposed boundary change.



It's a numbers game, banking on a new demographic

The longer the boundary review process drags on, the more new residents of the still-developing Hamilton Hill estate will be drawn in to the consultation process.

Once fully-occupied, the number of residents in Hamilton Hill will be greater than those in the existing Woodforde and Morialta areas combined – about 400 properties, of which approximately 260 are currently occupied.

These numbers will obviously slant any future survey result.

These new residents are people who have consciously bought into a precinct of incredibly dense urban infill and close-quarters living, in stark contrast to the neighbouring old, undeveloped and unspoiled areas.

But this is precisely what the existing residents of Woodforde and Morialta want to avoid and are resisting – we moved and bought or built in this area because it was not a concrete jungle, or the “urban desert” which former Campbelltown Mayor Simon Brewer feared much of his own council area was becoming.

In fact, a number of residents moved here years ago directly from Campbelltown, to avoid congested streets and crowded neighbourhoods.

Residents of Woodforde likewise value the peri-urban, semi-rural feel of their suburb.

No ‘confusion’ over planning

The survey backgrounder and questionnaire, provided to all residents by the AHC before the last vote, could not have been clearer or simpler.

It covered planning issues with a precise and impartial summary of the Planning & Design Code’s effect and then simply compared the then current planning requirements for the relevant areas of both Councils, side by side in a simple table. There was no mention of, or comparison with, so-called “rural block sizes” – unless Campbelltown now considers a 1,000 sq metre,

quarter-acre block to be unacceptably large and suitable for agriculture.

To suggest that ratepayers could be “confused” by such a straight-forward presentation is condescending, to say the least.

The AHC survey document also invited residents to a Planning & Design Code information session, which was jointly run by officers of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the AHC, and very well attended by Woodforde and Morialta/Rostrevor ratepayers.

No special benefits on offer in Campbelltown's sales pitch

Campbelltown claims its boundary realignment move is all about "belonging and shared community values" and the wide range of services and facilities available to its ratepayers.

But most of the services and facilities it boasts of in its promotional booklet are actually either freely offered by State-funded bodies, provided to the general public by business operations, or similarly available through the Adelaide Hills Council.

Being a Campbelltown ratepayer would bring you no special privileges or access to service like these:

Home Support Program

Both Campbelltown and Adelaide Hills offer a range of services for frail older people and younger people with a disability.

These programs are jointly funded by the Australian Government Department of Health and the Government of South Australia Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. Modest fees apply, whichever Council area you're in. Belonging to Campbelltown makes no difference.

eWaste Drop-off Facility

The free drop-off facility in Newton Road is funded by the State Government's Green Industries SA.

You can use it at anytime, no matter which Council area you're in.

It is just one of many facilities all



around the metropolitan and rural areas which are similarly State-financed.

Rubbish Collection

The same East Waste contractors would continue to pick up our household waste

and green bins. One 'at-call' hard waste collection would still be offered to each residence per financial year.

This essential service is currently already provided by East Waste on behalf of both Adelaide Hills Council and Campbelltown.

The ARC Campbelltown

This aquatic and fitness centre on Lower North East Road runs as a business, open to the public.

You pay to use its pool and gymnasium, no matter where you're from, just as residents of neighbouring Norwood-Payneham-Saint Peters and Tea Tree Gully Councils do. Sporting clubs from both of those Council areas use it for a fee.

Roads

The same low-traffic neighbourhood roads would continue to be maintained at similar cost to whichever Council controls the area. And State-funded arterial roads would still serve as primary access.

Parks and Open Spaces

These are available all over Adelaide. Who hasn't visited Wigley Reserve at Glenelg or Victoria Park in the City?

Black Hill and Morialta Conservation Parks are listed by Campbelltown as attractions in their district. They're actually both in the AHC area – but that's irrelevant, as they're both State-owned and funded.

Sports & Recreation

Sporting groups in Campbelltown offer memberships to the general public and, quite reasonably, charge annual fees. Being a Campbelltown Council ratepayer doesn't provide free membership or access.

Meeting Rooms and Halls

Campbelltown's venues are for hire to the public and have their costs listed in its Schedule of Fees & Charges.

They're open for business at a price and available to anyone, from anywhere, who is prepared to pay.

Library

Council libraries, wherever they're located, are part of a Statewide network and receive substantial State funding.

If you borrow from Campbelltown library you are using the Statewide One Card public library network.

You're free to browse where you like, and books are constantly shuttled between libraries around the State.

Borrowers can just as easily be reading books drawn from the Kimba, Marion, Snowtown or Norwood libraries as those from Campbelltown.



To Council boundary realignment

ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL

Strategic Boundary Review

A report on the desktop study into
the opportunities for the potential
re-alignment of the Council boundaries

Prepared by
CL Rowe & Associates Pty Ltd

ABN 72 131 953 565
PO Box 573,
Goolwa SA 5214
t: 0430 348 377
e: clrowe@internode.on.net

September 2020

Disclaimer

The information, opinions and estimates presented herein or otherwise in relation hereto are made by C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd in their best judgement, in good faith and as far as possible based on data or sources which are believed to be reliable. With the exception of the party to whom this document is specifically addressed, C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd, its directors, employees and agents expressly disclaim any liability and responsibility to any person whether a reader of this document or not in respect of anything and of the consequences of anything done or omitted to be done by any such person in reliance whether wholly or partially upon the whole or any part of the contents of this document. All information contained within this document is confidential.

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 Adelaide Hills Council or C L Rowe and Associates Pty Ltd.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Act 2017 ("the Act") affords the opportunity for changes to Council boundaries in order to:

- constitute a council;
- amalgamate two or more councils;
- abolish a council and incorporate its area into the areas of two or more councils; or
- alter the boundaries of a council area.

Adelaide Hills Council has made the strategic decision to undertake a review of its boundaries (approximately 195 kms in total) with adjoining councils with the view to identifying any potential opportunities for boundary realignment and/or possible amalgamation with one or more of the nine (9) neighbouring councils.

The initial desktop study has been completed; and this report presents the findings of the investigations for consideration by the Adelaide Hills Council. It provides brief details regarding:

- the demographics and profiles of the nine neighbouring Councils and all of the affected suburbs/localities;
- the location and character of each of the identified opportunities/sites, and the approximate proximity thereof to municipal administrative/library services and the nearest townships or centres which likely service the day-to-day needs of the residents;
- the rates revenue applicable to the properties/identified localities within the Adelaide Hills Council (2019/2010);
- the 34 identified potential realignment opportunities, including the number of properties and residents (eligible electors) likely to be affected;
- an option for amalgamation with the neighbouring Mt Barker District Council; and
- an option to create a new Council based on the wider "Adelaide Hills" region.

For ease of presentation, the potential boundary realignment opportunities (and information pertaining thereto) have been presented hereinafter under the headings of the relevant Council and the suburb/locality.

It should be noted that the objective of this initial investigation was to identify potential opportunities for changes to the council boundary; and to provide Council with sufficient information, so that elected members are aware of such "opportunities" and can make relatively informed, strategic decisions as to what future course of action, if any, to take.

Regardless, the identification of the “opportunities” or irregularities should place Council in a position of readiness should it choose to work collaboratively with the affected residents and neighbouring councils to present a proposal or proposals for changes to the existing Council boundaries to the Local Government Boundaries Commission; or to respond to proposals which may be initiated by neighbouring Councils (e.g. the Campbelltown City Council).

Further information regarding the boundary realignment process has been provided hereinafter (refer 2.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION).

Neighbouring councils have been advised of the Strategic Boundary Review and encouraged to consider their boundaries and the appetite of their residents and ratepayers for boundary reform that would benefit those communities.

Some, if not all of the minor boundary realignment opportunities identified herein warrant consideration, and perhaps further investigation if Council believes that there are benefits to be achieved. Ultimately, any proposed minor changes could be the subject of a single “Administrative Proposal” to the South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission), in accordance with the Act, as the proposal(s) would correct recognised anomalies in the council boundary.

The significant boundary changes identified herein, and/or the option of amalgamating councils or creating a new council will require further, more comprehensive investigation and consideration, as well as consultation with the Commission. Should Council be inclined to pursue any of the more significant identified “opportunities”, it may be prudent to initially raise the matter with the Local Government Boundaries Commission with the view to obtaining some feedback regarding the merits of any proposal and, in the case of proposed multiple changes affecting a number of Councils, whether more than one “General Proposal” is required.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL

The Adelaide Hills Council was established in 1997 through the amalgamation of the then District Councils of East Torrens, Gumeracha, Onkaparinga and Stirling.

During the period July – August 1998 consultants were engaged to undertake a “strategic opportunity assessment” of the council boundaries in and about the Adelaide Hills Council area as one of the case studies undertaken by the then Local Government Boundary Reform Board. The study was to include assessment and consideration of a range of strategic indicators for boundary definition; and the identification of opportunities arising from the alteration of the Adelaide Hills Council boundaries (together with an assessment of the impacts of these alterations). The consultants were unable to deliver the requirements of the brief because:

- the then members of the Adelaide Hills Council were concerned about the timing of the study, given that Council had only been established in 1997 through an amalgamation process and, as such, their attention was required in respect to other key issues; and
- most of adjoining councils decided not to participate in the study.

The following information may be useful (for comparison purposes) when considering the character, demographics and community profiles of the neighbouring councils and any affected suburbs/localities.


Adelaide Hills Council covers approximately 795 km²; and is a predominantly rural area, with substantial rural-residential and township localities.

The Council area:

- is bounded by the City of Playford and the Barossa Council area in the north, the Mid Murray Council area in the east, the Mount Barker District Council area to the east and south-east; the City of Onkaparinga in the south, and the City of Mitcham, the City of Burnside, the Campbelltown City Council and the City of Tea Tree Gully in the west (refer Aerial photograph 1);
- had an estimated population of the council area was 39,734 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 0.50 persons per hectare;
- is divided into two wards, with the Ranges Ward having 17,813 electors (7 members @ 1:2,545) and the Valleys Ward having 12,701 electors (5 members @ 1:2,414); and
- contains 17,885 rateable assessments and 829 non-rateable assessments (2019), equating to an estimated total rates revenue (2019/2020) of \$37.57 million.

For 2019/2020 the “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.002469 (no specified minimum rate). A fixed charge of \$662.00 per assessment also applies, as well as annual charges for waste collection services and the CWMS connection (where applicable).

Aerial photograph 1: Adelaide Hills Council and adjoining councils



2.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The Boundaries Commission (the Commission) is the body established to undertake the initial assessment of reform proposals, oversee investigations, and make recommendations to the Minister responsible for the Act.

The Commission assesses all boundary realignment proposals in accordance with the requirements of the Act and proposal guidelines. The Commission may refuse to inquire into a proposal if it is considered to be vexatious, frivolous or trivial; or if it is not considered to be in the public interest; or if it is the same or substantially similar to a proposal already inquired into; or if there is some other good reason to refuse to enquire into a proposal.

The Act gives the Commission flexibility to deal with proposals to ensure that the most effective inquiry into an identified issue is undertaken. If the Commission determines to inquire into a proposal, there are separate processes for administrative proposals and general proposals.

If the Commission determines to inquire into an “Administrative Proposal”, the Commission will conduct an inquiry as the Commission thinks fit, provided that a reasonable amount of consultation is conducted in accordance with any guidelines published by the Commission.

As for more significant proposals, the Commission requests that councils make a “General Proposal” in two stages so as to enable the Commission to provide early feedback on a potential proposal. This assists a council to determine at the outset whether a proposal is likely to proceed prior to undertaking extensive work on a potential proposal.

Stage 1 involves a council writing to the Commission outlining the nature of the potential proposal and the reasons why the council considers boundary change as the best option, with reference to the principles espoused under Section 26 of the Local Government Act 1999. At this point, the Commission will consider the correspondence and provide advice, including whether a general proposal can be referred for consideration; if more work is recommended to be undertaken; or further information is sought by the Commission. Advice from the Commission to the effect that a general proposal can be submitted does not guarantee that the proposal will be formally accepted.

Stage 2 involves the preparation of a submission to the Commission that sets out, in detail, the grounds on which the proposal is made; and provides detailed information pertaining to the matters listed hereinafter. The Commission expects a proposal to cover these matters, as far as the initiating council can be reasonably aware of them.

- Description of the proposal.
- The Principles specified under Section 26 of the Local Government Act 1999.
- Communities of interest.
- Consultation with the community and key agencies.

- Advantages and Disadvantages.
- Calendar of events.
- Administrative matters (relevant maps and Council contact details)

When considering any boundary change proposal, the Commission must refer to the objects of the Act as a whole, and in particular, the following principles which are contained within Section 26 of the Local Government Act 1999.

- The resources available to local communities should be used as economically as possible while recognising the desirability of avoiding significant divisions within a community.
- Proposed changes should, wherever practicable, benefit ratepayers
- A council should have a sufficient resource base to fulfil its functions fairly, effectively and efficiently.
- A council should offer its community a reasonable range of services delivered on an efficient, flexible, equitable and responsive basis.
- A council should facilitate effective planning and development within an area, and be constituted with respect to an area that can be promoted on a coherent basis.
- A council should be in a position to facilitate sustainable development, the protection of the environment and the integration of land use schemes.
- A council should reflect communities of interest of an economic, recreational, social, regional or other kind, and be consistent with community structures, values, expectations and aspirations.
- A council area should incorporate or promote an accessible centre (or centres) for local administration and services.
- The importance within the scheme of local government to ensure that local communities within large council areas can participate effectively in decisions about local matters.
- Residents should receive adequate and fair representation within the local government system, while over-representation in comparison with councils of a similar size and type should be avoided (at least in the longer term).
- A scheme that provides for the performance of functions and delivery of services in relation to 2 or more councils (for example, a scheme for regional governance) may improve councils' capacity to deliver services on a regional basis and therefore offer a viable and appropriate alternative to structural change.

3. BOUNDARY REVIEW

The review of the existing council boundary has revealed a significant number of irregularities and/or opportunities which may warrant further consideration. These include:

- minor boundary irregularities which may or may not require attention;
- options which entail the annexation or relinquishment of suburbs/localities (or parts thereof) so as to achieve a more rational boundary alignment which ensures that whole “communities of interest” (suburbs/localities) are maintained, where possible, within one council area;
- opportunities to extend the council boundary so as to include suburbs/localities which are considered to exhibit and/or complement the landscape, land uses and/or character exhibited within the Adelaide Hills Council;
- the creation of a new council based on the amalgamation of the Adelaide Hills Council and the Mt Barker District Council, which may also involve the inclusion of additional areas of land which lie adjacent to the proposed council, or the exclusion of land from within the current council boundaries; and
- the potential creation of a new, large council based on the “Adelaide Hills” region.

Any of the aforementioned, and/or combinations thereof, can be considered.

The following provides some brief details regarding the various scenarios and circumstances which have been identified to date.

3.1 MINOR IRREGULARITIES

A total of 12 instances have been identified whereby the existing council boundary has inexplicably been aligned around small areas of land or properties, resulting in the division of perceived “communities of interest” or suburbs/localities between 2 or 3 Councils.

These minor peculiarities or anomalies in the council boundary may or may not need to be further considered or rectified; and are unlikely to have any significant consequences in terms of the Council administration or the provision of services and/or facilities to the affected residents.

Should Council choose to take the opportunity to “tidy up” some or all of these minor irregularities, a single broad “Administrative Proposal” may suffice.

3.2 OVERCOME DIVISION OF SUBURBS/LOCALITIES

The review revealed 22 instances whereby significant parts of suburbs/localities are dissected by the existing council boundary, again resulting in the division of perceived “communities of interest” between 2 or 3 Councils. In some cases the topography may have had an influence on the determination of the alignment of the current council boundary, but in other cases there appears to be no evident rationale.

Council needs to determine whether there will be sufficient benefits to be achieved by the affected residents (or Council and the community in general) to warrant further consideration of these situations and/or a formal re-alignment proposal. These "opportunities" can either be disregarded, or alternatively the irregularity addressed by adopting the principle to maintain whole suburbs/localities within the one Council area.

The Local Government Boundaries Commission will need to be consulted on the issues of whether any potential future Council proposal will constitute an "Administrative" or "General" proposal under the provisions of the Act; and whether it will be appropriate and/or prudent to incorporate all of the variations in one comprehensive proposal.

3.3 INCLUSION OF NEIGHBOURING LAND

Some localities/suburbs (or parts thereof) in neighbouring councils have been identified as potential inclusions in the Adelaide Hills Council, based on the assessment that the topography, character and/or land use complements the Adelaide Hills Council area. These opportunities include part of the suburb/locality of Humbug Scrub and the suburb/locality of Sampson Flat (City of Playford); the suburbs/localities of Leawood Gardens and Brown Hill Creek, as well as the Belair National Park (City of Mitcham); and the suburbs/localities of Coromandel East and Cherry Gardens (City of Onkaparinga). Most of these opportunities exhibit hilly terrain and lie adjacent to the existing western boundary of the Adelaide Hills Council.

The appropriateness, viability and impacts of any future proposal to include any additional land within the Adelaide Hills Council will need further comprehensive investigation and consideration. Further, any future proposition to include additional land within the Council boundaries will require the preparation and submission of a "General Proposal" under the provisions of the Act.

3.4 COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

The only obvious option to create a new council through amalgamation would involve the Adelaide Hills Council and the Mount Barker District Council.

These councils:

- have a common boundary which is approximately 60.0 kilometres in length;
- appear to have strong community connections;
- have similar economic/land use bases (i.e. residential, farming/rural, rural living and tourism);
- exhibit similar topography and character;
- are perhaps viewed by some as the "hills" or a single "community of interest";
- are similar in area and population; and
- cover much of the Mount Lofty Ranges and the "Adelaide Hills" wine region.

The amalgamation of these councils would result in the creation of a new council area which would:

- be approximately 1,390 km² in area;
- have an estimated population of over 75,000;
- comprise over 35,300 rateable and 1,450 non-rateable properties; and
- have a combined rates revenue of approximately \$66 million (based on 2019/20 assessments).

With regard to the potential council, it is noted that:

- 31 existing regional councils are greater in area, ranging from 1,528 kms² to 8,831 kms² (average of approximately 4,295 kms²); and
- 7 metropolitan councils (i.e. Charles Sturt, Marion, Onkaparinga, Playford, Port Adelaide Enfield, Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully) will have a greater numbers of residents, ranging from 92,308 (ABS 2018) – 171,489 (average of 120,416).

Any proposed amalgamation will require considerable further investigation, including (but not limited to) economic viability and the financial benefits of the amalgamation; the impact on rates; the protection/expansion of the rates base; the impact upon elector representation; the delivery of services to the community; the protection of perceived “communities of interest”; and acquisition and protection of valued assets. Information pertaining to all of these issues, and more, will be required to justify any future “General Proposal” to the Local Government Boundaries Commission.

3.5 NEW COUNCIL BASED ON “ADELAIDE HILLS” REGION


In February 1998 “Adelaide Hills” was entered in the “Register of Protected Names” in accordance with the provisions of the Wine Australia Corporation Act 1990.

Essentially, the registration identifies the specified area as a recognised wine region, and the use of “Adelaide Hills” guarantees that a product has originated from the geographical location, and possesses qualities and/or a reputation that are specific to the region of origin.

The “Adelaide Hills Geographical Indication” is an extensive area; and is depicted on Map 1.

Whilst the creation of a new Council based on the “Adelaide Hills Geographical Indication” may be a “step too far”, it is noted that the current “General Proposal” submitted to the Local Government Boundaries Commission by The Barossa Council seeks to adjust the current council boundary so that the majority of the area covered by the Barossa Geographical Indication is within The Barossa Council boundary.

Map 1: Adelaide Hills Geographical Identification



It is noted that The Barossa Council claims that its proposal will:

- establish a boundary that empowers The Barossa Council to support and oversee the majority of the area known as Barossa GI;
- bring together the communities of interest within the Barossa GI so that the cultural, identity, place, social, economic and environmental interests reside together under the banner of one council;
- maximise the opportunities and better coordinate the land use policy, economic development, tourism integration and service delivery across the communities of interest; and
- potentially deliver efficiencies in service provision.


The Barossa Council obviously believes that the existence of the Barossa Geographical Identification lends considerable support to its current proposed boundary adjustment.

This being the case, it would be prudent to observe the progress and outcome of The Barossa Council proposal, perhaps with the view to utilising (in part) a similar argument to justify any potential future proposal which seeks to expand the Adelaide Hills Council area; or amalgamate with the Mount Barker District Council (much of which is also covered by the Adelaide Hills Geographical Identification).

4. IDENTIFIED BOUNDARY REALIGNMENT OPPORTUNITIES

4.1 THE BAROSSA COUNCIL

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and The Barossa Council is approximately 35.9 kilometres in length.
- The Barossa Council covers approximately 893 km²; and is predominantly rural in character, with substantial rural-residential and township areas.
- The estimated population of the council area was 24,808 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 0.28 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 12,916 rateable assessments and 542 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/20 rate revenue is \$31.3 million.
- The current “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential assessment is 0.0035137 (no specified minimum rate). A fixed charge of \$356.00 per assessment also applies, as well as annual charges for waste collection services and the CWMS connection (where applicable).
- Two opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Cromer and Mount Crawford.



4.1.1 Cromer

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1, 638 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 630 ha (38.5%) – 39 properties (31 property assessments).
- The Barossa Council: 1,008 ha (61.5%) – 94 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rates revenue (2019/2020): \$43,423.25.
- Character: Undulating rural land exhibiting low intensity rural land uses on allotments of varying sizes and considerable areas of vegetation.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments.
- The Barossa Council Zoning: Rural Living Zone – Detached dwellings on large allotments and rural activities; Watershed Policy Area 3 Watershed – Low intensity rural and semi-rural activities, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Gumeracha (8.5 kms – 11.25 kms); The Barossa Council - Mt Pleasant (6.0 kms – 8.75 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Birdwood (3.25 kms – 6.0 kms), Gumeracha (8.5 kms – 11.25 kms); The Barossa Council - Mt Pleasant (6.0 kms – 8.75 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 187.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 41; The Barossa Council – 111.
- Median Age: 48 years.
- Age Profile: Aged 0 – 14 years - 17.6%; aged 65 or older - 25.0%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 81.7%; England - 7.8%.
- Dwellings (2016): 80.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 34.2%; owned with a mortgage - 54.8%.
- Average residents per dwelling: 2.5.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,593 (10.8% above Australian average of \$1,438).

Comments

- The Barossa Council portion of the suburb/locality generally comprises rural living allotments of varying sizes and larger farm holdings, whilst the Adelaide Hills Council portion incorporates the Cromer Conservation Park (approximately 44 ha) and larger rural living allotments or small farming properties of varying sizes.
- It may be beneficial (in terms of communities of interest) to maintain the whole of the suburb within one council area, although little practical benefits would likely be achieved for the residents or either Council.
- The Barossa Council is not divided into wards and, as such, a decrease or increase in the number of electors should have little if any detrimental impact upon elector representation within the council area. Likewise, the relatively small gains or losses in elector numbers from any proposed council boundary realignment should not significantly impact upon elector representation within the Adelaide Hills Council, given that the existing Valleys Ward contains over 12,700 electors (current elector ratio of 1:2,414).

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Cromer in The Barossa Council. Such action may require a "General Proposal"; and would result in 39 properties (41 electors) being moved to The Barossa Council (total current rates of \$43,423.25).



4.1.2 Mount Crawford

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 8,385 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 355 ha (4.2%) – 3 properties (1 property assessment).
- The Barossa Council: 8,030 ha (95.8%) – 301 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rates revenue (2019/2020): \$1,884.12.
- Character: Undulating rural land exhibiting open or wooded pasture land, stands of native vegetation, commercial forests and reservoirs.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments
- The Barossa Council Zoning: Watershed Protection (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone – Protection of water catchment areas in the Mount Lofty Ranges, farming on large holdings, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Gumeracha (9.5 kms – 12.5 kms); The Barossa Council - Mt Pleasant (4.5 kms – 8.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Kersbrook (7.25 kms – 9.5 kms); The Barossa Council – Williamstown (6.25 kms – 9.5 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 127.
- Electors (2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 2; The Barossa Council – 95.
- Median Age: 54 years.
- Age Profile: Aged 0 – 14 years – 14.6%; aged 65 or older – 23.8%
- Birth Place: Australia - 82.3%; England - 7.3%.
- Dwellings (2016): 56.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 50.0% ; owned with a mortgage - 50.0%.
- Average residents per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,228 (14.6% below Australian average).

Comments

- The part of the suburb/locality of Mount Crawford which lies within the Adelaide Hills Council comprises the Warren Conservation Park (approximately 350 ha) within which there are only three properties (one property assessment).
- It may be prudent to have the whole of the suburb of Mount Crawford contained within one council area. Such a proposal would only impact upon a very small number of residents (i.e. 2 eligible electors).
- A realignment of the council boundary so as to include the whole of the suburb of Mount Crawford in The Barossa Council would rectify a minor anomaly with little, if any, physical, financial or elector representation ramifications.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Mount Crawford in The Barossa Council. Such action would likely be the subject of an "Administrative Proposal"; and would result in 3 properties being included as part of The Barossa Council (total current rates of \$1,884.12).



4.2 CITY OF BURNSIDE

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the City of Burnside is approximately 12.0 kilometres in length.
- The City of Burnside covers approximately 27 km²; and is a predominantly a residential area, with some rural areas in the east.
- The estimated population of the council area was 45,706 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 16.61 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 20,931 rateable assessments and 1,706 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is 41.11 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.00216 (specified minimum rate of \$875.00).
- Four opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Cleland and Waterfall Gully. The suburbs of Auldana, Skye and Stonyfell have been excluded from consideration given that there is little likelihood that either council, or the local communities, will agree to any change.



4.2.1 Cleland

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 957.4 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 944.7 ha (98.7%) - 9 properties (2 rateable property assessments).
- City of Burnside: 12.7 ha (1.3%) – 2 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rates revenue (2019/2020): \$5,498.00.
- Character: Hilly terrain, primarily natural landscape with little built form.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments.
- City of Burnside Zoning: Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (2.75 kms – 6.5 kms); City of Burnside - Tusmore (3.5 kms – 7.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Crafers (2.0 kms – 5.5 kms), Uraidla (3.0 kms – 6.0 kms), and Stirling (2.75 kms – 6.5 kms); City of Burnside - Adjacent to the eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (approximately 4.0 kms – 5.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 6.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 3; City of Burnside – 0.
- Median age: 54 years.
- Dwellings (2016): 0.


Comments

- Two small parcels of land the suburb/locality of Cleland are contained within the City of Burnside. All comprise natural landscape and, as such, a move to the Adelaide Hills Council should not create concerns.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.

- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Cleland in Adelaide Hills Council. This move would likely be the subject of an "Administrative Proposal"; would potentially only affect 2 properties (no residents); and would likely have minimal, if any, impacts on either councils in respect to the provision of community services and/or facilities, or rates revenue.



4.2.2 Waterfall Gully

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 178.14 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 5.24 ha (2.9%) – 7 properties (2 property assessments).
- City of Burnside: 172.9 ha (97.1%) – 24 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rates revenue (2019/2020): \$164.13.
- Character: Generally the suburb lies within a long gully along the western face of the Mt Lofty Ranges (adjacent to Cleland Conservation Park in the east); and exhibits a relatively small number of detached dwelling along the western ridge line. Access to communities to the east is via Greenhills Road in the north and the Mt Barker Road and South Eastern Freeway in the south. Suburb generally serviced by community facilities, schools, shops and professional services located in the established urban areas to the west.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments.
- City of Burnside Zoning: Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments; and small area of Residential Zone in the north-west (limited if any potential for additional dwellings).
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (5.0 kms – 8.25 kms); City of Burnside - Tusmore (2.5 kms – 5.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Crafers (4.0 kms – 7.0 kms), Summertown (4.75 kms – 6.0 kms), Stirling (5.0 kms – 8.25 kms) and Uraidla (6.0 kms – 7.0 kms); City of Burnside - Adjacent to the eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (0.25 kms – 3.25 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 145.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 4; City of Burnside – 111.
- Median age: 40 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 27.7%; aged 65 or older - 14.9%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 86.6%; England - 4.5%.
- Dwellings (2016): 52.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 37.8%; owned with a mortgage - 55.6%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.



- Median weekly household income: \$3,042 (111.5% above Australian average).

Comments

- Two boundary irregularities which result in two small portions of the suburb/locality of Waterfall Gully, comprising 2 rateable properties and a total of 5.24 hectares of land, being located within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The western portion of the Mt Lofty Ranges presents a significant physical barrier between Waterfall Gully and the towns/communities to the east (Adelaide Hills Council).
- Residents of Waterfall Gully are likely to go to the eastern suburbs/communities of metropolitan Adelaide for their day-to-day needs, rather than travel to towns to the east.


Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Waterfall Gully in the City of Burnside. Such action could be incorporated within an "Administrative Proposal"; and would result in 7 properties (4 eligible electors) being moved to the City of Burnside.



4.3 CAMPBELLTOWN CITY COUNCIL

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the Campbelltown City Council is approximately 9.75 kilometres in length.
- The Campbelltown City Council covers approximately 24 km²; and is a predominantly a residential area.
- The estimated population of the council area was 51,469 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 21.13 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 24,124 rateable assessments and 463 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$39.59 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.00305037 (minimum specified rate of \$984.00).
- The Campbelltown City Council has initiated a process to annex the existing residential parts of the suburbs Rostrevor and Woodforde, leaving only the sparsely populated areas of natural landscape with the Adelaide Hills Council. The proposal does not include the residential part of the neighbouring suburb of Teringie. The Boundaries Commission has agreed to allow the “General Proposal” to progress to Stage 2 (i.e. the Campbelltown City Council has to prepare a detailed submission for consideration by the Commission).



4.3.1 Rostrevor

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 456.5 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 103.6 ha (22.7%) – 139 properties (133 property assessments)..
- Campbelltown City Council: 352.9 ha (77.3%) – 3,424 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rates revenue (2019/2020): \$325,502.82.
- Character: Established residential area at the foot of the western slopes of the Mount Lofty Ranges; and an expansive area of natural landscape in the east.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Hills Face Zone (eastern part) – Preservation of natural character and landscape; low-intensity agricultural activities; and generally no additional development/allotments; Residential Zone – Full range of dwelling types; Residential Foothills Policy Area 31 - Detached dwellings at low densities.
- Campbelltown City Council Zoning: Residential Zone – Full range of dwelling types at increased densities; Suburban Policy Area 4 – Primarily detached dwellings and semi-detached dwellings on small (350m² minimum) allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (12.5.0 kms); Campbelltown City Council - Newton (2.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Crafers (10.0 kms), Stirling (12.5 kms); Campbelltown City Council - Directly adjacent to the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (0 kms – 0.75 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 7,743.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 272; Campbelltown City Council – 5,263.
- Median Age: 43 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 17.2%; 65 or older - 23.6%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 61.0%; Italy - 7.0%; China - 5.3%; and England 3.3%.
- Dwellings (2016): 3,158.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 78.2%; semi-detached, row or terrace houses - 17.6%
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 34.1%; owned with a mortgage - 33.5%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,364 (5.15% below Australian average).

Comments

- The residential development within the part of the suburb of Rostrevor which lies within the Adelaide Hills Council is broadly consistent with the residential development of the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide, albeit that it remains at a low density compared with the more recent medium density subdivisions across the region.

This part of the suburb of Rostrevor is physically separated from the communities of the Adelaide Hills Council to the east by the western foothills of the Mount Lofty Ranges.

- Given the above, it is reasonable to expect that the residents of the subject part of Rostrevor utilise the shops, services and facilities located in, metropolitan Adelaide to the west on a day-to-day basis.
- Access to the east is likely primarily gained via Montacute Road in the north and/or Norton Summit Road in the south.
- The boundaries of the proposal presented in the initial submission to the Local Government Boundaries Commission by the Campbelltown City Council are not clear, and appear to dissect existing properties. A more detailed description of the proposed boundary should be requested to enable further informed consideration.
- Under the proposal by the Campbelltown City Council, the suburb of Rostrevor will still be divided between two Councils.
- In November/December 2019, the Adelaide Hills Council surveyed the residents of Rostrevor (AHC) and Woodforde regarding the Campbelltown City Council boundary proposal. The majority (68%) of all respondents were against the proposal. Of the Rostrevor respondents, 81% were opposed to the proposal, 15% were in favour and 4% were either undecided or had no preference.

Options

- Wait for the detailed "General Proposal" from the Campbelltown City Council before giving further consideration to the boundary realignment proposal.
- Oppose, in principle, the "General Proposal" initiated by the Campbelltown City Council on the grounds that there has been no proof provided that the affected residents favour, and/or will benefit from, the proposed move to the Campbelltown City Council.
- Agree, in principle, with the "General Proposal" initiated by the Campbelltown City Council. Such action will result in the subject part of the suburb of Rostrevor (i.e. 139 properties and 272 eligible electors) being moved to the Campbelltown City Council, leaving only the remaining areas of natural landscape in the Adelaide Hills Council. The rates revenue from the subject area is \$325,502.82 (2019/2020).



4.3.2 Teringie

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 338 ha. (Existing residential development at the western end of the suburb covers approximately 30.53 ha).
- Adelaide Hills Council: 338 ha – 443 properties (375 property assessments). The residential development at the western end of the suburb contains approximately 210 properties.
- Campbelltown City Council: 0 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council rates revenue (2019/2020): \$821,576.00 (including approximately \$324,690 applicable to the subject residential area at the western end of the suburb).
- Character: Established residential area at the foot of the western slopes of the Mount Lofty Ranges; and an expansive area of natural landscape containing areas of residential along existing roadways amid natural landscape.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Hills Face Zone (eastern part) – Preservation of natural character and landscape; low-intensity agricultural activities; and generally no additional development/allotments; Residential Zone – Full range of dwelling types; Residential Foothills Policy Area 31 - Detached dwellings at low densities; Residential (Medium Density) Policy Area 32 – Precinct comprising medium density dwellings.
- Campbelltown City Council Zoning (adjacent boundary): Residential Zone – Full range of dwelling types at increased densities.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (10.5 kms); Campbelltown City Council - Newton (3.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Norton Summit (3.5 kms), Uraidla (7.0 kms), Stirling (10.5 kms); Campbelltown City Council - Directly adjacent to the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (i.e. Magill).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 820.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 626.
- Median Age: 45 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 18.0%; 65 or older – 18.2%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 68.6%; England 6.3%; Italy - 3.3%; and South Africa – 2.1%.
- Dwellings (2016): 329.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 79.5%; semi-detached, row or terrace houses - 20.5%.

- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 40.2.1%; owned with a mortgage - 46.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,960 (36.68% above Australian average).

Comments

- The boundary adjustment proposal by the Campbelltown City Council does not incorporate any part of the suburb of Teringie.
- The residents within the suburb of Teringie would likely utilise the shops, services and facilities located in metropolitan Adelaide to the west on a day-to-day basis. Access to the east is likely primarily gained via Norton Summit Road and Old Norton Summit Road.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.



4.3.3 Woodforde

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 460 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 460 ha (100%) – 478 properties (440 property assessments).
- Campbelltown City Council: 0 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$832,780.67.
- Character: Established residential area at the base (and within) the western foothills of the Mount Lofty Ranges. The developing “Hamilton Hill” residential estate may realise a total of 400 dwellings, whilst the remaining large part of the suburb to the east generally comprises hilly natural landscape.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Residential Zone – Full range of dwelling types; Residential Foothills Policy Area 31 - Detached dwellings at low densities; Glen Stuart Road Policy Area 43 – a range of dwelling types at medium density; Hills Face Zone (eastern part) – Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional allotments; Public Purpose Zone/Public Purpose (Education) Policy Area 65 – Approximately 19 hectares of land in the north-western corner of the suburb - community, educational, recreational and health care facilities.
- Campbelltown City Council Zoning: Residential Zone – Full range of dwelling types at increased densities; Suburban Policy Area 4 – Primarily detached dwellings and semi-detached dwellings on small (350m² minimum) allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (11.0 kms - 12.0 kms); Campbelltown City Council - Newton (1.75 kms – 2.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Summertown (6.75 kms – 7.25 kms), Uraidla Crafers (7.5 kms – 8.5 kms), Stirling (11.0 kms - 12.0kms); Campbelltown City Council - Directly adjacent to the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (0 kms – 1.0 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 618.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 479; Campbelltown City Council – 0.
- Median Age: 38 years.
- Age Profile: 0 - 14 years - 16.8%; 65 or older - 15.8%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 73.0%; China - 4.2%; Italy - 3.8%; and England - 3.3%.
- Dwellings (2016): 214.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 87.2%; flats and apartments - 12.8%.

- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 36.7%; owned with a mortgage - 46.4%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,895 (31.8% above Australian average).

Comments

- The residents of Woodforde would likely utilise the shops, services and facilities located in metropolitan Adelaide to the west on a day-to-day basis. Access to the east is likely primarily gained via Norton Summit Road.
- Under the proposal by the Campbelltown City Council, the suburb/locality of Woodforde will be divided between two Councils, leaving a large area of hilly natural landscape (Morialta Conservation Park) within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The Campbelltown City Council proposal does not include the existing residential properties within the suburb of Teringie which are located immediately to the south of the suburb/locality of Woodforde and adjacent the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide.
- In November/December 2019, the Adelaide Hills Council surveyed the residents of Rostrevor (AHC) and Woodforde regarding the Campbelltown City Council boundary proposal. The majority (68%) of all respondents were against the proposal. Of the Woodforde respondents, 52% were opposed to the proposal, 39% were in favour and 9% were either undecided or had no preference.


Options

- Wait for the detailed "General Proposal" from the Campbelltown City Council before giving further consideration to the boundary realignment proposal.
- Oppose, in principle, the "General Proposal" initiated by the Campbelltown City Council on the grounds that there has been no proof provided that the affected residents favour, and/or will benefit from, the proposed move to the Campbelltown City Council.
- Give consideration to realigning the council boundary in keeping with the "General Proposal" initiated by the Campbelltown City Council. Such action would result in the existing/developing residential part of the suburb of Woodforde (i.e. 440 properties and 479 electors) being annexed to the Campbelltown City Council, leaving only the remaining areas of natural landscape in the Adelaide Hills Council. The suburb of Woodforde would be divided between two Councils (which is currently not the case); and Adelaide Hills Council would lose the potential to levy over \$830,000 per annum in "rates" (based on 2019/2020 assessments).



4.4 MID MURRAY COUNCIL

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the Mid Murray Council is approximately 16.2 kilometres in length.
- The Mid Murray Council covers approximately 6,273 km²; is predominantly rural in character and incorporates several townships (i.e. Blanchetown, Cadell, Mannum, Morgan, Swan Reach and Truro).
- The estimated population of the council area was 8,983 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 0.01 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 10,462 rateable assessments and 1,226 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$15.337 million.
- The "rate in the dollar" levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.005321 (minimum specified rate of \$707.00).
- Two opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Birdwood and Mt Torrens.



4.4.1 Birdwood

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 4,880.7 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 4,341.8 ha (89.0%) – 686 properties (649 property assessments).
- Mid Murray Council: 538.9 ha (11.0%) – 17 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$1,360,522.54.
- Character: Undulating rural/farming area (farming, grazing, horticulture and viticulture) which incorporates one town (Birdwood) wherein there is a primary school and a high school.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments.
- Mid Murray Council Zoning: Rural Zone – Long-term rural production (cropping and grazing); Hills Policy Area 14 – Retention of open rural character in large land holdings with limited opportunities for land division.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Gumeracha (11.0 kms – 13.5 kms); Mid Murray Council - Mannum (24.5 kms – 27.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Birdwood (3.5 kms – 6.5 kms), Mt Torrens (5.5 kms – 8.5 kms); Mid Murray Council Palmer (11.5 kms – 14.5 kms) and Mannum (24.5 kms – 27.0 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 1,298.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 973; Mid Murray Council – 2.
- Median Age: 42 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 19.7%; 65 or older - 14.2%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 79.8%; and England - 9.4%.
- Dwellings (2016): 524.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 95.1%; semi-detached dwelling, row or terrace houses - 1.5%; and flats or apartments - 1.7%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 36.0%; owned with a mortgage - 48.5%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,371 (4.7% below Australian average).

Comments

- A large rural suburb/locality which, in the main (89%), is located within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Given the proximity of the portion of the suburb which is located within the Mid Murray Council to the township of Birdwood, it is likely that the small number of residents in the Mid Murray Council area rely on the township of Birdwood for their day-to-day needs.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Birdwood in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action would likely require a "General Proposal" (subject to the determination of the Local Government Boundaries Commission); and would result in 17 properties being gained by the Adelaide Hills Council.



4.4.2 Mount Torrens

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 5,923.1 ha (including Mt Barker District Council).
- Adelaide Hills Council: 4,168.2 ha (70.4%) – 448 properties (342 property assessments).
- Mid Murray Council: 1,342.1 ha (22.6%) - 74 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$636,595.78.
- Character: Undulating open rural land; rural allotments of varying sizes; scattered farm buildings.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments.
- Mid Murray Council Zoning: Rural Zone – Long-term rural production (cropping and grazing); Hills Policy Area 14 – Retention of open rural character in large land holdings with limited opportunities for land division.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Woodside (11.5 kms – 18.5 kms), Gumeracha (10.25 kms – 13.5 kms); Mid Murray Council – Mannum (21.5 kms – 23.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Mount Torrens (1.6 kms – 6.0 kms), Lobethal (9.5 kms – 14.0 kms); Mid Murray Council – Palmer (12.25 kms – 16.0 kms), Mannum (21.5 kms – 23.0 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 711.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 502; Mid Murray Council – 32.
- Median Age: 44 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 19.7%; 65 or older - 15.1%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 83.9%; England - 5.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 280.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 98.8%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 40.6%; owned with a mortgage - 48.0%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,523 (5.9% above Australian average).

Comments

- The suburb/locality of Mt Torrens is spread across 3 councils (Adelaide Hills Council - 4,168.2 ha; Mid Murray Council – 1,342.1 ha; and Mt Barker District Council – 412.8 ha). This must have some impact upon the local residents in regards to community identity.
- The Mid Murray Council portion of the suburb/locality contains only 74 properties (32 eligible electors) and, as such, transition to another Council may not have any significant impacts.
- It is noted that the “rate in the dollar” levied by the Mid Murray Council is considerably higher than that levied by the Adelaide Hills Council, however, the Adelaide Hills Council also has a fixed rate of \$662.00.
- Whilst the township of Mt Torrens likely meets the day-to-day needs of most residents within the suburb/locality of Mt Torrens; the townships of Gumeracha, Woodside, Mt Barker and perhaps Mannum are likely to be the primary service centres for the area.


Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Mt Torrens in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action would likely require a “General Proposal” (subject to the determination of the Local Government Boundaries Commission), as it would result in over 1,300 hectares (including 74 properties and 32 eligible electors) moving to the Adelaide Hills Council.



4.5 CITY OF MITCHAM

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the City of Mitcham is approximately 9.9 kilometres in length.
- The City of Mitcham covers approximately 76 km²; and is predominantly residential and semi-rural in character.
- The estimated population of the council area was 67,253 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 8.9 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 28,982 rateable assessments and 656 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$55.68 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.00285333 (minimum specified rate of \$1,077.00).
- Four opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Belair, Crafers West and Upper Sturt.



4.5.1 Belair

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,388.94 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 31.14 ha (2.1%) – 29 properties (29 property assessments).
- City of Mitcham: 1,457.8 ha (97.9.0%) – 2,043 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Long established residential development on undulating terrain in the west; and the Belair National Park in the east.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments.
- City of Mitcham Zoning: Residential (Hills) Zone – Detached dwellings on large allotments; retain existing and open landscape character; Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development and/or allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (3.5 kms – 4.0 kms); City of Mitcham - Torrens Park (7.5 kms - 8.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (3.5 kms – 4.0 kms); City of Mitcham - Hawthorndene and south-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (3.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 4,411.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 1; City of Mitcham – 3,526.
- Median Age: 46 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 15.9%; 65 or older – 23.4%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 73.8%; and England - 10.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 1,756.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings – 94.2%; semi-detached dwelling, row or terrace houses – 4.9%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 39.0%; owned with a mortgage – 44.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,883 (30.9% above Australian average).

Comments

- Only 29 allotments within the suburb of Belair are located within the Adelaide Hills Council, all of which exhibit natural landscape and are part of the Belair National Park.
- The affected properties contain one residential property (Melville House).
- The inclusion of the whole of the suburb of Belair within the City of Mitcham would result in a somewhat awkward boundary configuration; but the boundary would align with the long established Belair suburb/locality boundary. There may be no other tangible benefits to be achieved through this potential boundary realignment.
- The landscape of the Belair National Park is considered to be consistent with the character of, and natural landscape within, the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The inclusion of the Belair National Park within the Adelaide Hills Council is an option, but this would serve to divide the suburb, albeit in accordance with the long established land uses.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to:
 - a) include the whole of suburb of Belair in the City of Mitcham, this being a minor proposal which could be incorporated within an “Administrative Proposal”, and would result in 29 properties being relinquished by the Adelaide Hills Council (loss of \$0 rates revenue); or
 - b) include the whole of the Belair National Park in the Adelaide Hills Council, this being a significant proposal which would likely require the preparation of a detailed “General Proposal”.



4.5.2 Brown Hill Creek

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 685 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 0 ha.
- City of Mitcham: 685 ha - 45 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Hilly terrain, primarily natural landscape with little or built form.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: N/A
- City of Mitcham Zoning: Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development and/or allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (4.5 kms – 8.25 kms); City of Mitcham – Torrens Park (2.25 kms – 5.75 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (4.5 kms – 8.25 kms); City of Mitcham – Adjoins the suburbs of Belair, Mitcham and Springfield, and is in close proximity to the south-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide.

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 50.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 0; City of Mitcham – 45.
- Median Age: 49 years.
- Dwellings (2016): 22.
- Average people per dwelling: 27.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,624 (12.9% above Australian average).

Comments

- Brown Hill Creek is not an urban suburb/locality; and the character and topography thereof is consistent with that generally exhibited within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Any proposal to move the suburb/locality of Brown Hill Creek into the Adelaide Hills Council would need the suburb/locality of Leawood Gardens and the remaining portion of Crafers West to also be moved so as to provide contiguity with the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Moving the suburb/locality of Brown Hill Creek to the Adelaide Hills Council would likely be of little or no financial benefit to the residents within the suburb/locality and/or Council.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Brown Hill Creek in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action will be dependent on the suburbs/localities of Leawood Gardens and part of Crafers West also being moved to the Adelaide Hills Council. Given the significant area of land and the number of residents to be affected (i.e. 50 eligible electors in Brown Hill Creek alone), the proposition would likely have to be the subject of a “General Proposal” to the Local Government Boundaries Commission.



4.5.3 Crafers West

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,066.2 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 828.8 ha (77.7%) – 633 properties (554 property assessments).
- City of Mitcham: 237.2 ha (22.3.0%) – 38 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$1,225,109.39.
- Character: Undulating terrain (foothills) with low density residential development primarily existing within the southern portion and along the ridgeline (to the east).
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments.
- City of Mitcham Zoning: Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (3.5 kms – 5.25 kms); City of Mitcham – Blackwood (4.75 kms - 6.0 kms) and Torrens Park (5.0 kms – 7.0 kms).
- Nearest main town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (3.5 kms – 5.25 kms); City of Mitcham – eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (2.75 kms – 4.25 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 1,222.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 977; City of Mitcham – 60.
- Median Age: 42 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 22.9%; 65 or older – 14.7%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 79.7%; England - 7.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 491.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 38.0%; owned with a mortgage - 50.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$2,077 (44.4% above Australian average).

Comments

- The entire suburb of Crafers West lies in the Hills Face Zone. As such, the suburb exhibits a rural character; and there is limited opportunity or potential for further residential development.
- The portion of the subject/locality of Crafers West which lies in the City of Mitcham is part of the western face of the foothills. It is hilly terrain which is lightly populated and, as such, is considered to exhibit a similar character to much of the land to the east (i.e. the Adelaide Hills Council).
- The open natural landscape of the neighbouring suburbs of Belair and Brown Hill Creek present a physical barrier between the suburb of Crafers West and metropolitan Adelaide in the west. Further, the towns of Stirling, Aldgate and (to a lesser degree) Bridgewater are all relatively close and accessible and, as such, likely meet the day-to-day needs of the residents of Crafers West, whether they resided in the Adelaide Hills Council or the City of Mitcham.
- The inclusion of whole of the suburb/locality of Crafers West within the Adelaide Hills Council could be considered separately or as part of a more comprehensive proposal which could also include the suburbs/localities of Leawood Gardens and Brown Hill Creek.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Crafers West in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action may require a "General Proposal"; and would result in approximately 38 properties (60 eligible electors) being gained from the City of Mitcham.



4.5.4 Leawood Gardens

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 115 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 0 ha.
- City of Mitcham: 115 ha – 37 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Undulating natural landscape with low-density residential/rural living land uses.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: N/A.
- City of Mitcham Zoning: Hills Face Zone - Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development and/or allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (4.5 kms – 8.25 kms); City of Mitcham – Torrens Park (2.25 kms – 5.75 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (4.5 kms – 8.25 kms); City of Mitcham – Adjoins the suburbs of Belair, Mitcham and Springfield, and is in close proximity to the south-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (1.75 kms – 3.25 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 61.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 0; City of Mitcham – 36.
- Median Age: 54 years.
- Dwellings (2016): 27.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$2,125 (47.8% above Australian average).

Comments

- The City of Mitcham and the residents of Leawood Gardens may be reluctant to agree to a boundary realignment which would result in the whole of the suburb of Leawood Gardens being moved to the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The rural character and undulating natural landscape is considered to be more in keeping with the general character and topography of much of the Adelaide Hills Council area.
- The inclusion of Leawood Gardens into the Adelaide Hills Council would assist with any potential proposal to also move of Brown Hill Creek and portion of Crafers West from the City of Mitcham to the Adelaide Hills Council.

- The move of the suburb/locality of Leawood Gardens would affect 37 properties and a small relatively number of residents (i.e. 36 eligible electors).

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Leawood Gardens in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action may require a "General Proposal" (to be determined by the Local Government Boundaries Commission); and would result in approximately 37 properties and 36 eligible electors being gained from the City of Mitcham.



4.5.5 Upper Sturt

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,587.8 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 1,309.5 ha (82.5%) – 480 properties (343 property assessments).
- City of Mitcham: 278.3 ha (17.5%) – 78 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$626,643.94.
- Character: Hilly terrain, with residential and rural living land uses generally concentrated in the north-eastern part of the suburb/locality; and some low-density residential development in the western part of the suburb/locality. Some farming activities are also evident on the lower land in the south-eastern part of the suburb/locality.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Hills Face Zone – Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments; Rural (Landscape) Zone – Preservation of rural character and features with some low density rural living; Public Purpose Zone/Public Purpose (Education) Policy Area 65 – Community, educational, recreational and health care uses, and preservation of natural character; Country Living Zone – Residential development at very low densities.
- City of Mitcham Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preservation of natural character; low-intensity agricultural activities; generally no additional development/allotments; Rural (Landscape) Zone – Preservation of rural character and features with some low density rural living.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (2.5 kms – 6.0 kms); City of Mitcham – Blackwood (3.5 kms – 8.0 kms) and Torrens Park (6.5 kms – 8.25 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (2.5 kms – 6.0 kms); City of Mitcham – Hawthorndene and other eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (1.5 kms – 6.0 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 951.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 593; City of Mitcham – 135.
- Median Age: 43 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 19.6%; 65 or older – 14.1%.
- Birth Place: Australia – 79.2%; England – 7.4%.
- Dwellings (2016): 393.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings – 96.9%; semi-detached dwelling, row or terrace houses (0.9%).

- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 33.8%; owned with a mortgage - 58.6%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,818 (26.4% above Australian average).

Comments

- All but approximately 278 hectares (17.5%) of the suburb/locality of Upper Sturt lies within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The City of Mitcham and the residents of Upper Sturt may be reluctant to agree to a boundary realignment which purports the whole of the suburb/locality being moved to the Adelaide Hills Council.
- In isolation, the re-alignment of the council boundary around the suburb of Upper Sturt will result in an awkward boundary configuration, the appropriateness of which will ultimately be determined by the Local Government Boundaries Commission. However, this may not necessarily be the case if Upper Sturt was a part of a "General Proposal" which also sought the inclusion of the suburbs/localities of Coromandel East, Cherry Gardens and Dorset Vale (part) which are currently within the City of Onkaparinga (to be discussed later).
- The existing zonings of the land within the two council areas are very similar in intent and, as such, any future transition in regards to zonings and/or land use control should not be a difficult exercise.
- The rural character and hilly terrain of the Upper Sturt and the aforementioned three suburbs/localities are considered to be more in keeping with the landscape and character of much of the Adelaide Hills Council.


Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Upper Sturt in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action will likely require a "General Proposal" (to be determined by the Local Government Boundaries Commission); and would result in approximately 78 properties (135 eligible electors) being gained from the City of Mitcham.



4.6 MOUNT BARKER DISTRICT COUNCIL

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the Mount Barker District Council is approximately 60.0 kilometres in length.
- The Mount Barker District Council covers approximately 595 km²; and is predominantly rural in character, with rural-residential areas and rapidly growing urban areas. The major township is Mount Barker, with Littlehampton and Nairne in close proximity; and the council area is characterised by historic townships, crop growing and general farming (including some viticulture).
- The estimated population of the council area was 35,545 (ABS 2018); and the population density was 0.6 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 17,471 rateable assessments and 625 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$30.37 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.0042367 (minimum specified rate of \$760.00).
- Eleven opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Bradbury, Bridgewater, Dorset Vale, Hahndorf, Hay Valley, Littlehampton, Mount Torrens, Mylor, Verdun and Woodside.



4.6.1 Bradbury

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,258.4 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 897.2 ha (71.3%) – 576 properties (150 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 361.2 ha (28.7%) – 6 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$220,878.45.
- Character: Primarily steep and hilly natural landscape with some rural living along the hilltops to the west.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Public Purpose Zone - Community, educational, recreational and health care uses, and preservation of natural character.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Conservation Zone – Conservation of the natural environment and landscape; no additional dwellings.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (7.25 kms – 8.75 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (10.5 kms – 13.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Mylor (3.0 kms – 6.25 kms), Aldgate (6.0 kms – 8.0 kms), Stirling (7.25 kms – 8.75 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Echunga (5.0 kms – 7.25 kms), Hahndorf (7.25 kms – 10.5 kms), Mount Barker (10.0 kms – 12.75 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 182.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 190; Mt Barker District Council – 0.
- Median Age: 50 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 8.7%; 65 or older - 17.4%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 72.9%; England - 10.2%; Scotland - 3.4%.
- Dwellings (2016): 71.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 46.9%; owned with a mortgage - 48.4%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,625 (13.0% above Australian average).

Comments

- Primarily steep and hilly natural landscape located to the north-east of the Scott Creek Conservation Park. This is consistent with the areas of natural landscape (Mount Lofty Ranges) which are in the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Over 70% (approximately 900 hectares) of the suburb/locality of Bradbury is located in the Adelaide Hills Council.
- There does not appear to be any residential development within the portion of Bradbury which is within the Mount Barker District Council. As such, the inclusion of the whole of the suburb/locality of Bradbury in the Adelaide Hills Council would likely have no significant consequences.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Bradbury in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action may require an "Administrative Proposal", given that only 6 properties (no residents) would be affected.



4.6.2 Bridgewater

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 692.4 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 643.1 ha (92.9%) – 1,781 properties (1,620 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 49.3 ha (7.1%) – 8 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$2,875,310.01.
- Character: Open rural/farming land; cleared of most vegetation to enable existing/past farming activities; bounded to the east and south by the Onkaparinga River.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Country Living Zone – Dwellings at very low densities, varying allotment sizes (800m² - 9,000m²), with commercial and public purpose zones within the township of Bridgewater.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production and conservation of rural landscape, no additional allotments; Hahndorf Rural Activity Policy Area 24 – Diverse primary production, protection of rural landscape and rural character, generally no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (6.0 kms – 6.75 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (7.5 kms - 8.5kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Bridgewater (1.75 kms - 2.5 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Hahndorf (1.75 kms – 2.75 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 3,558.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 2,732; Mount Barker District Council – 12.
- Median Age: 40 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 21.7%; 65 or older -12.4%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 80.1%; England - 7.5%.
- Dwellings (2016): 1,486.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 98.3%; semi-detached, row or terrace houses - 1.1%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 34.8%; owned with a mortgage - 51.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,708 (18.8% above Australian average).

Comments

- There are only 8 properties (5 dwellings and/or 12 eligible electors) located within the suburb of Bridgewater which are within the Mount Barker District Council. Clearly these residents are part of the Bridgewater community which is predominantly located within the neighbouring Adelaide Hills Council.
- The inclusion of the aforementioned part of the suburb/locality of Bridgewater in the Adelaide Hills Council would result in the council boundary being aligned with the Onkaparinga River, this being an obvious natural boundary and the existing suburb boundary.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Bridgewater in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such action may require a "General Proposal"; and would result in approximately 8 properties being gained from the Mount Barker District Council.



4.6.3 Dorset Vale

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 3,088.3 ha (including City of Onkaparinga).
- Adelaide Hills Council: 1,450.8 ha (47.0%) – 68 properties (3 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 1,222.8 ha (39.6%) – 14 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Steep hilly terrain exhibiting natural landscape. No residential development. Includes the Scott Creek Conservation Park and is divided by the Onkaparinga River.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Watershed Protection Policy Area 5 – Primarily natural open space and low-intensity farming on large allotments; protection of water resources; Public Purpose Zone - Community, educational, recreational and health care uses, and preservation of natural character.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Conservation Zone – Conservation of the natural environment and landscape; no additional dwellings.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council - Stirling (9.0 kms – 14.5 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (10.5 kms – 15.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Mylor (6.0 kms); Aldgate (8.0 kms); Stirling (9.5 kms); Mount Barker District Council: - Echunga (4.5 kms); Mount Barker (10.5 kms – 15.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 0.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 0; Mount Barker District Council – 0.


Comments

- The suburb/locality of Dorset Vale is dissected by a natural boundary (i.e. the Onkaparinga River), resulting in the suburb/locality being divided between 3 councils.
- The suburb/locality is large in area and basically comprises natural landscape; steep terrain; and Scott Creek Conservation Park. The topography of the area is consistent with that of the neighbouring suburb of Bradbury.
- Very little will be achieved by realigning the council boundary other than to incorporate the whole of the suburb in one council area.

- Dorset Vale is the southern-most suburb/locality within the Adelaide Hills Council and could be retained or relinquished to either Mount Barker District Council or the City of Onkaparinga, without any detrimental impact.
- If Adelaide Hills Council is going to consider the possibility of realigning the council boundary to incorporate the suburbs of Coromandel East and Cherry Gardens (as addressed later), then it may be prudent to consider including the whole of Dorset Vale (including that part which lies within the City of Onkaparinga) into the Adelaide Hills Council.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Dorset Vale in the Adelaide Hills Council, or alternatively relinquishing the land to one or of the neighbouring council. Given the likely limited impacts (i.e. no rateable properties or residents would be affected); such action may only require an "Administrative Proposal".



4.6.4 Hahndorf

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 2,140.2 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 39.1 ha (1.8%) – 2 properties (2 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 2,101.1 ha (98.2%) – 1,433 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$4,286.79.
- Character: Undulating open rural land which has long been utilised for farming and/or horticultural land uses.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Onkaparinga Valley Policy Area 10 – Retain existing rural character through maintaining farming and horticultural land uses, no land division potential.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production and conservation of rural landscape, no additional allotments; Hahndorf Rural Activity Policy Area 24 – Diverse primary production, protection of rural landscape and rural character, generally no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Woodside (8.5 kms – 9.0 kms); Stirling (9.0 kms – 10.0 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (5.75 kms - 6.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Balhannah (2.5 kms – 3.0 kms), Oakbank (3.5 kms – 4.25 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Hahndorf (1.0 km – 1.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 2,670.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 2; Mount Barker District Council – 1,974.
- Median Age: 50 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 16.0%; 65 or older - 29.3%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 76.4%; England - 7.9%.
- Dwellings (2016): 1,101.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 86.3%; semi-detached, row or terrace houses - 8.6%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 43.1%; owned with a mortgage - 36.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.4.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,449 (0.8% above Australian average).

Comments

- The portion of the suburb/locality of Hahndorf which lies within the Adelaide Hills Council comprises only approximately 39 hectares; exhibits 2 properties (one farming allotment - 185 Balhannah Road, and one small rural living/residential allotment – 290 Jones Road); and has generally been cleared to facilitate past and present farming activities.
- It is unknown as to why the current council boundary is aligned so as to include only a very small portion of Hahndorf in the Adelaide Hills Council, when the remainder (approximately 98.2%) of the suburb/locality lies within Mt Barker District Council.
- A move of the identified part of the suburb/locality of Hahndorf to the Mount Barker District Council would result in a loss of \$4,286.79 in rates revenue (based on 2019/2020 assessment).

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Hahndorf in the Mt Barker District Council. Such action may only require an "Administrative Proposal" because of the minor nature of the proposed realignment; and the fact that only 2 properties and a small number of residents (2 eligible electors) will be directly affected by the proposal.



4.6.5 Hay Valley

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 564.9 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 33.6 ha (6.0%) – 16 properties (one property assessment).
- Mount Barker Council: 530.4 ha (94.0%) – 45 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$3,032.22.
- Character: Open farming land (primarily cropping and horticulture).
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Onkaparinga Valley Policy Area 10 – Retain existing rural character through maintaining farming and horticultural land uses, no land division potential.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production and conservation of rural landscape, no additional allotments; Prime Agricultural Policy Area 25 – Preserve rural land and landscape, productive agricultural sector, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Woodside (6.0 kms – 6.25 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (6.0 kms - 6.25kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Oakbank (4.0 kms – 5.0 kms), Balhannah (4.75 kms – 6.0 kms), Woodside (6.0 kms - 6.25 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Nairne (2.5 kms - 3.0 kms), Littlehampton (4.0 kms – 5.0 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 25.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 2; Mount Barker District Council – 31.
- Median Age: 45 years.
- Dwellings (2016): 12.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$2,083 (44.85% above Australian average).

Comments

- Another peculiar situation whereby the existing council boundary divides the suburb/locality of Hay Valley, resulting in only a small area (i.e. 33.6 ha or 6.0% of the suburb/locality) being located within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- There does not appear to be any obvious reason for this division.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Hay Valley in the Mt Barker District Council. This action may require an "Administrative Proposal" because of the minor nature of the proposed realignment; and the fact that only 1 assessable property and 2 people (eligible electors) would be directly affected by the proposal.



4.6.6 Littlehampton

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 880.4 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 1.3 ha (0.15%) – 8 properties (0 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 879.1 ha (99.85%) – 1,442 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Rural living allotments; small farms; and scattered stands of native vegetation.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Onkaparinga Valley Policy Area 10 – Retain existing rural character through maintaining farming and horticultural land uses, no land division potential.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Rural Living Zone – Large allotments accommodating a detached dwelling and rural activities whilst maintaining rural character; Allotment 20000 Policy Area 19 – Rural living allotments no less than 20,000m² to provide a buffer between the township and primary production.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Woodside (8.75 kms), Stirling (13.0 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (3.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Balhannah (5.0kms), Oakbank (5.0 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Littlehampton (2.0 kms), Mount Barker (3.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 3,044.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 0; Mount Barker District Council – 2,249.
- Median Age: 38 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 23.0%; 65 or older - 13.1%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 83.4%; England - 6.8%.
- Dwellings (2016): 1,139.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 98.9%; semi-detached, row or terrace houses - 0.7%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 30.6%; owned with a mortgage - 52.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,741 (21.07% above Australian average).

Comments

- A small parcel of land to the north of Littlehampton which is divided by the existing council boundary resulting in approximately 1.3 hectares (or 0.15% of the suburb/locality of Littlehampton) being located in the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The council boundary could be amended to align with the suburb boundary; but this would result in a slightly awkward boundary configuration. No residents would be affected; and boundary realignment would have no financial/rates implications.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Littlehampton in the Mt Barker District Council. This action would likely require an "Administrative Proposal" because of the minor nature of the proposed realignment; and the fact that only 8 properties and no residents (eligible electors) would be directly affected by the proposal.



4.6.7 Mount Torrens

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 5,923.1 ha (including Mid Murray Council).
- Adelaide Hills Council: 4,168.2 ha (70.4%) – 448 properties (342 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 412.8 ha (7.0%) – 21 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$636,595.78.
- Character: Undulating open rural land; rural allotments of varying sizes; scattered farm buildings.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production, no additional allotments; Broad Acre Agriculture Policy Area 23 – Protection of broad-acre farming on large holdings in open rural landscape.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Woodside (9.0 kms – 10.5 kms), Gumeracha (11.25 kms – 13.75 kms); Mt Barker District Council – Mount Barker (17.25 kms – 19.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Mount Torrens (2.75 kms – 5.25 kms), Lobethal (8.75 kms – 10.5 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Harrogate (4.0 kms – 6.75 kms), Brukunga (9.0 kms – 11.5 kms), Nairne (13.5 kms – 16.0 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 711.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 502; Mount Barker District Council – 4.
- Median Age: 44 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 19.7%; 65 or older - 15.1%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 83.9%; England - 5.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 280.
- Dwelling Type: Detached dwellings - 98.8%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 40.6%; owned with a mortgage - 48.0%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,523 (5.9% above Australian average).

Comments

- The portion of Mount Torrens which lies within the Mount Barker District Council area is a relatively large tract of land (412.8 ha); only exhibits 21 properties; is sparsely populated (4 eligible electors); and is generally closer to the townships and the Council services/facilities located in the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The rationale behind dividing the suburb/locality of Mount Torrens between 3 Councils is unknown.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Mount Torrens in the Adelaide Hills Council. This action may require a "General Proposal" simply because of the 412.8 hectares of land and 21 properties (21) to be affected.



4.6.8 Mylor

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,798.3 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 1,289.2 ha (71.7%) – 514 properties (434 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 509.1 ha (28.3%) – 88 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$873,838.47.
- Character: Open undulating land generally utilised for farming purposes; farm allotments of varying sizes; significant stands of trees.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Watershed Protection Policy Area 5 – Primarily natural open space and low-intensity farming on large allotments; protection of water resources; Public Purpose Zone - Community, educational, recreational and health care uses, and preservation of natural character.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production, no additional allotments; Hahndorf Rural Activity Policy Area 24 – Hahndorf hinterland, maintain a diverse range of primary production activities; Prime Agricultural Policy Area 25 – Preserve rural land and landscape, productive agricultural sector, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (6.5 kms – 8.5 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (8.5 kms – 9.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Mylor (1.0 km – 3.0 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Hahndorf (3.75 kms – 6.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 1,097.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 710; Mount Barker District Council – 129.
- Median Age: 45 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 18.0%; 65 or older - 15.4%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 75.0%; England - 8.0%.
- Dwellings (2016): 415.
- Dwelling Type: Detached dwellings - 98.9%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 43.2%; owned with a mortgage - 47.1%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.


- Median weekly household income: \$1,798 (25.03% above Australian average).

Comments

- The boundary which divides the suburb/locality of Mylor between the Adelaide Hills Council and the Mount Barker District Council aligns with the Onkaparinga River, this being a natural feature which serves to physically divide the locality.
- There are two parts of the suburb/locality of Mylor which lie within the Mount Barker District Council. One is a small (approximately 3.8 hectares) part of an allotment which lies adjacent the Onkaparinga River/northern boundary of the suburb/locality, whilst the second is reasonable in area (approximately 509.1 ha) and contains a good number of properties (88) and residents (i.e. 129 eligible electors).
- Whilst it may be preferable to have the whole of the suburb/locality of Mylor located entirely within a single council area, the watercourse represents a significant physical line of division, and the subject parts of the suburb/locality incorporate (in total) considerable area and population.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Mylor in the Adelaide Hills Council. This action may require a "General Proposal" because of the considerable area of land and the significant number of residents likely to be affected. Should Council opt to remedy only the minor irregularity, this could be incorporated within an "Administrative Proposal".



4.6.9 Verdun

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 466.58 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 345.8 ha (74.1%) – 132 properties (118 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 120.78 ha (25.9%) – 20 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$245,633.68.
- Character: Open undulating land generally utilised for farming purposes; farm allotments of varying sizes; significant stands of trees.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Watershed Protection Policy Area 5 – Primarily natural open space and low-intensity farming on large allotments; protection of water resources; Onkaparinga Slopes Policy Area 11 – Retention of low-density rural development; Settlement Policy Area 18 – Mixed use village environment with small collection of very low-density detached dwellings.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production, no additional allotments; Hahndorf Rural Activity Policy Area 24 – Hahndorf hinterland, maintain a diverse range of primary production activities.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (6.25 kms – 7.5 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (7.5 kms – 8.25 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Bridgewater (1.25 kms – 2.75 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Hahndorf (1.5 kms – 2.5 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 207.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 133; Mount Barker District Council – 37.
- Median Age: 48 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 18.6%; 65 or older - 20.1%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 83.9%, England - 6.0%.
- Dwellings (2016): 89.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 37.2%; owned with a mortgage - 50.0%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.5.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,609 (11.9% above Australian average).

Comments

- Within the suburb/locality of Verdun, the existing Council boundary aligns with a roadway, a watercourse (in two places) and a property boundary. The rationale for this is unknown. It may therefore be prudent to simply align with the Council boundary with the existing suburb/locality boundary, thereby ensuring that the whole of Verdun (i.e. a perceived “community of Interest”) is located within the one Council area (i.e. Adelaide Hills Council).
- The aforementioned proposal would affect 20 properties and a reasonable number of residents (i.e. 37 eligible electors).
- It is likely that the affected property owners would benefit marginally in regards to Council rates and fees.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Verdun in the Adelaide Hills Council. This action may require a “General Proposal” because of the area of land (approximately 120 ha) and the number of residents likely to be affected.



4.6.10 Woodside

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 5,698.56 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 5,687.4 ha (99.8%) – 1,376 properties (1,370 property assessments).
- Mount Barker District Council: 11.16 ha (0.2%) - 1 property.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$3,024,166.71.
- Character: A single property within an open rural landscape which exhibits rural/farming properties of varying sizes.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Onkaparinga Springs Policy Area 17 – Retention of the existing open rural character, continuation of farming activities on large holdings.
- Mount Barker District Council Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Protection of primary production, no additional allotments; Broad Acre Agriculture Policy Area 23 – Protection of broad-acre farming on large holdings in open rural landscape.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Woodside (6.25 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Mount Barker (10.5 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council - Woodside (6.25 kms), Balhannah (10.0 kms); Mount Barker District Council – Brunkunga (2.0 kms), Nairne (5.5 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 2,608.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 1,914; Mount Barker District Council – 2.
- Median Age: 43 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 16.8%; 65 or older - 20.7%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 83.4%; England - 6.8%.
- Dwellings (2016): 1,018.
- Dwelling Types: Detached dwellings - 88.7%; semi-detached, row or terrace houses - 11.3%.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 33.8%; owned with a mortgage - 40.9%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.5.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,265 (12.07% below Australian average).

Comments

- A peculiar situation whereby the council boundary runs around the boundary of a single property (i.e. 3 Moore Road, Woodside).
- The reason for this boundary diversion is unknown.
- This is an anomaly which could be easily rectified, if required, as it affects only 1 property and a few residents (2 eligible electors).


Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Woodside in the Adelaide Hills Council. This action could be part of an "Administrative Proposal", given that the anomaly is obvious and only 1 property and a few residents (i.e. 2 eligible electors) would be affected.



4.7 CITY OF ONKAPARINGA

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the City of Onkaparinga is approximately 12.75 kilometres in length.
- The City of Onkaparinga covers approximately 518 km²; and exhibits extensive residential and rural areas, as well as commercial and industrial precincts.
- The estimated population of the council area was 171,489 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 3.31 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 80,079 rateable assessments and 2,394 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$134 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.0029667. A fixed charge of \$515.00 per assessment also applies.
- Four opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Cherry Gardens, Coromandel East, Dorset Vale and Ironbank.



4.7.1 Cherry Gardens

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,686 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 0 ha.
- City of Onkaparinga: 1,686 ha – 215 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Hilly and undulating terrain which exhibits rural living and farming allotments.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: N/A.
- City of Onkaparinga Zoning: Watershed Protection (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone – Protection of water catchment areas in the Mount Lofty Ranges, farming on large holdings, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (6.0 kms – 10.5 kms); City of Onkaparinga – The Hub Aberfoyle Park (3.25 kms – 8.25 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (6.0 kms – 10.5 kms), Aldgate (6.0 kms – 11.0 kms); City of Onkaparinga - The Hub Aberfoyle Park 3.25 kms – 8.25 kms), Woodcroft (9.5 kms – 14.0 kms), Noarlunga Centre (14.5 kms – 19.0 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 610.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 0; City of Onkaparinga – 449.
- Median Age: 44 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 20.8%; 65 or older – 18.5%.
- Birth Place: Australia – 80.5 %; England 9.9%; Scotland 2.0%.
- Dwellings (2016): 216.
- Dwelling Types: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 44.9%; owned with a mortgage – 46.4%.
- Average people per dwelling: 3.0.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,850 (28.7% above Australian average).

Comments

- Cherry Gardens is a suburb/locality which contains hilly and undulating terrain; primarily exhibits a rural character; and accommodates rural living and small farming properties. It is considered that these aspects are more in keeping with the communities and topography contained within the Adelaide Hills Council than the predominantly urban localities within the City of Onkaparinga.
- There was recently a call from some residents of Cherry Gardens to have the suburb moved to the Adelaide Hills Council, but this initiative appears to have stalled.
- Any proposal to move the suburb/locality of Cherry Gardens to the Adelaide Hills Council would affect 215 properties and a significant number of residents (i.e. 449 eligible electors).
- If it is proposed that part of the suburb/locality of Ironbank (which is currently located within the City of Onkaparinga) is to be the subject of a proposal to move to the Adelaide Hills Council (refer 4.7.4 Ironbank), then the potential move of the suburbs/localities of Cherry Gardens and Coromandel East to the Adelaide Hills Council becomes more logical. All three suburbs/localities are similar in character and topography to the Adelaide Hills Council; and have a physical correlation to each other and the Adelaide Hills Council.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Cherry Gardens in the Adelaide Hills Council. This option is reliant upon what Council determines in respect to the suburb/locality of Ironbank; may ultimately also incorporate the suburb/locality of Coromandel East; and will likely require a "General Proposal" because it involves/affects considerable area of land and a significant number of residents.



4.7.2 Coromandel East

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 909 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 0 ha.
- City of Onkaparinga: 909 ha – 178 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Hilly and undulating terrain which exhibits rural living and farming allotments.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: N/A.
- City of Onkaparinga Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preserve and enhance the natural character, low-intensity agricultural activities, land division non-complying; Primary Production Zone – Long-term continuation and preservation of primary production; Environment Protection Policy Area 30 – Preserve rural and natural character, low-intensity rural activities on large land holdings.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (5.5 kms – 10.25 kms); City of Onkaparinga – Aberfoyle Park (3.0 kms – 8.5 kms).
- Nearest main town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Aldgate (5.0 kms – 10.75 kms), Stirling (5.5 kms – 10.25 kms); City of Onkaparinga – The Hub Aberfoyle Park (3.25 kms – 8.75 kms), Woodcroft Shopping Centre (9.0 kms – 15.25 kms), Noarlunga Centre (14.25 kms – 19.25 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 340.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 0; City of Onkaparinga – 308.
- Median Age: 49 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 14.2%; 65 or older – 21.2%.
- Birth Place: Australia – 76.3%; England 11.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 131.
- Dwelling Types: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 49.6%; owned with a mortgage – 41.6%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.9.
- Median weekly household income: \$2,024 (40.8% above Australian average).

Comments

- The suburb/locality of Coromandel East incorporates a significant area of land (approximately 900 hectares) which is contiguous with the suburbs/localities of Ironbank and Cherry Gardens.
- The topography and character of the Coromandel East are consistent with those of the Adelaide Hills Council (in general).
- The locality is a lightly populated rural area which seemingly has more in common with the rural communities to the east than the urban areas to the west and south-west.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Subject to future decisions regarding the suburbs/localities of Ironbank and Cherry Gardens, give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Coromandel East in the Adelaide Hills Council. Given the significant number of properties (178) and residents (308 eligible electors) to be affected, any such proposition would likely have to be the subject of a "General Proposal".



4.7.3 Dorset Vale

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 3,088.3 ha (including Mount Barker District Council).
- Adelaide Hills Council: 1,450.8 ha (47.0%) – 68 properties (3 property assessments).
- City of Onkaparinga: 414.7 ha (13.4%) – 9 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Steep and hilly terrain exhibiting natural landscape. Lightly populated suburb/locality which is divided/bounded by the Onkaparinga River.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Watershed Protection Policy Area 5 – Primarily natural open space and low-intensity farming on large allotments; protection of water resources; Public Purpose Zone - Community, educational, recreational and health care uses, and preservation of natural character.
- City of Onkaparinga Zoning: Watershed Protection (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone – Protection of water catchment areas in the Mount Lofty Ranges, farming on large holdings, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (9.25 kms – 13.25 kms); City of Onkaparinga – The Hub Aberfoyle Park (7.5 kms – 9.75 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Aldgate (8.75 kms – 12.75 kms), Stirling (9.25 kms – 13.25 kms); City of Onkaparinga - The Hub Aberfoyle Park (7.5 kms – 9.75 kms), Woodcroft (11.5 kms – 12.5 kms), Noarlunga Centre (16.25 kms – 17.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 0.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 0; City of Onkaparinga – 2.


Comments

- The suburb/locality of Dorset Vale is divided between 3 Councils by a natural boundary (i.e. the Onkaparinga River).
- The suburb basically comprises natural landscape and steep terrain. This is consistent with the topography of much of the western part of the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Very little will be achieved by realigning the council boundary other than to incorporate the whole of the suburb within one council area.

- If Adelaide Hills Council is going to consider the possibility of realigning the council boundary so as to incorporate the suburbs/localities of Cherry Gardens, Coromandel East and/or Ironbank, it would be appropriate and rational to consider also including the portion of Dorset Vale which currently lies within the City of Onkaparinga.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb of Dorset Vale in the Adelaide Hills Council. Given the likely limited impacts (i.e. no rateable properties and only a few residents would be affected); such action may only require an "Administrative Proposal".



4.7.4 Ironbank

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 707 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 474 ha (67.0%) – 132 properties (125 property assessments).
- City of Onkaparinga: 233 ha (33.0%) – 65 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$267,059.28.
- Character: Residential/rural living and small farming properties located adjacent and within areas of hilly terrain which exhibit natural landscape.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments; Rural Landscape Policy Area 2 – Retention of low-density rural and rural living activities; Rural Living Policy Area 4 – Primarily accommodating farm, rural and rural residential development.
- City of Onkaparinga Zoning: Primary Production Zone – Long-term continuation of primary production; Environment Protection Policy Area 30 – Preservation of the natural and rural character, low-intensity rural activities on large land holdings.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Stirling (4.0 kms – 6.5 kms); City of Onkaparinga – The Hub Aberfoyle Park (8.5 kms – 10.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Aldgate (4.75 kms – 6.5 kms), Stirling (4.0 kms – 6.5 kms); City of Onkaparinga – The Hub Aberfoyle Park (8.5 kms – 10.0 kms), Woodcroft (15.0 kms – 15.5 kms), Noarlunga Centre (19.25 kms – 20.75 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 525.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council - 238; City of Onkaparinga – 108.
- Median Age: 45 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years – 17.5; 65 or older – 10.0%.
- Birth Place: Australia – 77.7%, England – 9.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 185.
- Dwelling Types: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 37.0%; owned with a mortgage – 58.0%.
- Average people per dwelling: 3.1.
- Median weekly household income: \$2,178 (51.5% above Australian average).

Comments

- Approximately a third of the suburb/locality of Ironbank is located within the City of Onkaparinga.
- The character and topography of the subject part of the suburb/locality of Ironbank is consistent with adjacent lands to the east (i.e. the land within the Adelaide Hills Council, including the remainder of the suburb/locality of Ironbank).
- There is some logic to incorporating the whole of the suburb/locality of Ironbank into the Adelaide Hills Council, and any proposal to do so will impact upon 65 properties and a considerable number of residents (i.e. 108 eligible electors).


Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Ironbank in the Adelaide Hills Council. Given the number of properties and residents to be affected, it is likely that a "General Proposal" would be required to facilitate the proposed boundary realignment.



4.8 CITY OF PLAYFORD

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the City of Playford is approximately 15.78 kilometres in length.
- The City of Playford covers approximately 346 km²; and is a rural and growing urban area, with some industrial and commercial precincts. The rural land is located mainly in the east, north and west, and is used largely for market gardens, orchards, vineyards, horse studs and hobby farms.
- The estimated population of the council area was 93,426 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 2.71 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 40,995 rateable assessments and 1,001 non-rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$88.3 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.0023640. A fixed charge of \$1,014.00 per assessment also applies.
- Two opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Humbug Scrub and Sampson Flat.



4.8.1 Humbug Scrub

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 2040.0 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 537.1 ha (26.3%) – 82 properties (82 property assessments).
- City of Playford: 1,502.9 ha (73.7%) – 81 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$162,825.26.
- Character: Undulating terrain comprising the western foothills and exhibiting natural landscape and low-density rural living land uses.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments.
- City of Playford Zoning: Primary Production (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone – Long-term continuation of primary production, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (11.5 kms – 16.0 kms); City of Playford – Elizabeth (13.5 kms – 15.25 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (11.5 kms – 16.0 kms); City of Playford – One Tree Hill (1.5 kms – 7.0 kms), northern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (9.0 kms or more, generally to the west).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 416.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 166; City of Playford – 148.
- Median Age: 51 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 12.1%; 65 or older - 21.9%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 73.2%; England - 11.2%; Scotland - 2.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 157.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 47.5%; owned with a mortgage - 49.6%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,797 (25.0% above Australian average).

Comments

- A large area of land which is relatively sparsely populated and exhibits considerable natural landscape and rural living allotments
- Equal arguments could be presented to have the whole of the suburb/locality contained within the Adelaide Hills Council or the City of Playford.
- The topography of the part of the suburb/locality which is located within the City of Playford is consistent with that of the Adelaide Hills Council (i.e. hilly, undulating rural land, much of which exhibits natural landscape).
- The adjacent suburbs/localities within the City of Playford which are located to the west of the suburb of Humbug Scrub generally exhibit a more urban influence.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to:
 - a) include the whole of the suburb/locality of Humbug Scrub in the City of Playford, this being a proposal which would be incorporated within a "General Proposal", and would result in 82 properties and a significant number of residents (i.e. 166 eligible electors) being moved to the City of Playford (loss of \$162,825.26 rates revenue); or
 - b) include the whole of the suburb/locality of Humbug Scrub in the Adelaide Hills Council, this being a proposal which would also have to be incorporated within a "General Proposal", and would result in 81 properties and a significant number of residents (i.e. 148 eligible electors) being moved to the Adelaide Hills Council.



4.8.2 Sampson Flat

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,642 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 0 ha.
- City of Playford: 1,642 ha – 98 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$Nil.
- Character: Hilly terrain to the west and undulating natural landscape elsewhere, the latter being lightly populated and generally utilised for small-scale farming and rural living.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: N/A.
- City of Playford Zoning: Watershed Protection (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone – Protection of water catchment areas, preserve surface and underground water resources, primarily farming on large land holdings, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (8.75 kms – 15.0 kms); City of Playford – Elizabeth (10.5 kms – 14.25 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (8.75 kms – 15.0 kms); City of Playford – One Tree Hill (1.75 kms – 8.0 kms), northern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (8.0 kms or more, generally to the west).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 124.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 0; City of Playford – 90.
- Median Age: 47 years.
- Dwellings (2016): 41.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.6.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,687 (17.3% above Australian average).


Comments

- The topography of the suburb/locality of Sampson Flat is consistent with that of the adjoining suburbs to the east (i.e. Humbug Scrub and Kersbrook) which are located within the Adelaide Hills Council.

- The general character of the suburb/locality is rural, with the prominent land use appearing to be rural living and/or small-scale farming. Again, this is considered to be consistent with the land uses to the east, although there are further parcels of rural land to the west (i.e. Gould Creek and One Tree Hill), between Sampson Flat and the established urban areas of northern metropolitan Adelaide.
- The inclusion of Sampson Flat into the Adelaide Hills Council would be a rational option if the whole of the suburb/locality of Humbug Scrub was to be moved into the Adelaide Hills Council.


Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Subject to future decision regarding the suburb/locality of Humbug Scrub, give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Sampson Flat in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such a proposal would affect a considerable parcel of land (1,642 hectares/98 properties) and a significant number of residents (90 eligible electors). As such, any such proposition would likely have to be the subject of a "General Proposal".



4.9 CITY OF TEA TREE GULLY

- The boundary between Adelaide Hills Council and the City of Tea Tree Gully is approximately 21.12 kilometres in length.
- The City of Tea Tree Gully covers approximately 95 km²; and is predominantly residential in character, with the hills interface providing a rural backdrop.
- The estimated population of the council area was 99,694 (ABS 2018), with a population density of 10.47 persons per hectare.
- The council area contains 40,725 rateable assessments (2019).
- The estimated 2019/2020 rate revenue is \$78.08 million.
- The “rate in the dollar” levied against a residential/general assessment is 0.0039677 (minimum specified rate of \$1,213.00). Annual CWMS fees also apply.
- Three opportunities have been identified for consideration, these involving the council boundary within the suburbs/localities of Houghton, Paracombe and Upper Hermitage.



4.9.1 Houghton

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 407.8 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 309.7 ha (76.0%) – 216 properties (191 property assessments).
- City of Tea Tree Gully: 98.1 ha (24.0%) – 26 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$367,721.03.
- Character: Undulating rural land which incorporates small-scale farms and rural living allotments. Parcels of natural landscape/vegetation are scattered throughout the locality, with a concentration thereof in the north-western corner of the suburb/locality (part of the Anstey Hill Recreation Park).
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed Protection (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone - Protection of water catchment areas, preserve surface and underground water resources, primarily farming on large land holdings, no additional allotments.
- City of Tea Tree Gully Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preserve and enhance the natural character, low-intensity agricultural activities, land division non-complying.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (11.0 kms – 13.0 kms); City of Tea Tree Gully – Modbury (4.75 kms – 7.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Houghton (0 kms – 2.0 kms), Inglewood (0.5 kms – 3.5 kms), Gumeracha (11.0 kms – 13.0 kms); City of Tea Tree Gully – North-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (1.5 kms – 3.5 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 492.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 336; City of Tea Tree Gully – 54.
- Median Age: 47 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 14.8%; 65 or older - 13.5%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 75.1%; England - 9.9%.
- Dwellings (2016): 184.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright - 41.0%; owned with a mortgage - 53.4%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,726 (20.0% above Australian average).

Comments

- The existing Council boundary basically divides the suburb/locality, the township and the community of Houghton into 2 parts (primarily along Range Road South), with the majority of the area being within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Apart from the area of land within the township, much of the suburb/locality which is located within the City of Tea Tree Gully comprises hilly natural landscape which is covered by native vegetation. The topography and character of this land is reflected in the Hills Face zoning.
- The topography and character of the suburb/locality of Houghton is more consistent with that of the Adelaide Hills Council, rather than the predominantly urban character of the City of Tea Tree Gully (with the exception of the Mt Lofty Ranges foothills).

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Houghton in the Adelaide Hills Council. As a proposed boundary realignment will affect 26 properties and a good number of residents (i.e. 54 eligible electors), it is likely that a "General Proposal" would be required.



4.9.2 Paracombe

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 1,682.1 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 1,492.5 ha (88.7%) – 203 properties (189 property assessments).
- City of Tea Tree Gully: 189.6 ha (11.3%) – 15 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$373,696.39.
- Character: Steep hilly landscape generally in the southern and western parts of the suburb/locality, with the remainder of the locality exhibiting open undulating rural land comprising farms of varying sizes and rural living properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments.
- City of Tea Tree Gully Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preserve and enhance the natural character, low-intensity agricultural activities, land division non-complying.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (8.25 kms – 14.0 kms); City of Tea Tree Gully – Modbury (5.0 kms – 10.0 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Houghton (1.0 km – 4.5 kms), Inglewood (1.25 kms – 4.5 kms), Gumeracha (8.25 kms – 14.0 kms); City of Tea Tree Gully – North-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (2.5 kms – 6.5 kms).

Community Snapshot

- Population (2016): 426.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 330; City of Tea Tree Gully – 28.
- Median Age: 45 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 18.8%; 65 or older - 22.4%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 80.8%; England - 9.3%; Netherlands - 2.2%.
- Dwellings (2016): 163.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 45.5%; owned with a mortgage - 40.6%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.8.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,952 (35.7% above Australian average).

Comments

- The current council boundary divides the suburb/locality of Paracombe into 2 parts, with nearly 90% of the suburb/locality being located within the Adelaide Hills Council.
- The portion of the suburb/locality which is located within the City of Tea Tree Gully is generally steep, hilly terrain; exhibits 15 properties (mainly along the ridgeline); contains a reasonable number of residents (i.e. 28 eligible electors); and is separated from metropolitan Adelaide (in the west) by steep, hilly natural landscape.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Paracombe in the Adelaide Hills Council. Any such boundary realignment will likely have to be the subject of a "General Proposal".



4.9.3 Upper Hermitage

Suburb Profile

- Area: Approximately 678.2 ha.
- Adelaide Hills Council: 593.5 ha (87.5%) – 61 properties (52 property assessments).
- City of Tea Tree Gully: 84.7 ha (12.5%) – 130 properties.
- Adelaide Hills Council rate revenue (2019/2020): \$111,863.00.
- Character: Undulating open rural land exhibiting small farms and rural living allotments.
- Adelaide Hills Council Zoning: Watershed (Primary Production) Zone – Maintain natural resources, conserve native vegetation, generally farming, no additional allotments
- City of Tea Tree Gully Zoning: Hills Face Zone – Preserve and enhance the natural character, low-intensity agricultural activities, land division non-complying; Watershed Protection (Mt Lofty Ranges) Zone - Protection of water catchment areas, preserve surface and underground water resources, primarily farming on large land holdings, no additional allotments.
- Nearest Council office/library: Adelaide Hills Council – Gumeracha (10.0 kms - 12.5 kms); City of Tea Tree Gully – Modbury (6.25 kms – 10.75 kms).
- Nearest town/centre: Adelaide Hills Council – Houghton (1.0 km – 6.5 kms), Inglewood (2.5 kms – 6.0 kms), Kersbrook (6.5 km – 10.75 kms); City of Tea Tree Gully – North-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide (0.75 km – 5.25 kms).

Community Snapshot


- Population (2016): 285.
- Electors (January 2020): Adelaide Hills Council – 85; City of Tea Tree Gully – 102.
- Median Age: 50 years.
- Age Profile: 0 – 14 years - 17.3%; 65 or older - 22.5%.
- Birth Place: Australia - 73.5%; England - 12.7%; Italy - 3.9%.
- Dwellings (2016): 106.
- Dwelling Type: All detached dwellings.
- Dwelling Ownership: Owned outright – 59.6%; owned with a mortgage - 36.2%.
- Average people per dwelling: 2.7.
- Median weekly household income: \$1,478 (2.8% above Australian average).

Comments

- The current council boundary effectively divides the suburb/locality of Upper Hermitage into 3 parts, 2 of which are located within the City of Tea Tree Gully.
- Only 12.5% (84.7 ha) of the suburb/locality lies within the City of Tea Tree Gully, this comprising some of the more hilly natural landscape.

Options

- Take no further action at this time.
- Give further consideration to the potential realigning of the council boundary so as to include the whole of suburb/locality of Upper Hermitage in the Adelaide Hills Council. Such a proposition would be the subject of a "General Proposal", as it would affect 130 properties and a considerable number of residents (i.e. 102 eligible electors).



5. REVIEW SUMMARY

The desktop review identified 34 potential opportunities for the realignment of the Council boundary, as well as an option of an amalgamation with the neighbouring Mount Barker District Council and an option to create a new council based upon the "Adelaide Hills" region.

A summary of the aforementioned opportunities and options follows.

5.1 MINOR IRREGULARITIES

The following 12 minor irregularities or anomalies in the existing council boundary have been identified. Council may choose to take no action in regards to some or all of these matters; or alternatively address and rectify some or all of these matters in one "Administrative Proposal" to the Local Government Boundaries Commission.

Should all of these matters be addressed, approximately 465 hectares of land would be moved to other Councils, and approximately 1,652 hectares of land would be moved to the Adelaide Hills Council (i.e. a net gain of approximately 1,187 hectares).

5.1.1 The Barossa Council

- Mount Crawford – Move 3 properties (1 property assessment, 355 hectares, 2 electors) to The Barossa Council.

5.1.2 City of Burnside

- Cleland – Move 2 properties (12.7 hectares, 0 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Waterfall Gully – Move 7 properties (2 property assessments, 5.24 hectares, 4 electors) to the City of Burnside.

5.1.3 City of Mitcham

- Belair – Move 29 properties (29 property assessments, 31.14 hectares, 1 elector) to the City of Mitcham.

5.1.4 Mount Barker District Council

- Bradbury – Move 6 properties (361.2 hectares, 0 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Dorset Vale – Move 14 properties (1,222.8 hectares, 0 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Hahndorf – Move 2 properties (2 property assessments, 39.1 hectares, 2 electors) to the Mount Barker District Council.
- Hay Valley – Move 16 properties (1 property assessment, 33.6 hectares, 2 electors) to the Mount Barker District Council.

- Littlehampton – Move 8 properties (0 property assessments, 1.3 hectares, 0 electors) to the Mount Barker District Council.
- Mylor – Move 1 property (3.8 hectares and 0 electors) to the Adelaide Hills Council.
- Woodside – Move 1 property (11.16 hectares, 2 electors) to the Adelaide Hills Council.

5.1.5 City of Onkaparinga

- Dorset Vale – Move 9 properties (414.7 hectares, 2 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.2 OVERCOME DIVISION OF SUBURBS/LOCALITIES

The review revealed that the existing Council boundary dissects 15 suburbs/localities (including Rostrevor which is the subject of a boundary realignment proposal by the Campbelltown City Council), resulting in the division of perceived “communities of interest” between 2 or 3 Councils.

Again, Council may decide to take no action in regards to some or all of these matters; or alternatively, should it believe that there are benefits to be achieved (by the affected residents, the relevant Councils and/or the community in general), it may opt to address and rectify some or all of these matters in a “General Proposal” to the Local Government Boundaries Commission. The latter course of action will ensure (where deemed appropriate) that whole “communities of interest” are located within the one suburb/locality.

Should all of these matters be addressed, approximately 733.6 hectares of land (178 properties) would be moved to other councils (including Rostrevor to Campbelltown City Council); and approximately 5,596.8 hectares of land (661 properties) would be moved to the Adelaide Hills Council from other councils (i.e. a net gain of approximately 4,863.2 hectares).

5.2.1 The Barossa Council

- Cromer – Move 39 properties (31 property assessments, 630 hectares, 41 electors) to The Barossa Council.

5.2.2 Campbelltown City Council

- Rostrevor – Subject of a realignment proposal by the Campbelltown City Council seeking to move 139 properties (133 property assessments, 103.6 hectares and 272 electors) to Campbelltown City Council.

5.2.3 Mid Murray Council

- Birdwood - Move 17 properties (538.9 hectares, 2 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

- Mount Torrens – Move 74 properties (1,342.1 hectares, 135 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.2.4 City of Mitcham

- Crafers West – Move 38 properties (237.2 hectares, 60 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Upper Sturt – Move 78 properties (278.3 hectares, 135 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.2.5 Mount Barker District Council

- Bridgewater – Move 8 properties (49.3 hectares, 12 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Mount Torrens – Move 21 properties (412.8 hectares, 4 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Mylor – Move 88 properties (509.1 hectares, 129 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Verdun – Move 20 properties (120.8 hectares, 37 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.2.6 City of Onkaparinga

- Ironbank – Move 65 properties (233 hectares, 108 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.2.7 City of Playford

- Humbug Scrub – Move 81 properties (1,502.9 hectares, 148 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.2.7 City of Tea Tree Gully

- Houghton – Move 26 properties (98.1 hectares, 54 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Paracombe – Move 15 properties (189.6 hectares, 28 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Upper Hermitage – Move 130 properties (84.7 hectares, 102 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.3 INCLUSION OF NEIGHBOURING LAND

The following suburbs/localities (or parts thereof) which lay within neighbouring councils have been identified as potential inclusions in the Adelaide Hills Council, based on the assessment that the topography, character and land uses therein complement the Adelaide Hills Council area.

It should be noted that the appropriateness, viability and impacts of any future proposal(s) to include any additional land within the Adelaide Hills Council will require further thorough investigation and consideration.

Ultimately, any future proposition to include additional land within the Council boundaries will need to be presented in a “General Proposal” to the Local Government Boundaries Commission.

5.3.1 City of Mitcham

- Belair- Move the Belair National Park (approximately 920 hectares, 0 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Brown Hill Creek - Move 45 properties (685 hectares, 45 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Leawood Gardens – Move 37 properties (115 hectares, 36 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

Should Council believe that it would be appropriate for the Belair National Park to be located within the Adelaide Hills Council (primarily due to the complementary topography, natural landscape and character of the land), the inclusion of the suburbs/localities of Brown Hill Creek and Leawood Gardens would also warrant consideration, so as to achieve physical contiguity.

5.3.2 City of Onkaparinga

- Cherry Gardens – Move 215 properties (1,686 hectares, 449 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.
- Coromandel East – Move 178 properties (909 hectares, 308 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.3.3 City of Playford

- Sampson Flat – Move 98 properties (1,642 hectares, 90 electors) to Adelaide Hills Council.

5.4 COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

The potential amalgamation of the Adelaide Hills Council and the Mount Barker District Council has likely been a topic of discussion for some time. Such an amalgamation would create a new Council which would be the largest in area in metropolitan Adelaide, and the eighth largest in terms of population.

The two councils share a common boundary; appear to have strong community connections; exhibit similar topography, land uses and character; are similar in area and population; and collectively incorporate much of the “Adelaide Hills”. This being the case, and should both Councils and their residents and ratepayers have the appetite for change/amalgamation, considerable further detailed investigations would have to be undertaken.

Any proposal to amalgamate Councils must be the subject of a comprehensive “General Proposal” to the Local Government Boundaries Commission.

5.5 CREATE A NEW COUNCIL

As previously stated, the creation of a new, large Council which is based upon the "Adelaide Hills" region may be a "step too far".

The "Adelaide Hills Geographical Indication" identifies the defined "Adelaide Hills" wine region. This region incorporates an extensive area; and extends from Council's northern boundary to Nangkita in the south; Chandler's Hill, Cherry Gardens, Ironbank, part of Coromandel East and most of Paracombe and Houghton in the west; and Mount Pleasant, Mount Barker and Macclesfield in the east.

This option is offered as an alternative to amalgamation, with the rationale being similar to that espoused within the current "General Proposal" initiated by The Barossa Council, which seeks to adjust the current council boundary so that the majority of the area covered by the "Barossa Geographical Indication" lies within The Barossa Council boundary.

City of Campbelltown



Efficiency and Comparative Review

December 2017

Approach


- **Comparative Review**

- Compare FY2016 performance with FY2014
- High level financial not service level review
- Benchmarking to provide a comparison of resource allocation not intended to be a process efficiency measure
- Benchmarking contextualised to identify if certain services are being delivered with a significant cost or resource variance to others over time

- **Benchmark Councils**

- City of Burnside
- City of Holdfast Bay
- City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
- City of Prospect
- City of Unley

Campbelltown 2011-2016



Overview

	FY2011	FY2014	FY2016	Change 2014-16
Population	49,847	51,344	51,983	1.24%
Rateable Properties	22,509	23,075	23,767	3.00%
- Residential	20,052	20,391	21,509	5.48%
- Non-Residential	2,457	2,684	2,258	-15.87%
Staff (FTEs)	133.8	147.6	157.3	6.57%

Source: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Overview

	FY2011	FY2014	FY2016	Change 2014-16
Total Operating Revenue (\$m)	\$30.827	\$36.208	\$42.573	17.58%
Grant income	\$3.674	\$2.813	\$5.633	100.25%
Total Operating Expenditure (\$m)	\$32.712	\$34.496	\$37.626	9.07%
Adjusted for LG Price Index			\$35.398	\$2.228
Capital Expenditure	\$13.601	\$10.447	\$29.590	183.24%

Source: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Revenue Sources (% of income)

Council	Rates	Statutory Charges	User Charges	Grants etc.	Invest.	Reimb.	Other
FY2016	78.01	2.47	2.68	13.23	0.89	1.28	1.44
FY2014	83.03	2.70	2.99	7.79	1.23	0.41	1.85
FY2011	79.72	2.48	2.97	11.92	0.32	0.61	1.98
Change 2014-16 (\$m)	3.212	0.073	0.059	2.820	-0.064	0.398	-0.055

Source: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Rate Revenue – 2011 to 2016

	FY2011	FY2014	FY2016	Change 2014-16
Total Rates Revenue (\$m)	\$24.575	\$29.994	\$33.206	10.71%
Average Rate per residential property	\$1,104	\$1,393	\$1,467	5.30%
Average Rate per non-residential property	\$991	\$594	\$736	23.94%
Rate revenue per capita	\$493	\$584	\$639	9.35%

Source: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Expenditure – 2011 to 2016

	FY2011	FY2014	FY2016	Change 2014-16
Opex per capita	\$656	\$672	\$724	7.73%
Opex per rateable properties	\$1,453	\$1,495	\$1,583	5.9%
Opex per FTE	\$244,484	\$233,713	\$239,199	2.35%

Source: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Expenditure – Key Areas

	FY2014 (\$m)	FY2016 (\$m)	Change %
Transport	6.687	8.274	23.73
Recreation	6.968	8.074	15.87
Other Environment	5.888	5.842	-0.78
Waste Management	4.196	4.383	4.46
Library Services	3.126	3.760	20.28
Community Support	2.551	2.324	-8.90
Regulatory Services	2.241	2.145	-4.28

Source: Source: Grants Commission 2014 and 2016

Expenditure – Roads, Footpaths & Drainage

	FY2011	FY2014	2017/18	Change 2014-17
Road Maintenance (per km)	\$22,641	\$22,550	\$23,453	4.00%
Footpath Maintenance (per km)	\$2,004	\$2,578	\$2,991	16.02%
Drainage Maintenance (per km)	\$6,683	\$6,792	\$9,822	44.61%

Source: Campbelltown Annual Business Plan and Budgets

FTEs – Campbelltown 2011 to 2016

Area	2011	2014	2016	Change 2014-16
Engineering / Infrastructure	65.5	72.8	74.7	2.61
Human Services	25.9	30.6	35	14.57
Environmental	14.5	15.3	15.7	2.28
Corporate	27.9	28.9	31.9	10.38
Total	133.8	147.6	157.3	6.57

Including Agency Staff

Source: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Strategic Directions

Strategic Direction	2015 Staff*	FY2016 Staff^
Quality Living	35.48	54.08
Leadership	40.87	41.33
City Planning	33.50	32.07
Environmental Responsibility	28.79	28.5
Local Economy	0.66	1.32
Total FTE	139.3	157.3

*Actuals at March 2015 as provided by Council excluding Agency Staff

^Actuals provided by Council including Agency Staff

Employees - Campbelltown 2011 to 2016

	FY2011	FY2014	FY2016	Change 2014-16
Total employee costs (\$m)	8.881	11.056	12.280	11.07
Employee costs as % of opex	27.15%	32.05%	32.64%	1.83
Average FTE	133.8	147.6	157.3	6.57
FTE per 1,000 population	2.68	2.87	3.03	-5.26
Rateable properties per FTE	168.23	156.33	151.09	-3.35

FTEs include Agency Staff

Sources: Grants Commission 2011, 2014 and 2016

Expenditure and FTE summary

- Expenditure

- Increased by 9.07% or \$3.130m (\$2.228m higher than if increased by LG Price Index)
- Opex per capita increased by \$52 (\$34 higher than if increased by the LG Price Index)
- Capex increased by 183.24% or \$19.143m

- Staff

- FTEs increased by 6.57% or 9.7FTE
- Agency FTEs increased by 49.4% or 4.1FTE
- Opex per FTE increased by 2.35%
- Per rateable properties decreased by -3.35%
- FTEs per 1,000 residents decreased by -5.26%

Conclusions

- Since 2014 Campbelltown has:
 - increased its spend in Transport, Library and Recreation;
 - increased spending on Business undertakings, Public Order and Safety, Health Services, Community Amenities, and Waste Management (EPA Levy);
 - reduced its spend on Community Support, Regulatory Services, Other Environment; and
 - reduced its spend on Cultural Services and Economic Development

FY2016 Comparative with Benchmark Councils



Benchmark Councils Context

Council	Population	Total FTE's (adjusted / unadjusted)	Operating Expenditure (\$m)	Operating Revenue (\$m)	Debt Levels June 2017 (\$m)
Burnside	45,337	164	42.293	43.642	11.710
Campbelltown	51,983	157.3	37.626	42.573	0.116
Holdfast	37,376	245.1 / 327.4	58.888	59.217	16.207
NPSP	37,496	132.3 / 152.8	37.711	40.871	10.416
Prospect	21,410	74.4	21.627	21.725	7.193
Unley	39,518	178.0	42.142	44.802	6.390

Sources: Grants Commission 2016 and Council Financial Statements 2016/17

Benchmark Council Context

Council	Total Rateable Properties	Residential Properties	Non-residential Properties	Roads (km)
Burnside	20,676	19,216	1,460	240
Campbelltown	23,767	21,509	2,258	255
Holdfast	20,167	18,425	1,742	179
NPSP	19,447	16,790	2,657	173
Prospect	9,656	8,933	723	91
Unley	18,662	16,855	1,807	171

Source: Grants Commission 2016

Benchmark Council Context



Age Profile	Burnside	Campbelltown	Holdfast	NPSP	Prospect	Unley	Greater Adelaide
Service Age Groups							
Babies and Pre-schoolers (0-4)	4.4	5.4	4.3	4.8	5.9	4.7	5.9
Primary Schoolers (5-11)	8.4	7.8	6.3	6.9	8.1	7.9	8.2
Children (12-17)	8.6	6.8	5.8	5.9	5.9	6.6	6.9
Youth (18-24)	8.6	8.8	7.9	9.8	10.2	9.4	9.5
Young workforce (25 to 34)	9.0	12.6	11.6	15.5	16.0	13.5	13.8
Parents and homebuilders (35 to 49)	19.3	20.0	18.2	19.3	20.6	19.8	19.7
Older workers and pre-retirees (50 to 59)	13.5	12.7	14.6	12.8	13.6	12.7	13.1
Empty nesters and retirees (60 to 69)	12.6	10.2	14.2	10.8	10.4	11.9	11.1
Seniors (70 to 84)	11.6	12.3	12.2	10.6	7.0	9.2	9.3
Elderly aged (85 and over)	3.8	3.3	4.8	3.7	2.3	4.3	2.6

Source: Census 2016

Revenue Comparative Assessment



Council	Rateable Properties	Total Revenue per Rateable Property	Total Revenue Per Capita
Burnside	20,676	\$2,111	\$963
Campbelltown	23,767	\$1,791	\$819
Holdfast	20,167	\$2,936	\$1,584
NPSP	19,447	\$2,102	\$1,090
Prospect	9,656	\$2,250	\$1,015
Unley	18,662	\$2,401	\$1,134

Source: Grants Commission 2016

Rate Revenue Comparative Assessment



Council	Rate Revenue Per Rateable Property	Rate Revenue per Residential Property	Rate Revenue Per Non- Residential Property	Rate Revenue Per Capita
Burnside	\$1,742	\$1,724	\$1,980	\$795
Campbelltown	\$1,397	\$1,467	\$736	\$639
Holdfast	\$1,609	\$1,487	\$2,900	\$868
NPSP	\$1,664	\$1,522	\$2,565	\$863
Prospect	\$1,916	\$1,760	\$3,840	\$864
Unley	\$2,010	\$1,737	\$4,552	\$949

Source: Grants Commission 2016

Revenue Sources (% of income)

Council	Rates	Statutory Charges	User Charges	Grants etc.	Invest.	Reimb.	Other
Burnside	84.02	2.53	3.84	7.72	0.07	0.64	1.19
Campbelltown	78.01	2.47	2.68	13.23	0.89	1.28	1.44
Holdfast	54.81	3.54	12.18	21.27	0.59	3.36	4.26
NPSP	79.20	4.15	8.02	6.15	0.29	1.27	0.92
Prospect	85.16	2.31	1.22	7.41	1.02	1.57	1.33
Unley	83.72	2.89	3.67	6.81	0.02	1.0	1.87
Average	77.49	2.98	5.27	10.43	0.48	1.52	1.84

Source: Grants Commission 2016

Operating Expenses

Council	Opex per Capita (\$)	Opex per Rateable Property (\$)	Opex per FTE (\$)
Burnside	\$933	\$2,046	\$257,884
Campbelltown	\$724	\$1,583	\$239,199
Holdfast	\$1,576	\$2,920	\$179,866
NPSP	\$1,006	\$1,939	\$246,800
Prospect	\$1,010	\$2,240	\$290,685
Unley	\$1,066	\$2,258	\$236,753

FTEs include Agency Staff and Aged Care Staff (Holdfast) and Childcare Staff (NPSP)
Source: Grants Commission 2016

Expenditure – Key Areas



	Burnside	Campbell -town	Holdfast	NPSP	Prospect	Unley	Average
Transport	2.217	8.274	4.710	5.183	3.155	7.317	5.143
Recreation	6.152	8.074	5.551	5.715	1.841	7.095	5.738
Other Environment	8.880	5.842	5.059	6.661	2.391	5.962	5.799
Waste Management	4.919	4.383	4.986	4.516	2.276	5.219	4.383
Library Services	3.648	3.760	2.587	2.324	1.632	3.390	2.890
Community Support	7.028	2.324	9.299	5.269	2.514	4.690	5.187
Regulatory Services	6.177*	2.145*	4.534	3.647*	2.310*	3.777	3.765

* Constituent Councils of EHA

Operating Expenses by Category



Activity	Burnside	Campbell-town	Holdfast	NPSP	Prospect	Unley	Average
Community Support (\$ per resident)	\$155.02	\$44.71	\$248.80	\$140.52	\$117.42	\$118.68	\$137.52
Library Services (\$ per resident)	\$80.46	\$72.33	\$69.22	\$61.98	\$76.23	\$85.78	\$74.33
Waste Management (\$ per property)	\$237.91	\$184.42	\$247.24	\$232.22	\$235.71	\$279.66	\$236.19
Other Environment (\$ per property)	\$429.48	\$245.80	\$250.86	\$342.52	\$247.62	\$319.47	\$305.96
Recreation (\$ per property)	\$297.54	\$339.71	\$275.25	\$293.88	\$190.66	\$380.18	\$296.20
Regulatory Services (\$ per property)	\$298.75	\$90.25	\$224.82	\$187.54	\$239.23	\$202.39	\$207.16
Transport (\$ per km)	\$9,238	\$32,447	\$26,328	\$30,046	\$34,862	\$42,865	\$29,298

Source: Grants Commission 2016

Employee Costs

Council	% of Opex Budget	Average FTE Cost	Ratebale Properties per FTE (adjusted / unadjusted)	FTE per 1000 Residents (adjusted / unadjusted)
Burnside	36.52%	\$94,189	126.07	3.62
Campbelltown	32.64%	\$78,067	151.09	3.03
Holdfast	47.37%	\$85,195	82.28/61.6	6.56/8.76
NPSP	32.80%	\$80,942	147/127.27	3.53/4.08
Prospect	34.45%	\$100,134	129.78	3.48
Unley	39.54%	\$93,612	104.84	4.5

Adjusted FTEs exclude Aged Care Staff (Holdfast) and Childcare Staff (NPSP)


Source: Grants Commission 2016

FTEs Per Service Area

Service Area	Campbelltown		Holdfast		NPSP		Prospect	
	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%	Nos.	%
Engineering / Infrastructure	74.7	47.49	61.5	25.09	55.0	41.57	22.7	30.51
Human Services	35.0	22.25	117.7	48.02	26.4	19.95	24.4	32.8
Environmental	15.7	9.98	25.0	10.2	17.1	12.93	8.3	11.16
Corporate	31.9	20.28	40.9	16.69	33.8	22.55	19.0	25.54
Total	157.3	100	245.1	100	132.3	100	74.4	100

Including Agency Staff and excluding Aged Care Staff (Holdfast) and Childcare Staff (NPSP)
Source: Grants Commission 2016

FTEs Per Service Area (excluding aged care and childcare staff) as % of Total



Source: Grants Commission 2016

Conclusions



- Operating Revenue
 - Lowest Revenue per Capita
 - Lowest Total Revenue per rateable property
- Rate Revenue
 - Lowest Total Rate Revenue per Capita
 - Lowest Total Rate Revenue per rateable property
 - Lowest Total Rate Revenue per residential property
 - Lowest Total Rate Revenue per non-residential property

Conclusions



- Operating Expenditure
 - Lowest per Capita
 - Lowest per rateable property
 - Fourth highest per FTE
- Employees:
 - Lowest employee costs as % of operating expenditure
 - Lowest average employee cost per FTE
 - Lowest FTEs per 1,000 residents
 - Highest number of rateable properties per FTE (adjusted)

BRM Holdich

Level 8, 420 King William Street
Adelaide SA 5000.

Phone: 08 8168 8400
Fax: 08 8168 8499

www.brmholdich.com.au

Campbelltown City Council

10 Year Financial Plan for the Years ending 30 June 2032

STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME - GENERAL FUND

Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFP - Option K

	Actuals 2020/21 \$'000	Current Year 2021/22 \$'000	2022/23 \$'000	2023/24 \$'000	2024/25 \$'000	2025/26 \$'000	Projected Years					
							2026/27 \$'000	2027/28 \$'000	2028/29 \$'000	2029/30 \$'000	2030/31 \$'000	2031/32 \$'000
Income												
Rates	40,240	41,804	43,620	45,381	47,076	48,836	50,472	52,113	53,860	55,719	57,531	59,459
Statutory Charges	1,222	1,062	1,100	1,129	1,157	1,184	1,214	1,243	1,274	1,307	1,339	1,372
User Charges	5,745	6,386	6,599	6,771	6,928	7,088	7,260	7,428	7,607	7,798	7,979	8,172
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions	4,369	3,430	3,824	3,897	3,974	4,053	4,138	4,220	4,309	4,403	4,492	4,587
Investment Income	236	207	140	146	98	88	131	123	118	90	18	23
Reimbursements	1,263	878	908	933	955	978	1,003	1,027	1,053	1,080	1,106	1,134
Other Income	669	638	666	687	707	729	750	771	794	817	840	865
Net gain - equity accounted Council businesses	53	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	7	-
Total Income	53,797	54,409	56,857	58,944	60,895	62,957	64,967	66,925	69,016	71,219	73,312	75,612
Expenses												
Employee Costs	13,678	15,349	16,530	17,119	17,725	18,388	18,998	19,610	20,281	20,948	21,622	22,334
Materials, Contracts & Other Expenses	23,707	27,095	25,646	26,253	26,979	27,524	28,098	28,674	29,280	29,918	30,744	31,408
Depreciation, Amortisation & Impairment	13,207	13,942	15,032	15,516	16,207	16,876	17,379	17,915	18,422	18,966	19,833	20,271
Finance Costs	5	7	1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	16	12
Net loss - Equity Accounted Council Businesses	-	-	14	12	10	7	5	2	-	-	-	-
Total Expenses	50,597	56,393	57,223	58,899	60,921	62,795	64,480	66,201	67,983	69,832	72,216	74,025
Operating Surplus / (Deficit)	3,200	(1,984)	(366)	45	(26)	162	487	724	1,033	1,387	1,096	1,586
Asset Disposal & Fair Value Adjustments	(1,323)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amounts Received Specifically for New or Upgraded Assets	2,352	11,388	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Physical Resources Received Free of Charge	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Result from Discontinued Operations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net Surplus / (Deficit)	4,250	9,404	(366)	45	(26)	162	487	724	1,033	1,387	1,096	1,586
Other Comprehensive Income												
Amounts which will not be reclassified subsequently to operating result												
Changes in Revaluation Surplus - I,PP&E	68,399	12,733	24,152	19,615	18,044	18,695	19,779	19,269	20,750	21,975	21,130	22,782
Share of Other Comprehensive Income - Equity Accounted Council Businesses	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Impairment (Expense) / Recoupments Offset to Asset Revaluation Reserve	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transfer to Accumulated Surplus on Sale of Revalued I,PP&E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net assets transferred - Council restructure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amounts which will be reclassified subsequently to operating result												
Available-for-Sale Financial Instruments - Change in Fair Value	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transfer to Accumulated Surplus on Sale of Available-for-Sale Financial Instru	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Movements in Other Reserves	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Comprehensive Income	68,425	12,733	24,152	19,615	18,044	18,695	19,779	19,269	20,750	21,975	21,130	22,782
Total Comprehensive Income	72,675	22,136	23,786	19,660	18,018	18,856	20,266	19,993	21,783	23,362	22,227	24,368

Campbelltown City Council

10 Year Financial Plan for the Years ending 30 June 2032

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION - GENERAL FUND

Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFP - Option K

	Actuals	Current Year	Projected Years									
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
ASSETS												
Current Assets												
Cash & Cash Equivalents	35,635	15,653	23,985	18,776	9,253	14,497	21,894	13,360	19,108	6,341	500	6,167
Trade & Other Receivables	2,660	3,246	2,888	2,973	3,057	3,129	3,213	3,295	3,380	3,472	3,565	3,661
Other Financial Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Inventories	21	28	26	27	28	28	29	30	30	31	32	32
Other Current Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-current assets classified as "Held for Sale"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Current Assets	38,316	18,927	26,899	21,776	12,338	17,654	25,136	16,685	22,518	9,844	4,097	9,860
Non-Current Assets												
Financial Assets	262	266	255	246	238	240	241	243	247	251	256	260
Equity Accounted Investments in Council Businesses	385	388	374	362	353	346	341	339	340	344	351	351
Investment Property	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Infrastructure, Property, Plant & Equipment	677,053	718,731	734,863	760,239	788,315	802,462	815,858	844,926	861,521	898,224	930,700	946,212
Intangible Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-current assets classified as "Held for Sale"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Non-Current Assets	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140	4,140
Total Non-Current Assets	681,840	723,525	739,632	764,988	793,046	807,187	820,580	849,648	866,248	902,960	935,447	950,963
TOTAL ASSETS	720,156	742,452	766,531	786,764	805,383	824,842	845,716	866,333	888,766	912,803	939,544	960,823
LIABILITIES												
Current Liabilities												
Cash Advance Debenture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,804	-
Trade & Other Payables	7,016	6,918	6,902	7,110	7,329	7,532	7,729	7,927	8,136	8,357	8,598	8,829
Borrowings	68	51	7	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Provisions	1,890	2,090	2,335	2,589	2,852	3,125	3,407	3,698	3,999	4,310	4,630	4,962
Other Current Liabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liabilities relating to Non-Current Assets classified as "Held for Sale"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Current Liabilities	8,974	9,058	9,244	9,701	10,182	10,658	11,136	11,624	12,135	12,667	17,033	13,790
Non-Current Liabilities												
Cash Advance Debenture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trade & Other Payables	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Borrowings	59	8	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Provisions	839	965	1,079	1,196	1,317	1,443	1,574	1,708	1,847	1,991	2,139	2,292
Liability - Equity Accounted Council Businesses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Non-Current Liabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liabilities relating to Non-Current Assets classified as "Held for Sale"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Non-Current Liabilities	898	974	1,080	1,196	1,317	1,443	1,574	1,708	1,847	1,991	2,139	2,292
TOTAL LIABILITIES	9,872	10,032	10,324	10,897	11,499	12,101	12,710	13,332	13,982	14,658	19,172	16,082
Net Assets	710,284	732,420	756,206	775,866	793,884	812,741	833,007	853,000	874,783	898,146	920,372	944,741
EQUITY												
Accumulated Surplus	125,418	147,394	135,732	126,188	120,779	112,911	103,462	108,585	99,943	92,639	99,314	100,887
Asset Revaluation Reserves	521,483	534,216	558,368	577,983	596,027	614,721	634,500	653,769	674,520	696,495	717,625	740,407
Available for Sale Financial Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Reserves	63,383	50,811	62,107	71,696	77,079	85,109	95,045	90,646	100,321	109,012	103,434	103,447
Total Equity	710,284	732,420	756,206	775,866	793,884	812,741	833,007	853,000	874,783	898,146	920,372	944,741

Campbelltown City Council
10 Year Financial Plan for the Years ending 30 June 2032
STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS - GENERAL FUND
Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFF - Option K

	Actuals 2020/21 \$'000	Current Year 2021/22 \$'000	2022/23 \$'000	2023/24 \$'000	2024/25 \$'000	2025/26 \$'000	Projected Years		2026/27 \$'000	2027/28 \$'000	2028/29 \$'000	2029/30 \$'000	2030/31 \$'000	2031/32 \$'000
Cash Flows from Operating Activities														
Receipts:														
Rates Receipts	40,440	41,334	43,699	45,457	47,150	48,912	50,544	52,185	53,936	55,800	57,610	59,543		
Statutory Charges	1,222	1,035	1,095	1,126	1,153	1,181	1,210	1,239	1,270	1,303	1,335	1,368		
User Charges	6,246	6,084	6,572	6,750	6,908	7,068	7,238	7,407	7,585	7,774	7,956	8,147		
Grants, Subsidies and Contributions (operating purpose)	4,369	3,206	4,217	3,894	3,971	4,050	4,135	4,218	4,306	4,400	4,489	4,584		
Investment Receipts	236	213	142	146	99	89	130	123	118	91	20	23		
Reimbursements	1,385	858	905	930	953	976	1,000	1,024	1,050	1,077	1,103	1,130		
Other	3,270	617	663	684	705	726	747	768	791	814	837	862		
Payments:														
Payments to Employees	(13,758)	(15,051)	(16,131)	(16,729)	(17,321)	(17,968)	(18,567)	(19,165)	(19,819)	(20,472)	(21,132)	(21,827)		
Payments for Materials, Contracts & Other Expenses	(25,652)	(26,711)	(25,779)	(26,197)	(26,912)	(27,474)	(28,045)	(28,621)	(29,224)	(29,859)	(30,668)	(31,347)		
Finance Payments	(5)	(6)	(1)	(0)	(0)	-	-	-	-	-	(16)	(12)		
Net Cash provided (or used in) Operating Activities	17,753	11,579	15,381	16,062	16,706	17,560	18,391	19,178	20,012	20,928	21,533	22,472		
Cash Flows from Investing Activities														
Receipts:														
Amounts Received Specifically for New/Upgraded Assets	3,760	11,388	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sale of Replaced Assets	310	539	267	275	281	288	295	302	310	318	326	334		
Sale of Surplus Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Sale of Investment Property	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Sale of Non Current Assets "Held for Sale"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Net Disposal of Investment Securities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Sale of Real Estate Developments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Sale of Intangible Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Repayments of Loans by Community Groups	-	7	12	12	12	12	2	2	2	-	-	-		
Sale of Interests in Joint Ventures & Associates	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Distributions Received from Equity Accounted Council Businesses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Other Investing Activity Receipts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Payments:														
Expenditure on Renewal/Replacement of Assets	(8,229)	(23,627)	(4,915)	(7,124)	(12,036)	(10,072)	(8,684)	(23,572)	(10,023)	(11,570)	(26,723)	(8,436)		
Expenditure on New/Upgraded Assets	(4,750)	(19,800)	(2,364)	(14,427)	(14,485)	(2,544)	(2,607)	(4,444)	(4,554)	(22,443)	(4,781)	(4,899)		
Purchase of Investment Property	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Net Purchase of Investment Securities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Development of Real Estate for Sale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Expenditure on Intangible Assets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Loans Made to Community Groups	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Purchase of Interests in Equity Accounted Council Businesses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Capital Contributed to Equity Accounted Council Businesses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Other Investing Activity Payments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Net Cash provided (or used in) Investing Activities	(8,909)	(31,492)	(6,999)	(21,264)	(26,227)	(12,316)	(10,994)	(27,712)	(14,265)	(33,695)	(31,178)	(13,001)		
Cash Flows from Financing Activities														
Receipts:														
Proceeds from CAD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,804	-	
Proceeds from Borrowings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Receipt of Funds from Leases	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Proceeds from Aged Care Facility Deposits	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Proceeds from Bonds & Deposits	149	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Receipts from Other Financing Activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Payments:														
Repayments of CAD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(3,804)	
Repayments of Borrowings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Repayment of Principal Portion of Lease Liabilities	(100)	(68)	(51)	(7)	(2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Repayment of Aged Care Facility Deposits	(246)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Repayment of Bonds & Deposits	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Payments of Other Financing Activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Net Cash Flow provided (used in) Financing Activities	(197)	(68)	(51)	(7)	(2)	-	-	-	-	-	3,804	(3,804)		
Net Increase/(Decrease) in Cash & Cash Equivalents	8,647	(19,982)	8,331	(5,209)	(9,523)	5,244	7,397	(8,534)	5,747	(12,767)	(5,841)	5,667		
plus: Cash & Cash Equivalents - beginning of year	26,988	35,635	15,653	23,985	18,776	9,253	14,497	21,894	13,360	19,108	6,341	500		
Cash & Cash Equivalents - end of the year	35,635	15,653	23,985	18,776	9,253	14,497	21,894	13,360	19,108	6,341	500	6,167		
Cash & Cash Equivalents - end of the year	35,635	15,653	23,985	18,776	9,253	14,497	21,894	13,360	19,108	6,341	500	6,167		
Investments - end of the year	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Cash, Cash Equivalents & Investments - end of the year	35,635	15,653	23,985	18,776	9,253	14,497	21,894	13,360	19,108	6,341	500	6,167		

Campbelltown City Council

10 Year Financial Plan for the Years ending 30 June 2032

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN EQUITY - GENERAL FUND

Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFP - Option K

	Actuals 2020/21 \$'000	Current Year 2021/22 \$'000	2022/23 \$'000	2023/24 \$'000	2024/25 \$'000	2025/26 \$'000	Projected Years		2026/27 \$'000	2027/28 \$'000	2028/29 \$'000	2029/30 \$'000	2030/31 \$'000	2031/32 \$'000
Opening Balance	637,609	710,284	732,420	756,206	775,866	793,884	812,741	833,007	853,000	874,783	898,146	920,372		
Net Surplus / (Deficit) for Year	4,250	9,404	(366)	45	(26)	162	487	724	1,033	1,387	1,096	1,586		
Other Comprehensive Income														
- Gain (Loss) on Revaluation of I,PP&E	68,400	12,733	24,152	19,615	18,044	18,695	19,779	19,269	20,750	21,975	21,130	22,782		
- Available for Sale Financial Instruments: change in fair value	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Impairment (loss) reversal relating to I,PP&E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Transfer to Accumulated Surplus on Sale of I,PP&E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Transfer to Acc. Surplus on Sale of AFS Financial Instruments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Share of OCI - Equity Accounted Council Businesses	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other Equity Adjustments - Equity Accounted Council Businesses	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other Movements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Comprehensive Income	68,425	12,733	24,152	19,615	18,044	18,695	19,779	19,269	20,750	21,975	21,130	22,782		
Total Comprehensive Income	72,675	22,136	23,786	19,660	18,018	18,856	20,266	19,993	21,783	23,362	22,227	24,368		
Transfers between Equity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equity - Balance at end of the reporting period	710,284	732,420	756,206	775,866	793,884	812,741	833,007	853,000	874,783	898,146	920,372	944,741		

Campbelltown City Council

10 Year Financial Plan for the Years ending 30 June 2032

UNIFORM PRESENTATION OF FINANCES - GENERAL FUND

	Actuals 2020/21 \$'000	Current Year 2021/22 \$'000	2022/23 \$'000	2023/24 \$'000	2024/25 \$'000	2025/26 \$'000	Projected Years					
							2026/27 \$'000	2027/28 \$'000	2028/29 \$'000	2029/30 \$'000	2030/31 \$'000	2031/32 \$'000
Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFP - Option K												
Operating Activities												
Income	53,797	54,409	56,857	58,944	60,895	62,957	64,967	66,925	69,016	71,219	73,312	75,612
less Expenses	(50,597)	(56,393)	(57,223)	(58,899)	(60,921)	(62,795)	(64,480)	(66,201)	(67,983)	(69,832)	(72,216)	(74,025)
Operating Surplus / (Deficit)	3,200	(1,984)	(366)	45	(26)	162	487	724	1,033	1,387	1,096	1,586
Capital Activities												
less (Net Outlays) on Existing Assets												
Capital Expenditure on Renewal and Replacement of Existing Assets	(8,229)	(23,627)	(4,915)	(7,124)	(12,036)	(10,072)	(8,684)	(23,572)	(10,023)	(11,570)	(26,723)	(8,436)
add back Depreciation, Amortisation and Impairment	13,207	13,942	15,032	15,516	16,207	16,876	17,379	17,915	18,422	18,966	19,833	20,271
add back Proceeds from Sale of Replaced Assets	310	539	267	275	281	288	295	302	310	318	326	334
(Net Outlays) on Existing Assets	5,288	(9,146)	10,384	8,667	4,453	7,092	8,989	(5,355)	8,709	7,715	(6,564)	12,169
less (Net Outlays) on New and Upgraded Assets												
Capital Expenditure on New and Upgraded Assets (including Investment Property & Real Estate Developments)	(4,750)	(19,800)	(2,364)	(14,427)	(14,485)	(2,544)	(2,607)	(4,444)	(4,554)	(22,443)	(4,781)	(4,899)
add back Amounts Received Specifically for New and Upgraded Assets	3,760	11,388	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
add back Proceeds from Sale of Surplus Assets (including Investment Property & and Real Estate Developments)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
(Net Outlays) on New and Upgraded Assets	(990)	(8,412)	(2,364)	(14,427)	(14,485)	(2,544)	(2,607)	(4,444)	(4,554)	(22,443)	(4,781)	(4,899)
Net Lending / (Borrowing) for Financial Year	7,498	(19,542)	7,654	(5,716)	(10,058)	4,709	6,870	(9,074)	5,188	(13,341)	(10,249)	8,857

Campbelltown City Council
10 Year Financial Plan for the Years ending 30 June 2032
KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - GENERAL FUND
Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFP - Option K

Scenario: DRAFT 2022/2023 LTFP - Option K			Current Year 2021/22	Projected Years									
				2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
				<div><div></div> Within green benchmark (green min and/or green max)</div> <div><div></div> Within amber benchmark (amber min and/or amber max)</div> <div><div></div> Not within benchmark (amber min and/or amber max)</div>				<div><div></div> Within green benchmark</div> <div><div></div> above green maximum and below amber maximum</div> <div><div></div> below green minimum and above amber minimum</div> <div><div></div> above amber maximum</div> <div><div></div> below amber minimum</div>					
Council's Target Benchmarks													
Note 15 Ratios													
Operating Surplus Ratio	Snapshot		<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
	Actual Ratio		-3.65%	-0.64%	0.08%	-0.04%	0.26%	0.75%	1.08%	1.50%	1.95%	1.50%	2.10%
Adjusted Operating Surplus Ratio	Snapshot		<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
	Actual Ratio		-3.65%	-0.64%	0.08%	-0.04%	0.26%	0.75%	1.08%	1.50%	1.95%	1.50%	2.10%
Net Financial Liabilities Ratio	Snapshot		<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
	Actual Ratio		-16.79%	-29.55%	-18.83%	-1.72%	-9.16%	-19.45%	-5.33%	-12.68%	6.45%	20.26%	7.93%
Asset Renewal Funding Ratio	Snapshot		<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
	Actual Ratio		415.60%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	103.73%	123.84%	100.00%	100.00%
Interest Cover Ratio	Snapshot		<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
	Actual Ratio		-0.37%	-0.25%	-0.25%	-0.16%	-0.14%	-0.20%	-0.18%	-0.17%	-0.13%	0.00%	-0.01%
Asset Consumption Ratio	Snapshot		<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
	Actual Ratio		55.40%	54.23%	53.89%	53.76%	52.77%	51.71%	51.51%	50.52%	50.49%	50.24%	49.03%

Have your say:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

Project Summary

Campbelltown City Council (CCC) has put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal (the Proposal) to the Boundaries Commission (a State Government body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister) to review the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC).

CCC proposes moving the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety. *See map included in this information pack.*

There are currently 573 properties (3.3% of total AHC properties) that are within the proposed Boundary Change Zone.

AHC does not have a formal position on the Proposal yet as we'd like your feedback on what you think about it first. Please take a moment to read this information sheet and complete the short survey.

Your feedback is important and AHC will compile it into a report for consideration by AHC Council Members, at this stage planned for early 2020.

How you can have your say

- Complete the hard copy survey attached, place it in the enclosed free return-paid envelope and post it back to us before Sunday 8 December 2019 (you don't need a postage stamp)
- Scan the survey and email it to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- Head to our website engage.ahc.sa.gov.au and complete the online survey

Survey closes Sunday 8 December 2019

We are here to help

If you've got a question, want additional hard copy surveys, or further information about the Boundary Change Proposal please get in touch with our team.



engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au



(08) 8408 0587

Boundary Change Proposal Map



Important information

Please note this survey is only intended for people over 18 years of age who live, work, or own a property in the proposed Boundary Change Zone. All names and addresses will be cross checked against the electoral role and council's database, and any identifying data will be kept strictly confidential.

Further detailed information is available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au, and additional hard copies of the survey can be requested by calling (08) 8408 0587 or emailing engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au.

This is just the beginning

This is the start of a comprehensive review process which will be undertaken by CCC and the Boundaries Commission. Adelaide Hills Council has no formal role to play in the process at this time. No decision has been made yet and the final decision lies with the Minister for Local Government.

Step 1 - Potential Proposal (January 2019)

Consideration of CCC's initial proposal by Boundaries Commission

Approved by Boundaries Commission to progress to next stage



Step 2 - General Proposal

CCC prepares general proposal for Boundaries Commission

CCC undertakes consultation with the community

Current
status



Step 3 (if proposal continues) - Investigation by Commission

Boundaries Commission assesses the proposal using an independent investigator

CCC must agree to the cost of the investigation

Criteria to be assessed include financial and resource implications and community support



Step 4 - Report to Minister

Boundaries Commission prepares a report for the Minister explaining recommendations

Published on Boundaries Commission website

Minister may make suggestions for further consideration



Step 5 - Decision

Minister decides whether proposal will proceed or not

Overview of the Boundary Change Proposal

We've summarised some of the key points of interest between AHC and CCC. If the information you are looking for is not covered here, take a look on our website, ahc.sa.gov.au, or call our Customer Service Team on 8408 0400.

	Adelaide Hills Council	Campbelltown City Council
Total population <i>Total number of people living in whole council area at 2018 Census.</i>	39,734 (0.50 persons per hectare)	51,469 (21.13 persons per hectare)
Land area <i>Total land size of whole council area.</i>	79,498 hectares	2,436 hectares
Electors* <i>The number of people living in the council area who are entitled to vote in Council elections.</i>	29,500 electors	35,000 electors
Council structure	One Mayor 12 Council Members Two Wards	One Mayor 10 Council Members Five Wards
Representation quota <i>The number of electors divided by all Council Members</i>	One Council Member represents 2,261 electors	One Council Member represents 3,183 electors
Annual Council Rates <i>Rate charged annually.</i>	AHC's rating structure consists of a Fixed Charge of \$662 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.002469. <i>If rating structures remained the same, most residents within the proposed Boundary Change Zone would receive a reduction in annual rates ranging from approximately \$22 to \$450.</i>	CCC's rating structure consists of a Minimum Rate of \$984 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.003050.
Planning and Development	There is a new Planning and Design Code being developed by the State Government which comes into effect on 1 July 2020. More details about planning and development comparison can be found overleaf.	
Minimum site area <i>For a detached dwelling</i>	The average minimum allowable site size in the AHC parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde (including Hamilton Hill) is 703m ² . <i>There is no suggestion, at this time, that either council would pursue changes to reduce allotment sizes in the Boundary Change Zone.</i>	In the CCC part of Rostrevor and Magill the average minimum site size is 350m ² .
Open space and civil services <i>Roads, footpaths, signs, street lights, parks, ovals, playgrounds, cemeteries.</i>	There are no noticeable differences in terms of open space and civil services functions and services between AHC and CCC.	

* The number of electors is obtained from the Electoral Commission of SA and the source date is 28 February 2018.

Environmental sustainability	AHC and CCC have both declared a climate emergency, and both councils have a number of sustainability initiatives.	
Kerbside bins	East Waste collects general waste weekly and recycling and green organics waste on alternating fortnights in both council areas.	
Green organics drop off days	AHC organises a number of free green organics drop off days throughout the year for residents.	CCC does not host free green organics drop off days.
Hard waste	Both AHC and CCC offer one 'at call' hard waste collection per property each financial year.	
Resource Recovery Centres	Residents can go to any resource recovery centre (including those outside of their council district). Each council has one resource recovery centre.	
School zones <i>In relation to which schools children are entitled to attend based on their residence.</i>	Catchment areas are not limited to council boundaries and are set by the State Government Department of Education.	
Community grants	In 2017-18 AHC awarded \$219,000 in funding through its grant program.	In 2017-18 CCC awarded \$41,341 in funding through its grant program.
Regulatory matters <i>This includes local laws established by councils to deal with issues specific to the relevant council area.</i>	There are no noticeable differences in regulatory matters between AHC and CCC except regarding domestic cats. In AHC cats must be confined to their owner's property from 1 January 2022. More information at ahc.sa.gov.au/council/delegations-and-by-laws .	

Need more information? Visit each council's website

	ahc.sa.gov.au	campbelltown.sa.gov.au
Council documents <i>Annual Reports, Strategic Plans, policies</i>	Council > Council Documents	Council > Documents and Publications
Community services <i>Youth, volunteering, diversity, seniors</i>	Community	Community
Community grants	Council > Grants and Tenders	Community > Grants
Regulatory matters <i>Local laws and rules</i>	Council > Delegations and By-laws	Council > Documents and Publications
Sport and recreation	Community > Sport and Recreation	Recreation and Leisure
Civil Services	Resident > Roads, Streetscapes, Works	Services > Capital Works Program
Environmental sustainability	Environment > Sustainability	Environment
Rates and property	Resident > Rates and Property	Council > Rates

Further information available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Planning and Development

The South Australian planning system is changing on 1 July 2020. A new Planning and Design Code (P&D Code) will become the single source of planning policy for assessing development applications across the state.

What does this mean if the boundary change proposal was to proceed?

The new P&D Code being developed by the State Government will replace all council development plans. The new Code means that planning policy will be standardised across council boundaries (this includes AHC and CCC).

Any changes to zonings in either council district after 1 July 2020 would require public consultation as well as Ministerial approval.

For further information about specific development controls applicable under the proposed P&D Code, please contact the P&D Code Free Hotline on 1800 318 102, or review the new P&D Code at sapanningportal.sa.gov.au.

What happens to development applications submitted before 1 July 2020?

The current planning rules will stay the same before 1 July 2020. Any planning application submitted before that time will be assessed under the current planning rules.

Current planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC:

	AHC		CCC
	Woodforde and Rostrevor	Hamilton Hill	Rostrevor and Magill
Site area The minimum size of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	Ranges from 929-1,000m ²	180m ²	Ranges from 350-500m ²
Frontage width The minimum width of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	21 metres	8 metres	Ranges from 7-20 metres
Front setback The minimum distance from the road to the house	6 metres	3 metres	5 metres
Rear setback The minimum distance from the back of the house to the back fence	4 metres	4 metres	4 metres
Site coverage The maximum percentage that a site can be covered by a dwelling	40%	60%	50%
Building height The maximum height allowed for a building	6 metres wall height	3 storeys	8.5 metres

Planning and Design Code Information Session

If you are interested in learning more about the SA Planning Reform please come along to our free Information Session.

Wednesday 27 November 2019 | 6:30pm - 8:00pm

Kelty Theatre, Rostrevor College

Register: planning-forum-woodforde.eventbrite.com.au or call 8408 0400

Survey:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Name _____ Year of birth: _____

Postal address _____

Email _____ Phone: _____

Are you a (tick all that apply)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Property owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tenant | <input type="checkbox"/> Business owner | |

Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (tick one)

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> No preference |

Why do you say that?

What are your areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal? (tick your top three)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning and development | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual Council Rates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Footpaths, road and park maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community services | <input type="checkbox"/> Council rules and regulations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental sustainability | <input type="checkbox"/> Community grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Level of representation (number of electors represented by each Council Member) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council to consider?

If you need more space please use the back of this page or attach additional pages.

Please place your completed survey in the free reply-paid envelope provided and into your nearest mailbox, or scan and email to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au by 8 December 2019.

2020



Adelaide Hills
COUNCIL



COUNCIL BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL

SURVEY OUTCOMES REPORT

Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey Analysis

Quick summary	2
Purpose of this report	2
Background	2
Snapshot of results	2
1. Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone	3
2. Survey approach	4
What we asked	4
Distribution	4
Survey pack contents	4
3. Survey responses	7
4. Boundary change proposal analysis	8
Overarching sentiment	8
Survey responses by age bracket	9
Survey response by location	10
5. Survey findings – Rostrevor	12
Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal	13
Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal	14
6. Survey findings - Woodforde	21
Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal	22
Woodforde respondents against the boundary change proposal	23
7. Respondents from suburbs outside	26
8. Notes about survey	27
Survey parameters	27
9. Appendix A	28

Quick summary

Purpose of this report

This report contains a summary of feedback received as part of the Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey undertaken in November/ December 2019. The intention is for a summary document and this longer report to be made available to anyone who participated in the survey.

Background

In January 2019 Campbelltown City Council (CCC) put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal to the Boundaries Commission for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

A community information meeting was held by AHC at Rostrevor College on 3 September for anyone who wanted to know more about the Council Boundary Change Proposal. The community meeting was attended by approximately 122 members of the local community. A copy of the presentation and minutes from the meeting can be accessed here:

<https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview2>

In September 2019 AHC decided to undertake a survey of residents and ratepayers of the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde affected by the CCC boundary change proposal. The purpose of the survey was to determine the level of support for the proposal in the community.

In November 2019 AHC residents and ratepayers in Woodforde and Rostrevor were invited to complete a short survey about the Council Boundary Change Proposal. The survey was accompanied with a document setting out key information relating to the potential impacts of the proposed boundary change.

The survey was available online from the AHC website and in hard-copy from 25 November 2019 until 8 December 2019 for those invited to participate.

Snapshot of results

We received 268 survey responses during the consultation. Here's a snapshot of the feedback received:

- 65% of all respondents are against the boundary change proposal
- 28% of respondents are in favour of it
- 7% are undecided or have no preference
- A large majority (81%) of **Rostrevor** respondents are against boundary change and 15% are in favour
- A small majority of **Woodforde** residents and those living in other Council areas (i.e. absentee landlords) who responded to the survey indicated that they are against boundary change (52%), balanced against an average of 39% being in favour.
- The key issues of interest for those **against** boundary change are: planning and development, environmental sustainability, council rules and regulations and climate change.
- For those in **favour** of boundary reform the key issues of interest are: community services, rates, footpaths, road and park maintenance.

1. Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone

CCC proposes to move the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone



2. Survey approach

In November 2019 Adelaide Hills Council residents and ratepayers in Woodforde and Rostrevor (including absentee landlords) were invited to complete a short survey about the Council Boundary Change Proposal.

The survey was available online from the AHC website and in hard-copy from 25 November 2019 until 8 December 2019.

What we asked

- Name, address, phone and year of birth
- Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (yes/ no/ undecided/ no preference)
- Why do you say that?
- What are your top three areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal?
- Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council?

Distribution

The survey was distributed by hand via a third party distribution company to all properties in the proposed boundary change zone (including residents and businesses). In addition, the survey was also posted to all property owners who had a postal address outside the boundary change zone (i.e. absentee landlords).

Survey pack contents


The survey pack included a fold-out information sheet, single page survey and reply-paid envelope (Refer to Appendix A).

The fold-out information sheet contained:

- Project summary
- Boundary change proposal map
- Boundary change process diagram
- Overview of key points of interest between AHC and CCC
- Links to policies and reports on each council's website
- Planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC.

To help the survey pack stand out amongst other mail it was packaged in a brightly designed envelope (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Survey pack distributed to boundary change zone



Adelaide Hills COUNCIL

Survey:
Council Boundary Change Proposal

This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Name _____ Year of birth: _____

Postal address _____

Email _____ Phone: _____

Are you a (tick all that apply)

☐ Resident ☐ Property owner ☐ Other: _____

☐ Tenant ☐ Business owner

Do you support the Council Boundary Change proposal? (tick one)

☐ Yes ☐ No

Why do you say that?

What are your areas of interest? (tick all that apply)

☐ Plains ☐ Campbelltown ☐ Forest Hill ☐ Commis ☐ Res

Have your say: Council Boundary Change Proposal

Have your say!

Adelaide Hills COUNCIL


For the resident
Council Boundary Change Proposal

If you have any comments, please email info@ahc.sa.gov.au or scan and

engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

The survey and accompanying background information was also made available online on our engagement portal engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Figure 3: Engagement website home page



The screenshot shows the Adelaide Hills Council website's engagement portal for the Council Boundary Change Proposal survey. The page features a navigation bar with links to 'All consultations', 'All projects', 'Visit our website', 'Home', and a search bar. The main heading is 'Council Boundary Change Proposal - Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill Community Survey'. A 'Welcome' section thanks participants and mentions that feedback has been captured. A 'Project background' section explains the Council's role and the survey's purpose. A map shows the proposed boundary change zone, highlighting Rostrevor, Woodforde, and Hamilton Hill. A 'Document Library' on the right lists various documents, including a survey overview, downloadable survey boundary change proposal, and community meeting presentations. A 'Key Dates' section states the survey closes on 08 December 2019. A 'Life Cycle' section outlines the stages: Stage 1 - Potential Proposal, Stage 2 - General Proposal, and Investigation by Commission. A 'SURVEY AND REGISTRATION' button is visible, and a notice at the bottom states 'CLOSED: This survey has concluded. Boundary Change Proposal Survey 2019'.

Participants could also choose to register online to be kept informed about the project via email updates.

3. Survey responses

As shown in Table 1, 268 people completed the survey during the engagement timeframe (25 November to 8 December 2019).

Table 1: Survey response type

Survey response type	Number
Online engage.ahc.sa.gov.au	174
Hard copy Posted back to Council or hand delivered to Customer Service Centre	76
Emailed as attachment engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au	18
Total	268

When looking at the location of respondents there were:

- 126 respondents in Rostrevor (47% of the total number of survey respondents)
- 109 respondents in Woodforde (41% of the total number of survey respondents)
- 33 respondents from other suburbs (12% of the total number of survey respondents).

Response numbers by location are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4: Map of responses



4. Boundary change proposal analysis

All responses received by 8 December were analysed (including emails, hard copy surveys and online responses).

Overarching sentiment

Across all survey responses, 65% are against the boundary reform proposal, which represents a majority. However it should be noted that there are clear differences between Rostrevor and Woodforde respondents.

Respondents from Rostrevor are against boundary reform by a large majority.

These percentages are underpinned by the detailed survey analysis and feedback from open response questions stemming from Rostrevor.

Responses from Woodforde fall into two groups:

- Respondents who feel similarly to Rostrevor respondents against boundary reform and cite similar concerns and issues
- Respondents who support boundary reform.

The numbers of respondents in Woodforde against boundary reform still outweigh those in favour (52% against versus 39% in favour).

The overall tone of feedback received, with some exceptions, in responses from Woodforde and other suburbs is also considered less emphatic and impassioned compared to responses from Rostrevor.


The key issues of interest for those against boundary reform are planning and development, environmental sustainability, council rules and regulations and climate change.

For those in favour of boundary reform, it is community services, rates, footpaths, road and park maintenance.

The analysis to follow provides detailed findings and insights.

Figure 5: Overall survey results


Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal?



Survey responses by age bracket

We briefly assessed responses by age of respondents. As shown in Figure 6, the highest response rate was from Generation X (those born between 1960 – 1979). 16 people did not provide their age.

Figure 6: Response rate by age



While there was some variation by age group, with residents born in the 70s and 80s being most in favour of boundary reform, the overall age distribution of respondents was similar across the suburbs and the overall pattern of opinions and preferences expressed by respondents remained consistent across the age groups (refer to Table 2).

Table 2: Response sentiment by age

Date of birth	Total	In favour of boundary reform	Against boundary reform	Undecided	No preference
1920 - 1929	3	0	3 (100%)	0	0
1930 - 1939	18	3 (17%)	14 (77%)	0	1 (6%)
1940 - 1949	34	7 (21%)	23 (68%)	4 (11%)	0
1950 - 1959	43	14 (34%)	28 (64%)	1 (2%)	0
1960 - 1969	52	15 (30%)	35 (67%)	2 (3%)	0
1970 - 1979	52	18 (35%)	29 (56%)	3 (6%)	2 (3%)
1980 - 1989	31	12 (39%)	18 (58%)	1 (3%)	0
1990 - 1999	18	4 (22%)	14 (78%)	0	0
2000 - 2009	1	0	1 (100%)	0	0
No date of birth given	16	3 (19%)	11 (69%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
TOTAL	268	76 (28%)	176 (65%)	12 (5%)	4 (2%)

Survey response by location

A review of survey responses found that an analysis of findings by suburb best reflects respondent sentiments and enables clear identification of the key themes of interest and / or concern. Our analysis has been divided into:

- Responses from Rostrevor
- Responses from Woodforde
- Responses from other suburbs (landlords who have a post address outside the boundary change proposal zone i.e. absentee landlords)

Table 3: Response number by location


Suburb	Response number
Rostrevor	126
Woodforde	109
Other suburbs	33
TOTAL	268

As indicated by Figure 7, 81% of respondents in Rostrevor have indicated they are against boundary change, 15% are in favour and 4% are undecided or have no preference.

This compares to a more even distribution of opinion from Woodforde residents, with 52% of respondents indicating they are against boundary change balanced against 39% being in favour and 9% being undecided or indicating they have no preference.

Of the 33 respondents in other suburbs 45% indicated they were in favour of the boundary change, 52% against the boundary change and 3% undecided.

Figure 7: Response Sentiment by Location



5. Survey findings – Rostrevor

There were 126 responses from residents/ businesses in Rostrevor. Of these 19 were in favour of the boundary change proposal, 102 were against the boundary change proposal, 3 undecided and 2 had no preference (Refer to Table 4).

Table 4: Rostrevor responses

	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Rostrevor	126	19 (15%)	102 (81%)	3 (3%)	2 (1%)

As part of the boundary change survey, respondents were asked to indicate their top three areas of interest about the proposal.

The responses for Rostrevor are summarised below and the boxes shaded, in Table 5, indicate issues that are of interest to the majority of respondents.

Environmental sustainability and climate change are not nominated by those in favour of the boundary change proposal. Instead, those in favour of the boundary change proposal are focussed on community services and footpaths, roads and park maintenance.

Table 5: Rostrevor Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	9	95
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	13	13
Community services	18	10
Environmental sustainability	-	81
Annual council rates	8	12
Climate change	-	26
Council rules and regulations	2	29
Community grants	-	-
Level of representation	-	2

As shown in the survey analysis for Woodforde (see section 6 below), the issues of interest follow the same pattern.

Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal

Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal raise two issues:

- Geographic location
- Level of support

It is worth noting the respondent responses are less emotive and shorter than for those against boundary change.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Geographic location

Respondents felt that the location of this pocket of Rostrevor is disconnected by distance from the rest of the Adelaide Hills and is instead, directly connected to the CCC. As a result, respondents stated the services provided by the CCC are closer and easier to access than those in the hills.

"Living at the base on the hills at Rostrevor, I feel closer engaged to the Campbelltown community. All council services at Campbelltown are within minutes, where the Adelaide Hills Council services are a 30min plus drive into the hills."

"If you stepped back and drew the council lines again, common sense would say that Rostrevor is within Campbelltown Council."

"These properties are logically connected to Campbelltown City Council not the Adelaide Hills council due to both their proximity and their nature (i.e. contiguous with other residential areas within the Greater Adelaide region, and they are residential blocks rather than larger rural properties)."

Level of support

A small number of respondents stated they have had little engagement with AHC and that requests for assistance or services have met with no support or response.

"Adelaide Hills Council seems not to hear when I call for assistance."

"We don't feel that we get any support from or use services provided by the Adelaide Hills Council."

"We have had little almost no contact from Adelaide Hills Council since living in the area (20 years) and there has been no assistance, beautification or upgrade of footpath/verge."

The following additional points were reiterated and emphasised in the final open response question of the survey:

- CCC services are closer and more readily accessible and the location of the suburb means it is more logical to be part of Campbelltown and not AHC.
- There is a perception amongst respondents that AHC focusses less effort and spend on the foothills suburbs – and that the residents in these areas are neglected / ignored / poorly understood.

Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal

The themes raised by Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal are highly consistent and are summarised below. Examples of the feedback obtained in the open response question about boundary change are also included to provide a sense of the flavour of the feedback.

It should be noted that there were more comments against the boundary change from Rostrevor than in support and this is why this section of the report is larger than other sections.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

The top themes raised align with the issues of interest nominated, that is, planning and development and environmental sustainability. The themes are listed in priority order.

Planning and development

It is strongly felt by respondents that the CCC has very different policies, principles and perspectives towards sub-division and development when compared to AHC. The CCC is perceived to be pro-development, irrespective of the character of the neighbourhood, with a track record of rezoning to reduce block sizes, reduce green spaces and tree canopy and enable sub-divisions and high density development. The potential for this to occur in this part of Rostrevor, should boundary change proceed, is by far the most significant issue of concern to respondents.

Respondents provided examples of development on the boundary of the AHC area which they feel are “typical” of what is allowed by CCC – and which they do not wish to see in the AHC portion of Rostrevor - such as the Chapel Estate development, townhouse and infill developments on Arcoona Avenue and the construction of large new houses in close proximity to each other and with little surrounding green space in the Yalpara Avenue area. The fact these developments have been allowed on the “doorstep” of the portion of Rostrevor that sits within AHC is viewed as evidence that a change to council boundaries would see the spread of such development.

Respondents also favourably referenced the opposition shown by AHC to development at the end of Wandilla Drive and expressed they did not feel the CCC would hold this position.

Some respondents stated they used to live in the CCC and personally experienced the increased rate of development and sub-division in their former neighbourhood. This was a driver for them to move away. Purchasing a property within the AHC area was furthermore seen as a form of “security” against overdevelopment. Respondents believe AHC has a strong track record of protecting the character of its semi-rural areas and resisting the opportunities presented by property developers in favour of protecting the Hills Face Zone, existing green spaces, large block sizes and low housing density.

It is understood that the CCC has sought to reassure residents that the area will continue to be protected from sub-divisions and development if the boundary change goes ahead, but it is fair to say the majority of survey respondents feel this is a somewhat “empty promise”, that will likely to be upheld for a short amount of time but then overturned.

Respondents therefore felt that a change to the CCC would cause a significant qualitative deterioration to the portion of Rostrevor currently within the AHC area.

Respondents also referenced the new state planning system and the uncertainty this brings. It is felt the protection of sensitive areas such as this portion of Rostrevor will, more than ever before, require residents and other groups to champion that protection. Respondents also made it clear the support from AHC is very important to them as they have to date seen the organisation as agreeing with and endorsing the efforts of residents to retain the bush-like amenity of the area. The expectation is therefore that AHC will continue to do this into the future.

"The Morialta area only looks like it does today because, over a period of more than fifty years, the residents and the Adelaide Hills Council (and its precursor) have worked together to create that bush-like area by planting thousands of trees and shrubs; by paying to have our electrical wires undergrounded; and by, every now and then, having to fight off inappropriate development by developers who don't give a toss about what happens to the area, as long as they make a quick buck."

"We are deeply concerned that the Campbelltown Council will allow development and subdivision of allotments which are currently subject to Adelaide Hills Council development regulations and approval processes."

"I am appalled at the rate of subdivision and overdevelopment through Campbelltown Council area in the last 2-5 years or so, and have very little faith that the strategic plan and vision for Campbelltown Council in any way aligns with the semi-rural nature of my area, particularly the zone behind Morialta."

"I have great concerns that our beautiful neighbourhood is going to be subject to the tiny blocks and subdivision that Campbelltown is known for."

"We do not agree with the minimum property zones Campbelltown consents to. We have already received a notice from a building development company interested in purchasing and subdividing our land."

"We love that the homes around us in Rostrevor have a minimum 1000m² and plenty of green space."

"Adelaide Hills Council acknowledges the unique area known locally as 'Morialta', and demonstrates its commitment to preserving its unique character by stating principles of development control, including low density detached housing, with detached dwellings requiring a minimum frontage of 20m and semi-detached 18m. This demonstrates the Adelaide Hills Council's appreciation and commitment to maintaining the character of the policy area, which is in line with what we as residents desire and expect in this distinct and environmentally beautiful area."

The semi-rural characteristics of the suburb are aligned with the broader Adelaide Hills Council area

Respondents expressed a strong sense that the area is unique and the priority should be to preserve its characteristics and surrounding green spaces, which align closely to those of the AHC.

Respondents felt AHC has resident and environmental interests in mind with its approach to planning and development decisions and zoning.

Respondents did not feel that CCC would take into account resident preferences and feedback or environmental considerations. Further to this respondents felt that this portion of Rostrevor, if it were to be absorbed within the CCC, would be a “minority” within the context of the whole council area and its needs would therefore be seen as being at odds with the urbanised majority – and therefore likely to be glossed over and ignored.

“I truly believe that, while we are only 12km from the city, the true nature of the area surrounding Morialta in the affected zones of Rostrevor and Woodforde are not “metropolitan”, but rather are much more aligned with the nature of property types and landscape through the Adelaide Hills Council area.”

“This pocket (aside from Hamilton Hill) is a hills environment which has a completely different feel, community and environment to the suburbia that is the whole of the Campbelltown City Council area. Just cross any street that marks the council boundary and you enter a different world.”

“The overwhelming sentiment is that residents are happy with Adelaide Hills Council, who have historically backed the area in environmental and other matters. We DO NOT want this change.”

“I enjoy being part of the Adelaide Hills Council because I believe that it appreciates the unique characteristics of the area, including the large blocks and bushy surrounds, and will do all in its power to preserve it into the future in these uncertain times of planning change.”

Environmental considerations

It is felt by respondents that the development ethos of the CCC has had a significant side-effect of a significant reduction in the quality and volume of tree canopy cover. While it is acknowledged some replanting has taken place, this is not seen as having replaced what was removed in both quantity and quality. More broadly, it is felt by respondents that CCC has less regard for the preservation of flora, fauna and the environment than AHC.

This pocket of Rostrevor is viewed by respondents as part of the Adelaide Hills, offering natural habitats for wildlife, open spaces, large blocks and old trees – a place where nature is nurtured and respected as it is elsewhere in the AHC area.

Preserving and enhancing the natural environment is of vital importance to respondents and a fundamental part of their choice to live in the area. They also felt that AHC is better equipped to protect the Morialta area from bushfires through clearing notices and organic waste drop-off days and the like.

"We desperately want to restrict the overdevelopment and urban infill for which Campbelltown is so notorious, for the sake of the residents' amenity but also, in a state of climate emergency, for the sake of the environment."

"Campbelltown City Council is well known to be one of the major urban infill suburbs, subdividing properties in a non-environmentally sustainable way. We live in a protected area with which offers shelter for native flora and fauna and deserves to be protected."

"Adelaide Hills Council policies are by far more closely aligned, and more sympathetic to the amenity and natural environment of the area."

"My area does not share any communities of interest with the Campbelltown City Council. We are firmly aligned culturally, services, values and environmentally with Adelaide Hills Council. Adelaide Hills Council has done a brilliant job of protecting the natural environment in this area and increasing amenity."

City of Campbelltown seeking increased income

Despite assertions to the contrary by representatives from the CCC, many respondents expressed they still feel that the move to change the council boundary is primarily driven by "numbers and dollars" and there is no other obvious rationale.

"Campbelltown Council is engaging in a blatant land grab."

"We need to keep greedy councils and developers away from our environs."

"The way they support their community is financially business driven for expansion, not to retain the living environment enjoyed by those of the Morialta part of Rostrevor."

No compelling reason to change

A number of respondents simply state there is no reason or justification for change. They express their overall satisfaction with AHC services and policies and do not wish to see change for the sake of it.

"Change is totally unnecessary."

"Adelaide Hills Council is the best."

"Happy to be in Adelaide Hills Council."

"I own properties in both Council areas and the claimed benefits and reasons provided by the City of Campbelltown are spurious."

"In short, we have enjoyed a long period of productive cooperation with the Adelaide Hills Council. Why change to a council that we suspect may not share the same values as us?"

Council services and rates

Council rates and services were hardly referenced by respondents against boundary change.

A handful of respondents stated that slightly lower rates are not an inducement to support council boundary change. Respondents also make the point that rates are not part of the decision-making to

live in the AHC area – or not – but that other factors such as amenity, block size, development policies and the semi-rural characteristics of the area are far more significant factors.

Some respondents also felt that AHC facilities and services were superior to those of the CCC – but more importantly, better tailored to the area as they are more aligned with the needs of rural and semi-rural areas than metropolitan and highly developed areas.

Additional points raised in the final open response question of the survey

Respondents added further detail and repeated their position on issues already raised. In addition, it was very clear that respondents feel the vast majority of residents in their area are against boundary change – an assumption that is verified by the survey findings.

Respondents clearly state they do not wish to be rezoned and feel their majority opinion should be the only decision-making driver. Many respondents point out that when they purchased their property, a big selling point was being part of the AHC area and this should be respected.

Survey respondents have actively requested the support of AHC to fight the boundary change request and support their preferred outcome – which is to remain within the AHC area.

“We don’t want to be rezoned, and feel the residents should have the final say. We bought here for a reason and feel that by changing boundaries could jeopardise the reasons we love living here!”

“Please continue to fight to maintain us. We do not want to lose our quality of life. We are very happy with the services and support provided by Adelaide Hills Council, including rates. It is not about the money!”

“I would appreciate the support of Adelaide Hills in this matter and not allow Campbelltown City to pursue the takeover. It would be devastating for the area if the takeover is executed as it is visually obvious what Campbelltown City Council has been done with their own council area with the continuous over development.”

“I would like Adelaide Hills Council to vehemently fight this take-over. It is clear that the majority of residents in the proposed takeover area are opposed and wanting Adelaide Hills Council support in this.”

“Please support the residents of your council area to prevent this boundary change.”

“The Minister for Planning (and Member for Morialta Hon John Gardner) must give strong consideration to the views of residents in this decision. If the majority of residents are opposed to this boundary change, then the Minister must reject the proposal.”

It was reiterated by respondents that planning and development policies and environmental protection are other key issues of concern. Respondents felt that CCC has a very different perspective on these issues and does not listen or respect the sentiments and concerns of their residents.

"Clearly development and environment are my key concerns, and I imagine would be key concerns of most residents through the affected area, as most if not all are fiercely passionate to protect the semi-rural environment in which we invested and the homes within it that we love. I understand that there are State Planning Code changes to occur in July 2020. This does not alter my opinion that I fiercely reject Campbelltown's bid to acquire the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde, which is very obviously driven by greed on Campbelltown's part."

"Past behaviour is the best predictor of future behaviour, and on this basis I believe Adelaide Hills Council and Campbelltown City Council have shown their true nature (Adelaide Hills Council having helped residents preserve the magnificent characteristics of the area and Campbelltown City Council allowing as much infill development as possible) and that is why I want to stay with Adelaide Hills Council."

"Extremely concerned about CCC's propensity to approve high density living as can be seen in the current planning policy comparisons between the two councils. This will affect wildlife and drive out the koalas, kangaroos and other native Australian animals and bird life."

"As a resident who does not use the services or facilities of Campbelltown council I strongly object to being governed by them. I am vehemently opposed to the boundary realignment. Campbelltown Council has destroyed the amenity of their area and I do not want it to happen to my home."

"I do not support the change as the Campbelltown Council does not respect the environment and is pushing to have my area as high density living. This area must remain protected for its unique value and proximity to nature."

It was reiterated that there are no compelling reasons for change and that respondents are satisfied with AHC.

"So-called geographic isolation from Stirling or Woodside has never been an issue in my 25 years as resident in this area."

"Adelaide Hills Council staff have always been easily contacted by phone and/or email and respond promptly to requests for service / assistance."

"Very comfortable with AHC - if it ain't broke, why change it."

Respondents indicated a lack of trust in CCC relating to their assurances around retention of the Hills Face Zone and existing AHC development policies and approaches for the area. In addition, they felt that CCC has misrepresented the residents in the area through claims they favour boundary change.

"Campbelltown City Council's claimed commitment to maintaining the hills face zone does not provide any guarantee whatsoever, given the turnover of staff and representation, and what would be dilution of our voice in the wider Campbelltown area, compared with a demonstrated commonality of interest in Adelaide Hills Council representation. I seek Adelaide Hills Council's rejection of the Campbelltown proposal."

"I oppose the proposal in the strongest possible terms, and urge Adelaide Hills Council to resist it. There is not the slightest reason to trust Campbelltown's promises that the character of the area will be maintained, when their only plausible rationale is to profit from through facilitating development."

"Campbelltown Council cannot be trusted to succumb to greedy developers. One has to only look at every street ruined in their area."

"Adelaide Hills Council has fought for keeping our street and neighbourhood free from developers in the past so we trust them!"

"Our physical environment is completely different to the area that Campbelltown city council presently has jurisdiction over. This clearly reflects they do not share the same philosophies with respect to the environment and our current climate change emergency."

Respondents expressed that a saving in Council rates is not a key decision-making factor for them.

"The prospect of a potential modest saving in annual rates is not worth the risk of being controlled by a Council with a long history of large scale, unsympathetic development."

"They have not shown any interest in the beauty and sustainability of the area. They seem purely concerned with making money. The State Government would be mad to let this happen."

"Let's be blunt, the Campbelltown City Council's actions are driven solely by money. Effectively, they want to steal a portion of the rates revenue from an adjoining council. Not very neighbourly."

Some respondents sum up their feelings with a very clear rejection of the boundary change proposal.

"This is unwelcome."

"We absolutely do not support this move and wish to remain under Adelaide Hills Council."

"I DO NOT SUPPORT MOVING TO CAMPBELLTOWN COUNCIL."

"Would be a disaster for Morialta and surrounds."

6. Survey findings - Woodforde

There were 109 responses from residents/ businesses in Woodforde. Of these 42 were in favour of the boundary change proposal, 57 were against the boundary change proposal, 8 undecided and 2 had no preference (Refer to Table 6).

Table 6: Rostrevor responses

Suburb	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Woodforde	109	42 (39%)	57 (52%)	8 (7%)	2 (2%)

As part of the boundary change survey, respondents were asked to indicate their top three areas of interest about the proposal.

The responses for Woodforde are summarised below, noting a total of 109 individual survey responses were received. No single issue was of interest to the majority of respondents. This is reflective of the overall findings for Woodforde being more evenly split between those in favour and against boundary change.

In alignment with Rostrevor respondents, the two top issues of interest for those against boundary change are planning and development and environmental sustainability.

Similarly, environmental sustainability and climate change are not identified as issues of interest for respondents in favour of boundary change in Woodforde (as was the case for Rostrevor). Their focus is instead on rates, community services and maintenance.

Table 7: Woodforde Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	14	44
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	29	14
Community services	24	6
Environmental sustainability	3	33
Annual council rates	26	14
Climate change	2	7
Council rules and regulations	2	21
Community grants	-	4
Level of representation	2	4

Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal

Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal raised a range of reasons for their support, including council rates, geographic location and community services. Responses were generally short and little additional commentary was shared as part of the last open response question in the survey.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Geographic location

The most frequently raised issue in favour of boundary change is the belief that this part of Woodforde is more connected to the CCC than to the Adelaide Hills. The services provided by the CCC are closer and easier to access than those in the hills and it is seen as logical to change council boundaries. In addition, it is felt this part of Woodforde is more “metropolitan” than hills in terms of the services it needs and the characteristics of the suburb, which again means a better fit with the CCC.

“We live in the Hamilton Hill development, the areas that we use already lie within the Campbelltown City Council, we would not travel up into the hills, so makes sense to us to be within that council.”

“Makes sense, council chambers and depot are much closer and can serve the residents better than Adelaide Hills Council.”

“Woodforde is too far from Adelaide Hills Council.”

“I am a frequent and grateful user of Campbelltown's services. Council offices and various services are more accessible.”

“It makes sense. This Rostrevor/Woodforde area is a highly-populated suburban area - it belongs with a metro council.”

“We use more Campbelltown Council resources and have more engagement with them than Adelaide Hills Council. To go to Adelaide Hills Council office is a 45 min drive. I believe we are more likely to be a respected part of Campbelltown than being “not really a hills” resident.”

Council rates

Several respondents referenced that the potential reduction in council rates would be appealing.

Level of support

A small number of respondents stated they have experienced a disappointing level of service from AHC and feel this would be improved if they were part of the CCC.

“Better levels of service from Campbelltown. Council offices and depot located just down the road so quicker response to customer requests. Campbelltown have no debt and are well organised.”

“Shorter response times to service ratepayer needs.”

Woodforde respondents against the boundary change proposal

Respondents articulated a similar set of reasons to Rostrevor residents in explaining their position against boundary change. The themes are listed in priority order.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Planning and development

As was the case for respondents from Rostrevor, the most significant issue for Woodforde respondents against boundary change is the concern that the CCC has very different policies, principles and perspectives towards sub-division and development when compared to AHC. It is felt by respondents that CCC will actively seek to bring more people into the area through changes to zoning and this is not supported. Respondents do not trust the CCC to keep the green spaces, which are not national parks or protected, undeveloped.

It was also frequently stated the area has distinctly “hills” characteristics and a strong sense of community – which are viewed as being consistent with the AHC area and not CCC.

“We feel that we are part of the hills and have more confidence in Adelaide Hills Council maintaining the integrity of these suburbs.”

“Recent high density development in Campbelltown is a concern even if the protest they will not do the same thing here.”

“We bought our house in Woodforde in 2011 due the beauty and character of the area. A change in planning law and increase in development density etc. will impact on the character and amenity of our area and potentially destroy the character of it.”

“Physically Campbelltown City Council may be closer but they are miles away in mind and so alien to us.”

“I do not like their policy of urban infill. It has ruined suburbs like Tranmere turning it into a concrete jungle.”

“The boundary change would change this area from being “hills” to being “metropolitan”. This change seems absurd to me, as anyone who has set foot in this area can clearly tell that it is much more hills than metropolitan in terms of environment, terrain, community and layout. Changing this doesn’t really seem to have any positive outcomes for me or my community.”

No compelling reason to change

A number of residents simply state there is no reason or justification for change and they are happy with the status quo.

“It seems like there is not any benefit.”

“Happy with Adelaide Hills Council.”

"Prefer to stay as Adelaide Hills resident."

"As a Hills facing suburb we prefer to be under the jurisdiction of a Hills Council."

Environmental considerations

Some respondents viewed the north-eastern parts of Woodforde (not Hamilton Hill), as part of the Adelaide Hills, offering natural habitats for wildlife, open spaces, large blocks and old trees – a place where nature is nurtured and respected as it is elsewhere in the AHC area. They felt AHC does more to protect green spaces and restrict development – which is preferred.

"Pushing more people into this area by allowing for smaller lot sizes and subdivisions will likely put stress on the local flora and fauna that we are so lucky to share this area with. Increased noise, traffic density, and population in general will most likely drive this wildlife back into the park, which would be a loss for the entire community."

"Because Adelaide Hills Council do more to protect the environment and don't just hand it over to developers!"

"I am concerned about the removal of so many mature trees in Campbelltown City Council. They are necessary for our climate and wildlife. They take a long time to grow and any replacements (if they find room for them) will be unsuitable for our wildlife for 40-50 years."

City of Campbelltown seeking increased income

Despite assertions to the contrary by representatives from the CCC, some respondents expressed they still feel that the move to change the council boundary is primarily driven by wanting to add more rateable properties to their area.

"Campbelltown are just making a cynical grab for more rates."

"This is a self-serving exercise by Campbelltown City Council rather than being centred on the interests of residents."

Lack of trust in City of Campbelltown assurances

A handful of respondents expressed a lack of trust and belief in the assurances provided by the CCC that planning and zoning policies in the area would not change if the boundary change were to go ahead.

"We are worried about Campbelltown City Council's planning and development in the long term despite their assurance it will never change. We simply don't believe them."

Property value

A small number of respondents referenced that they felt the boundary change would have a negative impact on property values, causing them to either stagnate or even decrease. Some respondents outlined direct experience of owning a property in CCC subject to stagnating or falling property prices while others made the assumption future higher density development in Woodforde as a result of boundary change would negatively impact property value.

"I don't want my property devalued and housing congested."

"Because they allow the building of "match box" type of dwelling being built on crowded allotments - which devalues our individual and unique properties - it is very bad and sad."

The following additional points were reiterated and emphasised by respondents in the final open response question of the survey:

- There is strong support for AHC stance on development and planning policy and respondents made it clear they wish for this to continue as this ethos protects the area from overdevelopment.
- Respondents request AHC take a strong stand and resist the council boundary change. In a similar vein, respondents also request AHC to listen and then act upon the wishes of the majority of residents in the area.
- There is a level of disappointment expressed at the time, energy and money being spent on a boundary change venture that appears, in the eyes of respondents, to be financially driven by CCC.
- Respondents emphasize they see themselves as part of the hills community and firmly believe the right fit for their area is to be part of AHC.

"Adelaide Hills Council should respect and support the wishes of residents."

"Unless there is an overwhelming majority of residents support the boundary change proposal, it should not proceed."

"As a resident of Woodforde I strongly object to any inclusion within the Campbelltown City Council area. There is no justification for their boundary change proposal."

"We identify strongly with the semi-rural lifestyle that being part of Adelaide Hills Council affords us and vehemently oppose what we believe is a revenue raising exercise by Campbelltown City Council with zero net benefit to us, the residents."

"In over 40 years in Woodforde, Campbelltown City Council has shown no interest in us until the development of Hamilton Hill estate. Campbelltown City Council sees this as a pot of gold to add to their revenue."

7. Respondents from suburbs outside

There were 33 survey responses in total from respondents in other suburbs. Of these 15 were in favour of the boundary change, 17 were against the boundary change and one respondent was undecided (Refer to Table 8).

Table 8: Response numbers from other suburbs

Suburb	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Other suburbs	33	15 (45%)	17 (52%)	1 (3%)	0

These respondents provided less detail in the open response questions posed but key themes were still able to be identified. Responses were in general pragmatic rather than impassioned – with the exception of a small number of responses against boundary change.

Issues of interest were broad, with climate change, council rules and regulations and community grants being of little to no interest.

Table 9: Other Suburbs Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	4	9
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	10	5
Community services	10	3
Environmental sustainability	3	6
Annual council rates	8	6
Climate change	-	-
Council rules and regulations	-	2
Community grants	-	-
Level of representation	-	3

The themes identified below summarise all the issues raised both in favour and against council boundary change across both open response questions asked in the survey.

Respondents against council boundary change focussed on the following:

- Content with status quo and see no reason for the change.
- Preference for planning and development ethos / low density housing approach taken by AHC.
- Better rules and planning for fire protection within AHC.
- Outright rejection of the proposal (“It is not a good proposal.”)
- AHC viewed as taking better care of the natural environment.
- Sentiment that “ground rules” in terms of planning and development should not be allowed to change as a result of boundary change as people have specifically elected to purchase a

property in the area because of those rules and the characteristics of the suburb that are enjoyed as a result.

Respondents in favour of council boundary change provided the following reasons:

- The CCC is geographically better connected to Woodforde, making services easier and more convenient to access.
- Having a Council focussed on suburban / metropolitan needs suits the area better than one that is focussed on semi-rural / hills needs.
- AHC does not support the area particularly well.
- Given many residents use CCC services, it seems fair to also pay rates to that council.

8. Notes about survey

Survey parameters

Parameters for survey included:

- Participants must be 18 years or over
- Participating in the survey is not mandatory
- Multiple submissions per household accepted (e.g. if four adults living at address they can each provide a submission)
- Survey will only be available in English – but assistance to be provided if required
- One 'survey pack' sent to each household (additional copies can be requested from AHC Customer Service Centres)
- Renters are encouraged to participate
- Name and address details are required but the results will be anonymised and not associated with their contact details for Council consultation and public reporting
- Survey is available online and in hard copy

9. Appendix A

Have your say:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

Project Summary

Campbelltown City Council (CCC) has put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal (the Proposal) to the Boundaries Commission (a State Government body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister) to review the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC).

CCC proposes moving the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety. *See map included in this information pack.*

There are currently 573 properties (3.3% of total AHC properties) that are within the proposed Boundary Change Zone.

AHC does not have a formal position on the Proposal yet as we'd like your feedback on what you think about it first. Please take a moment to read this information sheet and complete the short survey.

Your feedback is important and AHC will compile it into a report for consideration by AHC Council Members, at this stage planned for early 2020.

How you can have your say

- Complete the hard copy survey attached, place it in the enclosed free return-paid envelope and post it back to us before Sunday 8 December 2019 (you don't need a postage stamp)
- Scan the survey and email it to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- Head to our website engage.ahc.sa.gov.au and complete the online survey

Survey closes Sunday 8 December 2019

We are here to help

If you've got a question, want additional hard copy surveys, or further information about the Boundary Change Proposal please get in touch with our team.



engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au



(08) 8408 0587

Boundary Change Proposal Map



Important information

Please note this survey is only intended for people over 18 years of age who live, work, or own a property in the proposed Boundary Change Zone. All names and addresses will be cross checked against the electoral role and council's database, and any identifying data will be kept strictly confidential.

Further detailed information is available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au, and additional hard copies of the survey can be requested by calling (08) 8408 0587 or emailing engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au.

This is just the beginning

This is the start of a comprehensive review process which will be undertaken by CCC and the Boundaries Commission. Adelaide Hills Council has no formal role to play in the process at this time. No decision has been made yet and the final decision lies with the Minister for Local Government.

Step 1 - Potential Proposal (January 2019)

Consideration of CCC's initial proposal by Boundaries Commission

Approved by Boundaries Commission to progress to next stage



Step 2 - General Proposal

CCC prepares general proposal for Boundaries Commission

CCC undertakes consultation with the community

Current
status



Step 3 (if proposal continues) - Investigation by Commission

Boundaries Commission assesses the proposal using an independent investigator

CCC must agree to the cost of the investigation

Criteria to be assessed include financial and resource implications and community support



Step 4 - Report to Minister

Boundaries Commission prepares a report for the Minister explaining recommendations

Published on Boundaries Commission website

Minister may make suggestions for further consideration



Step 5 - Decision

Minister decides whether proposal will proceed or not

Overview of the Boundary Change Proposal

We've summarised some of the key points of interest between AHC and CCC. If the information you are looking for is not covered here, take a look on our website, ahc.sa.gov.au, or call our Customer Service Team on 8408 0400.

	Adelaide Hills Council	Campbelltown City Council
Total population <i>Total number of people living in whole council area at 2018 Census.</i>	39,734 (0.50 persons per hectare)	51,469 (21.13 persons per hectare)
Land area <i>Total land size of whole council area.</i>	79,498 hectares	2,436 hectares
Electors* <i>The number of people living in the council area who are entitled to vote in Council elections.</i>	29,500 electors	35,000 electors
Council structure	One Mayor 12 Council Members Two Wards	One Mayor 10 Council Members Five Wards
Representation quota <i>The number of electors divided by all Council Members</i>	One Council Member represents 2,261 electors	One Council Member represents 3,183 electors
Annual Council Rates <i>Rate charged annually.</i>	AHC's rating structure consists of a Fixed Charge of \$662 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.002469. <i>If rating structures remained the same, most residents within the proposed Boundary Change Zone would receive a reduction in annual rates ranging from approximately \$22 to \$450.</i>	CCC's rating structure consists of a Minimum Rate of \$984 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.003050.
Planning and Development	There is a new Planning and Design Code being developed by the State Government which comes into effect on 1 July 2020. More details about planning and development comparison can be found overleaf.	
Minimum site area <i>For a detached dwelling</i>	The average minimum allowable site size in the AHC parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde (including Hamilton Hill) is 703m ² . <i>There is no suggestion, at this time, that either council would pursue changes to reduce allotment sizes in the Boundary Change Zone.</i>	In the CCC part of Rostrevor and Magill the average minimum site size is 350m ² .
Open space and civil services <i>Roads, footpaths, signs, street lights, parks, ovals, playgrounds, cemeteries.</i>	There are no noticeable differences in terms of open space and civil services functions and services between AHC and CCC.	

* The number of electors is obtained from the Electoral Commission of SA and the source date is 28 February 2018.

Environmental sustainability	AHC and CCC have both declared a climate emergency, and both councils have a number of sustainability initiatives.	
Kerbside bins	East Waste collects general waste weekly and recycling and green organics waste on alternating fortnights in both council areas.	
Green organics drop off days	AHC organises a number of free green organics drop off days throughout the year for residents.	CCC does not host free green organics drop off days.
Hard waste	Both AHC and CCC offer one 'at call' hard waste collection per property each financial year.	
Resource Recovery Centres	Residents can go to any resource recovery centre (including those outside of their council district). Each council has one resource recovery centre.	
School zones <i>In relation to which schools children are entitled to attend based on their residence.</i>	Catchment areas are not limited to council boundaries and are set by the State Government Department of Education.	
Community grants	In 2017-18 AHC awarded \$219,000 in funding through its grant program.	In 2017-18 CCC awarded \$41,341 in funding through its grant program.
Regulatory matters <i>This includes local laws established by councils to deal with issues specific to the relevant council area.</i>	There are no noticeable differences in regulatory matters between AHC and CCC except regarding domestic cats. In AHC cats must be confined to their owner's property from 1 January 2022. More information at ahc.sa.gov.au/council/delegations-and-by-laws .	

Need more information? Visit each council's website

	ahc.sa.gov.au	campbelltown.sa.gov.au
Council documents <i>Annual Reports, Strategic Plans, policies</i>	Council > Council Documents	Council > Documents and Publications
Community services <i>Youth, volunteering, diversity, seniors</i>	Community	Community
Community grants	Council > Grants and Tenders	Community > Grants
Regulatory matters <i>Local laws and rules</i>	Council > Delegations and By-laws	Council > Documents and Publications
Sport and recreation	Community > Sport and Recreation	Recreation and Leisure
Civil Services	Resident > Roads, Streetscapes, Works	Services > Capital Works Program
Environmental sustainability	Environment > Sustainability	Environment
Rates and property	Resident > Rates and Property	Council > Rates

Further information available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Planning and Development

The South Australian planning system is changing on 1 July 2020. A new Planning and Design Code (P&D Code) will become the single source of planning policy for assessing development applications across the state.

What does this mean if the boundary change proposal was to proceed?

The new P&D Code being developed by the State Government will replace all council development plans. The new Code means that planning policy will be standardised across council boundaries (this includes AHC and CCC).

Any changes to zonings in either council district after 1 July 2020 would require public consultation as well as Ministerial approval.

For further information about specific development controls applicable under the proposed P&D Code, please contact the P&D Code Free Hotline on 1800 318 102, or review the new P&D Code at sapanningportal.sa.gov.au.

What happens to development applications submitted before 1 July 2020?

The current planning rules will stay the same before 1 July 2020. Any planning application submitted before that time will be assessed under the current planning rules.

Current planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC:

	AHC		CCC
	Woodforde and Rostrevor	Hamilton Hill	Rostrevor and Magill
Site area The minimum size of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	Ranges from 929-1,000m ²	180m ²	Ranges from 350-500m ²
Frontage width The minimum width of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	21 metres	8 metres	Ranges from 7-20 metres
Front setback The minimum distance from the road to the house	6 metres	3 metres	5 metres
Rear setback The minimum distance from the back of the house to the back fence	4 metres	4 metres	4 metres
Site coverage The maximum percentage that a site can be covered by a dwelling	40%	60%	50%
Building height The maximum height allowed for a building	6 metres wall height	3 storeys	8.5 metres

Planning and Design Code Information Session

If you are interested in learning more about the SA Planning Reform please come along to our free Information Session.

Wednesday 27 November 2019 | 6:30pm - 8:00pm

Kelty Theatre, Rostrevor College

Register: planning-forum-woodforde.eventbrite.com.au or call 8408 0400

Survey:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Name _____ Year of birth: _____

Postal address _____

Email _____ Phone: _____

Are you a (tick all that apply)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Property owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tenant | <input type="checkbox"/> Business owner | |

Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (tick one)

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> No preference |

Why do you say that?

What are your areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal? (tick your top three)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning and development | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual Council Rates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Footpaths, road and park maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community services | <input type="checkbox"/> Council rules and regulations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental sustainability | <input type="checkbox"/> Community grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Level of representation (number of electors represented by each Council Member) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council to consider?

If you need more space please use the back of this page or attach additional pages.

Please place your completed survey in the free reply-paid envelope provided and into your nearest mailbox, or scan and email to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au by 8 December 2019.

Project No: 11691

CITY OF CAMBELLTOWN

COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE

Sample: n= up to 600	Mail out survey
Other information	Residents, Businesses Owners and Ratepayers in the suburbs of Rostrevor and Woodforde.
Approximate length of survey 10-12 minutes depending on answers	

McGregor Tan is conducting a **survey** about the council boundary change proposal for the Campbelltown City Council and would appreciate your opinion.

Participation in the survey is voluntary. McGregor Tan is an independent social and market research company and complies with the Privacy Act. We can assure you that all information given will remain confidential and we do not sell, promote or endorse any product or service, there are no right or wrong answers. Your details will only be used for research purposes and will not be sold to any third party.

1. Do you live or own a property or do you own a business owner located in Rostrevor or Woodforde? [Circle all that apply](#)

1.	Rostrevor
2.	Woodforde

2. Are you a ... [Circle all that apply](#)

1.	Resident – home owner
2.	Resident – tenant
3.	Owner of a business in Rostrevor or Woodforde
4.	Property owner but not residing in Rostrevor or Woodforde
5.	Other (<i>please specify below</i>)

3. How long have you lived, owned a business or property in this area? [Circle one only](#)

1.	Less than one year
2.	1 to less than 3 years
3.	3 to less than 5 years
4.	5 to less than 10 years
5.	More than 10 years

4. Do you have any children in your household who currently attend, or who have previously attended, childcare, school, kindergarten, or other educational facility **in the local area**?
Circle all that apply
For example if you have children attending Magill Kindergarten and Athelstone School, please circle **1. Preschool or Kindergarten** and **2. Primary School** - it is not necessary to circle which school they attend.

1.	Preschool or Kindergarten		
	Athelstone Preschool	Campbelltown Community Children's Centre	Campbelltown Preschool
	Emali Early Learning Centre Hectorville	Goodstart Early Learning Campbelltown	Green Leaves Early Learning Newton
	Guardian Childcare & Education Paradise	il nido Children's Centre	il nido Children's Centre Kindergarten
	Magill Campus Community Children's Centre	Magill Kindergarten	Montessori House Newton
	Paradise Kindergarten	Rostrevor Kindergarten	Sunrise Christian Early Learning Centre
	Thorndon Park Kindergarten		
2.	Primary School		
	Athelstone School	Charles Campbell College	East Marden School
	East Torrens School	Paradise School	St Joseph's School Tranmere
	St. Francis of Assisi School	St. Joseph's School Hectorville	Stradbroke School
	Sunrise Christian School	Thorndon Park School	
3.	Secondary School		
	Charles Campbell College	Norwood Morialta High School: Middle Campus	
	Rostrevor College	St. Ignatius College	
4.	Tertiary Education		
	University of South Australia – Magill Campus		
5.	No children in the house attend a school in the local area		

5. How frequently do you engage in the following activities in the Campbelltown City Council area?

Circle one answer per statement	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Attend church	1	2	3	4	5
Attend Community events such as fetes, festivals	1	2	3	4	5
Attend events such as Moonlight Markets, Tour Down Under, movie screenings, Christmas Parade, Christmas Carols etc.	1	2	3	4	5
Attend immunisation clinics	1	2	3	4	5
Attend medical/specialist appointments	1	2	3	4	5
Attend organised sport or Community groups	1	2	3	4	5
Participate in activities for older people including CHSP social program, U3A, activities at the Marchant Community Centre	1	2	3	4	5
Receive Meals on Wheels deliveries	1	2	3	4	5
Shop in supermarkets, specialty shops, or purchase dine in or takeaway	1	2	3	4	5
Visit the ArtHouse, Community Garden, Community Orchard	1	2	3	4	5
Visit The ARC	1	2	3	4	5
Visit local parks and playgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Visit the Campbelltown Library	1	2	3	4	5
Visit Thorndon Park, use the outdoor exercise equipment, attend walking groups	1	2	3	4	5

6. How frequently do you engage in activities like community events or activities in the **Adelaide Hills Council** area?

Circle one answer	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Engage in activities in the Adelaide Hills Council area.	1	2	3	4	5

7. Are you, or is any member of your household, a member or participant of any of the following clubs or groups in the **Campbelltown City Council** area? [Circle all that apply](#)

1.	Arts/cultural groups like Campbelltown ArtHouse, SA Watercolour Society, Campbelltown Writer's Group, Ripples Community Arts, etc
2.	Campbelltown City Band
3.	Campbelltown Little Athletics Club
4.	Community Clubs or groups like Campbelltown Community Club, Probus, Community Workshop, etc
5.	Cricket Clubs like Athelstone, East Torrens, Magill, Hectorville etc
6.	Dance studios
7.	Facebook or Social Media Groups related to Campbelltown
8.	Football Clubs like Athelstone, Hectorville
9.	Gym/Health Clubs (excluding the ARC)
10.	Martial Arts clubs
11.	Mature Age Badminton Club
12.	Netball clubs like Newton Jaguars, Campbelltown Comets, Hectorville etc.
13.	Norwood Flames Basketball Club
14.	Rostrevor Old Collegians Club (cricket, football or soccer)
15.	Rostrevor Tennis Club
16.	Service Clubs like Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Inner Wheel etc.
17.	Soccer clubs like Campbelltown, Athelstone, Eastern United etc
18.	Table Tennis clubs like Athelstone, Houghton, East Adelaide Community Club etc
19.	Tennis clubs like Campbelltown, Athelstone, Hectorville etc
20.	The ARC Campbelltown
21.	Any other club or group in the Campbelltown City Council area <i>(please specify below)</i>
22.	Not a member of any of these clubs

8. Are you a member of any social / sporting / service clubs or groups in the **Adelaide Hills Council** area? [Circle one only](#)

1.	Yes <i>(Please specify which club/group below)</i>
2.	No

9. Do you currently volunteer in the **Campbelltown City Council** area (including Emergency Services)? [Circle one only](#)

1.	Yes <i>(Please specify where you volunteer below)</i>
2.	No

10. Do you currently volunteer in the **Adelaide Hills Council** area (including Emergency Services)? [Circle one only](#)

1.	Yes <i>(Please specify where you volunteer below)</i>
2.	No

As you see in the cover letter provided with this survey, in January 2019 the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal to the Boundaries Commission for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Rostrevor and Woodforde suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

11. Please rate your level of support for the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal to move Rostrevor and Woodforde into the Campbelltown City Council's area on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly oppose and 5 is strongly support?

Circle one answer	1. Strongly oppose	2. Somewhat oppose	3. Neither support nor oppose	4. Somewhat support	5. Completely support
Boundary change proposal	1	2	3	4	5

12. Why did you give that answer? [Be specific](#)

13. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely negative impact and 5 is extremely positive impact, to what extent will the proposed Council boundary change proposal to move Rostrevor and Woodforde into the Campbelltown City Council's area impact you and your family? [Select one](#)

Circle one answer	1. Extremely negative impact	2. Slightly negative impact	3. No impact at all	4. Slightly positive impact	5. Extremely positive impact
Boundary change proposal	1	2	3	4	5

14. Why do you say that? [Be specific](#)

15. Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like to mention? [Be specific](#)

16. Do you identify as... [Circle one only](#)

1.	Male
2.	Female
3.	Non-binary / Gender fluid / Agender
4.	Prefer not to say

17. Please indicate your age group. [Circle one only](#)

1.	Under 18
2.	18-24 years
3.	25-34 years
4.	35-44 years
5.	45-54 years
6.	55-64 years
7.	65-74 years
8.	75-84 years
9.	85 years or over

18. Do you wish to be involved in any McGregor Tan market research activities like paid focus groups, surveys etc.? [Circle one only](#)

1.	Yes (<i>Please provide your details below</i>)	
	First name	
	Email	
	Contact number	
	Postcode	
	Year of Birth	
2.	No	

Thank you for your time to fill out this survey.

If you need more space please use the back of this page or attach additional pages.

Please place your completed survey in the free reply-paid envelope provided and into your nearest mailbox **by Monday the 30th November 2020.**

McGregor Tan is accredited to the highest professional industry standards (ISO 20252:2019 Market, Opinion and Social Research) for the full scope of research and strategy services including customised research for consumer, social and commercial studies, as recognised by the Australian Market and Social Research Society.



Your Community Your Future Your Opportunity

Boundary Realignment – What Does it Mean for You?

CCC (Campbelltown City Council) is investigating the possibility of moving its boundary to include Woodforde and part of Rostrevor.

We would like to hear what you think about the possibility of living in the City of Campbelltown. Apart from being much closer to the centre of your Community, we think there are many reasons this boundary change makes sense.

There are strong common interests between CCC and Woodforde and Rostrevor. These include managing the hills face zone and protecting the environment, tackling climate change, and preventing further infill development.

Being so close means we can provide prompt and efficient services, and you can influence and shape delivery of these services and facilities as a member of our Community. You may already attend schools, belong to sporting or other clubs, shop, work or play in the area. We have a strong, vibrant and connected Community. We are committed to you for the long term, which provides certainty for your future.

Soon you will receive a survey on the very important topic of Boundary Realignment. Before you complete it, we would like to provide you with some information about the history of this issue, as well as what being a Resident of CCC could look like for you.

It's all about Belonging

The best local communities make you feel like you belong.

You share common interests, common values and often, a common history too.

The communities of Campbelltown, Rostrevor, and Woodforde share a common history that stretches all the way back to the 1850s.

At that time, we were all together in what was called East Torrens Council, the second Council to be declared in the new state of South Australia.

As Campbelltown grew and prospered, we became our own Council in 1868, bound together and sharing a common purpose with areas that we know today as Woodforde, Hamilton Hill, and Upper Rostrevor.

Indeed, our modern landscape is dotted with many old landmarks like St George's Anglican Church, Fourth Creek Estate (Rostrevor College), Woodforde House and the pristine and peaceful Glen Stuart Falls (Morialta Falls).

Families, businesses and social enterprises worked, lived and played together, creating the sense of belonging that is so strongly embedded in our Community more than a century later.

Over time, discussions, even Royal Commissions (1933, 1973), have been held around boundary changes, as Governments seek to bring together local Communities that have the perfect fit.

In 2020, we are still talking about it and that's a good thing. Councils should always review and reflect upon what is best for their local Communities, their shared purpose, and their common interests.

Boundary reform is all about belonging.

Rates

We offer lower, value for money rates. In 2020/2021, Campbelltown was proud to deliver a **0% rate increase**.

To work out what your rates would be in Campbelltown Council in 2020/2021, use this formula:

Capital value <input type="text"/> (found on your rates notice)	X .00304791 (CCC rate in \$)	= Rates payable in Campbelltown
---	--	--

We also provided a package of rate relief measures for our Community to support them through the COVID 19 pandemic. We carry no debt and have healthy cash and investment balances, which provide certainty for future generations.

Our Long Term Financial Plan shows low rate increases in all 10 years and healthy operating surpluses, with the exception of 2022 & 2023 where there are small operating deficits forecast, due to the COVID-19 rate relief measures Council introduced.

CHSP (Campbelltown Home Support Program)

Council is funded to provide CHSP activities for eligible older people including home maintenance, domestic assistance, home modifications and social support for individuals. As a CHSP client you can access unique initiatives like our transport service and social programs.

CHSP Social Program

Eligible CHSP clients can participate in our social program which includes bus trips, art classes, walking groups, chair yoga, information talks on a range of topics, songs around the campfire, singles lunches, coffee club, and an annual Christmas Celebration.

One of our most popular offerings are our Bus trips which provide an opportunity for you to see some of the wonderful things Adelaide and South Australia has to offer. Recently our clients have been to:

- Victor Harbor
- Port Adelaide
- Monarto Zoo
- Festival Theatre to see Billy Elliot the Musical
- Fishing at Brighton

During COVID-19 we did our best to ensure that our CHSP clients remained connected.

We phoned them regularly to see if they were OK, and so that they could have a chat to someone if they were isolated. We also delivered 320 activity kits to our social program clients (including toilet paper!). Our clients were so grateful for this meaningful distraction in such worrying and uncertain times.



Volunteer Transport Service

We run a transport service for eligible clients for daily essential needs such as medical, personal or social appointments, and daily shopping. It is flexible and affordable. Subsidised taxi vouchers may also be provided when no alternative options are available.

CHSP transport clients can also participate in small group trips for cemetery visits and special shopping trips e.g. Westfield Marion, Harbour Town and Adelaide Central Market.

Community Bus

Our Community Bus provides a door to door service Wednesday to Friday to attend local shopping centres and the Campbelltown Library. More local destinations can be added on request. This service is available to all residents.

You are invited to attend a bus tour on Tuesday 17 November at 10.30 am. The tour will visit some of the beautiful features of our area and end with a BBQ lunch at Thorndon Park. To reserve your place on the tour please call 8366 9261. Seats are limited.



Neighbours

Council knows that people feel safer and more connected to their Community when they know their neighbours. We have a number of initiatives that support local area and street activities.

Street Play

Council works with local residents to close their streets for play and social connections. These are Community led events which give neighbours a chance to meet and get to know each other, while the kids enjoy playing in the street.

Neighbourhood BBQs

During daylight savings Council selects 6 parks across the City and invites all residents within 400m of each park to come to a Neighbourhood BBQ. This is an informal way to meet new people and rekindle friendships. The Neighbourhood BBQs finish in March each year with a final 'Neighbour Day' celebration.



Arts & Culture

We are proud of our artistic Community. We have several arts groups using Council facilities and we have just launched a self drive public art map to see the current public art in the area which continues to grow.

We hold a very popular Art Show annually in conjunction with the Rotary Club of Campbelltown, and have monthly exhibitions at the Campbelltown ArtHouse and Campbelltown Library Gallery.

Along with our existing events we are also working to attract external events to the area. Earlier this year we hosted the Police Band at Thorndon Park, which was a lovely night for people to relax and have a picnic in the park and enjoy music.

Council is currently finalising its Arts and Culture action plan in partnership with artists and groups which will further develop Campbelltown as a creative Community.



Community Grants

Our Community Grants Program aims to support its Community through recognising individual excellence, as well as groups and organisations to provide activities, services and events that make Campbelltown an even greater place to live. Community grants are based on the principles of social inclusion, access and equity, and openness and transparency.

Grants are available in the following categories:

Minor Grants – up to \$700 for equipment or programs, and includes in-kind hall hire or bus use

Major Grants – from \$700 up to \$2,000 for projects, programs or equipment

Events Grants – 50% of the total cost of a Community event up to \$5,000

Personal Achievement Grants – \$50 to \$300 depending on location, when representing South Australia or Australia

Private Bus Subsidy – up to \$400 per trip

Council is also very supportive of groups or organisations who apply for external grant funding and can assist with these applications or provide letters of support.

Volunteering in Campbelltown

We have over 250 active volunteers who provide a range of services and programs in the Community including graffiti removal, Lochend House history tours, Community Orchard, Library and so much more. Council recognises these volunteers each year with a dinner during National Volunteers Week where years of service are awarded, and also an end of year celebration.

Fruit Crew

One unique volunteer program we have is the Fruit Crew. Volunteers harvest excess fruit from people's yards, that would otherwise be left to rot, and redistribute it to local preschools, schools, churches and domestic violence services. The lesser quality fruit is given to Fauna Rescue for animals. Since the Fruit Crew began they have rescued over a tonne of fruit.



Give an Hour

Council has commenced a campaign to support people who can give one hour to the Community to make Campbelltown an even better place to live. The first 'Give an Hour' initiative was the Waste Warrior Project where over 150 people gifted over 780 hours to assemble, pack and deliver 9,000 kitchen caddies to their Community.



Campbelltown Library

Our Library is a vibrant hub of Community and family activity offering a wide range of services including a Justice of the Peace Service. Below is a sample of what we have on offer.

Toy Library

The very popular Toy Library is located within the Library. The aim of the Toy Library is to provide toys, games and puzzles of an educational nature that provide pleasurable learning experiences and promote child development in language, numeracy, social interaction, muscle development, imagination and creativity; all for a modest annual membership fee.



Housebound Service

We offer a Housebound Service for residents who are unable to visit the Library due to medical reasons or disability. This was an extremely popular service during the COVID-19 period.

Child and Youth Programs

A range of programs are offered across age groups including:

- Wriggle and Giggle (0-2 Years)
- Storytime (3-5 years)
- Little Bang Discovery Club (3-5 years)
- Discovery Club (6+ years)
- Minecraft Mondays (8-12 years)
- 12-16 year Club
- Chesslife Club
- School Holiday Programs

We were very proud to be able to continue most of these services online during the COVID period and Library staff continue to find innovative ways to provide online opportunities for the Community.

Gallery Space

There is a gallery space located near the front entrance to the Library which has lovely natural lighting along with a professional tracking system for spotlights. This space is offered to locals who wish to display their work to an audience of over 600 people per day.

Digital Literacy

The Library offers free computer classes on topics including computer basics, iPads, androids and internet safety. Classes are delivered by a skilled trainer, and supported by Library volunteers. We also offer a Digital drop in service where Library volunteers are on hand to try and answer your technology questions and help you discover ways of using technology for learning, entertainment and staying connected.

The ARC Campbelltown

This high profile facility opened in July 2016 and provides state of the art aquatic, fitness, sports, café, function and crèche facilities. The ARC is a well loved Community asset which operates on a very successful business that funds its operations. The learn to swim program is extremely popular and along with the usual gym offerings, the ARC also offers a range of classes for our residents aged 55+ including bowls, badminton, aqua classes and chair yoga.



The ARC is the home of the Norwood Basketball Club and is the regular training facility for Futsal, Norwood Volleyball Club, Campbelltown Squash Club and two Tea Tree Gully Swim Clubs. It is also a popular venue for high profile State and National Competitions such as Squash SA State Championships, Australian Open Table Tennis Championships, Pacific School Games (International), SA Country Basketball Championships, Special Olympics Australia (Basketball), and the Australian Masters Games (Volleyball).



Community Events

We love to bring the Community together when we can, to celebrate all things great about Campbelltown. We run our very successful Moonlight Markets at Thorndon Park across the summer months and these Markets are well attended and attract people from all over Adelaide.

We have a Christmas Parade, which enables Community groups and businesses to share in the Christmas spirit and showcase their members or services. This event culminates in a Christmas Carols Event in Thorndon Park which is a joint partnership with the Lions Club of Athelstone.



Other events across the year include Movies in the Park, Pizza Festival, School Holiday Trail, Anzac Day Service, Mayoral Bowls Tournament, Literary Awards and Reconciliation Week. Service Clubs are very active in our Community and also host several events themselves such as Markets, Breakfast in the Park and Fundraising Events.

Committees

As Residents you can help shape the Community you live in by nominating for one of the following Advisory Committees when opportunities arise:

- Active Ageing
- Reconciliation
- Youth
- Disability Access & Inclusion
- Service Clubs

We also have the following Committees, which include Residents with the relevant skills to provide professional advice to Council:

- Council Assessment Panel
- Audit & Governance
- Economic Development

Disability Access and Inclusion

We have a Disability Access & Inclusion Plan that outlines how we ensure that our area is physically accessible and socially inclusive for people of all abilities. When we make facilities better for people with disabilities, we make them better for everyone. We have some best practice accessible facilities including Campbelltown Memorial Oval and The ARC.

Reconciliation

Council is committed to Reconciliation. We have a Reconciliation Action Plan, endorsed by Reconciliation Australia and we commit to a whole of organisation approach to the shaping and implementation of our Plan.

Parks and Open Spaces

We have some beautiful parks and open spaces including the beautiful River Torrens Linear Park which boasts great walking and riding trails, abundant nature, and several recreational spaces.

Thorndon Park offers a beautiful shaded lawn area for family gatherings and recreation, BBQs, and parties. There is a covered playground area, which includes a Liberty Swing, and of course the wonderful Pavilion which offers all round weather access to the park. Council is currently consulting on its Thorndon Park Super Playground which proposes some great improvements to the Playground area and will make the park a destination of choice for families across Adelaide. The park also offers walking trails, an amphitheatre, an Oval, a small heritage museum and a kiosk that is open on weekends.



Other parks that are popular for family gatherings, parties, BBQs, and even weddings, include The Gums Reserve, Magill, Foxfield Oval, Wadmore Park (Pulyonna Wirra), Gurners Reserve and Lochiel Park. We also have a fully fenced playground at Charlesworth Park.

We have several well used sporting facilities including the newly renovated world class facility at Campbelltown Memorial Oval. Steve Woodcock Sports Centre, Daly Oval and the Max Amber Sportsfield are homegrounds for successful sporting Clubs, as well as being available for Community use. Tennis and Netball are also strong elements of our Community and we have several court spaces throughout the Council area for Clubs and the Community to enjoy.



The Environment

We are fortunate to be set amongst the foothills with an abundance of natural environment areas and open space including 3 main creeks and the River Torrens.

We have an Open Space Strategy as well as an Environment Plan with vision of a City where people choose to live because of its sustainable living options, healthy and biodiverse environment, and connected open spaces. Our Community highly values the proximity to the hills, open space, creeks, nature/wildlife and trees.

Key achievements under our Environment Plan over the last 4 years include:

- Creek Management Plans for Third, Fourth and Fifth Creeks
- Native Bee Hotels
- Water Sensitive Urban Design Trials
- Expanded kitchen caddy system for food waste to all residents
- Baseline heat, canopy cover and biodiversity mapping
- Increased greening measures in Council operations
- Transitioned to LED street lighting
- Compostable dog bags available throughout Council reserves.

Our draft Environment Plan 2020-2024 is currently out for consultation and has 4 pillars. The Liveable Campbelltown Pillar has a strong focus on:

- Protecting and enhancing natural areas, creeks, flora and fauna, biodiversity, and open space
- Investing in, maintaining and expanding green infrastructure (including canopy cover, verges and open space)
- Implementing and managing water sensitive urban design (WSUD)

We also have several Community Groups who assist with looking after our Environment.

Friends of Lochiel Park

This group collects and grows around 1,000 local native plants each year for Council plantings. Their work contributes to biodiversity and provides habitat for native animals, and helps our Community connect and engage with nature.



Campbelltown Landcare Group

This group, which has been supported by Council for 15 years, undertakes countless hours of weed control and planting in selected areas, which has significantly improved the condition of the vegetation. Recently the group undertook bird and fauna surveys, which will inform Council's Wadmore Park/Pulyonna Wirra Management Plan.

Gums Landcare Group

This group helps improve biodiversity at an area of The Gums Reserve along Third Creek. They have removed feral olives, planted additional local native understorey, installed several native bee hotels, engaged local schools (including an 'Adopt a Tree' program), and organised a successful Festival of Nature event for the Community.

Campbelltown Friends of the Environment

This group provides feedback to Council on policies and programs and aims to increase public awareness of environmental issues through information sharing and practical activities. The group is committed to sharing the message about environmental responsibility and sustainable living.



Friends of Black Hill and Morialta

We proudly support this group who work to conserve, protect and restore the beautiful foothill areas of Black Hill and Morialta Conservation Parks.

Climate Change

Council has been part of the Resilient East Climate Adaptation partnership since 2016. Resilient East works on collaborative and regional climate adaptation issues with a focus on greening initiatives, urban heat island impacts and increasing water sensitive urban design.

In 2019 Council signed the Climate Emergency Declaration, adopting climate change as a key priority as part of Council's Strategic Plan. Council is also preparing a Climate Solutions Strategy and Policy to lead broader action on climate change issues. We are currently trialling new approaches to greening and cooling our streets.

We recently ran a successful Climate Ready Campbelltown forum. We shared information about heat mapping, heat waves and impacts within our local Community. The forum allowed us to inform the Community about how to be prepared for extreme heat events, how to use their gardens and water to cool their homes, and tips for smarter energy use.

Clean Campbelltown

Council offers a 3 bin waste collection service which collects general household waste weekly, and green waste and recyclables fortnightly.

All residential households are entitled to one free hard waste collection per financial year, and one free at call mattress collection. We also offer scrap metal collection.



Council also runs a FREE household TV, computer and chemical drop off facility at its Depot at 6 Newton Road, Campbelltown. This facility is a self-service, user friendly way to drop off unwanted household chemicals and electronic goods (TVs and computer items).

All residential households have recently been provided with a free food waste kitchen basket for food scraps and an annual allocation of 150 bags.

Public Health

Campbelltown is a member of the regional subsidiary, EHA (Eastern Health Authority). EHA protects the health and wellbeing of about 160,000 residents plus visitors and is an example of Council shared service delivery at its very best.

EHA manages vital public and environment health services such as immunisation, hygiene and sanitation control, and inspection and regulation of food outlets. Free immunisation clinics are held monthly in the Council area.

We are a partner to the Regional Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2020-2025 'Better Living, Better Health' which focuses on regional activities that require collaboration between the Councils and Community partners. The Plan builds on regional strengths and addresses regional challenges. It also considers priority populations identified in South Australia's State Public Health Plan 2019-2024, and it addresses the State's four strategic priorities.


Planning and Development

Like all Councils, we need to follow the Planning Legislation and policy framework established by the State Government. Council successfully lobbied the State Government and won recent changes to Campbelltown's Development Plan, which resulted in increased block sizes and other improved conditions for ratepayers within the Council area. You can be confident that Campbelltown will fight to protect the Adelaide Hills area (Rostrevor and Woodforde) and commits to maintaining the hills face zone.

Campbelltown has publicly committed to maintaining the Development Plan Rules in the AHC exactly as they are now by creating a separate planning policy zone, just like we have with Poets Corner, Tranmere. The draft Planning and Design Code would retain both Woodforde and Rostrevor as very low density areas with minimum allotments sizes of 1000sqm and minimum frontages of 20 metres. Going forward, the Planning Minister will have primary responsibility for maintenance and changes to the Code. If you ever need to inspect plans of a development that are available for public inspection, the Council Office is just down the road!

Footpaths

Council has a policy to provide a footpath on at least one side of each street in our Council area in consultation with Residents. In some cases where there is high pedestrian use or special circumstances, footpaths may be installed on both sides of the road. Roads without footpaths are priority listed for construction as funds become available, and this construction program is almost complete.



Rostrevor College

We already have a strong relationship with Rostrevor College, even though it is just outside of our Council area. We include Rostrevor Students in our Young Citizen of the Year Awards, NAIDOC Awards, and the College has a representative on our Youth Advisory Committee.

We look forward to developing stronger partnerships with the College and we are committed to installing footpaths around the College if the Boundary Realignment proceeds.

We would also work with the College to effectively manage traffic around the College during peak hours.

Bushfire Safety

Bushfire prevention is a year-round responsibility and a necessity for property owners in the Urban/Rural interface of the Council area. Recent fires in South Australia have shown that Bushfires can have a significant impact on areas across the Urban/Rural Interface. An appropriately maintained garden and well prepared house can minimise the risk of a bushfire impacting you and your family.

Council is diligent in managing inflammable undergrowth at properties within the Council area and ensuring that all access points are clear in the event they need to be accessed by emergency services vehicles. The Athelstone CFS operates in our area and the Athelstone Fire Siren is located within the Black Hill Conservation Park.

ERA (Eastern Region Alliance)

ERA is a voluntary regional association of eastern metropolitan Councils including Campbelltown, Burnside, Norwood Payneham St Peters, Prospect, Unley, and Walkerville. These Councils have executed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to form ERA.

The magnificent eastern suburbs of Adelaide are areas of high-quality residential amenity, with proud communities that expect high standard facilities and services, and share interests in many issues including quality public transport, youth, and environmental sustainability.

ERA provides an opportunity for these Councils to work together to better serve their Communities. With the goal of securing a sustainable lifestyle, excellent services and facilities for its constituent Communities, ERA aims to:

- Improve cooperation, collaboration, and coordination across the member Councils
- Establish a robust operational framework to deliver effective and efficient services
- Be successful in attracting State and Federal Government funding for regional initiatives
- Increase awareness, and the influence, of ERA within the three spheres of Government.

We Listen to Our Community

Council provides many opportunities for our Community to connect with Council and provide feedback. We use the IAP2 framework for Community Engagement and seek to engage people from all ages and demographics. We provide open, transparent, accessible opportunities to help people connect with Council via online, hard copy and face to face consultation methods. In 2019/2020 we ran 21 consultations on plans, policies, playgrounds, new facilities and traffic matters where respondents gave meaningful input into project outcomes.

We consistently strive for continuous improvement in our Community engagement program and have been recognised twice in recent years for IAP2 SA Project of the Year.

Need More Information?

If you would like any more information about us and the services we offer please visit our website at www.campbelltown.sa.gov.au

If you would like more information about the boundary realignment process, or to see the information that we have previously provided to you please visit www.campbelltown.sa.gov.au/council/our-city/boundaryrealignment

If you have a question or any comments please email boundary@campbelltown.sa.gov.au

We would love to welcome you to our Community. Please fill out the survey you will receive, from McGregor Tan, so that we know your views on living in the City of Campbelltown.



Tel: 8366 9222

Email: boundary@campbelltown.sa.gov.au

Address: 172 Montacute Road, Rostrevor SA 5073

Appendix 10 McGregor Tan Survey Outcomes Report



CITY OF CAMPBELLTOWN

BOUNDARIES CHANGE PROPOSAL RESEARCH

JANUARY 2021 | REF 11691

CONTENTS

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	3	APPENDIX 1: RESPONDENT PROFILE	26
SUMMARY	4	APPENDIX 2: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	29
• Survey Statistics	5	APPENDIX 3: GUIDE TO READING THE REPORT	36
• Executive Summary	6	APPENDIX 4: SAMPLING TOLLERANCE	38
KEY FINDINGS	7	APPENDIX 5: SURVEY TOOL	40
• BOUNDARY CHANGE	8		
• Boundary Proposal	9		
• Reasons for Support of Opposition to Boundary Proposal	11		
• Impact on Family	13		
• Reasons for Impact on Family	15		
• Further Comments	16		
• RESIDENT PROFILE	18		
• Living in the area	19		
• Children in Educational Facilities in the Local area	20		
• Engaging in Activities	21		
• Activities Engaged in Campbelltown City Council Area	22		
• Member of a Social / Sporting / Service Club or Group	23		
• Member of a Social / Sporting Service Club or Group in the Campbelltown City Council Area	24		
• Volunteering	25		

METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted by McGregor Tan from Sunday 15 November to Tuesday 29 December 2020.



The purpose of the research is to determine the level of support and any issues or concerns regarding the proposed boundary changes (effectively move the suburbs of Rostrevor and Woodforde completely into City of Campbelltown's area), from those residents and ratepayers who would be affected by the change.



Market research has been conducted in accordance with ISO 20252.

This survey was distributed via postal mail to 759 residents and ratepayers within the affected suburbs.

A variety of options were provided to complete the survey, including online via a unique pin and completing the paper survey and returning to McGregor Tan.



A sample of 222 who are residents and ratepayers in the suburbs of Rostrevor or Woodforde completed the survey.

Participation in the survey was voluntary.



Over the past 40 years, McGregor Tan has grown to be one of the largest independent market and social research companies in Australia.


We have achieved this through the vision of our researchers which is underpinned by a strong company ethos respecting tradition while driving innovation and new technologies.



SUMMARY

SURVEY STATISTICS

759 residents and ratepayers in Rostrevor and Woodforde were invited to participate in the survey, three in ten (29%, n=222) completed the survey. Approximately two thirds were from Woodforde (64%) with the remainder from Rostrevor (37%) with the majority of the responses coming from residents – home owners or tenants.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At an overall level, one in three residents surveyed from Rostrevor and Woodforde (35%) support the boundary change proposal to move Rostrevor and Woodforde into the Campbelltown City Council's area from the Adelaide Hills Council area. There are slight differences between the residents in the two suburbs - those in Woodforde are more likely to support the proposal (44%) compared to those in Rostrevor (21%). Those who support the boundary change acknowledged that they are closer to the facilities of Campbelltown Council and are in-fact using these facilities at the moment. They also believe that they would pay lower rates if moved into the Campbelltown Council area.

However, majority of the respondents are not in favour of the boundary change (62%) and one in two residents surveyed strongly oppose (55%) the boundary change proposal. Those in Rostrevor are more likely to oppose the proposal of boundary change with three in four residents (74%) strongly opposing compared to those in Woodforde, where more than two in five strongly oppose (43%) the change. Those who oppose the change are concerned with the high density of housing / infilling in the Campbelltown Council area. They claimed to be happy with the Adelaide Hills Council and do not feel the need to be moved to Campbelltown Council.

Those who have lived in the suburbs for 5 years or more (71%), those older than 45 years (66%) and females (66%) are more likely to oppose the change.

Residents who have a higher level of engagement with the Campbelltown Council area i.e. those having a child in the childcare, school, kindergarten, or other educational facility in the local area or residents engaged in activities like shopping in supermarkets, visiting local parks, library or medical appointments in the Campbelltown Council area or residents who are members of clubs in the Campbelltown Council area are more likely to support the boundary change proposal.



KEY FINDINGS



BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL


BOUNDARY PROPOSAL

Approximately a third (35%) support the boundary change proposal while the majority opposes the proposal to move Rostrevor and Woodforde into the Campbelltown City Council’s area from the Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) area.

The opposition is stronger among those residing in Rostrevor where three in four residents (74%) strongly oppose the change compared to those in Woodforde where more than two in five strongly oppose (43%).


Those who have lived in the suburbs for 5 years or more (71%), particularly those who have lived in the area for more than 10 years (75%), those older than 45 years (66%) and females (66%) are more likely to oppose the change.

Those who have lived in the area less than 1 year (71%), under 45 years (47%) and males (42%) are more likely to support the change.



35%


Support the boundary change proposal



62%

Oppose the boundary change proposal

BOUNDARY PROPOSAL (cont.)



35%

Support the boundary change proposal


62%

Oppose the boundary change proposal

REASONS FOR SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION TO BOUNDARY PROPOSAL

The main reasons for supporting the proposal was the convenience in that they live closer to Campbelltown facilities and services and the rates would be cheaper.

The main reasons for opposition is the high density housing and infill in the Campbelltown Council area and the current level of satisfaction with the AHC. A few also mentioned that they do not see any benefit of moving to the Campbelltown City Council area.



REASONS FOR SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION TO BOUNDARY PROPOSAL (cont.)

We are more a part of the CCC including accessing services and use the roads than we do AHC.

I feel connected to the Campbelltown City Council area. I feel my council rates can go to the area I utilize. The Adelaide Hills council rates are ridiculous.

It makes sense for Campbelltown Council to take over the remaining area of Rostrevor since it already has 90%+ holdings.

Don't feel connected with the Hills Council. Mainly use Campbelltown Council for services like E-waste, Library, Playgrounds, shopping and general day to day living.

Not happy with Adelaide Hills Council - did not cap rates this year during Covid - do not clean the streets and gutters - lighting in street is terrible!

My family associates with and participates in the Campbelltown community, living in very close proximity to all the events and organisations. We do not associate with the Adelaide Hills community at all. We seldom see the Adelaide Hills Council in our area.

We don't want this to happen. Our local area does not want this to happen. Leave our environment/homes as they are. We don't want CCC as our local Council.

CCC values do NOT align with those of a Hills Suburb. This is nothing more than a rates grab.

Previous dealing with CCC have left me without a doubt on my decision.

Completely and absolutely distrust Campbelltown Council regarding zoning/ development regulations. Very happy with approach and demonstrated achievements by the AHC on these matters. We completely loathe the Campbelltown Council.

We have seen first hand the infill, over-development, poor design, budget housing, narrow streets, lack of parking and lack of planning within the Campbelltown Council area. For example, the eyesore development that includes blocks of 3 storey budget apartments being constructed on Stradbroke Rd directly opposite Morialta Conservation Park.

We paid a premium to live in the Adelaide Hills Council District rather than live in the CCC. We do not see any benefits of switching councils. We do not want Woodforde to be redeveloped like all the CCC suburbs are.


Specifically moved to Woodforde for bigger land. Do not want to see development infill introduced to the older/established Woodforde area.

No advantage at all and positive disadvantage, CCC are shocking - not interested.

IMPACT ON FAMILY


Six in ten (59%) thought the boundary proposal would have a negative impact on their family with almost half (47%) indicating an extremely negative impact – more likely to be those opposing the boundary change (93%) and those residing in Rostrevor (76%).

Approximately a third (32%) thought the boundary proposal would have a positive impact on their family with 20% indicating an extremely positive impact – likely to be those supporting the boundary change (88%).



32%


Positive impact on family



59%

Negative impact on family

IMPACT ON FAMILY (cont.)



32%

Positive impact on family


59%

Negative impact on family

REASONS FOR IMPACT ON FAMILY

Reasons for a positive impact on family life included convenience with better access to services and facilities, a belief they will be better off and not ignored and that the rates would be cheaper.

Reasons for a negative impact on family life included over development and high density with smaller blocks, a negative impact on the environment, a reduction in both the quality of life and property values and their desire to not change councils and remain within the AHC.



FURTHER COMMENTS


Respondents were invited to add further comments about the Campbelltown City Council’s boundary change proposal.

Half (50%) of the respondents provided additional comments (43% Woodforde, 63% Rostrevor).

Those that oppose the proposal (60%) were more likely to provide a comment than those who support the proposal (32%).

A variety of comments were provided with the top three being ‘listen to ratepayers – we oppose the boundary change’ (23%), ‘Council wants to raise more rates/money/ they have their own agenda’ (16%) and ‘don’t want high density housing’ (15%).

Other verbatim can be found in Appendix 2 – Additional comments.



FURTHER COMMENTS (cont.)

We do not wish to leave the Adelaide Hills Council.

This proposal is not supported by Adelaide Hills and any change should be sought through a bipartisan fashion.

We moved to Woodforde to be zoned for certain schools. We would be negatively impacted should these zones be changed as well.

CCC's long history of poor infill housing policy would destroy the remanent flora and fauna and overwhelm the very limited road, sewage and water infrastructure, which will have a negative impact on existing CCC residents.

I think that it is totally inappropriate to move out a perfectly satisfied suburb, against majority wishes with a project that has minority support. IF ANY!

This survey expresses the view of our whole household - not just me. Leave our area alone! We moved on from your council area on purpose. Anything we use in CCC AREA IS SOMETHING WE PAY FOR - THERE ARE NO BENEFITS TO US JOINING CAMPBELLTOWN COUNCIL. Only negatives and big negatives at that.

We don't want to be part of Campbelltown!! Their attitude towards the environment conflicts with ours!! It would detrimentally affect our properties and our environment.

65% of Woodforde/ Rostrevor AHC residents voted against the boundary realignment, this is a misuse of council funds.

I use many shops, facilities and clubs across Adelaide, this includes bringing business to the Campbelltown Council. I also recognise that people from other council areas walk in the Morialta Park or take a Sunday drive in the hills. I see no benefit to adjust the boundaries.

We believe the only reason CCC want to absorb our precious area is a blatant and greedy grab for more rates and more open space to cram more ugly housing.

I would support on the condition that "existing" Woodforde does not see block reduction size (and crappy infill as per rest of Campbelltown).

The council just wants money. I do not believe for a minute that they won't change the area It's MONEY, MONEY, MONEY!

Personally I feel as though Rostrevor and Woodforde never really belonged to the Hills Council as the suburbs are right on the edge/ foothills of the Adelaide Hills and belong more to the CCC.

I am all for the Campbelltown boundary change because we get nothing out of Adelaide Hills for any services such as garden maintenance and police help in our areas, as it all comes from the Mount Barker police station - too far away.




RESIDENT PROFILE

LENGTH OF TIME IN AREA

More than half have lived in the area for more than 10 years (55%), particularly those in Rostrevor (77%) compared to Woodforde (42%).

A third have lived in the area for less than 5 years (34%) with respondents more likely to live in Woodforde for this period of time (46%) compared to Rostrevor (11%).



55%

More than 10 years

11%


5 to 10 years

34%

Less than 5 years

CHILDREN IN EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES IN THE LOCAL AREA

Four in ten (38%) have a child in an educational facility in the local area (Rostrevor 44%, Woodforde 35%), while a third (32%) do not have a child using an educational facility in the local area. Residents in Rostrevor had a higher incidence of having a child in primary or secondary school than those in Woodforde. Those who support the boundary change proposal are more likely to have a child in an education facility (42%) compared to those who oppose the proposal (36%).



38%

Have a child in educational facility

32%

Do not

ENGAGING IN ACTIVITIES


Residents are more likely to engage in activities in the Adelaide Hills area (66%) compared to the Campbelltown area (44%).

Those residing in Rostrevor had a higher incidence of engaging in the Adelaide Hills area (73%) compared to those living in Woodforde (62%). While those residing in Woodforde are more likely to participate in activities in the Campbelltown area (47%) than those living in Rostrevor (40%).

Three in ten (31%) never engage in activities in the Adelaide Hills area compared to over half (53%) for the Campbelltown area.

Those that support the boundary proposal are likely to be engaging in activities in the Campbelltown area (64%) while those that opposed the proposal are likely to be engaging in activities in the Adelaide Hills area (88%).


Frequency of engaging in activities in the following areas



ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN CAMPBELLTOWN CITY COUNCIL AREA

The top activities engaged in to some degree were:

- Shop in supermarkets, specialty shops, or purchase dine in or takeaway (92%)
- Visit local parks and playgrounds (73%)
- Attend medical/specialist appointments (59%)
- Visit the Campbelltown Library (58%)
- Attend events such as Moonlight Markets, Tour Down Under, movie screenings, Christmas Parade, Christmas Carols etc. (57%)
- Attend Community events such as fetes and festivals (53%)
- Visit Thorndon Park, use the outdoor exercise equipment, attend walking groups (52%)




MEMBER OF A SOCIAL / SPORTING / SERVICE CLUB OR GROUP

More than a third are members of a social / sporting / service club or group in the Campbelltown area (36%) compared to the Adelaide Hills area (11%).


Those residing in Woodforde are had a higher incidence of being a club member in the Campbelltown area (41%) compared to those in Rostrevor (29%). While those residing in Rostrevor are more likely to be a member in the Adelaide Hills area (21%) than those in Woodforde (5%).

Over half are not a member of a club or group in the Campbelltown area (59%) while the majority are not a member in the Adelaide Hills area (86%).

Those that support the boundary proposal are likely to be a club member in the Campbelltown area (54%) while those that oppose the proposal are likely to be a member in the Adelaide Hills area (16%).




MEMBER OF A SOCIAL / SPORTING / SERVICE CLUB OR GROUP IN THE CAMPBELLTOWN CITY COUNCIL AREA



VOLUNTEERING


Few respondents volunteer in either the Campbelltown area (6%) or the Adelaide Hills area (8%).






APPENDIX 1: RESPONDENT PROFILE

RESPONDENT PROFILE



RESPONDENT PROFILE





APPENDIX 2: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional comments can provide a richness to the open ended questions, but in this report, where possible, comments have all been coded to quantify the responses.

This section lists a selection of responses, made by individual interviewees, which did not fit within the coded responses. These comments are included for completeness, but always remember they are minor responses, negligible in relation to the main, coded data. In other words, remember that these are generally isolated comments, providing flavour but not constituting the main ingredients.

To retain the colour and authenticity of the verbatim comments, they have been left largely unedited except for minimal spell checking.

Q7 Are you, or is any member of your household, a member or participant of any of the following clubs or groups in the Campbelltown City Council area?
Other

Vendata group.
Scouts, Lochiel Park run.
Moving to music.
Lochiel parkrun.

Q8 Which social / sporting / service clubs or groups in the Adelaide Hills Council area are you a member of? Other

Walking group.	Mt. Lofty Rangers 4WD Club.
Uraidla Market, Stirling Market, Yoga classes,	MRA, EFM.
Friends of Morialta & Black Hill.	MRA.
Softball.	Morialta Residents Association.
Softball.	Prefer not to say.
Save Our Wildlife Farm Animal Rescue.	Kersbrook Sporting Club.
Prefer not to say.	Crafters Netball Club.
Religious Group.	Community Garden.
Private.	Comets Netball.
Norton Summit Climbing Club of SA.	Church Club.
None of your business.	Adelaide Hills Environment Centre.
Prefer not to say.	Prefer not to say.

Additional comments

Q9 Who do you volunteer for in the Campbelltown City Council area?

Tutors at V3a.
St Vincent De Paul Hectorville.
St George's Church.
Rotary Club.
Rostrevor Tennis Club.
Rostrevor Baptist Church.
Norwood Flames Basketball Club.
Nona Cucina (Italian meals on wheels).
MOW.
Meals On Wheels.
Lochiel Parkrun.
Library.
Hectorville Football & Basketball Club.
Cat Adoption Foundation.

Q10 Who do you volunteer for in the Adelaide Hills Council area?

Walking Groups.
The Greens.
Rostrevor College Board.
Prefer not to say.
Private none of your business.
None of your business.
Prefer not to say.
Morialta Residents Association.
Prefer not to say.
Morialta Residents Association.
Historic society.
For church service activity.
FOBHM.
Currently registering our interest to volunteer in the AHC.
Prefer not to say.
Adelaide Hills Environment Centre.
Prefer not to say.

Additional comments

Q12 Why do you oppose the boundary change proposal? Other

The reason previously given that Woodforde residents wanted the convenience of the CCC activities in my opinion is no excuse.

Unsolicited move by the CCC. I suspect their motives, bearing in mind - this survey is very expensive, they will expect to recap their costs many times over.

AHC took a big hit with the 2019/20 fires and COVID-19 and wouldn't it be considerate to them to have our rates and taxes going to them when they really need to rebuild, and help the AHC community... CCC is going for a \$ grab.

Our rates will increase, we consider this as a "grab for cash" initiative by the CCC. AHC have always been very responsive to any of our concerns.

Because the original cost comparison between the two options had a flawed calculation that resulted it showing CCC was cheaper, when they were actually both about the same. Skeptical me says this was a deliberate mistake.

Increased council rates.

Q12 Why do you support the boundary change proposal? Other

Very little to no contact with AHC.

Single approach to traffic control on Glen Stuart Rd, better management of stormwater from the Hamilton Hill development. Better provision of services, council is committed to provision of footpaths around Rostrevor College to enhance student safety. A well managed council that is fiscally prudent and has a strong history of being run well.

We use Campbelltown facilities but are unable to access all benefits of a Campbelltown resident (e.g. compost bins and waste disposal options) as we are not council residents. We don't get any benefits from Adelaide Hills Council, other than bin collection, as the distance to council facilities and time taken to get there is too great.

It is probably the only way Glen Stuart Rd will be upgraded. Campbelltown has greater capacity to deliver services and facilities.

On the basis that the area has a specific development policy area with development restricted to larger allotment sizes of over 1200sqm, for example Tranmere Poets Corner. This would assist with maintaining the current street appeal of typically larger family homes.

Because Adelaide Hills so sweet all for the residents in Rostrevor. Waste - have to take to Gumeracha or Heathfield - give us a break.

I don't know my council and the council don't know me.

Additional comments

Q14 Why do you think the Council boundary change proposal will have a negative impact on you and your family? Other

We disagree with CCC's continuous and unethical badgering of AHC residents and unfounded claims that we are 'freeloading' on the CCC community.

See question 12.

Refer previous comment.

The services we receive from the AHC are prompt, prices are always transparent.

Same as question 12.

Yes.

As per q12 - other factors are not expected to impact.

See previous answer regarding reasons myself and all adults within my household are opposed to Campbelltown's boundary change proposal.

Notwithstanding recent assurances of maintaining the current conditions of the Adelaide Hills Council Development plan. Any slight change to the AHC Development plan will ameliorate those assurances.

There is no guarantee that a future CCC will not renege on any promises made by this CCC regarding development in this area. Such an outcome whether it be in 5 years or 50 would be deleterious to the neighborhood including future generations of my family.

See above.

As per above. Some years ago Campbelltown Council were considering fortnightly rubbish collection. This is ridiculous!

See previous, plus on top of that my rates would go up, so just leave things as they are, stop grabbing other people's land.

As above.

Division will remain due to planning.

As previously stated.

Q14 Why do you think the Council boundary change proposal will have a positive impact on you and your family? Other

Easy.

I have lived very happily for many years in the Hills. A change would be very emotional if I wanted a change I would move.

Costs more - poor management, poor planning in CCC sadness, small blocks.

The proof will be in the detail. Look forward to having proper footpaths to walk on safely.

Same as for question 12 above.

The development at Hamilton Hill will be better supervised, holding the developer to account, the council is in a strong financial position and rates will be cheaper.

I hope once the Council hid electric lines in front of my property under ground.

Please see the notes given in the previous box.

Property value will go up as the rates will come.

Additional comments

Q15 Please add any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal. Other

We don't want to be part of Campbelltown!! Their attitude toward the environment conflicts with ours!! It would detrimentally affect our properties and our environment.

Why do Campbelltown want to take over?

The literature from Campbelltown Council delivered to our letterbox has not adequately explained the reasons why it wishes to include our suburb within its boundary.

In the event that this proposal happens I would prefer a name change to "Morialta".

Hands off !!!! Fix the issues with Campbelltown Council's current boundary before looking to expand and ruin our streetscape. Your offer of reduced rates to attract a yes vote is deplorable.

I have read both councils publications and still can't see why Campbelltown council persist with something that Adelaide Hills Council residents.

I wonder if this change proposal has the support of Adelaide Hills Council.

Keep the push on the AHC and try it again in another five years.

In this survey you have asked whether we shop, use parks, watch movies, etc. in CCC but you have asked no such questions in relation to Adelaide Hills Council. This seems to be a biased approach to the matter. For the record we: - Shop in the Adelaide Hills regularly - Visit parks in the Adelaide Hills - Ride on bike trails and tracks in the Adelaide Hills - Go to markets and community events in the Adelaide Hills - Dine at cafes and restaurants in the Adelaide Hills - We attend organised sport in The Adelaide Hills - Attend major events such as Tour Down Under and car rallies in the Adelaide Hills If you compare this with our CCC-related answers, you will see we have a much closer connection to the Adelaide Hills.

We moved to Woodforde to be zoned for certain schools. We would be negatively impacted should these zones be changed as well.

This survey is using misleading information in its questions. For example, question 4 are not all in Campbelltown, in particular Rostrevor! The survey information does not even provide a map delineating Campbelltown Council Area from neighbouring areas. Our recreation largely occurs in Adelaide Hills Council, being Morialta Conservation Park and road cycling on various hills roads.

Additional comments

As I wrote in my email to the Campbelltown Council sent on 14/11/2020 - To get my vote, I would like to see 2 green waste bins picked up per fortnight for all residents in the CFS declared "HIGH FIRE RISK AREA" as per my house on the southern side of Arcoona Ave. Dispensing of green waste from a 1600m² property in a high fire risk area is a perpetual challenge. 2 green bins per fortnight is only fair for residents like myself in a declared "HIGH FIRE RISK AREA" Please refer to the email I sent to the CCC on the 14/11/2020.

I am concerned that Glen Stuart Rd is not wide enough anymore for volume of traffic with Hamilton Hill. Glen Stuart/Norton Summit/Woodforde Hill intersection is unsafe + unworkable. Norton Summit + Magill Rd intersection is too congested at peak hour.

Our family is concerned the streets and parks might also not be maintained as there is a lot of areas of leaf litter, overhanging trees, creatures.

There has been a quite passionate and sophisticated campaign against the proposal which I felt was largely exaggeration and misinformation. The concern that has had some influence is the worry about changes in local character which may follow the realignment. I accept the council's recent assurance that this would not be changed by any of their decisions. I believe that a similar assurance that the council reserve adjacent to the Morialta Conservation Park would never be made available for development, would address a concern which those bordering that reserve may have regarding consequences of the realignment.

Being on the boundary line, I already hate what CCC is doing with "light" industry directly opposite my home, making sleep difficult.

The Adelaide Hills survey did not invade my privacy as this one - I want my selection noted without my personal information being divulged.

Let's not confuse CCC services with what are public provided services.

See answer to question 12 - unbalanced, biased survey on which to be basing boundary change proposals.

I don't understand why Hamilton Hill development was ever considered - practically speaking - part of Adelaide Hills. The boundary change seems like a no brainer to me.


If CCC can articulate a plan on what they propose to do to improve the region/suburb then I would be amenable to a potential change. Items dear to me are: > maintenance of local infrastructure to a high standard >removal of power lines (underground power) on Glen Stuart Road >Plan to improve the aesthetic of the area.

Provide clarity with regards to a development plan for this specific area, as mentioned in an early response I would support these areas having a specified policy area which restricts high and medium density development.

What is there for the CCC to rest assure me that no such building blocks into the present landscape be allowed?

Campbelltown Council has a better handle on development and maintains good service than the Adelaide Hills that is more rural oriented.

AHC has run a terribly biased + negative smear campaign on this proposal + I have lost respect for my own council.



APPENDIX 3: GUIDE TO READING THE REPORT

GUIDE TO READING THE REPORT

The core report is typically analysed in order of the questions asked in the survey. Relevant statistically significant findings as well as other observations of interest are analysed in this report.

Please note that, because of rounding, answers in single response questions will not always sum precisely to 100%.

In addition, as the base for percentages is the number of respondents answering a particular question (rather than the number of responses) multiple response questions sum to more than 100%.



APPENDIX 4: SAMPLING TOLERANCE

SAMPLING TOLERANCE

It should be borne in mind throughout this report that all data based on sample surveys are subject to a sampling tolerance.

For example, that is, where a of 400 sample is used to represent the population, the resulting figures should not be regarded as absolute values, but rather as the mid-point of a range plus or minus 5% on a 50:50 response (see sampling tolerance table) i.e. if a response is 55% yes and 45% no – the Yes has a variance between 60%-50% and the No would have a variance between 50%-40% (+ or – 5 percentage points from the mid point).

Only variations clearly designated as significantly different are statistically valid differences and these are clearly pointed out in the report.

Other divergences are within the normal range of fluctuation at a 95% confidence level; they should be viewed with some caution and not treated as statistically reliable changes.

MARGIN OF ERROR TABLE (95% confidence level)										
SAMPLE SIZE ↓	Percentages giving a particular answer									
	5% 95%	10% 90%	15% 85%	20% 80%	25% 75%	30% 70%	35% 65%	40% 60%	45% 55%	50% 50%
50	6	9	10	11	12	13	14	14	14	14
100	4	6	7	8	9	9	10	10	10	10
150	4	5	6	7	7	8	8	8	8	8
200	3	4	5	6	6	6	7	7	7	7
250	3	4	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6
300	3	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	6	6
400	2	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
500	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5
600	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
700	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4
800	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
900	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1000	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1500	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
2000	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3000	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2



APPENDIX 5: SURVEY TOOL



Please type the survey link into your browser or scan the QR code. Enter your unique Survey Access code to enter the survey.

SCAN ME



Survey link: <https://bit.ly/CampbelltownSurvey>

Survey Access Code:
Pin:

You may only complete the survey once.

BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL SURVEY

1. Do you live or own a property or do you own a business owner located in Rostrevor or Woodforde? Tick all that apply

☐ Rostrevor ☐ Woodforde

2. Are you a... Tick all that apply

☐ Resident - Home Owner ☐ Resident - Tenant ☐ Owner of a business in Rostrevor or Woodforde
☐ Property owner but not residing in Rostrevor or Woodforde ☐ Other (please specify) _____

3. How long have you lived, owned a business or property in this area? Tick all that apply

☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 1 to less than 3 years ☐ 3 to less than 5 years
☐ 5 to less than 10 years ☐ More than 10 years

4. Do you have any children in your household who currently attend, or who have previously attended, childcare, school, kindergarten, or other educational facility in the local area?

For example if you have children attending Magill Kindergarten and Athelstone School, please circle 1. Preschool or Kindergarten and 2. Primary School - it is not necessary to circle which school they attend.

☐ Preschool or Kindergarten ☐ Primary School ☐ Secondary School ☐ Tertiary Education

SCHOOLS IN THE LOCAL AREA

PRESCHOOL OR KINDERGARTEN				PRIMARY SCHOOL			
Athelstone Preschool	Campbelltown Community Children's Centre	Campbelltown Preschool	Small Early Learning Centre Heidelberg	Athelstone School	Charles Campbell College	East Marden School	East Torrens School
Goodstart Early Learning Campbelltown	Green Leaves Early Learning Network	Island Children's Education & Education Paradise	Island Children's Centre	Paradise School	St Joseph's School Torrens	St Francis of Assisi School	St Joseph's School Hectorville
Kindo Children's Centre Kindergarten	Magill Campus Community Children's Centre	Magill Kindergarten	Montevic House Newton	Strathmore School	Sunrise Christian School	Thornhill Park School	
Paradise Kindergarten	Rostrevor Kindergarten	Sunrise Christian Early Learning Centre	Thornhill Park Kindergarten				
SECONDARY SCHOOL				TERTIARY EDUCATION			
Charles Campbell College	Norwood Morialta High School	Rostrevor College	St Ignace College	University of South Australia - Magill Campus			

5. How frequently do you engage in the following activities in the Campbelltown City Council area? Tick one box per statement

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Attend church	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend Community events such as fetes, festivals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend events such as Moonlight Markets, Tour Down Under, movie screenings, Christmas Parade, Christmas Carols etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend Immunisation clinics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend medical/specialist appointments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attend organised sport or Community groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participate in activities for older people including CHSP social program, U3A, activities at the Marchant Community Centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Receive Meals on Wheels deliveries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shop in supermarkets, specialty shops, or purchase dine in or takeaway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit the ArtHouse, Community Garden, Community Orchard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit The ARC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit local parks and playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit the Campbelltown Library	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit Thorndon Park, use the outdoor exercise equipment, attend walking groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. How frequently do you engage in activities like community events or activities in the Adelaide Hills Council?

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Often ☐ Always

7. Are you, or is any member of your household, a member or participant of any of the following clubs or groups in the Campbelltown City Council area? Tick all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arts/cultural groups like Campbelltown ArtHouse, SA Watercolour Society, Campbelltown Writers Group, Ripples Community Arts, etc. | <input type="checkbox"/> Netball clubs like Newton Jaguars, Campbelltown Comets, Hectorville etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Campbelltown City Band | <input type="checkbox"/> Norwood Flames Basketball Club |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Campbelltown Little Athletics | <input type="checkbox"/> Rostrevor Old Collegians Club (cricket, football or soccer) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Clubs or groups like Campbelltown Community Club, Probos, Community | <input type="checkbox"/> Rostrevor Tennis Club |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cricket Clubs like Athelstone, East Torrens, Magill, Hectorville | <input type="checkbox"/> Service Clubs like Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Inner Wheel etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dance Studios | <input type="checkbox"/> Soccer Clubs like Campbelltown, Athelstone, Eastern United etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Facebook or Social Media Groups related to Campbelltown | <input type="checkbox"/> Table Tennis clubs like Athelstone, Houghton, East Adelaide Community Club etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Football Clubs like Athelstone, Hectorville | <input type="checkbox"/> Tennis Clubs like Campbelltown, Athelstone, Hectorville etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gym/Health Clubs (excluding the ARC) | <input type="checkbox"/> The ARC Campbelltown |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Martial Arts clubs | <input type="checkbox"/> Any other club in the Campbelltown Council Area? (please specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mature Age Badminton Club | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Netball clubs like Newton Jaguars, Campbelltown Comets, Hectorville etc. | <input type="checkbox"/> Not a member of any of these clubs? |

8. Are you a member of any social / sporting / service clubs or groups in the Adelaide Hills Council area?

☐ Yes (please specify which club / group) _____ ☐ No

9. Do you currently volunteer in the Campbelltown City Council area (including Emergency Services) ?

☐ Yes (please specify where you volunteer) _____ ☐ No

10. Do you currently volunteer in the Adelaide Hills Council area (including Emergency Services) ?

☐ Yes (please specify where you volunteer) _____ ☐ No

As you see in the cover letter provided with this survey, in January 2019 the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal to the Boundaries Commission for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Rostrevor and Woodforde suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

11. Please rate your level of support for the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal to move Rostrevor and Woodforde into the Campbelltown City Council's area on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly oppose and 5 is strongly support?

	Strongly oppose	Somewhat oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat support	Completely support
Boundary change proposal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Why did you give that answer?

13. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely negative impact and 5 is extremely positive impact, to what extent will the proposed Council boundary change proposal to move Rostrevor and Woodforde into the Campbelltown City Council's area impact you and your family?

	Extremely negative impact	Slightly negative impact	No impact at all	Slightly positive impact	Extremely positive impact
Boundary change proposal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Why did you give that answer?

15. Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like to mention.

16. Do you identify as...

☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Non-binary / Gender fluid / Agender ☐ Prefer not to say

17. Please indicate your age group.

☐ Under 18 ☐ 18 - 24 years ☐ 25 - 34 years ☐ 35 - 44 years ☐ 45 - 54 years
☐ 55 - 64 years ☐ 65 - 74 years ☐ 75 - 84 years ☐ 85 years or over

18. Do you wish to be involved in any McGregor Tan market research activities like paid focus groups, surveys etc. ?

☐ Yes (Please provide your details below) ☐ No

First Name: _____
Email: _____
Contact Number: _____
Postcode: _____
Year of Birth: _____

Thank you for your time to fill out this survey.

If you need more space please attach additional pages. Please place your completed survey in the free reply-paid envelope provided and into your nearest mailbox by
Monday the 7th December 2020.

McGregor Tan is accredited to the highest professional industry standards (ISO 20252:2019 Market, Opinion and Social Research) for the full scope of research and strategy services including customised research for consumer, social and commercial studies, as recognised by the Australian Market and Social Research Society.






MCGREGOR **TAN**
RESEARCH. STRATEGY. SOLUTIONS.

THANK YOU





Boundary Realignment – Woodforde and part of Rostrevor



Information Sheet and Feedback Form

Council (Campbelltown Council) is investigating the possibility of moving its boundary to include Woodforde and part of Rostrevor as shown in blue on the map on the next page.

Council thinks that there are strong common interests between its Community and the residents of Woodforde and Rostrevor. These include managing the hills face zone and protecting the environment, tackling climate change, and preventing further infill development.

Changing the Council boundary would enable residents and ratepayers in these locations to have close access to Council's services and facilities. They could also help to influence and shape delivery of our services and facilities. Residents in the impacted area probably already attend local schools, belong to local sporting or other clubs, shop, work or play in the area. It makes sense that they might like to formally become part of our Community.

Adelaide Hills Council is currently considering boundary changes, or amalgamation options, with other Hills Councils. Council thinks this strengthens the argument for these metropolitan based properties to be included with our Council boundary.

The History of our Boundary

The best local communities make people feel like they belong. They share common interests, common values and often, a common history too. The communities of Campbelltown, Rostrevor, and Woodforde have a common history that stretches all the way back to the 1850s. At that time, we were all together in what was called East Torrens Council, the second Council to be declared in the new state of South Australia.

As Campbelltown grew and prospered, we became our own Council in 1868, however we continued to share a common purpose with areas that we know today as Woodforde, Hamilton Hill, and Upper Rostrevor.

Our modern landscape is dotted with many old landmarks like St George's Anglican Church, Fourth Creek Estate (Rostrevor College), Woodforde House and the pristine and peaceful Glen Stuart Falls (Morialta Falls) where families, businesses and social enterprises worked, lived and played together, creating a sense of belonging that is so strongly embedded in our Community more than a century later.

Over time, discussions, even Royal Commissions, (1933, 1973) have been held around boundary changes, as Governments seek to bring together local Communities that have the perfect fit. In 2020, we are still talking about this boundary change and that's a good thing. Councils should always review and reflect upon what is best for their local communities, their shared purpose, and their common interests.

What is the Process?

Changing the Boundary is a legislative process. Council has submitted a proposal to the Boundaries Commission, who provided permission for Campbelltown to explore this boundary change. Council is now seeking your views, as well as the views of the residents and property owners in the impacted area in Woodforde and Rostrevor. Once we have these views Council will decide whether to proceed with a further submission to the Boundaries Commission. If the Commission considers that the change has merit they will investigate it themselves and form a view. The final decision about the Boundary changes lies with the Local Government Minister.

Connect With Us

Council invites you to participate in a quick survey (2-3 minutes) by:

- Visiting connect2.campbelltown.sa.gov.au, or
- Collecting a hard copy survey from Council's Office, The ARC Campbelltown or Campbelltown Library.

Alternatively you can submit an email or letter.

For more information please visit:

www.campbelltown.sa.gov.au/council/our-city/boundaryrealignment

Enquiries can be made to

boundary@campbelltown.sa.gov.au or 8366 9222.

Consultation closes: 5pm, Monday 30 November 2020.



As a resident/property owner in the City of Campbelltown, we would like to hear what you think.

1. To ensure we can include your feedback we require your full name and address.

This will not be provided in any report or linked to any individual's feedback in accordance with our Privacy Policy.

Name Address


2. Are you:

- ☐ an owner/occupant of property within the Campbelltown Council area
☐ working or studying in the Council area
☐ none of the above

3. Do you support Campbelltown City Council exploring the option of changing its current boundary to incorporate the suburb of Woodforde and part of Rostrevor?

Level of Support

Strongly Oppose (please circle) 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Support Not Sure



4. Please confirm your suburb.

- ☐ Athelstone ☐ Campbelltown ☐ Hectorville ☐ Magill ☐ Newton
☐ Paradise ☐ Rostrevor ☐ Tranmere ☐ Other

5. Please indicate your gender.

- ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Prefer not to say

6. Please indicate your age group.

- ☐ Under 18 ☐ 18 – 24 years ☐ 25 – 34 years ☐ 35 – 44 years
☐ 45 – 54 years ☐ 55 – 64 years ☐ 65 – 74 years ☐ 75 – 84 years ☐ 85 years or over

If you would like to be kept in the loop with this consultation and informed of the engagement outcomes, please provide your email address.

Email:

Thank you for your feedback and comments.

Readers should not assume that this boundary realignment will proceed. Council will decide on the direction to be taken only after considering all submissions, and the Local Government Minister will make the final decision.

Appendix 12 CCC Survey Outcomes Report to Council

11.12 Boundary Realignment

General Manager Corporate & Community Services, Michelle Hammond
and Chief Executive Officer, Paul Di Iulio's Report

Purpose of Report

To consider the consultation outcomes of the Boundary realignment surveys and to decide whether to proceed to a Stage 2 Submission to the Boundaries Commission.

Strategic Plan Link

Focus Area 4.3.3 Plan for change in demographics, population needs and climatic conditions

Focus Area 5.1.2 Support Elected Members and Committee Members to undertake their legislative functions

Focus Area 5.3.3 Provide corporate and financial governance that meets the needs of our Community and legislative requirements

Background

Boundary realignment between AHC (Adelaide Hills Council) and CCC (Campbelltown Council) has been discussed for many years. Most Campbelltown residents would consider Morialta Conservation Park, for example, as part of the Campbelltown City Council area due to its close proximity and the fact that it borders the residential Rostrevor part of Council. Council has a strong relationship with Rostrevor College, whose students are eligible for Council grants and representation on Council Committees; again most Campbelltown residents assume that Rostrevor College is within the Council area. There is demonstrated strong communities of interest between some of the residents in the relevant areas of Adelaide Hills Council and the Campbelltown Council area.

A Royal Commission in 1973-74 recommended that Woodforde and Rostrevor should be linked to Campbelltown. Woodforde residents held a meeting in February 1997 attended by 60 residents and requested that the subject of joining with an eastern suburbs Council be considered within six months of the new Council and boundaries of East Torrens Council being formed.

In 2013 Campbelltown initiated a meeting with AHC staff to discuss boundary realignment options. In 2015 former AHC Mayor, Bill Spragg touted the idea of moving Woodforde and Teringie to Campbelltown as they 'had a closer connection to the metropolitan area than the Hills and use many more services and facilities provided by Campbelltown Council'. The Chief Executive Officers and Mayors of both Councils met in September 2015, and August and September 2016 to discuss this. In 2018 AHC initiated another meeting with Campbelltown and some of its other neighbouring Councils to discuss the potential for Campbelltown to take on most of the old East Torrens Council area. Subsequent to that AHC resolved not to make any changes.

As a result of the Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Bill 2016 being enacted, which provided the ability for individual Councils to initiate a boundary realignment proposal, Council submitted a Stage 1 General Proposal to the Boundaries Commission in 2019. The Commission approved the proposal in May 2019 and advised that Council could proceed to a Stage 2 proposal.

To progress this, Staff sought information from AHC regarding names and addresses of residents within the relevant area, capital valuations, and asset data. Names and address information was sought so that Council could meaningfully engage with the relevant AHC residents. Capital valuation and asset data was also sought as both of these pieces of information are critical to the financial analysis of this proposal.

Senior Council Staff met with Senior AHC Staff in August 2019 to discuss working together on this project. Council Staff considered this was the best way to proceed, particularly so that AHC residents were not surveyed twice, or did not have to repeat their concerns or support via several different means. Although the AHC Chief Executive Officer committed to working together, he advised that a public meeting had already been organised by AHC for their residents. Council's Chief Executive Officer asked if it was possible to change the date of that meeting, as it fell on a Campbelltown Council meeting night, to allow both Councils to attend, present information to AHC residents, and hear what concerns or points of interest were. The AHC Chief Executive Officer advised that the meeting could not be changed. As such, the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Senior Staff attended for a short time before the Council meeting. The Mayor also gave a short presentation to the public meeting.

Subsequently AHC conducted a survey with their own residents, which was disappointing given their Chief Executive Officer's commitment to work together with Council. As a result of that survey, along with the fact that Staff were unable to obtain the relevant data, Staff decided to wait until that process was finished before commencing engaging with AHC residents. The results of this survey are attached, and were also provided to Council in a deputation by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of AHC on 2 June 2020.

As a result of the devastating bushfires in the Adelaide Hills in December 2019 and January 2020, Campbelltown City Council Staff decided to postpone engagement with the AHC residents to enable AHC to have some recovery time during this period. Subsequent to that, the COVID-19 pandemic arrived, and again a decision was made to postpone further work on this project during that time.

As Members are aware, there has been much media attention surrounding this proposed boundary realignment, and Council have been accused of being slow at investigating the proposal, criticised for not engaging with the AHC residents, and of late, publicly accused of being predatory. To the contrary, Council has been absolutely respectful of, and to, the AHC residents, and any decisions made to postpone the process have been made with their best interests in mind as it was considered it would be disrespectful and poor timing to engage with residents.

Staff acknowledge that there is a lot of emotion surrounding this proposal, which is why some of the above decisions were made. The accusation of being predatory is disappointing. Council is simply investigating a concept in accordance with the legislation. Should Council submit a Stage 2 Proposal to the Boundaries Commission, the Local Government Minister will determine whether there is merit in pursuing the proposal. Council is not the decision maker, and Staff are confident that the Boundaries Commission and Local Government Minister will determine whether there is merit in investigating this proposal.

Council consulted with both the relevant AHC residents, and Campbelltown residents in November 2020, working with information publicly available and limited knowledge of residents most impacted by this proposal as data still had not been shared. Both consultations closed in early December.

It is important to note that AHC has resolved a strategic position to undertake a review of its boundaries with adjoining Councils to determine any potential boundary realignments and/or amalgamations. In line with this, AHC commissioned a desktop review of its boundaries and that report identified that the 'residential development within the part of the suburb of Rostrevor which lies within the Adelaide Hills Council is broadly consistent with the residential development of the north-eastern suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide, albeit that it remains at a low density compared with the more recent medium density subdivisions across the region.' The report goes on to say that 'This part of the suburb of Rostrevor is physically separated from the communities of the Adelaide Hills Council to the east by the western foothills of the Mount Lofty Ranges.'

Discussion


Consultation with Adelaide Hill's Council Residents

Council engaged MT (McGregor Tan) to undertake an independent survey of Adelaide Hill's residents. Concurrently Council provided a document to Adelaide Hill's residents (attached) to provide some information about the services available in the Council area. A deliberate decision was made not to compare or infer service levels provided within AHC; the document was purely to provide information about Campbelltown City Council and the services available.

The survey was distributed by post to 759 AHC residents and ratepayers and a total of 222 residents and ratepayers of AHC responded to this survey. Survey responses could be made online to MT using a unique pin, or by filling out a paper copy and returning the survey to MT. Only one response per household was permitted.

The detailed results of this survey are contained within the report from MT (attached). At a high level this survey reflected similar numbers to the AHC survey, with 62% AHC residents indicating they do not support the boundary realignment, and 35% indicating that they do support the boundary realignment. The opposition was much stronger from Rostrevor residents, with 74% strongly opposing the realignment, whereas with Woodforde residents only 43% opposed the realignment. There was also stronger opposition from those who had lived in the area for over five or 10 years, as compared to those who had lived in the area for less than five years (refer to page 9 MT report).

Page 10 of the MT report provides some greater insight into the numbers and is reproduced below:



This chart shows that those who have lived in the area for less than five years, and particularly less than one year, show a level of support for boundary reform, which is worth further exploration. Likewise, in the age group 45 and under there is less opposition to the boundary realignment. As residents new to the area, and those under 45 years of age, show less opposition to the realignment, Staff believe this initiative warrants further exploration.

The most overwhelming reason for opposing the realignment was the concern about infill and housing density, which Council has publicly stated will be no different under either Council. Council is committed to maintaining the policy area as is, outside of State Government influence, which is the same commitment that AHC can make. The next highest reason to oppose the realignment was that residents were happy with the service provided by AHC and would prefer to stay within AHC. The highest reason respondents supported the realignment was that they live close to, and use Campbelltown facilities and services. More detail about these perceptions is available in the attachment.

Council has two options to consider when looking at the data from the MT AHC survey:

1. As the overall numbers closely reflect those contained within the AHC survey, Council may consider that the survey results alone, provide a reason not to pursue the boundary realignment investigation
2. Looking at the data behind the numbers Council may consider that the future of the area (ie those new to the area, and residents under 45 years of age) are more open to investigating the boundary realignment.

As the legislation is untested at this point in time, it is unclear how much weight community consultation results will have in an ultimate decision by the Boundaries Commission. It is clear though, that Community consultation results will form part of the consideration for the Commission.

Consultation with Campbelltown Council Residents


A survey was provided for City of Campbelltown residents and ratepayers and was made available on Council's online survey platform at www.connect2.campbelltown.sa.gov.au. The survey was advertised using the following means:

- Advertisement in The Advertiser
- Banners x 2 in prominent locations throughout the City
- Corflutes
- Social media posts
- Direct mailout to residents within close vicinity to the Hamilton Hill Development
- Surveys and display at the Council Office, Library and The ARC
- Advice on email signature
- Direct advice to Online Panel members.

The survey asked one question in an attempt to understand whether the local Community supported Council further investigating the proposed boundary realignment.

The survey was deliberately silent on rates for two reasons. Firstly, whilst Council is aware it would receive additional rates income as a result of the boundary realignment, it is not aware of the associated expenditure that will come as a result of the realignment. As such no financial modelling has been undertaken to determine the potential impact this will have on Campbelltown ratepayers' rates. Secondly, it was considered that advising that Council will receive additional rates income may have positively influenced the survey results.

A total of 164 valid responses were received; 145 via the online survey, 12 emails, and 7 hardcopy surveys. The results are shown in the graph below:



A total of 79.88% of respondents strongly supported (68.29%) or somewhat supported further investigation in to the boundary realignment. 2.43% neither supported or opposed, and 17.68% strongly opposed (15.85%) or somewhat opposed it.

Members may be interested in the results from households outside of the Council area. These respondents were either ratepayers in the Council area, visited or studied within the Council area, or were simply interested. These responses are tabled below:

Suburb	No. Responses	Strongly Support	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose
Woodforde	9	4	1	4
Rostrevor (AHC)	7	1		6
Auldana	1	1		
Pooraka	1	1		

Members may also be interested in respondents from Rostrevor within the Campbelltown Council area. 18 Rostrevor (Campbelltown City Council) residents responded; 13 strongly supported, 4 somewhat supported, and 1 strongly opposed.

Overall, it is clear that Campbelltown residents and ratepayers do have an appetite for Council to further investigate this proposal. Staff also recognise that the Campbelltown Council Community needs further information and engagement on this matter should Council choose to proceed. Written comments received are attached.

If Council decides to proceed with a Stage 2 Submission to the Commission the submission could include:

- Timing options – If the Commission ultimately thought that the boundary realignment was sensible, the timing of the realignment could be in several years to allow AHC and their residents to prepare
- Recognition of the fact that there will be a loss of rate revenue (and associated expenditure) to AHC. The submission would note that Council is very supportive of progressively transitioning the rates revenue across to Campbelltown City Council in a way that best supports AHC
- Boundary Options – AHC and their consultant's report have indicated that they are confused as to why this realignment proposal did not include Teringie. The submission could indicate that Council is not wedded to this particular boundary and would be open to other suggestions that the Commission thought would be more sensible or efficient.

Council has two courses of action it could take:

1. *Cease the process and choose not to submit a Stage 2 Submission to the Boundaries Commission.*

2. *Submit a Stage 2 Submission to the Boundaries Commission.* The Boundaries Commission on receipt of the submission will decide whether the proposal is worth investigating further. If the Commission decides that it will investigate the proposal the Commission will provide a quote to Council for the cost of their investigation. At that point Council would have another decision to make as to whether it is prepared to pay the amount quoted to pursue this matter further.

Social Implications

Whilst the legislation remains untested, Staff assume that for the Boundaries Commission to support a boundary realignment, there would need to be benefits for both Communities.

AHC residents who are already associated strongly with Campbelltown Council, spend much of their time in the area, and have social, sports and other networks, may feel a sense of increased connection with the Campbelltown City Council Community. AHC Residents who strongly oppose the boundary realignment and are passionate about staying as part of AHC may feel a sense of loss, in moving to Campbelltown Council.

Environmental / Climate Change Implications

There are no environmental / climate change implications in relation to this report.

Asset Management Implications

There are no asset management implications in relation to this report. If the boundary did change in the future there would be asset management implications for Council. Staff have not been able to obtain asset management data so are unable to determine the asset maintenance and replacement requirements, or depreciation expense which has a direct impact on the operating surplus.

Governance / Risk Management

It is important that this process continues to be managed with the utmost transparency and integrity, and in accordance with the relevant legislation.

Community Engagement

This report considers the results of two Community engagements. The first being a survey undertaken by MT with the relevant AHC residents. The second being a survey undertaken primarily using the connect2campbelltown online platform with Campbelltown Council residents, and options to complete a hard copy survey or email or write in.

Regional Implications

This was a great opportunity for two Councils to work together to minimise the impact to residents within this area. Joint public meetings and Community engagements would have been a very efficient way to undertake this process, and would have also been cost efficient for both Councils. A joint process would have also reduced the amount of allegations that have been directed at Council.

Staff attempted to facilitate this joint effort, and the Chief Executive Officers from both Councils agreed it would be the best way forward. It is disappointing that AHC decided to proceed on their own.

Economic Development Implications

There are no economic development implications in relation to this report.

Financial Implications

The cost of the MT survey was \$14,050. The survey for Campbelltown residents was undertaken in-house.

Recommendation

That Council receive the report and:

- 1. note the outcomes of the consultation undertaken by McGregor Tan and the associated report**
 - 2. note the outcomes of the consultation undertaken with the City of Campbelltown residents and ratepayers**
 - 3. request Staff to prepare a Stage 2 Submission to the Boundaries Commission with respect to the boundary realignment between Campbelltown Council and Adelaide Hills Council.**
-



Office of the Mayor

28 June 2022

Mr Rob Donaldson
Chair
South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5000

Dear Mr Donaldson

Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

Thank you for your letter dated 6 June 2022 and for the opportunity to provide further information to the Commission.

As requested, I have attached the following information:

- (a) Further information about the advantages and disadvantages of the Proposal
- (b) Clear cadastral and topographic map/s of the Subject Area that clearly display the proposed boundary line relative to properties and landform and landscape features of the proposal area relative to adjacent areas of Campbelltown City Council.

I trust that this information will provide the appropriate information to further inform the Commission's consideration. Please don't hesitate to contact me should additional information be required.

Yours sincerely

Jill Whittaker
Mayor

ATTACHMENT (a): ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSAL

CCC (Campbelltown Council)'s proposed boundary realignment focusses on:

- Formalising the existing (and future) Community of interests, which currently extends beyond its existing eastern boundary
- Ensuring that people who are part of the Campbelltown Community are able to influence decisions affecting their quality of life and local services in their community
- Ensuring that people who are part of the Campbelltown Community are represented in the area they live
- Planning for the future growth of Hamilton Hill as it continues to develop to ensure the infrastructure is managed holistically

This is underpinned by the following principles:

- Strong existing communities of interest
- Economic and efficiency gains for both Councils
- The physical attributes and location of the subject (proposed realignment) area align with those of a metropolitan Council in character
- Better management of assets between the subject area and CCC
- Ability for AHC (Adelaide Hills Council) residents from the subject area to better influence and shape the services that they currently enjoy
- Formalising existing relationships and the sense of belonging that the majority of residents of the subject area have with the CCC area
- Formalising the strong relationship that exists between Rostrevor College and CCC

This Council boundary was determined over 150 years ago and there is significant evidence that the communities of interest have shifted and no longer match the current boundary. Local Government is all about 'local'. Our role is to serve our local Community and to represent their needs.

Local by definition means characterised by or relating to position in space, relating to or occurring in a particular area, city, or town, located or living nearby and existing in or belonging to the area where you live.

The residents in the subject area are local. Largely, they recreate, play sport and shop etc in CCC. It would be rare that they would do any of that in the AHC area. Formalising their relationship with their local Community will provide stronger community connection and a greater sense of belonging, as well as enabling them to have a say in shaping the future of their local area. Becoming part of CCC would also enable them to join Council Committees or stand for Council elections and have greater ability to influence the Community they live in.

The recent announcement of the boundaries of Morialta Secondary College based in CCC supports this concept of local. The school zoning includes the entirety of Rostrevor and the suburb of Woodforde (including Hamilton Hill) which is the exact area that Council is proposing should be included in the CCC area.

It is also an anomaly that residents from AHC in the subject area are required to travel through CCC to access the Council office or facilities in AHC.

The following pages outline the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed boundary realignment.


ADVANTAGES

To Adelaide Hills Council Residents (in the subject area):

- **Formalising the existing (and future) Community of interest:** for many residents in the subject area the Campbelltown Community and facilities are part of their everyday. They recreate, play sport, interact, have social networks etc in CCC and it makes sense for them to be included as part of our Community. This could foster a greater sense of connection and belonging for those residents and importantly provide them the right to have a say and influence how the services and facilities they use are shaped in the future. For AHC residents who feel an affinity with the CCC area and the people who live in CCC, becoming part of CCC would increase and formalise that sense of belonging.
- **Close proximity to Council services:** Being close to the Community means shorter travel times and more efficient response times. This is no reflection on service levels of either Council, rather a practical and logical statement. All things being equal, distance and location alone means that CCC will be in a better position to respond quickly to fallen trees, blocked stormwater, lost or wandering dogs, or dangerous potholes, to cite a few examples.
- **Cheaper rates for at least the same or improved levels of services:** Most ratepayers in the subject area would receive a reduction in Council rates. This is outlined in the submission and based on rate increases since 2020 this differential (saving) would now be greater.
- **Faster response to emergencies:** shorter distances to the depot means that CCC can respond within minutes to emergencies and safety issues. For example the picture below shows water which regularly ponds after rain at the intersection of Glen Stuart Road and Morialta Road adjacent Rostrevor College which creates a road safety hazard and is more effectively managed by CCC. In a storm event AHC will be faced with prioritising many other dangerous situations on rural roads in comparison to the quieter backstreets of the metropolitan area under consideration.



- **Closer proximity of Council services for AHC Residents who need or want to engage with their Council in person:** This proximity (shown in the map below) also means quicker response times as outlined in the point above and for things such as fixing potholes, removing fallen trees, animal management, building inspections, delivery or collection of items etc.



- **Stormwater Management:** One Council would be able to better manage the Stormwater issues, particularly in the vicinity of the new Hamilton Hill Development which has put pressure on CCC's stormwater and creek system.
- **Traffic Management:** CCC has been instrumental in addressing the traffic management and car parking issues on Glen Stuart Road in front of the Hamilton Hill Development and Stradbroke Road where the newly developed Morialta Mukanthi Conservation Park Playground has been built. It makes sense that one Council would manage these issues more effectively and efficiently
- **Rostrevor College:** CCC has a strong relationship with Rostrevor College despite it not being in the CCC area. Examples of our strong connection with the College include:
 - Student representatives have been appointed to CCC's Youth Advisory Committee for the past 20 years
 - Immunisations provided to students at Rostrevor College by Eastern Health Authority (funded by CCC)
 - Australian Day Young Citizen of the Year Nominees and winners
 - NAIDOC Award recipients
 - Personal Achievement Grants provided to College Students
 - Included in consultations with other Schools in the area
 - Students performing at Citizenship ceremonies
 - Participated in Youth Talent nights
 - Provided footpaths opposite the school to assist with pedestrian movements at their request
 - Discussed and consulted regarding pedestrian crossings at the school
 - Committed to constructing a footpath (as requested) in front of the school (on the AHC side of the boundary) if the boundary realignment proceeds
 - Discussed a potential joint venture between CCC and the College on the College site adjacent their oval, The Womma.
 - ROCS (Rostrevor Old Collegians) Football team have made their home base in CCC and are now enjoying the newly developed Campbelltown Memorial Oval.

CCC wishes to engage with the College in a stronger way and things like joint ventures are problematic on a site which is not in the CCC area. CCC agrees with the school that a footpath is needed on the eastern side of Glen Stuart Road (especially adjacent the bus stop) however as this is in the AHC area means that CCC can't assist with these works.

- **Defines a better delineation to the Hill Face "hills" Zone**

- **Programs to support older residents:** Older people will have access to CCC's CHSP program, door to door transport services, social programs, transport to medical appointments etc. It is difficult when a resident on one side of the street can access these services, and a resident on the opposite side of the street is unable to. Funding agreements align with Council boundaries and CCC is unable to assist these residents, despite the fact that they may have strong connections with our Community. AHC may be able to assist these residents however the timing of these services and the length of the journey is different to their friends and neighbours across the road.

To Adelaide Hills Council

- **Efficiency gains** in not having to travel the distance to service this area.
- **Reduction in asset management responsibility.**
- **Cost savings** in serving the subject area which would allow AHC to focus on the remainder of their Council area and not have to deal with the expectations/demands of a small metropolitan section of their council which is significantly different to the small town, rural nature of AHC
- **Supports the AHC Strategic Boundary Review** conducted in 2020.

To Campbelltown Council Residents

- **Communities of Interest:** – CCC residents would enjoy the opportunity to welcome their AHC friends who they already recreate, educate and socialise with. Strong communities of interest already exist and residents are often surprised to learn that residents in the subject area do not already belong to CCC. Formalising this existing relationship makes sense to CCC residents and would reinforce the strong bonds that already exists between families, sporting groups, students, environmental groups and community groups.
- **Rostrevor College:** – a large proportion of students at Rostrevor College reside in the CCC area and don't understand that the College is not in the council area. The students and College will benefit from the strengthened relationship that will occur if the College is within the CCC boundary including a more holistic approach to managing traffic issues for student safety.
- **An equitable funding model:** Currently CCC ratepayers are subsidising the stormwater management and creek management issues created by Hamilton Hill and are having to deal with increased traffic and parking issues that would be better funded and managed by one Council.

To Campbelltown Council

- **Increase in rates income** (offset by increased expenditure to service the subject area).
- **Better traffic management and stormwater controls:** The subject area has two creek catchment areas creating flooding risks caused by the significant increase in infill development. The impacts on housing downstream can be better treated when managed by one Council through mitigating flooding issues whilst maintaining environmental values.
- **Supports Council's role and function** as outlined in Section 6 and 7 of the Local Government Act 1999 and will enable CCC to act as a strong representative for its wider community and deliver efficient services in a socially just, economic, efficient and sustainable manner.
- **Supports the Section 26 Principles of the Local Government Act 1999**, notably using the resources available to local communities in an economic manner and fulfilling CCC's role and function fairly, effectively and efficiently.
- **Representation for residents** who regularly use Council services, recreate and 'live' in the CCC area.
- **Better long term asset management** as the subject area becomes sensibly integrated with neighbouring CCC areas and respective assets.
- **Improved community outcomes with partnership projects through other arms of government.** CCC has an excellent track record of attracting grant funding for much needed projects that benefit the Community.
- **Better strategic planning and master planning** eg the southern transport plan, footpath connectivity, storm water management, open spaces, and creek management.
- **Delivers what the 1973 Royal Commission into Local Government Boundaries identified as the best way forward almost 50 years ago:** It would be a great example of Local Government moving forward without politics preventing the right decisions being made. The Royal Commission noted that while there was no push for this change from either area at the time that a change made sense as outlined in this submission.
- **Streamlined and Efficient Consultation:** CCC often has to consult with AHC regarding adjacent areas on relevant matters. This adds time and complexity to the consultation process. Having these residents in one Council will reduce the need to consult with AHC and significantly streamline the process.

DISADVANTAGES

To Adelaide Hills Council Residents (in the subject area):

- **The fear and consequent opposition of some AHC residents that the planning rules in the subject area will change to allow more intense development to occur:** CCC is committed to maintaining the current zoning of the subject area and recognises the natural beauty of the Hills Face Zone. Increased traffic and stormwater management associated with more housing make this equally unappealing to CCC residents. In addition, the State Government is the final decision maker when it comes to changing a Development Plan so any changes will be at the bequest of the incumbent State Government.

To Adelaide Hills Council

- **Loss of rates income** (offset by a reduction in expenditure for the subject area).


To Campbelltown Council Residents

- Nil.

To Campbelltown Council

- **The condition of assets in the relevant area is unknown** to CCC at this time. This could be a significant risk.

ATTACHMENT (b): CADASTRAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP



Appendix 2

*AHC - Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change
General Proposal - 15 July 2022*

15 July 2022

Mr Rob Donaldson
Chair
South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001
E: boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Dear Mr Donaldson

Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

Firstly, congratulations on being appointed Chair of the Boundaries Commission. The Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) has enjoyed a positive and constructive relationship with the Commission, and we look forward to this continuing under your leadership.

It is therefore with some regret that I feel compelled to write to you regarding the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) Stage 2 Proposal and, more specifically, the supplementary information lodged by CCC on 28 June 2022 in response to the Commission's 6 June 2022 request for further information.

AHC has always respected the role of the Commission and the due process established for the consideration of proposals. As such, we understand that should the proposal proceed to an Inquiry that the investigator(s) will provide AHC with an opportunity to respond fully to the CCC proposal.

However I have taken this action to contact the Commission at this time due to the alarm the content of this document has caused in my Council, and is likely to cause among residents, and the concern that immediate subsequent decisions made by the Boundaries Commission may heavily rely on the information, much of which is presented as facts rather than opinions without data to back them up.

AHC has regarded CCC's proposal to be lacking genuine merit from its commencement in January 2019 through to the present time including through the lodgement of the Stage 2 proposal in April and again with the Supplementary Information. CCC's analysis appears rudimentary with vague, superficial and largely unsubstantiated justifications. We had expected to see a body of supporting research or data in the Supplementary Information given the years the proposal has been in the making.

In particular we are greatly concerned that the majority oppositional view of affected residents as surveyed by *both* Councils is not considered further or reflected in the focus of the 'Advantages and Disadvantages of the Proposal' arguments put forward. The term

'communities of interest' is stated as a given fact primarily on the basis of geography but not proven and not reflected in the majority view of residents surveyed. The repeated assertion that the AHC residents 'are part of the Campbelltown community' does not make it true. The 'strong communities of interest' that is claimed by CCC and the 'sense of belonging that the majority of residents have ...' absolutely contradicts the views of the majority of the surveyed residents and as such is quite disrespectful. The emphasis on explaining 'local' as a uniquely geographical construct is fraught: a person's 'position in space' should not be confused with their sense of place.

We believe we would be negligent in our duty to the affected residents and to the pursuit of good governance to let CCC's latest submission pass without comment. I do not intend this to be a comprehensive rebuttal however, the purpose of this letter is to highlight just a few examples of what appear to be unreasonable and unfounded elements.

The following is taken from their catalogue of Advantages and Disadvantages:

Advantage - Formalising the existing (and future) community of interest

The apparent logic put forward is that if residents from one council are travelling to shops, schools, venues or sporting grounds of another council, they should automatically be part of that council. Utilising this logic the Adelaide City Council should be expanded to encompass the entire metropolitan area given the prevalence of Adelaideans who travel to and utilize the shops, educational institutions, sporting grounds and facilities within that council area. All council districts have 'fringe dwellers' and commuters who share each other's resources. It's part of the characteristics of the local government family, nor should it be forgotten that AHC is classified as a Metropolitan Council comprising urban areas as well as rural townships.

The community of interest that is most tangible and demonstrable is those residents affected by the proposal. This community of interest has through an overwhelming majority of respondents from two surveys (one of which was initiated by CCC itself) indicated that they do not want to be within the CCC area and is an indicator that they are supportive of the level of services they get, as well as AHC's financial, social and environmental performance. This inconvenient fact appears to be largely ignored by CCC's original and supplementary submissions in preference for the more nebulous and vague descriptions of communities of interest.

It is also disingenuous to suggest that AHC residents are 'freeloading' when they use local recreational facilities. The Adelaide Hills foothills area around Rostrevor and Woodforde also offer recreational benefits to Campbelltown residents. Most recently the parklands and natural amphitheatre developed for and around the Hamilton Hill estate are open for all and will soon offer a gym, pool and retail precinct which will be heavily used by 'Campbelltown locals'. The foothills environment also offers recreational trails and open spaces for city dwellers that have to be maintained by AHC although it is noted that CCC is not advocating to include these in its boundary proposal.

Advantage - Close proximity to Council services and faster response to emergencies

The argument here appears predicated on the notion that AHC work staff are domiciled within the depots (at Heathfield and Gumeracha) and only venture out when a response is required. AHC operates a very mobile and agile workforce both through its zone maintenance programs, community rangers and its rapid response teams. This ensures timely response throughout the council area, including the suburbs of Woodforde and Rostrevor.

We also note that the community and social programs mentioned by CCC overlook the fact that AHC also provides such services, many of which are also available from our Norton Summit Community Centre (and about the same distance away as CCC's offices).

Advantage - Closer proximity of Council services for AHC residents who need or want to engage with their Council in person

While face-to-face counter services will always remain an important element of any council's customer interface, AHC's data for 2021-22 indicates that 96% of customer requests for service (potholes, fallen trees, animal management, etc) occur via the contact centre and web lodgement. As such proximity to council customer service desks is, at best, a marginal justification for an advantageous outcome from the proposal.

Advantage (for AHC) - Supports the AHC Strategic Boundary Review

While AHC is pleased that CCC has acknowledged and referred to a piece of boundary reform work that is robust, evidence-based and strategic, the AHC Strategic Boundary Review did not in any way conclude that the affected suburbs would be better serviced by CCC.

Disadvantage (for AHC) – Loss of rates income

CCC identifies the loss of rates income for AHC as a disadvantage and implies that it is mitigated by the 'offset' of a reduction in expenditure in the affected area. The suggestion that rates income raised is entirely and only utilised in providing services and facilities in the area from which it is derived is both fundamentally flawed and naive.

Cadastral and Topographical Map

AHC welcomed the Commission's request to CCC to produce a map that followed cadastral boundaries. Until its lodgement, the map repeatedly used by CCC cut through allotments and was therefore never accurate.

Rostrevor College

An extraordinary amount of space is given in the supplementary report to this institution as a major justification for changing the boundaries. AHC understands that the relationship between CCC and the College has historically been championed by the previous Mayor and current CEO due to personal connections. There is nothing inherently wrong with this but it's not necessarily sustainable into the future. (Although it is questionable as to why they are offering Australia Day Awards to citizens of another Council.) Furthermore, AHC would be open to engaging in conversations around partnership projects with CCC concerning stormwater, traffic and infrastructure management; and there would be no need for CCC to construct a footpath on the AHC side of the current boundary as this has already been agreed to in our next year's plans and the College were notified some time ago.

Whilst the above is only a snapshot of the inconsistencies of CCC's Supplementary Information, it serves to again highlight the lack of considered depth presented in CCC's boundary reform proposal. This proposal has now been in train for three-and-a-half years, and on the basis of the evidence produced it is hard for my Council not to see this as a continuation of an exercise started in January 2019 motivated by financial gain - particularly in view of the recent Hamilton Hill development rates opportunity - and culturally based on past history rather than the democratically expressed views of the community it impacts.

This proposal is entirely driven by Campbelltown City Council. Indeed had the AHC residents of Rostrevor and Woodforde brought this proposal forward, as was claimed by CCC in the early days and later proven by the surveys to not be true, then AHC would likely have taken a different position. The advantages of the CCC proposal, as presented through their documentation, overwhelmingly benefit CCC financially whereas in contrast the current boundaries have not been demonstrated to disadvantage CCC financially. Given the strong opposition of the community at this time, and the full impact of the Hamilton Hill development still unknown, there could be some merit in reviewing the boundaries in 15 or 20 years to gauge future community sentiment and infrastructure needs. There are many social, cultural and historical reasons why Ukraine might like to be part of Russia but only one sovereign reason why they are not – they do not wish to be at this time.

AHC would welcome the Commission bringing an end to this poorly conceived proposal that does not accurately reflect the values, expectations and aspirations of the current community as voiced by that community (twice).

Yours sincerely



Dr Jan-Claire Wisdom
Mayor

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday 30 May 2023
AGENDA BUSINESS ITEM**

Item: 8.2 Motion on Notice

Originating from: Cr Mark Osterstock

Subject: Community Engagement – Woodforde & Rostrevor

1. MOTION

That the Committee recommends to Council that the CEO develop a communication and engagement strategy, which targets the affected communities of Woodforde and Rostrevor, the subject of the Boundary Change Proposal, with a view to building a powerful community narrative, including yet not limited to:

- regularly informing these communities of the status of the proposal (in writing, social media, AHC website, Hills Voice newsletter, media)
- reinforcing with the communities the outcomes of the two community surveys that have been previously conducted (AHC and CCC) rejecting the proposal
- highlighting the advantages and benefits of remaining a part of the Adelaide Hills Council
- informing the communities of the services available to them that the Adelaide Hills Council has to offer and provides (community services)
- direct consultation with significant key community stakeholders

Once this strategy has been completed, a report be presented to the Committee for consideration.

2. BACKGROUND
Nil

3. OFFICER'S RESPONSE – Jennifer Blake, Manager Communications, Events & Engagement

➤ **Strategic Management Plan/Functional Strategy/Council Policy Alignment**

Strategic Plan 2020-24 – A brighter future

Goal Community Wellbeing

Objective C2 A connected, engaged and supported community

Priority C2.4 Increase participation from the broadest range of our community and engage with them to shape policies, places and decisions that affect them.

➤ **Legal Implications**

Council boundary reform provisions are contained within Chapter 3 - Constitution of councils, Part 2 – Reform proposals of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the “Act”). The current iteration of these provisions came into effect on 1 January 2019.

Collectively these provisions establish the LGBC as the body that receives, assesses and makes recommendations to the Minister for Local Government on proposals developed in accordance with principles set out in the Act and procedures developed by the Commission.

There are two categories of proposal: Administrative Proposals (these are minor boundary adjustments to correct anomalies and to facilitate a development that has been granted authorisation under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*) and General Proposals (which are all proposals that are not Administrative Proposals - in practice these are for the more substantial council boundary changes and amalgamations). Proposals can be initiated by one of more councils, the public, the Minister or either House of Parliament.

Campbelltown City Council (CCC) resolved to submit a boundary reform proposal to the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) on 22 January 2019. The submission was for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC’s area. The CCC lodged a Stage 2 Proposal on 18 May 2022 and on 29 July 2022 LGBC advised AHC and CCC that it has determined that the Stage 2 proposal meets the requirements of the applicable LGBC Guideline and s26 of the Act and that an Inquiry into the proposal may proceed.

➤ **Risk Management Implications**

Developing a communication and engagement strategy with a view to building a powerful community narrative regarding AHC’s response to the CCC boundary reform proposal could assist in mitigating the risk of:

Failure to consider the views of sectors of the community leading to loss of confidence in the Council representing the views of the community.

Inherent Risk	Residual Risk	Target Risk
Medium (1A)	Low (1C)	Low (1C)

➤ **Financial and Resource Implications**

Council’s Community Engagement Coordinator currently works three days per week (0.6 FTE) and is at full capacity managing the ‘business as usual’ engagement projects and special projects including the Community Survey, Strategic Plan, Redi Communities, and Subzone Planning in addition to supporting the planning and execution of community engagement processes relating to other projects across the organisation.

It is recommended that internal capacity be expanded at an approximate cost of between \$55 and \$75 per hour to deliver a Boundary Reform Communication and Engagement Strategy and during the life of the campaign. Alternatively a consultant could be employed to prepare the Strategy at an approximate cost of \$250 per hour. A brief would need to be prepared for estimates of expected time to prepare the strategy.

In addition, it is expected that delivery of the communication plan initiatives would require budget of \$5,000 to cover communication materials, postage/hand delivery, events, forums or other communications.

➤ **Customer Service and Community/Cultural Implications**

The intent of the motion is clearly to initiate a mechanism to engage with the affected part of the district in a targeted manner, which in turn leads to benefits by way of the target audience having better information about Council and the potential boundary reform process.

However, the potential outcomes of delivering the Boundary Reform Communication and Engagement Strategy could have significant community implications.

➤ **Sustainability Implications**

There are no direct sustainability implications from this report.

➤ **Engagement/Consultation conducted in the development of the report**

There was no direct consultation in the development of this report.

4. ANALYSIS

Background

CCC proposed to incorporate Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs entirely into the Campbelltown Council area in January 2019.

Based on the views of the affected residents, Council adopted a position not to support the boundary realignment. Both the AHC (late 2019) and the CCC (late 2020) have conducted surveys of residents in Woodforde and Rostrevor. The majority of respondents to both surveys (65% and 62% respectively) were not in favour of the boundary change proposal.

In January 2020, the Council resolved to request CCC to withdraw the proposal. Further and stated our position with the Ministers for Local Government and the LGBC. The request to withdraw the proposal has not been accepted and CCC has continued to progress the matter.

The LGBC has accepted CCC's 'Stage 2' proposal and preparations for a formal investigation are underway.

AHC resolved to conduct a survey and the Administration developed an engagement strategy in September 2019 which outlined engagement options and a further strategy which focused on the execution of the Boundary Change Proposal Survey (**Appendices 1 and 2**).

Communications and engagement undertaken to date

Council's engagement approach to date has been:

- Keep our residents and rate payers informed about the Boundary Change Proposal Project – explaining the process and providing updates when milestones are reached.
- Enable our residents and rate payers to have an opportunity to express their thoughts (survey, mail and email options)
- Understand what key concerns are so Council can consider these in shaping our position.

A number of communication pieces have been shared with the Woodforde, Hamilton Hill and Montacute communities.

Communications to date have included: resident letters, stakeholder letters, factsheets, hard copy survey with return envelope, online survey, newsletter articles, media releases, website news items, social media, survey outcome report (**Appendix 3**), and a Council run community information evening at Rostrevor College. Examples can be seen on the Engagement Hub Document Library: <https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview> and <https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview2020>

Council currently has a page on the Community Engagement Hub which includes information on process and copies of relevant communications – the page can be found here: <https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview2020> and has had 1,700 visitors.

The page contains a registration form to be kept up to date on the project. Building a digital mailing list has been an important part of this project. Council has collated 259 registered emails for the Boundary Change Proposal updates (29 via engagement page, 24 via the community information evening, 206 via survey).

After the survey was undertaken in 2019 all feedback was analysed and a report shared with the community - 562 people have downloaded the Survey Outcomes Report which is available on the engagement hub page.

Examples of key communications schedule to date

Dates	Material
February 2019	CCC lodges its Stage 1 proposal with the LGBC
March 2019	LGBC considers the CCC Stage proposal at its meeting and determines that CCC may refer a Stage 2 proposal to the LGBC
August 2019	Invitation to community to attend Community information meeting
September 2019	Community information meeting held by AHC at Rostrevor College to anyone who wanted to know more about the Boundary Change Proposal. 122 community members attended.
September 2019	Letter to residents providing meeting summary
September 2019	Email to all who have asked to be kept informed about the project
September 2019	Updates to the YourSay webpage (Notes from meeting and FAQs)
October 2019	Letter from Mayor CCC to our Mayor
November 2019	Letter from Acting Mayor on Update ahead of CCC survey

25 November - 8 Dec 2019	AHC undertakes a survey of residents and ratepayers (hand delivered to post boxes and by mail) of Rostrevor and Woodforde affected by the CCC boundary change proposal. 268 responses received
November 2019	Dedicated engagement site set up on AHC website
November 2019	Email from Sarah Hill AHC Engagement to mailing list of people who asked to be kept informed on the boundary change proposal.
January 2020	Boundary Change Proposal Survey Outcomes Report prepared and shared with Council
January 2020	Campaign Monitor email update about results from survey
June 2020	Campaign Monitor email update to subscribers about Deputation to CCC
June 2020	Media Release – AHC asks Campbelltown to withdraw proposal
October 2020	Media Release – Report explores strategic options for Council boundaries
November 2020	Letter from Deputy Mayor Nathan Daniel (hand delivered to post boxes and by mail) to residents of Woodforde and Rostrevor with an update of AHC's position in response to letter sent by Mayor of CCC.
November 2020	Campaign monitor email update to subscribers
March 2021	Letter from Mayor Jan-Claire Wisdom (hand delivered to post boxes and by mail) to residents of Woodforde and Rostrevor.
April 2021	Media Release - Council stands united with residents over boundary changes
May 2022	Media release – Council supports residents in opposing boundary proposal
August 2022	Media release – Council responds swiftly to defend its communities' boundaries
October 2022	Letter to residents from AHC Acting CEO updating residents of progress of proposal and next steps.

Updates to the engagement page have been made at major milestones.

Motion to develop a Communication and Engagement Strategy

The motion to develop a Communication and Engagement strategy, *'which targets the affected communities of Woodforde and Rostrevor, the subject of the Boundary Change Proposal, with a view to building a powerful community narrative'* would provide a clear pathway to improve engagement with impacted residents and assist in building confidence in AHC's commitment to representing them.

The proposed update to the Boundary Reform Engagement Strategy involves a more proactive approach that could reinforce the outcomes of the two community surveys, highlight the advantages and benefits of remaining a part of the AHC, provide information on services available to the community, and include direct consultation with significant key community stakeholders.

5. APPENDICES

- (1) Engagement Strategy Boundary Reform Options
- (2) Engagement Strategy Boundary Reform Survey Approach
- (3) Boundary Change Proposal Survey Results

APPENDIX 1

Engagement Strategy Boundary Reform Options

Engagement Options for Consideration - Rostrevor/Woodforde Boundary Change Proposal

Note: We are awaiting a copy of the Campbelltown City Council Engagement Plan relating to this project.

Adelaide Hills Council has no statutory obligation to consult residents and rate payers as part of the Boundaries Commission Process. Despite this our advice is to keep residents and rate payers informed during these early stages until Campbelltown Council commence their Engagement process.

Engagement purpose:

- Keep our residents and rate payers informed about the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) Boundary Change Project
- Enable our residents and rate payers to have an opportunity to express their thoughts
- Understand what key concerns are so we can consider these in shaping our position

Communication to date:

- Letters to residents within the boundary change proposal area (2)
- Engagement session at Rostrevor College 3.9.19
- Email to all who have asked to be kept informed about the project (100)
- Updates to the YourSay webpage (Notes from meeting and FAQs)
- Correspondence with Campbelltown City Council Governance Team

Current feedback options:

- Your Say webpage <https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview> (*Register for the Boundary Change Proposal Mailing List and Leave Your Thoughts*)
- Email: engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au (External link)
- Phone: 8408 0400
- Post: Adelaide Hills Council, PO Box 44, Woodside SA 5244

Feedback options going forward:

Tool	Detail	Considerations
Q&A on YourSay webpage	Questions received from participants in a managed space that accommodates public or private responses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables us to know the real questions people have and clarify, correct, and answer using our key messages. • Enables us to develop tailored materials e.g. if lots of questions about planning, we may develop a planning factsheet • It also maintains an open and ongoing dialogue. • Resourcing wise someone will need to be available to answer questions once or twice a week. It is not a live Q&A. • Options for publically or privately answering questions • Only accessible to people with internet and device (phone/ computer).
Quick Poll YourSay	Ability to ask a single question and get immediate insight.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polls are an easy way to activate simple engagement with a single question. • A great way to capture mood and sentiment towards a range of issues. • Results are available for participants instantly to show their contribution. • Negative is that it is quantitative only and does not allow people to explain their choice/ give reasoning.

Tool	Detail	Considerations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only accessible to people with internet access (although we could have a polling day at libraries where people can come and complete the poll). Not statistically valid. Can ask more than one quick poll question. Could be replicated on social media. Participants can be made to register so there is no 'stacking of votes'.
Survey	On YourSay website + hard copy made available – notified via targeted letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This enables users to provide more detail on how they feel about the boundary change proposal. can be completed on a smartphone Can create hard copy versions for anyone without a computer Would require someone to analyse feedback Need to be clear what we would do with comments Can promote widely amongst our network

We would advise against a traditional 'voting' poll. This would involve a physical mail out to all ratepayers in AHC, including a self-addressed envelope. Consider:

- Large postage cost
- Printing cost
- Low response rates
- Not statistically valid
- Manual handling and administration in recording hard-copy responses
- Generally from a democracy perspective we are moving away from this type of voting
- Does not help us understand why people feel the way they do about the boundary re-alignment if limited to a yes/no scenario.

Engagement and communication options going forward:

Tool	Detail	Considerations / purpose
Updates to YourSay	Updates as new information becomes available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures transparency Easy for team to do
Letters / email	To mailing list + all residents and ratepayers in 'zone'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep residents and ratepayers informed about project To invite them to any future information sessions
Information session	Drop-in session for community to receive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further opportunity for community to access Council staff and ask questions about what the process means Could have dedicated stations Opportunity to further understand how people feel about the proposed change Requires staff presence to answer questions Could be linked with an existing event to get foot traffic Need to understand what CCC is planning before proceeding
Information pack – topic specific fact sheets	Digital and physical documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suit of information to help community understand what it would mean to remain or move to CCC Available from website and physical copies
Hills Voice	Article in monthly electronic newsletter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to reach to the wider community who are subscribed to newsletter Allows us to communicate our key messages and avoids misinformation

Tool	Detail	Considerations / purpose
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit if we want to understand sentiment amongst wider AHC residents and ratepayers. • Consider this once we further understand status of CCC engagement • Only available to people with internet and device (phone/ computer)

Risks and mitigation:

Risk	Mitigation
Information vacuum (rumour-mill starts) – residents become outraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear communications from Council via existing communication channels. • Be proactive with communication, if no significant project milestones have been reached but too much time has passed since mail out on 9 September consider a check in email/ letter (in October). • If required meet with stakeholders who request further information to alleviate anxiety
CCC commence engagement without notifying us	Continue a respectful and open relationship with relevant CCC officers.
Stakeholders unaware of what is going on or a feeling that a decision has been made without them	Communicate that no decision has been made. Continue providing communication updates.
Negative media/ social media stories	Proactive media release as required or develop a media pack for distribution.

Other considerations:

- Consider next steps “in the shoes” of residents and ratepayers – demonstrating cohesiveness, concise information, opportunity to providing feedback and that we are listening is important
- Link our engagement with CCC to avoid duplication and confusion for residents
- Make CCC aware of a need to update the proposed boundary map
- Consider timing (e.g. a consultation period) what else is going in in Council, will there be clashes / school holidays etc.
- Develop key messages to enable consistent and jargon free messages

APPENDIX 2

Engagement Strategy Boundary Reform Survey Approach

Engagement Next Steps: Rostrevor/Woodforde Boundary Change Proposal

This plan outlines the next steps for getting the boundary change proposal survey to affected residents.

Project outline:

On 24 September 2019 Council agreed the following:

1. CEO conducts a postal survey of the residents and ratepayers of the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde
2. Distribution of the survey is accompanied by a short summary of the proposal
3. The survey asks whether the participant supports, opposes or is undecided with respect to the proposal
4. Space is provided in the survey for an explanation of reasons or general comments
5. That an amount of \$10,000 be included in the 2019/20 budget to fund any costs associated with undertaking the survey
6. A report be presented on the results of the survey to the October 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting or as soon as practicable after that

Engagement purpose:

- Enable our residents and rate payers to have an opportunity to express their thoughts about the boundary change proposal
- Understand what key concerns are from community
- Results from the survey will inform Council in shaping our position
- Deliver a smooth and easy feedback process accessible to everyone in our community

Key dates and proposed key actions:

Actions	2019		
	Oct	Nov	Dec
Development of 'survey pack'(design, printing, postage)			
Promotion of survey			
Distribution of survey (allow 21 days to respond)			
Community Information Drop-in Event			
Collating, digitizing and analysis of survey			
Prepare report to Council			
Report presented to Council			

Survey parameters:

- 18 years or over
- Participating in the survey is not mandatory
- Survey cannot be guaranteed to be a representative sample
- Multiple submissions per household accepted (e.g. if four adults living at address they can each provide a submission) – this will be cross checked and verified
- Survey will only be available in English – but will provide assistance if needed
- One 'survey pack' sent to each household (additional copies can be requested from AHC Customer service centres)
- Renters are encouraged to participate

- Name and address details are required but the results will be anonymised and not associated with their contact details for Council consultation and public reporting
- Survey is also available online – this is considered essential for an equitable process and to yield the highest response rates

Considerations:

- Barrier to participation - finding a post box to return the survey (this will be an issue for busy people, people with mobility issues, house bound people)
- Print more survey packs than households for those who request additional copies
- Survey packs will be hand delivered to all households within the zone, this ensures we capture those who are not ratepayers (e.g. renters)
- **A survey pack will only be posted to those ratepayers who do not live in the “zone”. To achieve this a list of all rate payers will be pulled from our database. Where a ratepayer lives in their home in the “zone” they will be removed from the list. They will receive their survey pack via hand delivery.**
- Use a highly reliable distribution company to hand deliver unaddressed envelopes (suggest bluetongue)
- Use a professional printer to produce the survey pack, with self-seal and return paid envelopes (suggest Bowden)
- Return of envelopes can be either via post or into an AHC service centre (make sure staff are adequately briefed)
- **Online survey option also available** (participants will need to register this includes name, address and email – we can verify addresses via database). This is considered essential to get Gen X&Y participating.
- Use existing communication channels to promote survey to residents (e.g. Hills Voice + campaign monitor)
- Background document to be made available on EHQ <https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview>
- **A community drop in information session** where affected residents and ratepayers can speak to council staff and ask questions about what the boundary change proposal could mean for them. This is considered essential for inclusive and fair engagement and is particularly relevant to people who may want more information than the information sheet. It enables people to ask for clarifications and being surrounded by others completing the survey will encourage participation rates. It is key that this session feels approachable (no formal presentations) so we get a wide representation of people attending especially those with children, if the venue allows for little ones to run around or complete an activity such as colouring in sheets.

Budget allocation:

Item	Cost	Detail
Advice on engagement approach	\$800	Consultant advice
Review of survey pack (editing for community friendliness)	\$1,200	Consultant advice
Designing survey to be print ready	\$1000	Mango Chutney
Developing physical survey pack (incl. printing) – printing company	\$3000	Bowden Printing (quote sought)
Pre-paid return mail	\$200-\$500	Depends on how many responses we receive
Hand delivery (distribution)	\$400	Bluetongue Outdoor (quote sought)
Postage (rate payers not in area + requests for additional copies)	\$200	Estimate based on number of residents living outside zone
Staff time to digitize hard copies (internal admin staff)	TBC	Depends on how many people respond via hard copy
Total	\$7100	

Feedback options for participants:

- Reply paid physical postal survey
- Online survey replicating physical survey*
- Customer service phone line 8408 0400
- Email via engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- Letter via Adelaide Hills Council, PO Box 44, Woodside SA 5244

* It is important to allow for a variety of feedback options for inclusivity and equity amongst all community members. E.g. those people who can no leave their home to post the survey due to illness, work, family commitments, will need to have access to an online survey.

Hard copy survey will be able to be posted back (reply paid envelope), dropped to an AHC customer service centre or at the drop-in day.

An online option will increase reach and so will enable Council to hear from more affected residents and ratepayers. Online surveys are also favourable for people who do not feel confident with spelling (because they know there will be spell-correct). Younger people are repeatedly underrepresented in decision making and an online survey tool will enable higher reach for Gen X and Y.

Survey-pack contents:

- Bright/ enticing to open, outer envelope (DLX size)
- Double sided A3 information sheet folded to A4 to fit in DLX envelope. Containing: instructions and welcome, a summary of the proposal (what would it mean for me if...) and invite to the drop-in session. This would also include the survey which will be perforated to be detached.
- Self-seal reply paid inner envelope (DL)

Every house within the zone will receive one postal survey, with the option of requesting more copies if required and the encouragement of completing the online survey if preferred.

Proposed survey questions:

1. Name, address, email, phone, age
2. Are you a resident/ tenant/ business / property owner?
3. Do you support the boundary change proposal? (yes/ no/ undecided/ no preference)
4. What is your main concern about the boundary change proposal? (tick from options + space for other)
5. What opportunities could the boundary change proposal present for you and your community? (tick from options + space for other)
6. Do you have any further comments about the boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council to consider?

Distribution:

Who	Hand delivered survey pack	Survey pack in post	Email inviting to participate	Online survey option
Renters living in the zone	●			●
Home owners living in the zone	●			●
Home owners with addresses outside of the zone (includes any interstate and overseas)		●		●

addresses)				
Homeowners with multiple properties in the zone	●	●		●
Businesses who have an ABN in the zone		●	●	●

Promotion tools:

To increase response rates and awareness of the survey amongst the community we propose the following existing communication channels are used:

- Hills Voice E-Newsletter
- AHC website
- Social Media
- Media release
- Email to known stakeholder groups (e.g. Montacute Residents Association)

Key messages:

- This is only a proposal, no decision has been made
- Campbelltown CC has put forward a proposal to the Boundaries Commission to review the boundary between them and Adelaide Hills Council.
- The proposal is to move the boundary eastwards so that the suburbs of Rostrevor and Woodforde move in their entirety to the Campbelltown City Council area.
- We are seeking your feedback on what you think about the boundary change proposal
- Your feedback is important and will help shape our (Adelaide Hills Council) position and next steps
- This is the start of a comprehensive review process which will be undertaken by Campbelltown City Council and the Boundaries Commission
- You can have your say in a number of ways: Hard Copy Survey or Online Survey
- This survey is only intended for people living or working in the proposed boundary change zone
- All names and addresses will be cross checked against the electoral role and council database
- Only one submission will be accepted per person
- Additional surveys can be requested from Adelaide Hills Council Customer Service Team 8408 0400 or engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- All submissions must be provided by **21 days**
- Your feedback will be collated by AHC and compiled into a report which will be presented to AHC Councillors
- Council is not a decision maker in this process, the final decision lies with the Minister for Local Government (Stephan Knoll MP)
- The rules, regulations, policies and services that apply to properties in the Adelaide Hills Council area will continue to operate as usual until a final decision has been made.

APPENDIX 3

Engagement Strategy Boundary Change Proposal Survey Results

2020



Adelaide Hills
COUNCIL



COUNCIL BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL

SURVEY OUTCOMES REPORT

Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey Analysis

Quick summary	2
Purpose of this report	2
Background	2
Snapshot of results	2
1. Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone	3
2. Survey approach	4
What we asked	4
Distribution	4
Survey pack contents	4
3. Survey responses	7
4. Boundary change proposal analysis	8
Overarching sentiment	8
Survey responses by age bracket	9
Survey response by location	10
5. Survey findings – Rostrevor	12
Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal	13
Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal	14
6. Survey findings - Woodforde	21
Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal	22
Woodforde respondents against the boundary change proposal	23
7. Respondents from suburbs outside	26
8. Notes about survey	27
Survey parameters	27
9. Appendix A	28

Quick summary

Purpose of this report

This report contains a summary of feedback received as part of the Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey undertaken in November/ December 2019. The intention is for a summary document and this longer report to be made available to anyone who participated in the survey.

Background

In January 2019 Campbelltown City Council (CCC) put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal to the Boundaries Commission for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

A community information meeting was held by AHC at Rostrevor College on 3 September for anyone who wanted to know more about the Council Boundary Change Proposal. The community meeting was attended by approximately 122 members of the local community. A copy of the presentation and minutes from the meeting can be accessed here:

<https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview2>

In September 2019 AHC decided to undertake a survey of residents and ratepayers of the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde affected by the CCC boundary change proposal. The purpose of the survey was to determine the level of support for the proposal in the community.

In November 2019 AHC residents and ratepayers in Woodforde and Rostrevor were invited to complete a short survey about the Council Boundary Change Proposal. The survey was accompanied with a document setting out key information relating to the potential impacts of the proposed boundary change.

The survey was available online from the AHC website and in hard-copy from 25 November 2019 until 8 December 2019 for those invited to participate.

Snapshot of results

We received 268 survey responses during the consultation. Here's a snapshot of the feedback received:

- 65% of all respondents are against the boundary change proposal
- 28% of respondents are in favour of it
- 7% are undecided or have no preference
- A large majority (81%) of **Rostrevor** respondents are against boundary change and 15% are in favour
- A small majority of **Woodforde** residents and those living in other Council areas (i.e. absentee landlords) who responded to the survey indicated that they are against boundary change (52%), balanced against an average of 39% being in favour.
- The key issues of interest for those **against** boundary change are: planning and development, environmental sustainability, council rules and regulations and climate change.
- For those in **favour** of boundary reform the key issues of interest are: community services, rates, footpaths, road and park maintenance.

1. Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone

CCC proposes to move the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone



2. Survey approach

In November 2019 Adelaide Hills Council residents and ratepayers in Woodforde and Rostrevor (including absentee landlords) were invited to complete a short survey about the Council Boundary Change Proposal.

The survey was available online from the AHC website and in hard-copy from 25 November 2019 until 8 December 2019.

What we asked

- Name, address, phone and year of birth
- Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (yes/ no/ undecided/ no preference)
- Why do you say that?
- What are your top three areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal?
- Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council?

Distribution

The survey was distributed by hand via a third party distribution company to all properties in the proposed boundary change zone (including residents and businesses). In addition, the survey was also posted to all property owners who had a postal address outside the boundary change zone (i.e. absentee landlords).

Survey pack contents


The survey pack included a fold-out information sheet, single page survey and reply-paid envelope (Refer to Appendix A).

The fold-out information sheet contained:

- Project summary
- Boundary change proposal map
- Boundary change process diagram
- Overview of key points of interest between AHC and CCC
- Links to policies and reports on each council's website
- Planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC.

To help the survey pack stand out amongst other mail it was packaged in a brightly designed envelope (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Survey pack distributed to boundary change zone



Adelaide Hills COUNCIL

Survey:
Council Boundary Change Proposal

This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Name _____ Year of birth: _____

Postal address _____

Email _____ Phone: _____

Are you a (tick all that apply)

☐ Resident ☐ Property owner ☐ Other: _____

☐ Tenant ☐ Business owner

Do you support the Council Boundary Change proposal? (tick one)

☐ Yes ☐ No

Why do you say that?

What are your areas of interest?

☐ Plains ☐ Campbelltown ☐ Forrester ☐ Commis ☐ Res

Have your say:
Council Boundary Change Proposal

Project Summary

Adelaide Hills COUNCIL


For the resident
Council Boundary Change Proposal

Have your say!

engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

The survey and accompanying background information was also made available online on our engagement portal engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Figure 3: Engagement website home page



The screenshot shows the Adelaide Hills Council website's engagement portal for the Council Boundary Change Proposal survey. The page features a navigation bar with links to 'All consultations', 'All projects', 'Visit our website', 'Home', a search bar, and 'Sign In | Register'. The main heading is 'Council Boundary Change Proposal - Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill Community Survey'. A 'Welcome' section thanks participants and states that all responses have been captured. A 'Project background' section explains the proposal by the Council Change Commission (CCC) to move the boundary eastwards. A map shows the proposed boundary change zone, including Rostrevor, Woodforde, and Hamilton Hill, with property counts: Rostrevor (157 properties), Woodforde (400 properties), and Hamilton Hill (240 properties). A 'Need more information' section provides contact details: Email: engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au, Phone: 8408 0400, and Post: Adelaide Hills Council, PO Box 44, Woodside SA 5244. A 'SURVEY AND REGISTRATION' button is present. A 'Document Library' on the right lists documents: 'Boundary Change Proposal overview and survey (1.18 MB) (pdf)', 'Downloadable Survey Boundary Change Proposal (239 KB) (pdf)', 'Community meeting presentation 3 September 2019 (735 KB) (pdf)', and 'Community meeting summary 3 September 2019 (659 KB) (pdf)'. 'Key Dates' indicate the survey closes on 08 December 2019. A 'Life Cycle' section outlines three stages: Stage 1 - Potential Proposal, Stage 2 - General Proposal, and Investigation by Commission.

Council Boundary Change Proposal - Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill Community Survey

Welcome

Thank you to everyone who have provided their feedback as part of the Boundary Change Proposal Survey. All responses have now been captured by the project team. All hard copy surveys have now been entered online ready for analysis.

Your feedback is important and we will compile it into a report for consideration by Adelaide Hills Council Members in early 2020.

Project background

CCC has put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal (the Proposal) to the Boundaries Commission (a State Government body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister) to review the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC).

CCC proposes moving the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety. See map included in the information pack (downloaded from the document library to the right of this page).

There are currently 573 properties (3.3% of total AHC properties) that are within the proposed Boundary Change Zone.

Need more information

We encourage you to take a look at the frequently asked questions to the right of this page. The question you have may be answered there.

If you're still after more information please get in touch with our team via:

- **Email:** engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- **Phone:** 8408 0400
- **Post:** Adelaide Hills Council, PO Box 44, Woodside SA 5244

SURVEY AND REGISTRATION

Document Library

- Boundary Change Proposal overview and survey (1.18 MB) (pdf)
- Downloadable Survey Boundary Change Proposal (239 KB) (pdf)
- Community meeting presentation 3 September 2019 (735 KB) (pdf)
- Community meeting summary 3 September 2019 (659 KB) (pdf)

Key Dates

Survey closes
08 December 2019

Life Cycle

- Stage 1 - Potential Proposal**
Consideration of initiating Council's proposal by Commission
Approved to progress to next stage or not
Approved by initiating Council to advance proposal or not
- Stage 2 - General Proposal**
Initiating Council prepare general proposal for Commission
Must include consultation with the community
No specific timeframe
- Investigation by Commission**
Commission assesses the proposal using an independent investigator
Initiating Council agrees to the cost of the investigation
Criteria include financial and resource implications, community

CLOSED: This survey has concluded.
Boundary Change Proposal Survey 2019

Participants could also choose to register online to be kept informed about the project via email updates.

3. Survey responses

As shown in Table 1, 268 people completed the survey during the engagement timeframe (25 November to 8 December 2019).

Table 1: Survey response type


Survey response type	Number
Online engage.ahc.sa.gov.au	174
Hard copy Posted back to Council or hand delivered to Customer Service Centre	76
Emailed as attachment engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au	18
Total	268

When looking at the location of respondents there were:

- 126 respondents in Rostrevor (47% of the total number of survey respondents)
- 109 respondents in Woodforde (41% of the total number of survey respondents)
- 33 respondents from other suburbs (12% of the total number of survey respondents).

Response numbers by location are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4: Map of responses



4. Boundary change proposal analysis

All responses received by 8 December were analysed (including emails, hard copy surveys and online responses).

Overarching sentiment

Across all survey responses, 65% are against the boundary reform proposal, which represents a majority. However it should be noted that there are clear differences between Rostrevor and Woodforde respondents.

Respondents from Rostrevor are against boundary reform by a large majority.

These percentages are underpinned by the detailed survey analysis and feedback from open response questions stemming from Rostrevor.

Responses from Woodforde fall into two groups:

- Respondents who feel similarly to Rostrevor respondents against boundary reform and cite similar concerns and issues
- Respondents who support boundary reform.

The numbers of respondents in Woodforde against boundary reform still outweigh those in favour (52% against versus 39% in favour).

The overall tone of feedback received, with some exceptions, in responses from Woodforde and other suburbs is also considered less emphatic and impassioned compared to responses from Rostrevor.


The key issues of interest for those against boundary reform are planning and development, environmental sustainability, council rules and regulations and climate change.

For those in favour of boundary reform, it is community services, rates, footpaths, road and park maintenance.

The analysis to follow provides detailed findings and insights.

Figure 5: Overall survey results


Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal?



Survey responses by age bracket

We briefly assessed responses by age of respondents. As shown in Figure 6, the highest response rate was from Generation X (those born between 1960 – 1979). 16 people did not provide their age.

Figure 6: Response rate by age



While there was some variation by age group, with residents born in the 70s and 80s being most in favour of boundary reform, the overall age distribution of respondents was similar across the suburbs and the overall pattern of opinions and preferences expressed by respondents remained consistent across the age groups (refer to Table 2).

Table 2: Response sentiment by age

Date of birth	Total	In favour of boundary reform	Against boundary reform	Undecided	No preference
1920 - 1929	3	0	3 (100%)	0	0
1930 - 1939	18	3 (17%)	14 (77%)	0	1 (6%)
1940 - 1949	34	7 (21%)	23 (68%)	4 (11%)	0
1950 - 1959	43	14 (34%)	28 (64%)	1 (2%)	0
1960 - 1969	52	15 (30%)	35 (67%)	2 (3%)	0
1970 - 1979	52	18 (35%)	29 (56%)	3 (6%)	2 (3%)
1980 - 1989	31	12 (39%)	18 (58%)	1 (3%)	0
1990 - 1999	18	4 (22%)	14 (78%)	0	0
2000 - 2009	1	0	1 (100%)	0	0
No date of birth given	16	3 (19%)	11 (69%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
TOTAL	268	76 (28%)	176 (65%)	12 (5%)	4 (2%)

Survey response by location

A review of survey responses found that an analysis of findings by suburb best reflects respondent sentiments and enables clear identification of the key themes of interest and / or concern. Our analysis has been divided into:

- Responses from Rostrevor
- Responses from Woodforde
- Responses from other suburbs (landlords who have a post address outside the boundary change proposal zone i.e. absentee landlords)

Table 3: Response number by location


Suburb	Response number
Rostrevor	126
Woodforde	109
Other suburbs	33
TOTAL	268

As indicated by Figure 7, 81% of respondents in Rostrevor have indicated they are against boundary change, 15% are in favour and 4% are undecided or have no preference.

This compares to a more even distribution of opinion from Woodforde residents, with 52% of respondents indicating they are against boundary change balanced against 39% being in favour and 9% being undecided or indicating they have no preference.

Of the 33 respondents in other suburbs 45% indicated they were in favour of the boundary change, 52% against the boundary change and 3% undecided.

Figure 7: Response Sentiment by Location



5. Survey findings – Rostrevor

There were 126 responses from residents/ businesses in Rostrevor. Of these 19 were in favour of the boundary change proposal, 102 were against the boundary change proposal, 3 undecided and 2 had no preference (Refer to Table 4).

Table 4: Rostrevor responses

	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Rostrevor	126	19 (15%)	102 (81%)	3 (3%)	2 (1%)

As part of the boundary change survey, respondents were asked to indicate their top three areas of interest about the proposal.

The responses for Rostrevor are summarised below and the boxes shaded, in Table 5, indicate issues that are of interest to the majority of respondents.

Environmental sustainability and climate change are not nominated by those in favour of the boundary change proposal. Instead, those in favour of the boundary change proposal are focussed on community services and footpaths, roads and park maintenance.

Table 5: Rostrevor Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	9	95
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	13	13
Community services	18	10
Environmental sustainability	-	81
Annual council rates	8	12
Climate change	-	26
Council rules and regulations	2	29
Community grants	-	-
Level of representation	-	2

As shown in the survey analysis for Woodforde (see section 6 below), the issues of interest follow the same pattern.

Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal

Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal raise two issues:

- Geographic location
- Level of support

It is worth noting the respondent responses are less emotive and shorter than for those against boundary change.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Geographic location

Respondents felt that the location of this pocket of Rostrevor is disconnected by distance from the rest of the Adelaide Hills and is instead, directly connected to the CCC. As a result, respondents stated the services provided by the CCC are closer and easier to access than those in the hills.

"Living at the base on the hills at Rostrevor, I feel closer engaged to the Campbelltown community. All council services at Campbelltown are within minutes, where the Adelaide Hills Council services are a 30min plus drive into the hills."

"If you stepped back and drew the council lines again, common sense would say that Rostrevor is within Campbelltown Council."

"These properties are logically connected to Campbelltown City Council not the Adelaide Hills council due to both their proximity and their nature (i.e. contiguous with other residential areas within the Greater Adelaide region, and they are residential blocks rather than larger rural properties)."

Level of support

A small number of respondents stated they have had little engagement with AHC and that requests for assistance or services have met with no support or response.

"Adelaide Hills Council seems not to hear when I call for assistance."

"We don't feel that we get any support from or use services provided by the Adelaide Hills Council."

"We have had little almost no contact from Adelaide Hills Council since living in the area (20 years) and there has been no assistance, beautification or upgrade of footpath/verge."

The following additional points were reiterated and emphasised in the final open response question of the survey:

- CCC services are closer and more readily accessible and the location of the suburb means it is more logical to be part of Campbelltown and not AHC.
- There is a perception amongst respondents that AHC focusses less effort and spend on the foothills suburbs – and that the residents in these areas are neglected / ignored / poorly understood.

Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal

The themes raised by Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal are highly consistent and are summarised below. Examples of the feedback obtained in the open response question about boundary change are also included to provide a sense of the flavour of the feedback.

It should be noted that there were more comments against the boundary change from Rostrevor than in support and this is why this section of the report is larger than other sections.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

The top themes raised align with the issues of interest nominated, that is, planning and development and environmental sustainability. The themes are listed in priority order.

Planning and development

It is strongly felt by respondents that the CCC has very different policies, principles and perspectives towards sub-division and development when compared to AHC. The CCC is perceived to be pro-development, irrespective of the character of the neighbourhood, with a track record of rezoning to reduce block sizes, reduce green spaces and tree canopy and enable sub-divisions and high density development. The potential for this to occur in this part of Rostrevor, should boundary change proceed, is by far the most significant issue of concern to respondents.

Respondents provided examples of development on the boundary of the AHC area which they feel are “typical” of what is allowed by CCC – and which they do not wish to see in the AHC portion of Rostrevor - such as the Chapel Estate development, townhouse and infill developments on Arcoona Avenue and the construction of large new houses in close proximity to each other and with little surrounding green space in the Yalpara Avenue area. The fact these developments have been allowed on the “doorstep” of the portion of Rostrevor that sits within AHC is viewed as evidence that a change to council boundaries would see the spread of such development.

Respondents also favourably referenced the opposition shown by AHC to development at the end of Wandilla Drive and expressed they did not feel the CCC would hold this position.

Some respondents stated they used to live in the CCC and personally experienced the increased rate of development and sub-division in their former neighbourhood. This was a driver for them to move away. Purchasing a property within the AHC area was furthermore seen as a form of “security” against overdevelopment. Respondents believe AHC has a strong track record of protecting the character of its semi-rural areas and resisting the opportunities presented by property developers in favour of protecting the Hills Face Zone, existing green spaces, large block sizes and low housing density.

It is understood that the CCC has sought to reassure residents that the area will continue to be protected from sub-divisions and development if the boundary change goes ahead, but it is fair to say the majority of survey respondents feel this is a somewhat “empty promise”, that will likely to be upheld for a short amount of time but then overturned.

Respondents therefore felt that a change to the CCC would cause a significant qualitative deterioration to the portion of Rostrevor currently within the AHC area.

Respondents also referenced the new state planning system and the uncertainty this brings. It is felt the protection of sensitive areas such as this portion of Rostrevor will, more than ever before, require residents and other groups to champion that protection. Respondents also made it clear the support from AHC is very important to them as they have to date seen the organisation as agreeing with and endorsing the efforts of residents to retain the bush-like amenity of the area. The expectation is therefore that AHC will continue to do this into the future.

“The Morialta area only looks like it does today because, over a period of more than fifty years, the residents and the Adelaide Hills Council (and its precursor) have worked together to create that bush-like area by planting thousands of trees and shrubs; by paying to have our electrical wires undergrounded; and by, every now and then, having to fight off inappropriate development by developers who don't give a toss about what happens to the area, as long as they make a quick buck.”

“We are deeply concerned that the Campbelltown Council will allow development and subdivision of allotments which are currently subject to Adelaide Hills Council development regulations and approval processes.”

“I am appalled at the rate of subdivision and overdevelopment through Campbelltown Council area in the last 2-5 years or so, and have very little faith that the strategic plan and vision for Campbelltown Council in any way aligns with the semi-rural nature of my area, particularly the zone behind Morialta.”

“I have great concerns that our beautiful neighbourhood is going to be subject to the tiny blocks and subdivision that Campbelltown is known for.”

“We do not agree with the minimum property zones Campbelltown consents to. We have already received a notice from a building development company interested in purchasing and subdividing our land.”

“We love that the homes around us in Rostrevor have a minimum 1000m² and plenty of green space.”

“Adelaide Hills Council acknowledges the unique area known locally as ‘Morialta’, and demonstrates its commitment to preserving its unique character by stating principles of development control, including low density detached housing, with detached dwellings requiring a minimum frontage of 20m and semi-detached 18m. This demonstrates the Adelaide Hills Council’s appreciation and commitment to maintaining the character of the policy area, which is in line with what we as residents desire and expect in this distinct and environmentally beautiful area.”

The semi-rural characteristics of the suburb are aligned with the broader Adelaide Hills Council area

Respondents expressed a strong sense that the area is unique and the priority should be to preserve its characteristics and surrounding green spaces, which align closely to those of the AHC.

Respondents felt AHC has resident and environmental interests in mind with its approach to planning and development decisions and zoning.

Respondents did not feel that CCC would take into account resident preferences and feedback or environmental considerations. Further to this respondents felt that this portion of Rostrevor, if it were to be absorbed within the CCC, would be a “minority” within the context of the whole council area and its needs would therefore be seen as being at odds with the urbanised majority – and therefore likely to be glossed over and ignored.

“I truly believe that, while we are only 12km from the city, the true nature of the area surrounding Morialta in the affected zones of Rostrevor and Woodforde are not “metropolitan”, but rather are much more aligned with the nature of property types and landscape through the Adelaide Hills Council area.”

“This pocket (aside from Hamilton Hill) is a hills environment which has a completely different feel, community and environment to the suburbia that is the whole of the Campbelltown City Council area. Just cross any street that marks the council boundary and you enter a different world.”

“The overwhelming sentiment is that residents are happy with Adelaide Hills Council, who have historically backed the area in environmental and other matters. We DO NOT want this change.”

“I enjoy being part of the Adelaide Hills Council because I believe that it appreciates the unique characteristics of the area, including the large blocks and bushy surrounds, and will do all in its power to preserve it into the future in these uncertain times of planning change.”

Environmental considerations

It is felt by respondents that the development ethos of the CCC has had a significant side-effect of a significant reduction in the quality and volume of tree canopy cover. While it is acknowledged some replanting has taken place, this is not seen as having replaced what was removed in both quantity and quality. More broadly, it is felt by respondents that CCC has less regard for the preservation of flora, fauna and the environment than AHC.

This pocket of Rostrevor is viewed by respondents as part of the Adelaide Hills, offering natural habitats for wildlife, open spaces, large blocks and old trees – a place where nature is nurtured and respected as it is elsewhere in the AHC area.

Preserving and enhancing the natural environment is of vital importance to respondents and a fundamental part of their choice to live in the area. They also felt that AHC is better equipped to protect the Morialta area from bushfires through clearing notices and organic waste drop-off days and the like.

"We desperately want to restrict the overdevelopment and urban infill for which Campbelltown is so notorious, for the sake of the residents' amenity but also, in a state of climate emergency, for the sake of the environment."

"Campbelltown City Council is well known to be one of the major urban infill suburbs, subdividing properties in a non-environmentally sustainable way. We live in a protected area with which offers shelter for native flora and fauna and deserves to be protected."

"Adelaide Hills Council policies are by far more closely aligned, and more sympathetic to the amenity and natural environment of the area."

"My area does not share any communities of interest with the Campbelltown City Council. We are firmly aligned culturally, services, values and environmentally with Adelaide Hills Council. Adelaide Hills Council has done a brilliant job of protecting the natural environment in this area and increasing amenity."

City of Campbelltown seeking increased income

Despite assertions to the contrary by representatives from the CCC, many respondents expressed they still feel that the move to change the council boundary is primarily driven by "numbers and dollars" and there is no other obvious rationale.

"Campbelltown Council is engaging in a blatant land grab."

"We need to keep greedy councils and developers away from our environs."

"The way they support their community is financially business driven for expansion, not to retain the living environment enjoyed by those of the Morialta part of Rostrevor."

No compelling reason to change

A number of respondents simply state there is no reason or justification for change. They express their overall satisfaction with AHC services and policies and do not wish to see change for the sake of it.

"Change is totally unnecessary."

"Adelaide Hills Council is the best."

"Happy to be in Adelaide Hills Council."

"I own properties in both Council areas and the claimed benefits and reasons provided by the City of Campbelltown are spurious."

"In short, we have enjoyed a long period of productive cooperation with the Adelaide Hills Council. Why change to a council that we suspect may not share the same values as us?"

Council services and rates

Council rates and services were hardly referenced by respondents against boundary change.

A handful of respondents stated that slightly lower rates are not an inducement to support council boundary change. Respondents also make the point that rates are not part of the decision-making to

live in the AHC area – or not – but that other factors such as amenity, block size, development policies and the semi-rural characteristics of the area are far more significant factors.

Some respondents also felt that AHC facilities and services were superior to those of the CCC – but more importantly, better tailored to the area as they are more aligned with the needs of rural and semi-rural areas than metropolitan and highly developed areas.

Additional points raised in the final open response question of the survey

Respondents added further detail and repeated their position on issues already raised. In addition, it was very clear that respondents feel the vast majority of residents in their area are against boundary change – an assumption that is verified by the survey findings.

Respondents clearly state they do not wish to be rezoned and feel their majority opinion should be the only decision-making driver. Many respondents point out that when they purchased their property, a big selling point was being part of the AHC area and this should be respected.

Survey respondents have actively requested the support of AHC to fight the boundary change request and support their preferred outcome – which is to remain within the AHC area.

“We don’t want to be rezoned, and feel the residents should have the final say. We bought here for a reason and feel that by changing boundaries could jeopardise the reasons we love living here!”

“Please continue to fight to maintain us. We do not want to lose our quality of life. We are very happy with the services and support provided by Adelaide Hills Council, including rates. It is not about the money!”

“I would appreciate the support of Adelaide Hills in this matter and not allow Campbelltown City to pursue the takeover. It would be devastating for the area if the takeover is executed as it is visually obvious what Campbelltown City Council has been done with their own council area with the continuous over development.”

“I would like Adelaide Hills Council to vehemently fight this take-over. It is clear that the majority of residents in the proposed takeover area are opposed and wanting Adelaide Hills Council support in this.”

“Please support the residents of your council area to prevent this boundary change.”

“The Minister for Planning (and Member for Morialta Hon John Gardner) must give strong consideration to the views of residents in this decision. If the majority of residents are opposed to this boundary change, then the Minister must reject the proposal.”

It was reiterated by respondents that planning and development policies and environmental protection are other key issues of concern. Respondents felt that CCC has a very different perspective on these issues and does not listen or respect the sentiments and concerns of their residents.

"Clearly development and environment are my key concerns, and I imagine would be key concerns of most residents through the affected area, as most if not all are fiercely passionate to protect the semi-rural environment in which we invested and the homes within it that we love. I understand that there are State Planning Code changes to occur in July 2020. This does not alter my opinion that I fiercely reject Campbelltown's bid to acquire the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde, which is very obviously driven by greed on Campbelltown's part."

"Past behaviour is the best predictor of future behaviour, and on this basis I believe Adelaide Hills Council and Campbelltown City Council have shown their true nature (Adelaide Hills Council having helped residents preserve the magnificent characteristics of the area and Campbelltown City Council allowing as much infill development as possible) and that is why I want to stay with Adelaide Hills Council."

"Extremely concerned about CCC's propensity to approve high density living as can be seen in the current planning policy comparisons between the two councils. This will affect wildlife and drive out the koalas, kangaroos and other native Australian animals and bird life."

"As a resident who does not use the services or facilities of Campbelltown council I strongly object to being governed by them. I am vehemently opposed to the boundary realignment. Campbelltown Council has destroyed the amenity of their area and I do not want it to happen to my home."

"I do not support the change as the Campbelltown Council does not respect the environment and is pushing to have my area as high density living. This area must remain protected for its unique value and proximity to nature."

It was reiterated that there are no compelling reasons for change and that respondents are satisfied with AHC.

"So-called geographic isolation from Stirling or Woodside has never been an issue in my 25 years as resident in this area."

"Adelaide Hills Council staff have always been easily contacted by phone and/or email and respond promptly to requests for service / assistance."

"Very comfortable with AHC - if it ain't broke, why change it."

Respondents indicated a lack of trust in CCC relating to their assurances around retention of the Hills Face Zone and existing AHC development policies and approaches for the area. In addition, they felt that CCC has misrepresented the residents in the area through claims they favour boundary change.

"Campbelltown City Council's claimed commitment to maintaining the hills face zone does not provide any guarantee whatsoever, given the turnover of staff and representation, and what would be dilution of our voice in the wider Campbelltown area, compared with a demonstrated commonality of interest in Adelaide Hills Council representation. I seek Adelaide Hills Council's rejection of the Campbelltown proposal."

"I oppose the proposal in the strongest possible terms, and urge Adelaide Hills Council to resist it. There is not the slightest reason to trust Campbelltown's promises that the character of the area will be maintained, when their only plausible rationale is to profit from through facilitating development."

"Campbelltown Council cannot be trusted to succumb to greedy developers. One has to only look at every street ruined in their area."

"Adelaide Hills Council has fought for keeping our street and neighbourhood free from developers in the past so we trust them!"

"Our physical environment is completely different to the area that Campbelltown city council presently has jurisdiction over. This clearly reflects they do not share the same philosophies with respect to the environment and our current climate change emergency."

Respondents expressed that a saving in Council rates is not a key decision-making factor for them.

"The prospect of a potential modest saving in annual rates is not worth the risk of being controlled by a Council with a long history of large scale, unsympathetic development."

"They have not shown any interest in the beauty and sustainability of the area. They seem purely concerned with making money. The State Government would be mad to let this happen."

"Let's be blunt, the Campbelltown City Council's actions are driven solely by money. Effectively, they want to steal a portion of the rates revenue from an adjoining council. Not very neighbourly."

Some respondents sum up their feelings with a very clear rejection of the boundary change proposal.

"This is unwelcome."

"We absolutely do not support this move and wish to remain under Adelaide Hills Council."

"I DO NOT SUPPORT MOVING TO CAMPBELLTOWN COUNCIL."

"Would be a disaster for Morialta and surrounds."

6. Survey findings - Woodforde

There were 109 responses from residents/ businesses in Woodforde. Of these 42 were in favour of the boundary change proposal, 57 were against the boundary change proposal, 8 undecided and 2 had no preference (Refer to Table 6).

Table 6: Rostrevor responses

Suburb	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Woodforde	109	42 (39%)	57 (52%)	8 (7%)	2 (2%)

As part of the boundary change survey, respondents were asked to indicate their top three areas of interest about the proposal.

The responses for Woodforde are summarised below, noting a total of 109 individual survey responses were received. No single issue was of interest to the majority of respondents. This is reflective of the overall findings for Woodforde being more evenly split between those in favour and against boundary change.

In alignment with Rostrevor respondents, the two top issues of interest for those against boundary change are planning and development and environmental sustainability.

Similarly, environmental sustainability and climate change are not identified as issues of interest for respondents in favour of boundary change in Woodforde (as was the case for Rostrevor). Their focus is instead on rates, community services and maintenance.

Table 7: Woodforde Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	14	44
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	29	14
Community services	24	6
Environmental sustainability	3	33
Annual council rates	26	14
Climate change	2	7
Council rules and regulations	2	21
Community grants	-	4
Level of representation	2	4

Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal

Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal raised a range of reasons for their support, including council rates, geographic location and community services. Responses were generally short and little additional commentary was shared as part of the last open response question in the survey.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Geographic location

The most frequently raised issue in favour of boundary change is the belief that this part of Woodforde is more connected to the CCC than to the Adelaide Hills. The services provided by the CCC are closer and easier to access than those in the hills and it is seen as logical to change council boundaries. In addition, it is felt this part of Woodforde is more “metropolitan” than hills in terms of the services it needs and the characteristics of the suburb, which again means a better fit with the CCC.

“We live in the Hamilton Hill development, the areas that we use already lie within the Campbelltown City Council, we would not travel up into the hills, so makes sense to us to be within that council.”

“Makes sense, council chambers and depot are much closer and can serve the residents better than Adelaide Hills Council.”

“Woodforde is too far from Adelaide Hills Council.”

“I am a frequent and grateful user of Campbelltown's services. Council offices and various services are more accessible.”

“It makes sense. This Rostrevor/Woodforde area is a highly-populated suburban area - it belongs with a metro council.”

“We use more Campbelltown Council resources and have more engagement with them than Adelaide Hills Council. To go to Adelaide Hills Council office is a 45 min drive. I believe we are more likely to be a respected part of Campbelltown than being “not really a hills” resident.”

Council rates

Several respondents referenced that the potential reduction in council rates would be appealing.

Level of support

A small number of respondents stated they have experienced a disappointing level of service from AHC and feel this would be improved if they were part of the CCC.

“Better levels of service from Campbelltown. Council offices and depot located just down the road so quicker response to customer requests. Campbelltown have no debt and are well organised.”

“Shorter response times to service ratepayer needs.”

Woodforde respondents against the boundary change proposal

Respondents articulated a similar set of reasons to Rostrevor residents in explaining their position against boundary change. The themes are listed in priority order.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Planning and development

As was the case for respondents from Rostrevor, the most significant issue for Woodforde respondents against boundary change is the concern that the CCC has very different policies, principles and perspectives towards sub-division and development when compared to AHC. It is felt by respondents that CCC will actively seek to bring more people into the area through changes to zoning and this is not supported. Respondents do not trust the CCC to keep the green spaces, which are not national parks or protected, undeveloped.

It was also frequently stated the area has distinctly “hills” characteristics and a strong sense of community – which are viewed as being consistent with the AHC area and not CCC.

“We feel that we are part of the hills and have more confidence in Adelaide Hills Council maintaining the integrity of these suburbs.”

“Recent high density development in Campbelltown is a concern even if the protest they will not do the same thing here.”

“We bought our house in Woodforde in 2011 due the beauty and character of the area. A change in planning law and increase in development density etc. will impact on the character and amenity of our area and potentially destroy the character of it.”

“Physically Campbelltown City Council may be closer but they are miles away in mind and so alien to us.”

“I do not like their policy of urban infill. It has ruined suburbs like Tranmere turning it into a concrete jungle.”

“The boundary change would change this area from being “hills” to being “metropolitan”. This change seems absurd to me, as anyone who has set foot in this area can clearly tell that it is much more hills than metropolitan in terms of environment, terrain, community and layout. Changing this doesn’t really seem to have any positive outcomes for me or my community.”

No compelling reason to change

A number of residents simply state there is no reason or justification for change and they are happy with the status quo.

“It seems like there is not any benefit.”

“Happy with Adelaide Hills Council.”

"Prefer to stay as Adelaide Hills resident."

"As a Hills facing suburb we prefer to be under the jurisdiction of a Hills Council."

Environmental considerations

Some respondents viewed the north-eastern parts of Woodforde (not Hamilton Hill), as part of the Adelaide Hills, offering natural habitats for wildlife, open spaces, large blocks and old trees – a place where nature is nurtured and respected as it is elsewhere in the AHC area. They felt AHC does more to protect green spaces and restrict development – which is preferred.

"Pushing more people into this area by allowing for smaller lot sizes and subdivisions will likely put stress on the local flora and fauna that we are so lucky to share this area with. Increased noise, traffic density, and population in general will most likely drive this wildlife back into the park, which would be a loss for the entire community."

"Because Adelaide Hills Council do more to protect the environment and don't just hand it over to developers!"

"I am concerned about the removal of so many mature trees in Campbelltown City Council. They are necessary for our climate and wildlife. They take a long time to grow and any replacements (if they find room for them) will be unsuitable for our wildlife for 40-50 years."

City of Campbelltown seeking increased income

Despite assertions to the contrary by representatives from the CCC, some respondents expressed they still feel that the move to change the council boundary is primarily driven by wanting to add more rateable properties to their area.

"Campbelltown are just making a cynical grab for more rates."

"This is a self-serving exercise by Campbelltown City Council rather than being centred on the interests of residents."

Lack of trust in City of Campbelltown assurances

A handful of respondents expressed a lack of trust and belief in the assurances provided by the CCC that planning and zoning policies in the area would not change if the boundary change were to go ahead.

"We are worried about Campbelltown City Council's planning and development in the long term despite their assurance it will never change. We simply don't believe them."

Property value

A small number of respondents referenced that they felt the boundary change would have a negative impact on property values, causing them to either stagnate or even decrease. Some respondents outlined direct experience of owning a property in CCC subject to stagnating or falling property prices while others made the assumption future higher density development in Woodforde as a result of boundary change would negatively impact property value.

"I don't want my property devalued and housing congested."

"Because they allow the building of "match box" type of dwelling being built on crowded allotments - which devalues our individual and unique properties - it is very bad and sad."

The following additional points were reiterated and emphasised by respondents in the final open response question of the survey:

- There is strong support for AHC stance on development and planning policy and respondents made it clear they wish for this to continue as this ethos protects the area from overdevelopment.
- Respondents request AHC take a strong stand and resist the council boundary change. In a similar vein, respondents also request AHC to listen and then act upon the wishes of the majority of residents in the area.
- There is a level of disappointment expressed at the time, energy and money being spent on a boundary change venture that appears, in the eyes of respondents, to be financially driven by CCC.
- Respondents emphasize they see themselves as part of the hills community and firmly believe the right fit for their area is to be part of AHC.

"Adelaide Hills Council should respect and support the wishes of residents."

"Unless there is an overwhelming majority of residents support the boundary change proposal, it should not proceed."

"As a resident of Woodforde I strongly object to any inclusion within the Campbelltown City Council area. There is no justification for their boundary change proposal."

"We identify strongly with the semi-rural lifestyle that being part of Adelaide Hills Council affords us and vehemently oppose what we believe is a revenue raising exercise by Campbelltown City Council with zero net benefit to us, the residents."

"In over 40 years in Woodforde, Campbelltown City Council has shown no interest in us until the development of Hamilton Hill estate. Campbelltown City Council sees this as a pot of gold to add to their revenue."

7. Respondents from suburbs outside

There were 33 survey responses in total from respondents in other suburbs. Of these 15 were in favour of the boundary change, 17 were against the boundary change and one respondent was undecided (Refer to Table 8).

Table 8: Response numbers from other suburbs

Suburb	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Other suburbs	33	15 (45%)	17 (52%)	1 (3%)	0

These respondents provided less detail in the open response questions posed but key themes were still able to be identified. Responses were in general pragmatic rather than impassioned – with the exception of a small number of responses against boundary change.

Issues of interest were broad, with climate change, council rules and regulations and community grants being of little to no interest.

Table 9: Other Suburbs Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	4	9
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	10	5
Community services	10	3
Environmental sustainability	3	6
Annual council rates	8	6
Climate change	-	-
Council rules and regulations	-	2
Community grants	-	-
Level of representation	-	3

The themes identified below summarise all the issues raised both in favour and against council boundary change across both open response questions asked in the survey.

Respondents against council boundary change focussed on the following:

- Content with status quo and see no reason for the change.
- Preference for planning and development ethos / low density housing approach taken by AHC.
- Better rules and planning for fire protection within AHC.
- Outright rejection of the proposal (“It is not a good proposal.”)
- AHC viewed as taking better care of the natural environment.
- Sentiment that “ground rules” in terms of planning and development should not be allowed to change as a result of boundary change as people have specifically elected to purchase a

property in the area because of those rules and the characteristics of the suburb that are enjoyed as a result.

Respondents in favour of council boundary change provided the following reasons:

- The CCC is geographically better connected to Woodforde, making services easier and more convenient to access.
- Having a Council focussed on suburban / metropolitan needs suits the area better than one that is focussed on semi-rural / hills needs.
- AHC does not support the area particularly well.
- Given many residents use CCC services, it seems fair to also pay rates to that council.

8. Notes about survey

Survey parameters

Parameters for survey included:

- Participants must be 18 years or over
- Participating in the survey is not mandatory
- Multiple submissions per household accepted (e.g. if four adults living at address they can each provide a submission)
- Survey will only be available in English – but assistance to be provided if required
- One 'survey pack' sent to each household (additional copies can be requested from AHC Customer Service Centres)
- Renters are encouraged to participate
- Name and address details are required but the results will be anonymised and not associated with their contact details for Council consultation and public reporting
- Survey is available online and in hard copy

9. Appendix A

Have your say:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

Project Summary

Campbelltown City Council (CCC) has put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal (the Proposal) to the Boundaries Commission (a State Government body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister) to review the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC).

CCC proposes moving the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety. *See map included in this information pack.*

There are currently 573 properties (3.3% of total AHC properties) that are within the proposed Boundary Change Zone.

AHC does not have a formal position on the Proposal yet as we'd like your feedback on what you think about it first. Please take a moment to read this information sheet and complete the short survey.

Your feedback is important and AHC will compile it into a report for consideration by AHC Council Members, at this stage planned for early 2020.

How you can have your say

- Complete the hard copy survey attached, place it in the enclosed free return-paid envelope and post it back to us before Sunday 8 December 2019 (you don't need a postage stamp)
- Scan the survey and email it to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- Head to our website engage.ahc.sa.gov.au and complete the online survey

Survey closes Sunday 8 December 2019

We are here to help

If you've got a question, want additional hard copy surveys, or further information about the Boundary Change Proposal please get in touch with our team.




engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au



(08) 8408 0587

Boundary Change Proposal Map



Important information

Please note this survey is only intended for people over 18 years of age who live, work, or own a property in the proposed Boundary Change Zone. All names and addresses will be cross checked against the electoral role and council's database, and any identifying data will be kept strictly confidential.

Further detailed information is available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au, and additional hard copies of the survey can be requested by calling (08) 8408 0587 or emailing engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au.

This is just the beginning

This is the start of a comprehensive review process which will be undertaken by CCC and the Boundaries Commission. Adelaide Hills Council has no formal role to play in the process at this time. No decision has been made yet and the final decision lies with the Minister for Local Government.

Step 1 - Potential Proposal (January 2019)

Consideration of CCC's initial proposal by Boundaries Commission

Approved by Boundaries Commission to progress to next stage



Step 2 - General Proposal

CCC prepares general proposal for Boundaries Commission

CCC undertakes consultation with the community

Current
status



Step 3 (*if proposal continues*) - Investigation by Commission

Boundaries Commission assesses the proposal using an independent investigator

CCC must agree to the cost of the investigation

Criteria to be assessed include financial and resource implications and community support



Step 4 - Report to Minister

Boundaries Commission prepares a report for the Minister explaining recommendations

Published on Boundaries Commission website

Minister may make suggestions for further consideration



Step 5 - Decision

Minister decides whether proposal will proceed or not

Overview of the Boundary Change Proposal

We've summarised some of the key points of interest between AHC and CCC. If the information you are looking for is not covered here, take a look on our website, ahc.sa.gov.au, or call our Customer Service Team on 8408 0400.

	Adelaide Hills Council	Campbelltown City Council
Total population <i>Total number of people living in whole council area at 2018 Census.</i>	39,734 (0.50 persons per hectare)	51,469 (21.13 persons per hectare)
Land area <i>Total land size of whole council area.</i>	79,498 hectares	2,436 hectares
Electors* <i>The number of people living in the council area who are entitled to vote in Council elections.</i>	29,500 electors	35,000 electors
Council structure	One Mayor 12 Council Members Two Wards	One Mayor 10 Council Members Five Wards
Representation quota <i>The number of electors divided by all Council Members</i>	One Council Member represents 2,261 electors	One Council Member represents 3,183 electors
Annual Council Rates <i>Rate charged annually.</i>	AHC's rating structure consists of a Fixed Charge of \$662 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.002469. <i>If rating structures remained the same, most residents within the proposed Boundary Change Zone would receive a reduction in annual rates ranging from approximately \$22 to \$450.</i>	CCC's rating structure consists of a Minimum Rate of \$984 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.003050.
Planning and Development	There is a new Planning and Design Code being developed by the State Government which comes into effect on 1 July 2020. More details about planning and development comparison can be found overleaf.	
Minimum site area <i>For a detached dwelling</i>	The average minimum allowable site size in the AHC parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde (including Hamilton Hill) is 703m ² . <i>There is no suggestion, at this time, that either council would pursue changes to reduce allotment sizes in the Boundary Change Zone.</i>	In the CCC part of Rostrevor and Magill the average minimum site size is 350m ² .
Open space and civil services <i>Roads, footpaths, signs, street lights, parks, ovals, playgrounds, cemeteries.</i>	There are no noticeable differences in terms of open space and civil services functions and services between AHC and CCC.	

* The number of electors is obtained from the Electoral Commission of SA and the source date is 28 February 2018.

Environmental sustainability	AHC and CCC have both declared a climate emergency, and both councils have a number of sustainability initiatives.	
Kerbside bins	East Waste collects general waste weekly and recycling and green organics waste on alternating fortnights in both council areas.	
Green organics drop off days	AHC organises a number of free green organics drop off days throughout the year for residents.	CCC does not host free green organics drop off days.
Hard waste	Both AHC and CCC offer one 'at call' hard waste collection per property each financial year.	
Resource Recovery Centres	Residents can go to any resource recovery centre (including those outside of their council district). Each council has one resource recovery centre.	
School zones <i>In relation to which schools children are entitled to attend based on their residence.</i>	Catchment areas are not limited to council boundaries and are set by the State Government Department of Education.	
Community grants	In 2017-18 AHC awarded \$219,000 in funding through its grant program.	In 2017-18 CCC awarded \$41,341 in funding through its grant program.
Regulatory matters <i>This includes local laws established by councils to deal with issues specific to the relevant council area.</i>	<p>There are no noticeable differences in regulatory matters between AHC and CCC except regarding domestic cats.</p> <p>In AHC cats must be confined to their owner's property from 1 January 2022. More information at ahc.sa.gov.au/council/delegations-and-by-laws.</p>	

Need more information? Visit each council's website

	ahc.sa.gov.au	campbelltown.sa.gov.au
Council documents <i>Annual Reports, Strategic Plans, policies</i>	Council > Council Documents	Council > Documents and Publications
Community services <i>Youth, volunteering, diversity, seniors</i>	Community	Community
Community grants	Council > Grants and Tenders	Community > Grants
Regulatory matters <i>Local laws and rules</i>	Council > Delegations and By-laws	Council > Documents and Publications
Sport and recreation	Community > Sport and Recreation	Recreation and Leisure
Civil Services	Resident > Roads, Streetscapes, Works	Services > Capital Works Program
Environmental sustainability	Environment > Sustainability	Environment
Rates and property	Resident > Rates and Property	Council > Rates

Further information available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Planning and Development

The South Australian planning system is changing on 1 July 2020. A new Planning and Design Code (P&D Code) will become the single source of planning policy for assessing development applications across the state.

What does this mean if the boundary change proposal was to proceed?

The new P&D Code being developed by the State Government will replace all council development plans. The new Code means that planning policy will be standardised across council boundaries (this includes AHC and CCC).

Any changes to zonings in either council district after 1 July 2020 would require public consultation as well as Ministerial approval.

For further information about specific development controls applicable under the proposed P&D Code, please contact the P&D Code Free Hotline on 1800 318 102, or review the new P&D Code at sapanningportal.sa.gov.au.

What happens to development applications submitted before 1 July 2020?

The current planning rules will stay the same before 1 July 2020. Any planning application submitted before that time will be assessed under the current planning rules.

Current planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC:

	AHC		CCC
	Woodforde and Rostrevor	Hamilton Hill	Rostrevor and Magill
Site area The minimum size of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	Ranges from 929-1,000m ²	180m ²	Ranges from 350-500m ²
Frontage width The minimum width of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	21 metres	8 metres	Ranges from 7-20 metres
Front setback The minimum distance from the road to the house	6 metres	3 metres	5 metres
Rear setback The minimum distance from the back of the house to the back fence	4 metres	4 metres	4 metres
Site coverage The maximum percentage that a site can be covered by a dwelling	40%	60%	50%
Building height The maximum height allowed for a building	6 metres wall height	3 storeys	8.5 metres

Planning and Design Code Information Session

If you are interested in learning more about the SA Planning Reform please come along to our free Information Session.

Wednesday 27 November 2019 | 6:30pm - 8:00pm

Kelty Theatre, Rostrevor College

Register: planning-forum-woodforde.eventbrite.com.au or call 8408 0400

Survey:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Name _____ Year of birth: _____

Postal address _____

Email _____ Phone: _____

Are you a (tick all that apply)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Property owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tenant | <input type="checkbox"/> Business owner | |

Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (tick one)

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> No preference |

Why do you say that?

What are your areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal? (tick your top three)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning and development | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual Council Rates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Footpaths, road and park maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community services | <input type="checkbox"/> Council rules and regulations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental sustainability | <input type="checkbox"/> Community grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Level of representation (number of electors represented by each Council Member) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council to consider?

If you need more space please use the back of this page or attach additional pages.

Please place your completed survey in the free reply-paid envelope provided and into your nearest mailbox, or scan and email to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au by 8 December 2019.

**ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL
BOUNDARY CHANGE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday 30 May 2023
AGENDA BUSINESS ITEM**

Item:	9.1
Responsible Officer:	Lachlan Miller Executive Manager Governance & Performance Office of the Chief Executive
Subject:	Correspondence with the Local Government Boundaries Commission
For:	Information

SUMMARY

The Campbelltown City Council (the “CCC”) boundary reform proposal for the suburbs of Woodforde and Rostrevor (AHC) has been in progress since January 2019.

During this time, Council has advocated with the Local Government Boundaries Commission (the “LGBC”) in relation to its concerns regarding the proposal.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with a compilation of the correspondence between AHC and the LGBC.

RECOMMENDATION

The Boundary Change Committee resolves that the report be received and noted.

1. BACKGROUND

On 1 January 2019, new provisions in the *Local Government Act 1999* regarding boundary reform came into effect (Chapter 3, Part 2). The provisions fundamentally changed the way boundary reform proposals would be managed.

Two of the key changes were as follows:

- The Local Government Boundaries Commission (LGBC) was established to oversee boundary change proposals undertaken under Part 2; and
- Boundary reform proposals could be initiated by one council without the consent of a neighbouring ‘affected’ council.

At its 22 January 2019 meeting, the CCC resolved to submit a Stage 1 proposal to the LGBC. The submission was for the boundary between CCC and AHC to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC’s area.

The CCC proposal has progressed through each of the boundary reform stages (see Legal Implications below for a description of the key stages of the boundary reform process).

Unfortunately, the legislated process does not enable the ‘affected’ council to have any formal role in the process until a proposal has progressed to the Inquiry (investigation) stage other than the LGBC notifying the council on the progression of the proposal through the process stages. Notwithstanding this lack of formal ‘status’, AHC has been very active in communicating with the LGBC regarding the CCC proposal.

Appendix 1 contains the key correspondence between AHC and LGBC with some minor and inconsequential administrative pieces omitted. It should be noted that in addition to the communication with the LGBC, Council has had numerous (approx. 200) contacts with responsible Ministers, Opposition Spokespersons, local Members of Parliament, CCC Mayor and Councillors, GAROC, and members of the public regarding the proposal.

2. ANALYSIS

➤ Strategic Management Plan/Functional Strategy/Council Policy Alignment

Strategic Plan 2020-24 – A brighter future

Goal 5	A Progressive ORGANISATION
Objective O4	We actively represent our community
Priority O4.3	Advocate to, and exert influence with, our stakeholders on behalf of our community to promote the needs and ambitions of the region
Priority O4.4	Explore council boundary reform options that best serve the community.
Objective O5	We are accountable, informed, and make decisions in the best interests of the whole community
Priority O5.1	Enhance governance structures and systems to prudently adapt to changing circumstances and meet our legislative obligations

➤ Legal Implications

Council boundary reform provisions are contained within Chapter 3 - Constitution of councils, Part 2 – Reform proposals of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the “Act”). The current iteration of these provisions came into effect on 1 January 2019.

Collectively these provisions establish the LGBC as the body that receives, assesses and makes recommendations to the Minister for Local Government on proposals developed in accordance with principles set out in the Act and procedures developed by the Commission.

There are two categories of proposal: Administrative Proposals (these are minor boundary adjustments to correct anomalies and to facilitate a development that has been granted authorisation under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*) and General Proposals (which are all proposals that are not Administrative Proposals - in practice these are for the more substantial council boundary changes and amalgamations). Proposals can be initiated by one of more councils, the public, the Minister or either House of Parliament.

In accordance with s27(2) of the Act, the LGBC has prepared and published a series of guidelines for the purposes of processing reform proposals.

As this report deals with a General Proposal submitted by a council, subsequent information will focus on the processes associated with this form of proposal only.

The following is a brief overview of the General Proposal process as contained in the Commission's guidelines:

Stage 1 *Submission by the initiating council containing brief overview of the reform proposal*

- The LGBC reviews the submission and if it considers it has merit it will advise the initiating council that they can refer a Stage 2 proposal to the LGBC.

Stage 2 *Detailed submission by the initiating council addressing the 12 principles set out in s26 and the additional requirements of the application guidelines*

- The LGBC reviews the proposal against the principles and guidelines and will advise the initiating council:
 - That the proposal lacks merit (and will not be continued in its current form); or
 - That additional information is required to establish merit; or
 - The proposal has merit.
- Where the LGBC determines that a proposal has merit it will advise the initiating council that the LGBC intends to (independently) inquire into the proposal, the initiating council will be provided with an estimate of the cost of the independent inquiry and will need to resolve to process (and fund the inquiry).

Stage 3 *Inquiry by LGBC-appointed investigators into the merits of the proposal*

- The investigators will assess the proposal against the s26 principles, financial and resource implications, extent of community support, employment implications, etc.
- Affected councils are able to make submissions to the investigators and to provide information to assist inquiry, as requested.

Stage 4 *The LGBC prepares a reform Proposal Report and this is provided to the Minister and is published on the Commission's website*

- The Minister may request consideration of suggestions for report resubmission, if resubmitted the revised report is also a public document
- If the Minister accepts the recommendations, it is sent to the Governor for proclamation and comes into effect

➤ **Risk Management Implications**

Advocacy in relation to the CCC boundary reform proposal will assist in mitigating the risk of:

Realignment of Council boundaries bordering Campbelltown City Council leading to financial, resource allocation, social and representation changes

Inherent Risk	Residual Risk	Target Risk
Extreme (5C)	High (4C)	Medium

➤ **Financial and Resource Implications**

The resource and financial implications associated with the advocacy position in relation to the LGBC has been absorbed within the Governance & Performance Department workload.

To be clear and, as distinct from the above, the potential outcomes of the boundary reform proposal could have significant financial and resource implications.

➤ **Customer Service and Community/Cultural Implications**

There are minimal community implications associated with the advocacy position in relation to the LGBC.

To be clear and, as distinct from the above, the potential outcomes of the boundary reform proposal could have significant community implications.

➤ **Sustainability Implications**

Not applicable.

➤ **Engagement/Consultation conducted in the development of the report**

As this report is a collation of correspondence there was not any direct consultation in its compilation.

➤ **Additional Analysis**

A number of the documents contained in **Appendix 1** relate to the CCC's Stage 1 proposal, Stage 2 proposal and Supplementary Information to the Stage 2 proposal. These documents have been provided in the response to the Motion on Notice at Item 7.1 in this agenda and should be read in conjunction with the correspondence contained in this report.

3. OPTIONS

As this is an Information Report, the Committee is limited to receiving the report.

4. APPENDIX

- (1) Compilation of correspondence with the Local Government Boundaries Commission, 2019-2023

Appendix 1

*Compilation of correspondence with the Local
Government Boundaries Commission,
2019-2023*

Mr Andrew Aitken
Chief Executive Officer
Adelaide Hills Council
PO Box 44
WOODSIDE SA 5244

Re: Campbelltown City Council Boundary Realignment Proposal

Dear Mr Aitken

I write to notify you of a proposed boundary realignment proposal by the City of Campbelltown to realign the boundary between the City of Campbelltown and the Adelaide Hills Council in the Woodforde area.

The SA Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) discussed and considered the City of Campbelltown's Stage 1 proposal at its meeting on 21 March 2019. The proposal was considered against the objectives of the *Local Government Act 1999* and the requirements of a Stage 1 proposal that are contained in the Commission's Guideline 3.

The Commission determined that the City of Campbelltown may refer a Stage 2 general proposal to the Commission. Please note that this does not guarantee that the proposal will be formally accepted.

I have encouraged the City of Campbelltown to contact your Council to discuss this proposal.

I trust that this information is of assistance to you. If you have further questions, please contact Mr Thomas Rossini in the Office of Local Government on 7109 7443, or thomas.rossini@sa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Bruce Green
Chair, SA Local Government Boundaries Commission

6 May 2019

7 February 2020

Bruce Green
Chair
Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001
E: DPTI:BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au

Dear Bruce

Proposed Council Boundary Realignment - Rostrevor and Woodforde

As you know, Campbelltown City Council (CCC) is in the process of developing a Stage 2 general proposal for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor (AHC) suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

AHC has been diligent in keeping the potentially affected community informed in relation to the boundary realignment process, the current status of the CCC proposal and in seeking the views of that community to the proposed realignment.

At its 24 September 2019 Ordinary meeting, AHC resolved to conduct a postal survey of the residents and ratepayers of the affected area to determine the level of support for the realignment proposal.

The survey was conducted over the November/December 2019 period and AHC received the *Survey Outcomes Report* (attached) at its 28 January 2020 meeting. In consideration of the Report, AHC resolved:

1. *That the report be received and noted.*
2. *To note that electronic copies of the Council Boundary Change Survey Report have been provided to the residents and ratepayers who participated in the survey and to the Mayor of Campbelltown City Council.*
3. *To provide the Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey Report at Appendix 1 to the Boundaries Commission, the Minister for Local Government, the Shadow Minister for Local Government and the Member for Morialta.*

4. *To recognise and accept that the majority of Rostrevor (AHC) and Woodforde community respondents in the Council Boundary Change Survey are against the boundary change proposal. As such, Council requests that Campbelltown City Council, in light of these results, consider withdrawing their proposal with the Boundaries Commission.*

At the same meeting, AHC resolved to receive and note the following petition from 61 residents of Rostrevor:

"We are Adelaide Hills Council residents/ratepayers and live within the area of the proposed boundary changes initiated by Campbelltown City Council.

We do not want under any circumstance to be incorporated into Campbelltown City Council and be affected by their own requirements in regards to planning and building regulation signage etc.

We understand that the wishes and concerns of residents so affected must be of paramount importance when assessing and deciding on such important issues".

Council further resolved to forward this information to the CCC, the Boundaries Commission, the Minister for Local Government, the Shadow Minister for Local Government and the Member for Morialta for their information.

AHC acknowledges that there is a comprehensive and robust process for assessing boundary alignment proposals however it equally believes that the sentiment of the potentially affected communities should be actively represented as the process progresses.

Yours sincerely

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance

Enclosed: Council Boundary Change Proposal – Survey Outcomes Report – January 2020

2020



Adelaide Hills
COUNCIL



COUNCIL BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL

SURVEY OUTCOMES REPORT

Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey Analysis

Quick summary.....	2
Purpose of this report.....	2
Background	2
Snapshot of results	2
1. Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone.....	3
2. Survey approach.....	4
What we asked.....	4
Distribution	4
Survey pack contents	4
3. Survey responses.....	7
4. Boundary change proposal analysis.....	8
Overarching sentiment	8
Survey responses by age bracket.....	9
Survey response by location	10
5. Survey findings – Rostrevor.....	12
Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal	13
Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal.....	14
6. Survey findings - Woodforde.....	21
Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal.....	22
Woodforde respondents against the boundary change proposal.....	23
7. Respondents from suburbs outside	26
8. Notes about survey.....	27
Survey parameters	27
9. Appendix A.....	28

Quick summary

Purpose of this report

This report contains a summary of feedback received as part of the Council Boundary Change Proposal Survey undertaken in November/ December 2019. The intention is for a summary document and this longer report to be made available to anyone who participated in the survey.

Background

In January 2019 Campbelltown City Council (CCC) put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal to the Boundaries Commission for the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) to be realigned to the eastern and southern side of Woodforde and Rostrevor suburbs, effectively moving those suburbs into CCC's area.

A community information meeting was held by AHC at Rostrevor College on 3 September for anyone who wanted to know more about the Council Boundary Change Proposal. The community meeting was attended by approximately 122 members of the local community. A copy of the presentation and minutes from the meeting can be accessed here:

<https://engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreview2>

In September 2019 AHC decided to undertake a survey of residents and ratepayers of the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde affected by the CCC boundary change proposal. The purpose of the survey was to determine the level of support for the proposal in the community.

In November 2019 AHC residents and ratepayers in Woodforde and Rostrevor were invited to complete a short survey about the Council Boundary Change Proposal. The survey was accompanied with a document setting out key information relating to the potential impacts of the proposed boundary change.

The survey was available online from the AHC website and in hard-copy from 25 November 2019 until 8 December 2019 for those invited to participate.

Snapshot of results

We received 268 survey responses during the consultation. Here's a snapshot of the feedback received:

- 65% of all respondents are against the boundary change proposal
- 28% of respondents are in favour of it
- 7% are undecided or have no preference
- A large majority (81%) of **Rostrevor** respondents are against boundary change and 15% are in favour
- A small majority of **Woodforde** residents and those living in other Council areas (i.e. absentee landlords) who responded to the survey indicated that they are against boundary change (52%), balanced against an average of 39% being in favour.
- The key issues of interest for those **against** boundary change are: planning and development, environmental sustainability, council rules and regulations and climate change.
- For those in **favour** of boundary reform the key issues of interest are: community services, rates, footpaths, road and park maintenance.

1. Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone

CCC proposes to move the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Council Boundary Change Proposal Zone



2. Survey approach

In November 2019 Adelaide Hills Council residents and ratepayers in Woodforde and Rostrevor (including absentee landlords) were invited to complete a short survey about the Council Boundary Change Proposal.

The survey was available online from the AHC website and in hard-copy from 25 November 2019 until 8 December 2019.

What we asked

- Name, address, phone and year of birth
- Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (yes/ no/ undecided/ no preference)
- Why do you say that?
- What are your top three areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal?
- Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council?

Distribution

The survey was distributed by hand via a third party distribution company to all properties in the proposed boundary change zone (including residents and businesses). In addition, the survey was also posted to all property owners who had a postal address outside the boundary change zone (i.e. absentee landlords).

Survey pack contents


The survey pack included a fold-out information sheet, single page survey and reply-paid envelope (Refer to Appendix A).

The fold-out information sheet contained:

- Project summary
- Boundary change proposal map
- Boundary change process diagram
- Overview of key points of interest between AHC and CCC
- Links to policies and reports on each council's website
- Planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC.

To help the survey pack stand out amongst other mail it was packaged in a brightly designed envelope (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Survey pack distributed to boundary change zone




The image shows a survey pack for the Adelaide Hills Council Boundary Change Proposal. It includes a survey form and a flyer. The survey form has the following sections:

- Header:** Adelaide Hills COUNCIL logo, "Survey: Council Boundary Change Proposal", and a green bar stating "This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au".
- Personal Information:** Fields for Name, Year of birth, Postal address, Email, and Phone.
- Are you a (tick all that apply):**
 - ☐ Resident
 - ☐ Property owner
 - ☐ Other: _____
 - ☐ Tenant
 - ☐ Business owner
- Do you support the Council Boundary Change proposal? (tick one)**
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
- Why do you say that?** (Open text field)
- What are your areas of interest?**
 - ☐ Plains
 - ☐ Campbelltown
 - ☐ Forestville
 - ☐ Commis...

The flyer, titled "Have your say: Council Boundary Change Proposal", features the Adelaide Hills Council logo, a stylized bird, and the text "Have your say!". It also includes the URL engage.ahc.sa.gov.au.

The survey and accompanying background information was also made available online on our engagement portal engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Figure 3: Engagement website home page



The screenshot shows the Adelaide Hills Council website's engagement portal for the Council Boundary Change Proposal survey. The page features a header with navigation links, a search bar, and a sign-in/register option. The main content area is titled "Council Boundary Change Proposal - Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill Community Survey". It includes a welcome message, a project background section, and a need more information section. A map of the survey area is displayed, showing the proposed boundary change zone and surrounding areas. A document library on the right lists various resources, including a survey overview, downloadable survey boundary change proposal, and community meeting presentations. A key dates section indicates the survey closes on 08 December 2019. A life cycle section outlines the stages of the proposal process, from potential proposal to investigation by commission.

Adelaide Hills Council

All consultations All projects Visit our website Home Search Sign In | Register

Home » Council Boundary Change Proposal - Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill Community Survey

Council Boundary Change Proposal - Rostrevor, Woodforde and Hamilton Hill Community Survey

Welcome

Thank you to everyone who have provided their feedback as part of the Boundary Change Proposal Survey. All responses have now been captured by the project team. All hard copy surveys have now been entered online ready for analysis.

Your feedback is important and we will compile it into a report for consideration by Adelaide Hills Council Members in early 2020.

Project background

CCC has put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal (the Proposal) to the Boundaries Commission (a State Government body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister) to review the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC).

CCC proposes moving the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety. See map included in the information pack (downloaded from the document library to the right of this page).

There are currently 573 properties (3.3% of total AHC properties) that are within the proposed Boundary Change Zone.

Need more information

We encourage you to take a look at the frequently asked questions to the right of this page. The question you have may be answered there.

If you're still after more information please get in touch with our team via:

- Email:** engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- Phone:** 8408 0400
- Post:** Adelaide Hills Council, PO Box 44, Woodside SA 5244

SURVEY AND REGISTRATION

CLOSED: This survey has concluded.
Boundary Change Proposal Survey 2019

Document Library

- Boundary Change Proposal overview and survey (1.18 MB) (pdf)
- Downloadable Survey Boundary Change Proposal (239 KB) (pdf)
- Community meeting presentation 3 September 2019 (735 KB) (pdf)
- Community meeting summary 3 September 2019 (659 KB) (pdf)
- more...

Key Dates

Survey closes
08 December 2019

Life Cycle

- Stage 1 - Potential Proposal**
 - Consideration of initiating Council's proposal by Commission
 - Approved to progress to next stage or not
 - Approved by initiating Council to advance proposal or not
- Stage 2 - General Proposal**
 - Initiating Council prepare general proposal for Commission
 - Must include consultation with the community
 - No specific timeframe
- Investigation by Commission**
 - Commission assesses the proposal using an independent investigator
 - Initiating Council agrees to the cost of the investigation
 - Criteria include financial and resource implications, community

Participants could also choose to register online to be kept informed about the project via email updates.

3. Survey responses

As shown in Table 1, 268 people completed the survey during the engagement timeframe (25 November to 8 December 2019).

Table 1: Survey response type


Survey response type	Number
Online engage.ahc.sa.gov.au	174
Hard copy Posted back to Council or hand delivered to Customer Service Centre	76
Emailed as attachment engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au	18
Total	268

When looking at the location of respondents there were:

- 126 respondents in Rostrevor (47% of the total number of survey respondents)
- 109 respondents in Woodforde (41% of the total number of survey respondents)
- 33 respondents from other suburbs (12% of the total number of survey respondents).

Response numbers by location are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4: Map of responses



4. Boundary change proposal analysis

All responses received by 8 December were analysed (including emails, hard copy surveys and online responses).

Overarching sentiment

Across all survey responses, 65% are against the boundary reform proposal, which represents a majority. However it should be noted that there are clear differences between Rostrevor and Woodforde respondents.

Respondents from Rostrevor are against boundary reform by a large majority.

These percentages are underpinned by the detailed survey analysis and feedback from open response questions stemming from Rostrevor.

Responses from Woodforde fall into two groups:

- Respondents who feel similarly to Rostrevor respondents against boundary reform and cite similar concerns and issues
- Respondents who support boundary reform.

The numbers of respondents in Woodforde against boundary reform still outweigh those in favour (52% against versus 39% in favour).

The overall tone of feedback received, with some exceptions, in responses from Woodforde and other suburbs is also considered less emphatic and impassioned compared to responses from Rostrevor.


The key issues of interest for those against boundary reform are planning and development, environmental sustainability, council rules and regulations and climate change.

For those in favour of boundary reform, it is community services, rates, footpaths, road and park maintenance.

The analysis to follow provides detailed findings and insights.

Figure 5: Overall survey results


Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal?



Survey responses by age bracket

We briefly assessed responses by age of respondents. As shown in Figure 6, the highest response rate was from Generation X (those born between 1960 – 1979). 16 people did not provide their age.

Figure 6: Response rate by age



While there was some variation by age group, with residents born in the 70s and 80s being most in favour of boundary reform, the overall age distribution of respondents was similar across the suburbs and the overall pattern of opinions and preferences expressed by respondents remained consistent across the age groups (refer to Table 2).

Table 2: Response sentiment by age

Date of birth	Total	In favour of boundary reform	Against boundary reform	Undecided	No preference
1920 - 1929	3	0	3 (100%)	0	0
1930 - 1939	18	3 (17%)	14 (77%)	0	1 (6%)
1940 - 1949	34	7 (21%)	23 (68%)	4 (11%)	0
1950 - 1959	43	14 (34%)	28 (64%)	1 (2%)	0
1960 - 1969	52	15 (30%)	35 (67%)	2 (3%)	0
1970 - 1979	52	18 (35%)	29 (56%)	3 (6%)	2 (3%)
1980 - 1989	31	12 (39%)	18 (58%)	1 (3%)	0
1990 - 1999	18	4 (22%)	14 (78%)	0	0
2000 - 2009	1	0	1 (100%)	0	0
No date of birth given	16	3 (19%)	11 (69%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
TOTAL	268	76 (28%)	176 (65%)	12 (5%)	4 (2%)

Survey response by location

A review of survey responses found that an analysis of findings by suburb best reflects respondent sentiments and enables clear identification of the key themes of interest and / or concern. Our analysis has been divided into:

- Responses from Rostrevor
- Responses from Woodforde
- Responses from other suburbs (landlords who have a post address outside the boundary change proposal zone i.e. absentee landlords)

Table 3: Response number by location


Suburb	Response number
Rostrevor	126
Woodforde	109
Other suburbs	33
TOTAL	268

As indicated by Figure 7, 81% of respondents in Rostrevor have indicated they are against boundary change, 15% are in favour and 4% are undecided or have no preference.

This compares to a more even distribution of opinion from Woodforde residents, with 52% of respondents indicating they are against boundary change balanced against 39% being in favour and 9% being undecided or indicating they have no preference.

Of the 33 respondents in other suburbs 45% indicated they were in favour of the boundary change, 52% against the boundary change and 3% undecided.

Figure 7: Response Sentiment by Location



5. Survey findings – Rostrevor

There were 126 responses from residents/ businesses in Rostrevor. Of these 19 were in favour of the boundary change proposal, 102 were against the boundary change proposal, 3 undecided and 2 had no preference (Refer to Table 4).

Table 4: Rostrevor responses

	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Rostrevor	126	19 (15%)	102 (81%)	3 (3%)	2 (1%)

As part of the boundary change survey, respondents were asked to indicate their top three areas of interest about the proposal.

The responses for Rostrevor are summarised below and the boxes shaded, in Table 5, indicate issues that are of interest to the majority of respondents.

Environmental sustainability and climate change are not nominated by those in favour of the boundary change proposal. Instead, those in favour of the boundary change proposal are focussed on community services and footpaths, roads and park maintenance.

Table 5: Rostrevor Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	9	95
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	13	13
Community services	18	10
Environmental sustainability	-	81
Annual council rates	8	12
Climate change	-	26
Council rules and regulations	2	29
Community grants	-	-
Level of representation	-	2

As shown in the survey analysis for Woodforde (see section 6 below), the issues of interest follow the same pattern.

Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal

Rostrevor respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal raise two issues:

- Geographic location
- Level of support

It is worth noting the respondent responses are less emotive and shorter than for those against boundary change.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Geographic location

Respondents felt that the location of this pocket of Rostrevor is disconnected by distance from the rest of the Adelaide Hills and is instead, directly connected to the CCC. As a result, respondents stated the services provided by the CCC are closer and easier to access than those in the hills.

"Living at the base on the hills at Rostrevor, I feel closer engaged to the Campbelltown community. All council services at Campbelltown are within minutes, where the Adelaide Hills Council services are a 30min plus drive into the hills."

"If you stepped back and drew the council lines again, common sense would say that Rostrevor is within Campbelltown Council."

"These properties are logically connected to Campbelltown City Council not the Adelaide Hills council due to both their proximity and their nature (i.e. contiguous with other residential areas within the Greater Adelaide region, and they are residential blocks rather than larger rural properties)."

Level of support

A small number of respondents stated they have had little engagement with AHC and that requests for assistance or services have met with no support or response.

"Adelaide Hills Council seems not to hear when I call for assistance."

"We don't feel that we get any support from or use services provided by the Adelaide Hills Council."

"We have had little almost no contact from Adelaide Hills Council since living in the area (20 years) and there has been no assistance, beautification or upgrade of footpath/verge."

The following additional points were reiterated and emphasised in the final open response question of the survey:

- CCC services are closer and more readily accessible and the location of the suburb means it is more logical to be part of Campbelltown and not AHC.
- There is a perception amongst respondents that AHC focusses less effort and spend on the foothills suburbs – and that the residents in these areas are neglected / ignored / poorly understood.

Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal

The themes raised by Rostrevor respondents against the boundary change proposal are highly consistent and are summarised below. Examples of the feedback obtained in the open response question about boundary change are also included to provide a sense of the flavour of the feedback.

It should be noted that there were more comments against the boundary change from Rostrevor than in support and this is why this section of the report is larger than other sections.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

The top themes raised align with the issues of interest nominated, that is, planning and development and environmental sustainability. The themes are listed in priority order.

Planning and development

It is strongly felt by respondents that the CCC has very different policies, principles and perspectives towards sub-division and development when compared to AHC. The CCC is perceived to be pro-development, irrespective of the character of the neighbourhood, with a track record of rezoning to reduce block sizes, reduce green spaces and tree canopy and enable sub-divisions and high density development. The potential for this to occur in this part of Rostrevor, should boundary change proceed, is by far the most significant issue of concern to respondents.

Respondents provided examples of development on the boundary of the AHC area which they feel are “typical” of what is allowed by CCC – and which they do not wish to see in the AHC portion of Rostrevor - such as the Chapel Estate development, townhouse and infill developments on Arcoona Avenue and the construction of large new houses in close proximity to each other and with little surrounding green space in the Yalpara Avenue area. The fact these developments have been allowed on the “doorstep” of the portion of Rostrevor that sits within AHC is viewed as evidence that a change to council boundaries would see the spread of such development.

Respondents also favourably referenced the opposition shown by AHC to development at the end of Wandilla Drive and expressed they did not feel the CCC would hold this position.

Some respondents stated they used to live in the CCC and personally experienced the increased rate of development and sub-division in their former neighbourhood. This was a driver for them to move away. Purchasing a property within the AHC area was furthermore seen as a form of “security” against overdevelopment. Respondents believe AHC has a strong track record of protecting the character of its semi-rural areas and resisting the opportunities presented by property developers in favour of protecting the Hills Face Zone, existing green spaces, large block sizes and low housing density.

It is understood that the CCC has sought to reassure residents that the area will continue to be protected from sub-divisions and development if the boundary change goes ahead, but it is fair to say the majority of survey respondents feel this is a somewhat “empty promise”, that will likely to be upheld for a short amount of time but then overturned.

Respondents therefore felt that a change to the CCC would cause a significant qualitative deterioration to the portion of Rostrevor currently within the AHC area.

Respondents also referenced the new state planning system and the uncertainty this brings. It is felt the protection of sensitive areas such as this portion of Rostrevor will, more than ever before, require residents and other groups to champion that protection. Respondents also made it clear the support from AHC is very important to them as they have to date seen the organisation as agreeing with and endorsing the efforts of residents to retain the bush-like amenity of the area. The expectation is therefore that AHC will continue to do this into the future.

"The Morialta area only looks like it does today because, over a period of more than fifty years, the residents and the Adelaide Hills Council (and its precursor) have worked together to create that bush-like area by planting thousands of trees and shrubs; by paying to have our electrical wires undergrounded; and by, every now and then, having to fight off inappropriate development by developers who don't give a toss about what happens to the area, as long as they make a quick buck."

"We are deeply concerned that the Campbelltown Council will allow development and subdivision of allotments which are currently subject to Adelaide Hills Council development regulations and approval processes."

"I am appalled at the rate of subdivision and overdevelopment through Campbelltown Council area in the last 2-5 years or so, and have very little faith that the strategic plan and vision for Campbelltown Council in any way aligns with the semi-rural nature of my area, particularly the zone behind Morialta."

"I have great concerns that our beautiful neighbourhood is going to be subject to the tiny blocks and subdivision that Campbelltown is known for."

"We do not agree with the minimum property zones Campbelltown consents to. We have already received a notice from a building development company interested in purchasing and subdividing our land."

"We love that the homes around us in Rostrevor have a minimum 1000m² and plenty of green space."

"Adelaide Hills Council acknowledges the unique area known locally as 'Morialta', and demonstrates its commitment to preserving its unique character by stating principles of development control, including low density detached housing, with detached dwellings requiring a minimum frontage of 20m and semi-detached 18m. This demonstrates the Adelaide Hills Council's appreciation and commitment to maintaining the character of the policy area, which is in line with what we as residents desire and expect in this distinct and environmentally beautiful area."

The semi-rural characteristics of the suburb are aligned with the broader Adelaide Hills Council area

Respondents expressed a strong sense that the area is unique and the priority should be to preserve its characteristics and surrounding green spaces, which align closely to those of the AHC.

Respondents felt AHC has resident and environmental interests in mind with its approach to planning and development decisions and zoning.

Respondents did not feel that CCC would take into account resident preferences and feedback or environmental considerations. Further to this respondents felt that this portion of Rostrevor, if it were to be absorbed within the CCC, would be a “minority” within the context of the whole council area and its needs would therefore be seen as being at odds with the urbanised majority – and therefore likely to be glossed over and ignored.

“I truly believe that, while we are only 12km from the city, the true nature of the area surrounding Morialta in the affected zones of Rostrevor and Woodforde are not “metropolitan”, but rather are much more aligned with the nature of property types and landscape through the Adelaide Hills Council area.”

“This pocket (aside from Hamilton Hill) is a hills environment which has a completely different feel, community and environment to the suburbia that is the whole of the Campbelltown City Council area. Just cross any street that marks the council boundary and you enter a different world.”

“The overwhelming sentiment is that residents are happy with Adelaide Hills Council, who have historically backed the area in environmental and other matters. We DO NOT want this change.”

“I enjoy being part of the Adelaide Hills Council because I believe that it appreciates the unique characteristics of the area, including the large blocks and bushy surrounds, and will do all in its power to preserve it into the future in these uncertain times of planning change.”

Environmental considerations

It is felt by respondents that the development ethos of the CCC has had a significant side-effect of a significant reduction in the quality and volume of tree canopy cover. While it is acknowledged some replanting has taken place, this is not seen as having replaced what was removed in both quantity and quality. More broadly, it is felt by respondents that CCC has less regard for the preservation of flora, fauna and the environment than AHC.

This pocket of Rostrevor is viewed by respondents as part of the Adelaide Hills, offering natural habitats for wildlife, open spaces, large blocks and old trees – a place where nature is nurtured and respected as it is elsewhere in the AHC area.

Preserving and enhancing the natural environment is of vital importance to respondents and a fundamental part of their choice to live in the area. They also felt that AHC is better equipped to protect the Morialta area from bushfires through clearing notices and organic waste drop-off days and the like.

"We desperately want to restrict the overdevelopment and urban infill for which Campbelltown is so notorious, for the sake of the residents' amenity but also, in a state of climate emergency, for the sake of the environment."

"Campbelltown City Council is well known to be one of the major urban infill suburbs, subdividing properties in a non-environmentally sustainable way. We live in a protected area with which offers shelter for native flora and fauna and deserves to be protected."

"Adelaide Hills Council policies are by far more closely aligned, and more sympathetic to the amenity and natural environment of the area."

"My area does not share any communities of interest with the Campbelltown City Council. We are firmly aligned culturally, services, values and environmentally with Adelaide Hills Council. Adelaide Hills Council has done a brilliant job of protecting the natural environment in this area and increasing amenity."

City of Campbelltown seeking increased income

Despite assertions to the contrary by representatives from the CCC, many respondents expressed they still feel that the move to change the council boundary is primarily driven by "numbers and dollars" and there is no other obvious rationale.

"Campbelltown Council is engaging in a blatant land grab."

"We need to keep greedy councils and developers away from our environs."

"The way they support their community is financially business driven for expansion, not to retain the living environment enjoyed by those of the Morialta part of Rostrevor."

No compelling reason to change

A number of respondents simply state there is no reason or justification for change. They express their overall satisfaction with AHC services and policies and do not wish to see change for the sake of it.

"Change is totally unnecessary."

"Adelaide Hills Council is the best."

"Happy to be in Adelaide Hills Council."

"I own properties in both Council areas and the claimed benefits and reasons provided by the City of Campbelltown are spurious."

"In short, we have enjoyed a long period of productive cooperation with the Adelaide Hills Council. Why change to a council that we suspect may not share the same values as us?"

Council services and rates

Council rates and services were hardly referenced by respondents against boundary change.

A handful of respondents stated that slightly lower rates are not an inducement to support council boundary change. Respondents also make the point that rates are not part of the decision-making to

live in the AHC area – or not – but that other factors such as amenity, block size, development policies and the semi-rural characteristics of the area are far more significant factors.

Some respondents also felt that AHC facilities and services were superior to those of the CCC – but more importantly, better tailored to the area as they are more aligned with the needs of rural and semi-rural areas than metropolitan and highly developed areas.

Additional points raised in the final open response question of the survey

Respondents added further detail and repeated their position on issues already raised. In addition, it was very clear that respondents feel the vast majority of residents in their area are against boundary change – an assumption that is verified by the survey findings.

Respondents clearly state they do not wish to be rezoned and feel their majority opinion should be the only decision-making driver. Many respondents point out that when they purchased their property, a big selling point was being part of the AHC area and this should be respected.

Survey respondents have actively requested the support of AHC to fight the boundary change request and support their preferred outcome – which is to remain within the AHC area.

“We don’t want to be rezoned, and feel the residents should have the final say. We bought here for a reason and feel that by changing boundaries could jeopardise the reasons we love living here!”

“Please continue to fight to maintain us. We do not want to lose our quality of life. We are very happy with the services and support provided by Adelaide Hills Council, including rates. It is not about the money!”

“I would appreciate the support of Adelaide Hills in this matter and not allow Campbelltown City to pursue the takeover. It would be devastating for the area if the takeover is executed as it is visually obvious what Campbelltown City Council has been done with their own council area with the continuous over development.”

“I would like Adelaide Hills Council to vehemently fight this take-over. It is clear that the majority of residents in the proposed takeover area are opposed and wanting Adelaide Hills Council support in this.”

“Please support the residents of your council area to prevent this boundary change.”

“The Minister for Planning (and Member for Morialta Hon John Gardner) must give strong consideration to the views of residents in this decision. If the majority of residents are opposed to this boundary change, then the Minister must reject the proposal.”

It was reiterated by respondents that planning and development policies and environmental protection are other key issues of concern. Respondents felt that CCC has a very different perspective on these issues and does not listen or respect the sentiments and concerns of their residents.

"Clearly development and environment are my key concerns, and I imagine would be key concerns of most residents through the affected area, as most if not all are fiercely passionate to protect the semi-rural environment in which we invested and the homes within it that we love. I understand that there are State Planning Code changes to occur in July 2020. This does not alter my opinion that I fiercely reject Campbelltown's bid to acquire the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde, which is very obviously driven by greed on Campbelltown's part."

"Past behaviour is the best predictor of future behaviour, and on this basis I believe Adelaide Hills Council and Campbelltown City Council have shown their true nature (Adelaide Hills Council having helped residents preserve the magnificent characteristics of the area and Campbelltown City Council allowing as much infill development as possible) and that is why I want to stay with Adelaide Hills Council."

"Extremely concerned about CCC's propensity to approve high density living as can be seen in the current planning policy comparisons between the two councils. This will affect wildlife and drive out the koalas, kangaroos and other native Australian animals and bird life."

"As a resident who does not use the services or facilities of Campbelltown council I strongly object to being governed by them. I am vehemently opposed to the boundary realignment. Campbelltown Council has destroyed the amenity of their area and I do not want it to happen to my home."

"I do not support the change as the Campbelltown Council does not respect the environment and is pushing to have my area as high density living. This area must remain protected for its unique value and proximity to nature."

It was reiterated that there are no compelling reasons for change and that respondents are satisfied with AHC.

"So-called geographic isolation from Stirling or Woodside has never been an issue in my 25 years as resident in this area."

"Adelaide Hills Council staff have always been easily contacted by phone and/or email and respond promptly to requests for service / assistance."

"Very comfortable with AHC - if it ain't broke, why change it."

Respondents indicated a lack of trust in CCC relating to their assurances around retention of the Hills Face Zone and existing AHC development policies and approaches for the area. In addition, they felt that CCC has misrepresented the residents in the area through claims they favour boundary change.

"Campbelltown City Council's claimed commitment to maintaining the hills face zone does not provide any guarantee whatsoever, given the turnover of staff and representation, and what would be dilution of our voice in the wider Campbelltown area, compared with a demonstrated commonality of interest in Adelaide Hills Council representation. I seek Adelaide Hills Council's rejection of the Campbelltown proposal."

"I oppose the proposal in the strongest possible terms, and urge Adelaide Hills Council to resist it. There is not the slightest reason to trust Campbelltown's promises that the character of the area will be maintained, when their only plausible rationale is to profit from through facilitating development."

"Campbelltown Council cannot be trusted to succumb to greedy developers. One has to only look at every street ruined in their area."

"Adelaide Hills Council has fought for keeping our street and neighbourhood free from developers in the past so we trust them!"

"Our physical environment is completely different to the area that Campbelltown city council presently has jurisdiction over. This clearly reflects they do not share the same philosophies with respect to the environment and our current climate change emergency."

Respondents expressed that a saving in Council rates is not a key decision-making factor for them.

"The prospect of a potential modest saving in annual rates is not worth the risk of being controlled by a Council with a long history of large scale, unsympathetic development."

"They have not shown any interest in the beauty and sustainability of the area. They seem purely concerned with making money. The State Government would be mad to let this happen."

"Let's be blunt, the Campbelltown City Council's actions are driven solely by money. Effectively, they want to steal a portion of the rates revenue from an adjoining council. Not very neighbourly."

Some respondents sum up their feelings with a very clear rejection of the boundary change proposal.

"This is unwelcome."

"We absolutely do not support this move and wish to remain under Adelaide Hills Council."

"I DO NOT SUPPORT MOVING TO CAMPBELLTOWN COUNCIL."

"Would be a disaster for Morialta and surrounds."

6. Survey findings - Woodforde

There were 109 responses from residents/ businesses in Woodforde. Of these 42 were in favour of the boundary change proposal, 57 were against the boundary change proposal, 8 undecided and 2 had no preference (Refer to Table 6).

Table 6: Rostrevor responses

Suburb	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Woodforde	109	42 (39%)	57 (52%)	8 (7%)	2 (2%)

As part of the boundary change survey, respondents were asked to indicate their top three areas of interest about the proposal.

The responses for Woodforde are summarised below, noting a total of 109 individual survey responses were received. No single issue was of interest to the majority of respondents. This is reflective of the overall findings for Woodforde being more evenly split between those in favour and against boundary change.

In alignment with Rostrevor respondents, the two top issues of interest for those against boundary change are planning and development and environmental sustainability.

Similarly, environmental sustainability and climate change are not identified as issues of interest for respondents in favour of boundary change in Woodforde (as was the case for Rostrevor). Their focus is instead on rates, community services and maintenance.

Table 7: Woodforde Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	14	44
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	29	14
Community services	24	6
Environmental sustainability	3	33
Annual council rates	26	14
Climate change	2	7
Council rules and regulations	2	21
Community grants	-	4
Level of representation	2	4

Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal

Woodforde respondents in favour of the boundary change proposal raised a range of reasons for their support, including council rates, geographic location and community services. Responses were generally short and little additional commentary was shared as part of the last open response question in the survey.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Geographic location

The most frequently raised issue in favour of boundary change is the belief that this part of Woodforde is more connected to the CCC than to the Adelaide Hills. The services provided by the CCC are closer and easier to access than those in the hills and it is seen as logical to change council boundaries. In addition, it is felt this part of Woodforde is more “metropolitan” than hills in terms of the services it needs and the characteristics of the suburb, which again means a better fit with the CCC.

“We live in the Hamilton Hill development, the areas that we use already lie within the Campbelltown City Council, we would not travel up into the hills, so makes sense to us to be within that council.”

“Makes sense, council chambers and depot are much closer and can serve the residents better than Adelaide Hills Council.”

“Woodforde is too far from Adelaide Hills Council.”

“I am a frequent and grateful user of Campbelltown's services. Council offices and various services are more accessible.”

“It makes sense. This Rostrevor/Woodforde area is a highly-populated suburban area - it belongs with a metro council.”

“We use more Campbelltown Council resources and have more engagement with them than Adelaide Hills Council. To go to Adelaide Hills Council office is a 45 min drive. I believe we are more likely to be a respected part of Campbelltown than being “not really a hills” resident.”

Council rates

Several respondents referenced that the potential reduction in council rates would be appealing.

Level of support

A small number of respondents stated they have experienced a disappointing level of service from AHC and feel this would be improved if they were part of the CCC.

“Better levels of service from Campbelltown. Council offices and depot located just down the road so quicker response to customer requests. Campbelltown have no debt and are well organised.”

“Shorter response times to service ratepayer needs.”

Woodforde respondents against the boundary change proposal

Respondents articulated a similar set of reasons to Rostrevor residents in explaining their position against boundary change. The themes are listed in priority order.

Note: Quotes in italics have been corrected for grammatical errors. In some instances quotes are extracts from respondent feedback, this does not change the intent of the statements made.

Planning and development

As was the case for respondents from Rostrevor, the most significant issue for Woodforde respondents against boundary change is the concern that the CCC has very different policies, principles and perspectives towards sub-division and development when compared to AHC. It is felt by respondents that CCC will actively seek to bring more people into the area through changes to zoning and this is not supported. Respondents do not trust the CCC to keep the green spaces, which are not national parks or protected, undeveloped.

It was also frequently stated the area has distinctly “hills” characteristics and a strong sense of community – which are viewed as being consistent with the AHC area and not CCC.

“We feel that we are part of the hills and have more confidence in Adelaide Hills Council maintaining the integrity of these suburbs.”

“Recent high density development in Campbelltown is a concern even if the protest they will not do the same thing here.”

“We bought our house in Woodforde in 2011 due the beauty and character of the area. A change in planning law and increase in development density etc. will impact on the character and amenity of our area and potentially destroy the character of it.”

“Physically Campbelltown City Council may be closer but they are miles away in mind and so alien to us.”

“I do not like their policy of urban infill. It has ruined suburbs like Tranmere turning it into a concrete jungle.”

“The boundary change would change this area from being “hills” to being “metropolitan”. This change seems absurd to me, as anyone who has set foot in this area can clearly tell that it is much more hills than metropolitan in terms of environment, terrain, community and layout. Changing this doesn’t really seem to have any positive outcomes for me or my community.”

No compelling reason to change

A number of residents simply state there is no reason or justification for change and they are happy with the status quo.

“It seems like there is not any benefit.”

“Happy with Adelaide Hills Council.”

"Prefer to stay as Adelaide Hills resident."

"As a Hills facing suburb we prefer to be under the jurisdiction of a Hills Council."

Environmental considerations

Some respondents viewed the north-eastern parts of Woodforde (not Hamilton Hill), as part of the Adelaide Hills, offering natural habitats for wildlife, open spaces, large blocks and old trees – a place where nature is nurtured and respected as it is elsewhere in the AHC area. They felt AHC does more to protect green spaces and restrict development – which is preferred.

"Pushing more people into this area by allowing for smaller lot sizes and subdivisions will likely put stress on the local flora and fauna that we are so lucky to share this area with. Increased noise, traffic density, and population in general will most likely drive this wildlife back into the park, which would be a loss for the entire community."

"Because Adelaide Hills Council do more to protect the environment and don't just hand it over to developers!"

"I am concerned about the removal of so many mature trees in Campbelltown City Council. They are necessary for our climate and wildlife. They take a long time to grow and any replacements (if they find room for them) will be unsuitable for our wildlife for 40-50 years."

City of Campbelltown seeking increased income

Despite assertions to the contrary by representatives from the CCC, some respondents expressed they still feel that the move to change the council boundary is primarily driven by wanting to add more rateable properties to their area.

"Campbelltown are just making a cynical grab for more rates."

"This is a self-serving exercise by Campbelltown City Council rather than being centred on the interests of residents."

Lack of trust in City of Campbelltown assurances

A handful of respondents expressed a lack of trust and belief in the assurances provided by the CCC that planning and zoning policies in the area would not change if the boundary change were to go ahead.

"We are worried about Campbelltown City Council's planning and development in the long term despite their assurance it will never change. We simply don't believe them."

Property value

A small number of respondents referenced that they felt the boundary change would have a negative impact on property values, causing them to either stagnate or even decrease. Some respondents outlined direct experience of owning a property in CCC subject to stagnating or falling property prices while others made the assumption future higher density development in Woodforde as a result of boundary change would negatively impact property value.

"I don't want my property devalued and housing congested."

"Because they allow the building of "match box" type of dwelling being built on crowded allotments - which devalues our individual and unique properties - it is very bad and sad."

The following additional points were reiterated and emphasised by respondents in the final open response question of the survey:

- There is strong support for AHC stance on development and planning policy and respondents made it clear they wish for this to continue as this ethos protects the area from overdevelopment.
- Respondents request AHC take a strong stand and resist the council boundary change. In a similar vein, respondents also request AHC to listen and then act upon the wishes of the majority of residents in the area.
- There is a level of disappointment expressed at the time, energy and money being spent on a boundary change venture that appears, in the eyes of respondents, to be financially driven by CCC.
- Respondents emphasize they see themselves as part of the hills community and firmly believe the right fit for their area is to be part of AHC.

"Adelaide Hills Council should respect and support the wishes of residents."

"Unless there is an overwhelming majority of residents support the boundary change proposal, it should not proceed."

"As a resident of Woodforde I strongly object to any inclusion within the Campbelltown City Council area. There is no justification for their boundary change proposal."

"We identify strongly with the semi-rural lifestyle that being part of Adelaide Hills Council affords us and vehemently oppose what we believe is a revenue raising exercise by Campbelltown City Council with zero net benefit to us, the residents."

"In over 40 years in Woodforde, Campbelltown City Council has shown no interest in us until the development of Hamilton Hill estate. Campbelltown City Council sees this as a pot of gold to add to their revenue."

7. Respondents from suburbs outside

There were 33 survey responses in total from respondents in other suburbs. Of these 15 were in favour of the boundary change, 17 were against the boundary change and one respondent was undecided (Refer to Table 8).

Table 8: Response numbers from other suburbs

Suburb	Response number	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change	Undecided	No preference
Other suburbs	33	15 (45%)	17 (52%)	1 (3%)	0

These respondents provided less detail in the open response questions posed but key themes were still able to be identified. Responses were in general pragmatic rather than impassioned – with the exception of a small number of responses against boundary change.

Issues of interest were broad, with climate change, council rules and regulations and community grants being of little to no interest.

Table 9: Other Suburbs Areas of Interest

Area of interest	In favour of boundary change	Against boundary change
Planning and development	4	9
Footpaths, road and park maintenance	10	5
Community services	10	3
Environmental sustainability	3	6
Annual council rates	8	6
Climate change	-	-
Council rules and regulations	-	2
Community grants	-	-
Level of representation	-	3

The themes identified below summarise all the issues raised both in favour and against council boundary change across both open response questions asked in the survey.

Respondents against council boundary change focussed on the following:

- Content with status quo and see no reason for the change.
- Preference for planning and development ethos / low density housing approach taken by AHC.
- Better rules and planning for fire protection within AHC.
- Outright rejection of the proposal (“It is not a good proposal.”)
- AHC viewed as taking better care of the natural environment.
- Sentiment that “ground rules” in terms of planning and development should not be allowed to change as a result of boundary change as people have specifically elected to purchase a

property in the area because of those rules and the characteristics of the suburb that are enjoyed as a result.

Respondents in favour of council boundary change provided the following reasons:

- The CCC is geographically better connected to Woodforde, making services easier and more convenient to access.
- Having a Council focussed on suburban / metropolitan needs suits the area better than one that is focussed on semi-rural / hills needs.
- AHC does not support the area particularly well.
- Given many residents use CCC services, it seems fair to also pay rates to that council.

8. Notes about survey

Survey parameters

Parameters for survey included:

- Participants must be 18 years or over
- Participating in the survey is not mandatory
- Multiple submissions per household accepted (e.g. if four adults living at address they can each provide a submission)
- Survey will only be available in English – but assistance to be provided if required
- One 'survey pack' sent to each household (additional copies can be requested from AHC Customer Service Centres)
- Renters are encouraged to participate
- Name and address details are required but the results will be anonymised and not associated with their contact details for Council consultation and public reporting
- Survey is available online and in hard copy

9. Appendix A

Have your say:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

Project Summary

Campbelltown City Council (CCC) has put forward a Council Boundary Change Proposal (the Proposal) to the Boundaries Commission (a State Government body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister) to review the boundary between CCC and Adelaide Hills Council (AHC).

CCC proposes moving the boundary eastwards so that the parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde that are currently in AHC, move to the CCC area in their entirety. *See map included in this information pack.*

There are currently 573 properties (3.3% of total AHC properties) that are within the proposed Boundary Change Zone.

AHC does not have a formal position on the Proposal yet as we'd like your feedback on what you think about it first. Please take a moment to read this information sheet and complete the short survey.

Your feedback is important and AHC will compile it into a report for consideration by AHC Council Members, at this stage planned for early 2020.

How you can have your say

- Complete the hard copy survey attached, place it in the enclosed free return-paid envelope and post it back to us before Sunday 8 December 2019 (you don't need a postage stamp)
- Scan the survey and email it to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au
- Head to our website engage.ahc.sa.gov.au and complete the online survey

Survey closes Sunday 8 December 2019

We are here to help

If you've got a question, want additional hard copy surveys, or further information about the Boundary Change Proposal please get in touch with our team.



engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au



(08) 8408 0587

Boundary Change Proposal Map



Important information

Please note this survey is only intended for people over 18 years of age who live, work, or own a property in the proposed Boundary Change Zone. All names and addresses will be cross checked against the electoral role and council's database, and any identifying data will be kept strictly confidential.

Further detailed information is available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au, and additional hard copies of the survey can be requested by calling (08) 8408 0587 or emailing engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au.

This is just the beginning

This is the start of a comprehensive review process which will be undertaken by CCC and the Boundaries Commission. Adelaide Hills Council has no formal role to play in the process at this time. No decision has been made yet and the final decision lies with the Minister for Local Government.

Step 1 - Potential Proposal (January 2019)

Consideration of CCC's initial proposal by Boundaries Commission

Approved by Boundaries Commission to progress to next stage



Step 2 - General Proposal

CCC prepares general proposal for Boundaries Commission

CCC undertakes consultation with the community

Current
status



Step 3 (*if proposal continues*) - Investigation by Commission

Boundaries Commission assesses the proposal using an independent investigator

CCC must agree to the cost of the investigation

Criteria to be assessed include financial and resource implications and community support



Step 4 - Report to Minister

Boundaries Commission prepares a report for the Minister explaining recommendations

Published on Boundaries Commission website

Minister may make suggestions for further consideration



Step 5 - Decision

Minister decides whether proposal will proceed or not

Overview of the Boundary Change Proposal

We've summarised some of the key points of interest between AHC and CCC. If the information you are looking for is not covered here, take a look on our website, ahc.sa.gov.au, or call our Customer Service Team on 8408 0400.

	Adelaide Hills Council	Campbelltown City Council
Total population <i>Total number of people living in whole council area at 2018 Census.</i>	39,734 (0.50 persons per hectare)	51,469 (21.13 persons per hectare)
Land area <i>Total land size of whole council area.</i>	79,498 hectares	2,436 hectares
Electors* <i>The number of people living in the council area who are entitled to vote in Council elections.</i>	29,500 electors	35,000 electors
Council structure	One Mayor 12 Council Members Two Wards	One Mayor 10 Council Members Five Wards
Representation quota <i>The number of electors divided by all Council Members</i>	One Council Member represents 2,261 electors	One Council Member represents 3,183 electors
Annual Council Rates <i>Rate charged annually.</i>	AHC's rating structure consists of a Fixed Charge of \$662 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.002469. <i>If rating structures remained the same, most residents within the proposed Boundary Change Zone would receive a reduction in annual rates ranging from approximately \$22 to \$450.</i>	CCC's rating structure consists of a Minimum Rate of \$984 and a Rate in the Dollar against Capital Value of 0.003050.
Planning and Development	There is a new Planning and Design Code being developed by the State Government which comes into effect on 1 July 2020. More details about planning and development comparison can be found overleaf.	
Minimum site area <i>For a detached dwelling</i>	The average minimum allowable site size in the AHC parts of Rostrevor and Woodforde (including Hamilton Hill) is 703m ² . <i>There is no suggestion, at this time, that either council would pursue changes to reduce allotment sizes in the Boundary Change Zone.</i>	In the CCC part of Rostrevor and Magill the average minimum site size is 350m ² .
Open space and civil services <i>Roads, footpaths, signs, street lights, parks, ovals, playgrounds, cemeteries.</i>	There are no noticeable differences in terms of open space and civil services functions and services between AHC and CCC.	

* The number of electors is obtained from the Electoral Commission of SA and the source date is 28 February 2018.

Environmental sustainability	AHC and CCC have both declared a climate emergency, and both councils have a number of sustainability initiatives.	
Kerbside bins	East Waste collects general waste weekly and recycling and green organics waste on alternating fortnights in both council areas.	
Green organics drop off days	AHC organises a number of free green organics drop off days throughout the year for residents.	CCC does not host free green organics drop off days.
Hard waste	Both AHC and CCC offer one 'at call' hard waste collection per property each financial year.	
Resource Recovery Centres	Residents can go to any resource recovery centre (including those outside of their council district). Each council has one resource recovery centre.	
School zones <i>In relation to which schools children are entitled to attend based on their residence.</i>	Catchment areas are not limited to council boundaries and are set by the State Government Department of Education.	
Community grants	In 2017-18 AHC awarded \$219,000 in funding through its grant program.	In 2017-18 CCC awarded \$41,341 in funding through its grant program.
Regulatory matters <i>This includes local laws established by councils to deal with issues specific to the relevant council area.</i>	<p>There are no noticeable differences in regulatory matters between AHC and CCC except regarding domestic cats.</p> <p>In AHC cats must be confined to their owner's property from 1 January 2022. More information at ahc.sa.gov.au/council/delegations-and-by-laws.</p>	

Need more information? Visit each council's website

	ahc.sa.gov.au	campbelltown.sa.gov.au
Council documents <i>Annual Reports, Strategic Plans, policies</i>	Council > Council Documents	Council > Documents and Publications
Community services <i>Youth, volunteering, diversity, seniors</i>	Community	Community
Community grants	Council > Grants and Tenders	Community > Grants
Regulatory matters <i>Local laws and rules</i>	Council > Delegations and By-laws	Council > Documents and Publications
Sport and recreation	Community > Sport and Recreation	Recreation and Leisure
Civil Services	Resident > Roads, Streetscapes, Works	Services > Capital Works Program
Environmental sustainability	Environment > Sustainability	Environment
Rates and property	Resident > Rates and Property	Council > Rates

Further information available at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Planning and Development

The South Australian planning system is changing on 1 July 2020. A new Planning and Design Code (P&D Code) will become the single source of planning policy for assessing development applications across the state.

What does this mean if the boundary change proposal was to proceed?

The new P&D Code being developed by the State Government will replace all council development plans. The new Code means that planning policy will be standardised across council boundaries (this includes AHC and CCC).

Any changes to zonings in either council district after 1 July 2020 would require public consultation as well as Ministerial approval.

For further information about specific development controls applicable under the proposed P&D Code, please contact the P&D Code Free Hotline on 1800 318 102, or review the new P&D Code at sapanningportal.sa.gov.au.

What happens to development applications submitted before 1 July 2020?

The current planning rules will stay the same before 1 July 2020. Any planning application submitted before that time will be assessed under the current planning rules.

Current planning policy comparisons between AHC and CCC:

	AHC		CCC
	Woodforde and Rostrevor	Hamilton Hill	Rostrevor and Magill
Site area The minimum size of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	Ranges from 929-1,000m ²	180m ²	Ranges from 350-500m ²
Frontage width The minimum width of a 'block' for a detached dwelling	21 metres	8 metres	Ranges from 7-20 metres
Front setback The minimum distance from the road to the house	6 metres	3 metres	5 metres
Rear setback The minimum distance from the back of the house to the back fence	4 metres	4 metres	4 metres
Site coverage The maximum percentage that a site can be covered by a dwelling	40%	60%	50%
Building height The maximum height allowed for a building	6 metres wall height	3 storeys	8.5 metres

Planning and Design Code Information Session

If you are interested in learning more about the SA Planning Reform please come along to our free Information Session.

Wednesday 27 November 2019 | 6:30pm - 8:00pm

Kelty Theatre, Rostrevor College

Register: planning-forum-woodforde.eventbrite.com.au or call 8408 0400

Survey:

Council Boundary Change Proposal

This survey is also online at engage.ahc.sa.gov.au

Name _____ Year of birth: _____

Postal address _____

Email _____ Phone: _____

Are you a (tick all that apply)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Property owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tenant | <input type="checkbox"/> Business owner | |

Do you support the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal? (tick one)

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Undecided |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> No preference |

Why do you say that?

What are your areas of interest about the council boundary change proposal? (tick your top three)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning and development | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual Council Rates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Footpaths, road and park maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community services | <input type="checkbox"/> Council rules and regulations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental sustainability | <input type="checkbox"/> Community grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Level of representation (number of electors represented by each Council Member) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

Do you have any further comments about the Campbelltown City Council's boundary change proposal that you would like Adelaide Hills Council to consider?

If you need more space please use the back of this page or attach additional pages.

Please place your completed survey in the free reply-paid envelope provided and into your nearest mailbox, or scan and email to engagement@ahc.sa.gov.au by 8 December 2019.

Mr Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance
Adelaide Hills Council
PO Box 44
WOODSIDE SA 5244

Dear Mr Miller

Thank you for your letter dated 7 February 2020 regarding the potential council boundary change proposal by the Campbelltown City Council and outcomes of a resident survey undertaken by the Adelaide Hills Council (the Council).

The Commission noted the attached *Council Boundary Change Proposal – Survey Outcomes Report* (the report) at its 13 February 2020 meeting.

As you are aware, the South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) is the independent body that assesses and investigates council boundary change proposals, and makes recommendations to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (the Minister).

The Commission's responsibilities and procedures are set out in Chapter 3, Part 2 of the *Local Government Act 1999*. The Commission has also prepared nine Guidelines that detail the process by which it will receive, assess and progress council boundary change proposals.

Whilst the Commission acknowledges the findings of the attached report and understands that the Council wishes to keep its community informed during this process, the Commission, in line with *Guideline No. 9—Engagement and Consultation* will undertake a thorough investigation of all aspects of any proposal that the Commission decides to investigate. These investigations will include thorough consultation with the affected communities and Councils.

Ultimately, the recommendations that the Commission makes to the Minister will reflect the Commission's view on what is best for the community in that area.

I must emphasise that, while the new system enables individual councils to initiate proposals, and make a case to the Commission that they be investigated, it is the Commission's responsibility to investigate these proposals and make recommendations to the Minister—not the initiating council, nor the affected Councils.

As you are aware, the Commission advised the Campbelltown City Council in May 2019 that they may refer a General Proposal for the Commission's consideration if they wish to do so. It is ultimately the Campbelltown City Council's decision if it wishes to progress with the development and referral of a General Proposal.

If you have further questions, please contact Mr Thomas Rossini in the Office of Local Government on 7109 7443, or thomas.rossini@sa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Bruce Green

Chair, SA Local Government Boundaries Commission

10 March 2020

Lachlan Miller

From: Pam Williams
Sent: Tuesday, 3 May 2022 9:59 AM
To: David Waters
Subject: FW: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Importance: High

Pam Williams
Executive Assistant to Mayor & CEO

p 08 8408 0438
e pwilliams@ahc.sa.gov.au
w ahc.sa.gov.au

Available Mon - Thurs

Visit me at: 63 Mount Barker Road, Stirling SA 5152
PO Box 44 Woodside SA 5244

From: Ilee, Peter (AGD) <Peter.Ilee@sa.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 April 2022 12:34 PM
To: Jan-Claire Wisdom <jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Subject: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown
Importance: High

[EXTERNAL]

OFFICIAL

Dear Mayor Wisdom,

Thank you for your letter of 17 March 2022 to the Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) requesting that the Commission consider establishing a timeframe from the acceptance of a Stage 1 proposal and the referral of a Stage 2 boundary change proposal.

The Commission considered and discussed your correspondence at its meeting on 20 April 2022. The Commission resolved that changes to the Commission's Guidelines will be made having regard to setting timelines for the submission of proposals. Changes to the Commission's guidelines are being considered and the Commission will notify your Council of these changes and will upload the amended Guidelines on the Commissions webpage when they are finalised.

You may also be aware that the Commission received a Stage 2 general boundary change proposal from the City of Campbelltown on 14 April 2022, which seeks to amend the boundary between the City of Campbelltown and the

Adelaide Hills Council in the area of Woodforde/Rostrevor. This proposal will be considered by the Commission at its meeting on 18 May 2022 and the Commission will inform your Council of its resolutions in due course.

Should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact my Senior Policy Officer, Mr Tom Rossini on 7109 7164 or myself on 7109 7148.

Thanks

Peter Ilee | Executive Officer

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission

Office of Local Government

Planning and Land Use Services

Attorney-General's Department

T 08 7109 7148 (internal 97148) • M 0401 719 083 • E peter.ilee@sa.gov.au

Level 3, 77 Grenfell Street ADELAIDE SA 5000 • GPO Box 2329 ADELAIDE SA 5001 • DX

171 • www.agd.sa.gov.au

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
In the Office	In the Office	In the Office	Working from Home	Working from Home
Best Contact				
08 7109 7148	08 7109 7148	08 7109 7148	0401 719 083	0401 719 083
Peter.ilee@sa.gov.au				



collaboration . honesty . excellence . enjoyment . respect

We acknowledge and respect Aboriginal peoples as South Australia's first peoples and nations, we recognise Aboriginal peoples as traditional owners and occupants of land and waters in South Australia and that their spiritual, social, cultural and economic practices come from their traditional lands and waters; and they maintain their cultural and heritage beliefs, languages and laws which are of ongoing importance; We pay our respects to their ancestors and to their Elders.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.



Lachlan Miller

From: Lachlan Miller
Sent: Thursday, 5 May 2022 1:41 PM
To: Jan-Claire Wisdom; Andrew Aitken
Cc: David Waters; Steven Watson; Lachlan Miller
Subject: RE: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Hello All

In relation to the Mayor's queries regarding the Commission's processing of Campbelltown's Stage 2 proposal, I contacted Peter Ilee (Executive Officer, Boundaries Commission) by email and he returned my call to discuss each of the queries.

I have included the responses against each of the questions below.

My recommendation is that the Mayor write to the Commission Chair requesting to receive a copy of the Administration's covering report and to be permitted to attend the Commission's meeting on 18 May 2022.

I look forward to receiving your advice.

Regards

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance

Ext. 516

From: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 5 May 2022 9:55 AM
To: Peter.Ilee@sa.gov.au
Cc: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Subject: RE: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Good morning Peter

I refer to the email message below to Mayor Wisdom regarding, the Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 general proposal.

I did leave a voicemail message earlier this week but thought it might be better to put the following queries from the Mayor to you in writing.

In relation to the advised Boundaries Commission meeting on 18 May 2022 which will consider the Stage 2 proposal, can you please advise the following:

1. Is the Commission meeting open to the public (or at least attendees from the affected councils)?

Response: there aren't any specific provisions but in the past the meetings have not been open to the public (or affected councils), although he wasn't sure whether a request have ever been made. He suggests that Council can request to attend the meeting and the Commission Chair will determine whether to grant the request.

2. When the Commission considers the Stage 2 proposal, is it expected to make a decision on whether or not to proceed to the next stage and conduct its own investigation? Or is the meeting likely to be a 'receive and note' with further analysis prior to it coming back to the Commission for a decision later?

Response: the Campbelltown Stage 2 proposal was tabled as a late item at the Commission's 20 April 2022 meeting but there was no Administration report accompanying it. The Commission's Administration are currently reviewing and assessing the proposal against the provisions of the LG Act (specifically s26) and the Commission's Guidelines in order to prepare the covering report for the Commission's 18 May 2022 meeting on the matter. Depending on how that assessment proceeds (and whether Campbelltown has sufficiently addressed the provisions), the covering report may recommend that further information be required or (if the information is sufficient) may make a recommendation to the Commission that the matter proceed to an inquiry (i.e. Stage 3). If it is to proceed to inquiry, the parties will be advised, CCC will need to agree to the funding estimate and a procurement process initiated to engage the investigator(s). From there the inquiry process commences (I can provide further details on this if needed).

3. Is AHC to be afforded the opportunity to review the CCC Stage 2 proposal report and make a submission to the Commission prior to it considering the matter on 18 May? (one would presume not given the timeframe.)

Response: On the subject of whether the Administration's covering report will be available prior to the meeting, Peter advised that it isn't usually done but it could be a request put to the Commission Chair. He clarified that this is not the appropriate step of the process for AHC to make a submission as the Commission still needs to determine whether the Stage 2 proposal has any merit (affected council submissions are done during the Stage 3 Inquiry). He did say that affected councils and residents can make submissions to the Commission at any time however they will usually be advised on the legislated process.

4. Will the Commission publish the CCC Stage 2 proposal report on its website? If so, when?

Response: With the proposals to date, the Stage 2 proposal has published at the same time as the Commission's response to it (i.e. to reject, to proceed to next stage). So we could expect this to be done (depending on the Commission's deliberations) after the 18 May 2022 meeting.

I look forward to receiving your response in the near future.

Thanks in anticipation.

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance
Adelaide Hills Council

p 08 8408 0516
e lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au
w ahc.sa.gov.au

Visit me at: 63 Mount Barker Road, Stirling SA 5152
PO Box 44 Woodside SA 5244

From: Ilee, Peter (AGD) <Peter.Ilee@sa.gov.au>

Sent: Tuesday, 26 April 2022 12:34 PM

To: Jan-Claire Wisdom <jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au>

Subject: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Importance: High

OFFICIAL

Dear Mayor Wisdom,

Thank you for your letter of 17 March 2022 to the Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) requesting that the Commission consider establishing a timeframe from the acceptance of a Stage 1 proposal and the referral of a Stage 2 boundary change proposal.

The Commission considered and discussed your correspondence at its meeting on 20 April 2022. The Commission resolved that changes to the Commission's Guidelines will be made having regard to setting timelines for the submission of proposals. Changes to the Commission's guidelines are being considered and the Commission will notify your Council of these changes and will upload the amended Guidelines on the Commissions webpage when they are finalised.

You may also be aware that the Commission received a Stage 2 general boundary change proposal from the City of Campbelltown on 14 April 2022, which seeks to amend the boundary between the City of Campbelltown and the Adelaide Hills Council in the area of Woodforde/Rostrevor. This proposal will be considered by the Commission at its meeting on 18 May 2022 and the Commission will inform your Council of its resolutions in due course.

Should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact my Senior Policy Officer, Mr Tom Rossini on 7109 7164 or myself on 7109 7148.

Thanks

Peter Ilee | Executive Officer

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission

Office of Local Government

Planning and Land Use Services

Attorney-General's Department

T 08 7109 7148 (internal 97148) • M 0401 719 083 • E peter.ilee@sa.gov.au

Level 3, 77 Grenfell Street ADELAIDE SA 5000 • GPO Box 2329 ADELAIDE SA 5001 • DX

171 • www.agd.sa.gov.au

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
In the Office	In the Office	In the Office	Working from Home	Working from Home
Best Contact				
08 7109 7148	08 7109 7148	08 7109 7148	0401 719 083	0401 719 083
Peter.ilee@sa.gov.au				



collaboration . honesty . excellence . enjoyment . respect

We acknowledge and respect Aboriginal peoples as South Australia's first peoples and nations, we recognise Aboriginal peoples as traditional owners and occupants of land and waters in South Australia and that their spiritual, social, cultural and economic practices come from their traditional lands and waters; and they maintain their cultural and heritage beliefs, languages and laws which are of ongoing importance; We pay our respects to their ancestors and to their Elders.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.

HAVE YOUR SAY ON
SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S
NEW PLANNING SYSTEM



9 May 2022

Rob Donaldson
Chair
SA Local Government Boundaries Commission
BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au

Dear Chair

Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 General Boundary Change Proposal - Woodforde/Rostrevor

I write in relation to the Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal (the Campbelltown Proposal) lodged with the Boundaries Commission (the Commission) by the Campbelltown City Council in April 2022 regarding Woodforde and Rostrevor.

I have been advised by the Commission's Executive Officer, Peter Ilee, that the Commission will be considering a report in relation to the Campbelltown Proposal at its 18 May 2022 meeting.

This proposal is of great interest to the Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) and the residents of the suburbs of Woodforde and Rostrevor (AHC). As such, I would like to request that myself and a member of the Administration be permitted to attend the meeting and that a copy of the agenda (relating to the Campbelltown Proposal) be made available to AHC at the time it is despatched to the Commission members. I understand that there is no legislation or guidelines prohibiting these matters and they are within your discretion to grant.

I would further seek your consideration of the granting of the opportunity for me to address the Commission at the 18 May 2022 meeting in relation to the Campbelltown Proposal, within certain parameters (if necessary) should you wish to set them.

Given that the 18 May meeting will soon be upon us, I look forward to your response in the near future.

Yours sincerely



Dr Jan-Claire Wisdom
Mayor

Lachlan Miller

From: Lachlan Miller
Sent: Thursday, 5 May 2022 1:41 PM
To: Jan-Claire Wisdom; Andrew Aitken
Cc: David Waters; Steven Watson; Lachlan Miller
Subject: RE: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Hello All

In relation to the Mayor's queries regarding the Commission's processing of Campbelltown's Stage 2 proposal, I contacted Peter Ilee (Executive Officer, Boundaries Commission) by email and he returned my call to discuss each of the queries.

I have included the responses against each of the questions below.

My recommendation is that the Mayor write to the Commission Chair requesting to receive a copy of the Administration's covering report and to be permitted to attend the Commission's meeting on 18 May 2022.

I look forward to receiving your advice.

Regards

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance

Ext. 516

From: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 5 May 2022 9:55 AM
To: Peter.Ilee@sa.gov.au
Cc: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Subject: RE: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Good morning Peter

I refer to the email message below to Mayor Wisdom regarding, the Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 general proposal.

I did leave a voicemail message earlier this week but thought it might be better to put the following queries from the Mayor to you in writing.

In relation to the advised Boundaries Commission meeting on 18 May 2022 which will consider the Stage 2 proposal, can you please advise the following:

1. Is the Commission meeting open to the public (or at least attendees from the affected councils)?

Response: there aren't any specific provisions but in the past the meetings have not been open to the public (or affected councils), although he wasn't sure whether a request have ever been made. He suggests that Council can request to attend the meeting and the Commission Chair will determine whether to grant the request.

2. When the Commission considers the Stage 2 proposal, is it expected to make a decision on whether or not to proceed to the next stage and conduct its own investigation? Or is the meeting likely to be a 'receive and note' with further analysis prior to it coming back to the Commission for a decision later?

Response: the Campbelltown Stage 2 proposal was tabled as a late item at the Commission's 20 April 2022 meeting but there was no Administration report accompanying it. The Commission's Administration are currently reviewing and assessing the proposal against the provisions of the LG Act (specifically s26) and the Commission's Guidelines in order to prepare the covering report for the Commission's 18 May 2022 meeting on the matter. Depending on how that assessment proceeds (and whether Campbelltown has sufficiently addressed the provisions), the covering report may recommend that further information be required or (if the information is sufficient) may make a recommendation to the Commission that the matter proceed to an inquiry (i.e. Stage 3). If it is to proceed to inquiry, the parties will be advised, CCC will need to agree to the funding estimate and a procurement process initiated to engage the investigator(s). From there the inquiry process commences (I can provide further details on this if needed).

3. Is AHC to be afforded the opportunity to review the CCC Stage 2 proposal report and make a submission to the Commission prior to it considering the matter on 18 May? (one would presume not given the timeframe.)

Response: On the subject of whether the Administration's covering report will be available prior to the meeting, Peter advised that it isn't usually done but it could be a request put to the Commission Chair. He clarified that this is not the appropriate step of the process for AHC to make a submission as the Commission still needs to determine whether the Stage 2 proposal has any merit (affected council submissions are done during the Stage 3 Inquiry). He did say that affected councils and residents can make submissions to the Commission at any time however they will usually be advised on the legislated process.

4. Will the Commission publish the CCC Stage 2 proposal report on its website? If so, when?

Response: With the proposals to date, the Stage 2 proposal has published at the same time as the Commission's response to it (i.e. to reject, to proceed to next stage). So we could expect this to be done (depending on the Commission's deliberations) after the 18 May 2022 meeting.

I look forward to receiving your response in the near future.

Thanks in anticipation.

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance
Adelaide Hills Council

p 08 8408 0516
e lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au
w ahc.sa.gov.au

Visit me at: 63 Mount Barker Road, Stirling SA 5152
PO Box 44 Woodside SA 5244

From: Ilee, Peter (AGD) <Peter.Ilee@sa.gov.au>

Sent: Tuesday, 26 April 2022 12:34 PM

To: Jan-Claire Wisdom <jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au>

Subject: SA Local Government Boundaries Commission - Correspondence of 17 March 2022 and Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal from the City of Campbelltown

Importance: High

OFFICIAL

Dear Mayor Wisdom,

Thank you for your letter of 17 March 2022 to the Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) requesting that the Commission consider establishing a timeframe from the acceptance of a Stage 1 proposal and the referral of a Stage 2 boundary change proposal.

The Commission considered and discussed your correspondence at its meeting on 20 April 2022. The Commission resolved that changes to the Commission's Guidelines will be made having regard to setting timelines for the submission of proposals. Changes to the Commission's guidelines are being considered and the Commission will notify your Council of these changes and will upload the amended Guidelines on the Commissions webpage when they are finalised.

You may also be aware that the Commission received a Stage 2 general boundary change proposal from the City of Campbelltown on 14 April 2022, which seeks to amend the boundary between the City of Campbelltown and the Adelaide Hills Council in the area of Woodforde/Rostrevor. This proposal will be considered by the Commission at its meeting on 18 May 2022 and the Commission will inform your Council of its resolutions in due course.

Should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact my Senior Policy Officer, Mr Tom Rossini on 7109 7164 or myself on 7109 7148.

Thanks

Peter Ilee | Executive Officer

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission

Office of Local Government

Planning and Land Use Services

Attorney-General's Department

T 08 7109 7148 (internal 97148) • M 0401 719 083 • E peter.ilee@sa.gov.au

Level 3, 77 Grenfell Street ADELAIDE SA 5000 • GPO Box 2329 ADELAIDE SA 5001 • DX

171 • www.agd.sa.gov.au

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
In the Office	In the Office	In the Office	Working from Home	Working from Home
Best Contact				
08 7109 7148	08 7109 7148	08 7109 7148	0401 719 083	0401 719 083
Peter.ilee@sa.gov.au				



collaboration . honesty . excellence . enjoyment . respect

We acknowledge and respect Aboriginal peoples as South Australia's first peoples and nations, we recognise Aboriginal peoples as traditional owners and occupants of land and waters in South Australia and that their spiritual, social, cultural and economic practices come from their traditional lands and waters; and they maintain their cultural and heritage beliefs, languages and laws which are of ongoing importance; We pay our respects to their ancestors and to their Elders.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.

HAVE YOUR SAY ON
SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S
NEW PLANNING SYSTEM



Lachlan Miller

From: DIT:Boundaries Commission <DIT.BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 24 May 2022 1:47 PM
To: Lachlan Miller; DIT:Boundaries Commission
Cc: Ilee, Peter (AGD); Lachlan Miller
Subject: RE: Boundaries Commission meeting - Campbelltown Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal

[EXTERNAL]

OFFICIAL

Hi Lachlan,

Thanks for your email.

The Local Government Boundaries Commission considered the City of Campbelltown boundary change proposal at its meeting on 18 May 2022. The Commission's response to the City of Campbelltown will be confirmed shortly. Adelaide Hills Council will also be advised. This correspondence will be published on the Commission's website, as is the Commission's standard practice.

Kind Regards,

Tom Rossini | Senior Policy Officer

Office of Local Government

Planning & Land Use Services | Attorney General's Department

E thomas.rossini@sa.gov.au

T 7133 1411

Level 3, 77 Grenfell Street, Adelaide SA 5000 • GPO Box 1533 Adelaide SA 5001 • DX 171

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
In the Office	Working from Home	In the Office	Working from Home	In the Office
Best Contact				
871097443	thomas.rossini@sa.gov.au	871097443	thomas.rossini@sa.gov.au	thomas.rossini@sa.gov.au



collaboration . honesty . excellence . enjoyment . respect

We acknowledge and respect Aboriginal peoples as South Australia's first peoples and nations, we recognise Aboriginal peoples as traditional owners and occupants of land and waters in South Australia and that their spiritual, social, cultural and economic practices come from their traditional lands and waters; and they maintain their cultural and heritage beliefs, languages and laws which are of ongoing importance; We pay our respects to their ancestors and to their Elders.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.



><(((°> Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail <°)))><

From: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 23 May 2022 10:03 AM
To: DIT:Boundaries Commission <DIT.BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au>
Cc: Ilee, Peter (AGD) <Peter.Ilee@sa.gov.au>; lmiller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Subject: Boundaries Commission meeting - Campbelltown Stage 2 Boundary Change Proposal

Good morning Peter

Are you in a position to advise the outcome of the Commission's deliberations on 18 May 2022 regarding the Campbelltown proposal?

As you can imagine, there is a lot of interest at my end.


Thanks in anticipation.

Regards

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance
Adelaide Hills Council

p 08 8408 0516
e lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au
w ahc.sa.gov.au

Visit me at: 63 Mount Barker Road, Stirling SA 5152
PO Box 44 Woodside SA 5244



This email (including any attachments) is confidential and intended only for use by the addressee. It has been sent by Adelaide Hills Council. If you are not the intended recipient of this document, you are advised that any use, reproduction, disclosure or distribution of the information contained in this document is prohibited. If you have received this document in error, please advise us immediately and destroy the document. It is noted that legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email or its attachments. Any loss or damage incurred by using this document is the recipient's responsibility. Adelaide Hills Council's entire liability will be limited to resupplying the document. No warranty is made that this document is free from computer virus or other defect.

6 June 2022

Mayor Jill Whittaker
Campbelltown City Council
PO Box 1
CAMPBELLTOWN SA 5074

By email: mayor@campbelltown.sa.gov.au

Campbelltown City Council - Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

Dear Mayor Whittaker

Thank you for the Campbelltown City Council's (the Council) Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal (the Proposal) submitted for the SA Local Government Boundaries Commission's (the Commission's) consideration on 14 April 2022.

The Proposal was considered by the Commission at its meeting on 18 May 2022, having regard to the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act) and *Guideline 3 — Submitting a General Proposal to the Commission* (Guideline 3).

The Commission acknowledges the significant work that the Council has undertaken to develop this Proposal and to address the requirements of Guideline 3.

Following an assessment of the information provided against the requirements of the Act and Guideline 3, the Commission resolved the following at its meeting on 18 May 2022:

That the Commission:

1. *Require the following further information before it will consider whether to inquire into the Campbelltown City Council Proposal:*
 - a. *Further information about the advantages and disadvantages of the Proposal;*
 - b. *Clear cadastral and topographic map/s of the Subject Area that clearly display the proposed boundary line relative to properties and landform and landscape features of the proposal area relative to adjacent areas of Campbelltown City Council;*
2. *Defer consideration of whether to inquire into the Proposal until the information requested is provided by the Campbelltown City Council;*
3. *Advise Campbelltown City Council that the Commission will consider the further information when received and determine whether to prepare an Inquiry Plan for the Council's consideration, and anticipates that any Inquiry that may proceed would be undertaken following the 2022 periodic local government elections; ...*

The Commission would appreciate the Council providing the additional information described in point 1 by **30 June 2022**.

The Commission will then finalise its assessment of the proposal in accordance with the Act and the guidelines and determine whether or not an inquiry into the Proposal may proceed. Please note that a determination that an inquiry may proceed does not mean that the proposed boundary change will be recommended to the Minister.

If the Commission determines that an inquiry may proceed, the Commission will develop an inquiry plan and request feedback on this plan from the Council and the Adelaide Hills Council. Section 31 of the Act and *Guideline 4 – Investigation of General Proposals Initiated by Councils* sets out the process for these inquiries. This process will take approximately 4-6 weeks.

Once an inquiry plan is finalised, the Commission will develop a cost estimate in accordance with *Guideline 8 – Costs for General Proposals Initiated by a Council or Councils* for the Council's consideration. This process will take approximately 3-4 weeks. If the Council then advises the Commission that the inquiry can proceed, the Commission will procure and undertake a thorough investigation into the Proposal, which must be completed before any recommendations for boundary change are made to the Minister. The investigation will include engagement with the affected Councils and community.

Please note that a copy of this correspondence has been forwarded to Mayor Wisdom, Adelaide Hills Council and published on the Boundaries Commission's webpage.

Should you have any further queries about the information required for the Commission to complete its assessment of the Campbelltown City Council's General Proposal, please contact Mr Peter Ilee, Executive Officer of the Commission on 7109 7164 or by email to boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Yours sincerely



Rob Donaldson

CHAIR

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

CC: Mayor Jan-Claire Wisdom – Adelaide Hills Council

15 July 2022

Mr Rob Donaldson
Chair
South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001
E: boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Dear Mr Donaldson

Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

Firstly, congratulations on being appointed Chair of the Boundaries Commission. The Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) has enjoyed a positive and constructive relationship with the Commission, and we look forward to this continuing under your leadership.

It is therefore with some regret that I feel compelled to write to you regarding the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) Stage 2 Proposal and, more specifically, the supplementary information lodged by CCC on 28 June 2022 in response to the Commission's 6 June 2022 request for further information.

AHC has always respected the role of the Commission and the due process established for the consideration of proposals. As such, we understand that should the proposal proceed to an Inquiry that the investigator(s) will provide AHC with an opportunity to respond fully to the CCC proposal.

However I have taken this action to contact the Commission at this time due to the alarm the content of this document has caused in my Council, and is likely to cause among residents, and the concern that immediate subsequent decisions made by the Boundaries Commission may heavily rely on the information, much of which is presented as facts rather than opinions without data to back them up.

AHC has regarded CCC's proposal to be lacking genuine merit from its commencement in January 2019 through to the present time including through the lodgement of the Stage 2 proposal in April and again with the Supplementary Information. CCC's analysis appears rudimentary with vague, superficial and largely unsubstantiated justifications. We had expected to see a body of supporting research or data in the Supplementary Information given the years the proposal has been in the making.

In particular we are greatly concerned that the majority oppositional view of affected residents as surveyed by *both* Councils is not considered further or reflected in the focus of the 'Advantages and Disadvantages of the Proposal' arguments put forward. The term

'communities of interest' is stated as a given fact primarily on the basis of geography but not proven and not reflected in the majority view of residents surveyed. The repeated assertion that the AHC residents 'are part of the Campbelltown community' does not make it true. The 'strong communities of interest' that is claimed by CCC and the 'sense of belonging that the majority of residents have ...' absolutely contradicts the views of the majority of the surveyed residents and as such is quite disrespectful. The emphasis on explaining 'local' as a uniquely geographical construct is fraught: a person's 'position in space' should not be confused with their sense of place.

We believe we would be negligent in our duty to the affected residents and to the pursuit of good governance to let CCC's latest submission pass without comment. I do not intend this to be a comprehensive rebuttal however, the purpose of this letter is to highlight just a few examples of what appear to be unreasonable and unfounded elements.

The following is taken from their catalogue of Advantages and Disadvantages:

Advantage - Formalising the existing (and future) community of interest

The apparent logic put forward is that if residents from one council are travelling to shops, schools, venues or sporting grounds of another council, they should automatically be part of that council. Utilising this logic the Adelaide City Council should be expanded to encompass the entire metropolitan area given the prevalence of Adelaideans who travel to and utilize the shops, educational institutions, sporting grounds and facilities within that council area. All council districts have 'fringe dwellers' and commuters who share each other's resources. It's part of the characteristics of the local government family, nor should it be forgotten that AHC is classified as a Metropolitan Council comprising urban areas as well as rural townships.

The community of interest that is most tangible and demonstrable is those residents affected by the proposal. This community of interest has through an overwhelming majority of respondents from two surveys (one of which was initiated by CCC itself) indicated that they do not want to be within the CCC area and is an indicator that they are supportive of the level of services they get, as well as AHC's financial, social and environmental performance. This inconvenient fact appears to be largely ignored by CCC's original and supplementary submissions in preference for the more nebulous and vague descriptions of communities of interest.

It is also disingenuous to suggest that AHC residents are 'freeloading' when they use local recreational facilities. The Adelaide Hills foothills area around Rostrevor and Woodforde also offer recreational benefits to Campbelltown residents. Most recently the parklands and natural amphitheatre developed for and around the Hamilton Hill estate are open for all and will soon offer a gym, pool and retail precinct which will be heavily used by 'Campbelltown locals'. The foothills environment also offers recreational trails and open spaces for city dwellers that have to be maintained by AHC although it is noted that CCC is not advocating to include these in its boundary proposal.

Advantage - Close proximity to Council services and faster response to emergencies

The argument here appears predicated on the notion that AHC work staff are domiciled within the depots (at Heathfield and Gumeracha) and only venture out when a response is required. AHC operates a very mobile and agile workforce both through its zone maintenance programs, community rangers and its rapid response teams. This ensures timely response throughout the council area, including the suburbs of Woodforde and Rostrevor.

We also note that the community and social programs mentioned by CCC overlook the fact that AHC also provides such services, many of which are also available from our Norton Summit Community Centre (and about the same distance away as CCC's offices).

Advantage - Closer proximity of Council services for AHC residents who need or want to engage with their Council in person

While face-to-face counter services will always remain an important element of any council's customer interface, AHC's data for 2021-22 indicates that 96% of customer requests for service (potholes, fallen trees, animal management, etc) occur via the contact centre and web lodgement. As such proximity to council customer service desks is, at best, a marginal justification for an advantageous outcome from the proposal.

Advantage (for AHC) - Supports the AHC Strategic Boundary Review

While AHC is pleased that CCC has acknowledged and referred to a piece of boundary reform work that is robust, evidence-based and strategic, the AHC Strategic Boundary Review did not in any way conclude that the affected suburbs would be better serviced by CCC.

Disadvantage (for AHC) – Loss of rates income

CCC identifies the loss of rates income for AHC as a disadvantage and implies that it is mitigated by the 'offset' of a reduction in expenditure in the affected area. The suggestion that rates income raised is entirely and only utilised in providing services and facilities in the area from which it is derived is both fundamentally flawed and naive.

Cadastral and Topographical Map

AHC welcomed the Commission's request to CCC to produce a map that followed cadastral boundaries. Until its lodgement, the map repeatedly used by CCC cut through allotments and was therefore never accurate.

Rostrevor College

An extraordinary amount of space is given in the supplementary report to this institution as a major justification for changing the boundaries. AHC understands that the relationship between CCC and the College has historically been championed by the previous Mayor and current CEO due to personal connections. There is nothing inherently wrong with this but it's not necessarily sustainable into the future. (Although it is questionable as to why they are offering Australia Day Awards to citizens of another Council.) Furthermore, AHC would be open to engaging in conversations around partnership projects with CCC concerning stormwater, traffic and infrastructure management; and there would be no need for CCC to construct a footpath on the AHC side of the current boundary as this has already been agreed to in our next year's plans and the College were notified some time ago.

Whilst the above is only a snapshot of the inconsistencies of CCC's Supplementary Information, it serves to again highlight the lack of considered depth presented in CCC's boundary reform proposal. This proposal has now been in train for three-and-a-half years, and on the basis of the evidence produced it is hard for my Council not to see this as a continuation of an exercise started in January 2019 motivated by financial gain - particularly in view of the recent Hamilton Hill development rates opportunity - and culturally based on past history rather than the democratically expressed views of the community it impacts.

This proposal is entirely driven by Campbelltown City Council. Indeed had the AHC residents of Rostrevor and Woodforde brought this proposal forward, as was claimed by CCC in the early days and later proven by the surveys to not be true, then AHC would likely have taken a different position. The advantages of the CCC proposal, as presented through their documentation, overwhelmingly benefit CCC financially whereas in contrast the current boundaries have not been demonstrated to disadvantage CCC financially. Given the strong opposition of the community at this time, and the full impact of the Hamilton Hill development still unknown, there could be some merit in reviewing the boundaries in 15 or 20 years to gauge future community sentiment and infrastructure needs. There are many social, cultural and historical reasons why Ukraine might like to be part of Russia but only one sovereign reason why they are not – they do not wish to be at this time.

AHC would welcome the Commission bringing an end to this poorly conceived proposal that does not accurately reflect the values, expectations and aspirations of the current community as voiced by that community (twice).

Yours sincerely



Dr Jan-Claire Wisdom
Mayor

29 July 2022

Mayor Jan-Claire Wisdom
Adelaide Hills Council
PO Box 44 WOODSIDE SA 5244

By email: jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au

Dear Mayor Wisdom

Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

I write to inform you that the South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) has received a council initiated Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal (the Proposal) from the Campbelltown City Council. The Proposal relates to a boundary change between the Campbelltown City Council and the Adelaide Hills council in the areas of Rostrevor and Woodforde.

At its meetings on 18 May 2022 and 20 July 2022, the Commission considered the Campbelltown City Council's Proposal. Your correspondence of 15 July 2022 was noted by the Commission.

As you are aware, the process by which the Commission deals with boundary change proposals under Chapter 3 Part 2 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act) is set out in the nine guidelines that the Commission has published on this matter.

When discussing a proposal, the Commission gives close consideration to the requirements of *Guideline 3 – Submitting a Proposal to the Commission* and the principles contained under section 26 of the Act. These principles are of fundamental importance to boundary change proposals and ultimately form the basis of any recommendation that the Commission may make to the Minister.

The Commission formed the view that the Proposal meets the requirements of Guideline 3 and generally aligns with the section 26 principles. The Commission therefore determined that an inquiry into the Proposal may proceed in accordance with Section 31 of the Act and *Guideline 4 – Investigations of General Proposals Initiated by Councils*.

I must emphasise that the Commission's determination to inquire into the Proposal does not mean that the Proposal has been recommended to proceed. A recommendation to the Minister regarding this Proposal can only be made once the Commission has conducted and considered the findings of an inquiry.

Section 31(1)(b) of the Act enables the Commission to appoint one or more investigators to conduct the inquiry. It is expected that the inquiry into the Proposal will require the appointment of a number of specialised investigators, given the extensive potential impact that the proposal may have on affected councils.

The appointment of investigators will be undertaken in accordance with the Act, and with *Guideline 5 – Appointment of Investigators for General Proposals*. As s 31(2) of the Act makes clear, the Commission must seek to ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable that the qualifications, knowledge, expertise and experience of a particular investigator are relevant to the inquiry for which the investigator is being appointed.

Given this, an overview of the matters that the Commission is of the view should be inquired into for this proposal is attached. **The Commission invites your Council to comment on this document to assist the Commission to formulate an estimate of costs** that is as accurate as possible. I would appreciate it if any comments could be provided by **29 August 2022**.

In accordance with s 31 (2)(b) of the Act, the Commission must also consult with councils affected by the proposal on the proposed appointment of investigators. While the Commission will therefore consult with your Council before formally appointing investigators, you may also wish make comments on these appointments at this stage.

In accordance with *Guideline 8 - Costs*, the Commission's next step will be to obtain a cost estimate for the inquiry. It is anticipated that this will be provided to the Campbelltown City Council for its consideration following the conclusion of the 2022 periodic local government elections. As you may be aware, the inquiry will only proceed if the Campbelltown City Council provides a clear direction to do so, when it has considered this cost estimate.

I also note that, if the inquiry proceeds, engagement and consultation for an inquiry will be undertaken with the engagement principles and the mandatory requirements outlined in *Guideline 9 – Engagement and Consultation*. As part of the inquiry, an engagement and communications plan will be developed which will outline how the engagement process will proceed.

I take this opportunity to emphasise that this engagement will be extensive, and involve affected councils and their communities to ensure that the Commission is fully informed of all views. Equally, it is essential that the affected communities have the opportunity to make their views known to the Commission in the context of full information about the potential impacts of the Proposal, as these are detailed through the Commission's inquiry.

The Commission understands that the Adelaide Hills Council may wish to keep your community informed about the Proposal and the inquiry process.

If your Council does choose to provide information to your community regarding the Proposal, the Commission requests that you clarify that the Commission is an independent statutory authority that will undertake its own consultation to ensure that it fully understands the informed views of all affected communities on any proposed boundary change before it makes a recommendation to the Minister.

Accordingly, as noted above, both your Council and community will be closely engaged with any inquiry that may proceed.

This will provide an opportunity for your Council to provide submissions to the Commission that may include the matters the Council has raised in previous correspondence to date.

As part of any inquiry, the Commission or the investigator(s) may request additional information from your Council in accordance with section 32A(1) of the Act and Guideline 4. This will allow the Commission to obtain the information it believes relevant to assist in undertaking the inquiry. The Commission would appreciate your Council's assistance with providing this information in a timely manner.

To assist the Commission in finalising this Proposal, please nominate a staff member in your Council who can act as the primary contact person for the Commission while considering the Proposal.

I also advise that, under the Commission's publication policy, the information about the Proposal has been made available at— www.dit.sa.gov.au/local-government/boundaries-commission.

Thank you for your Council's co-operation in this matter. If you have further questions, please contact the Commission on 7109 7164 or boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Rob Donaldson

CHAIR

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Attachment: Outline of matters to be investigated – Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change General Proposal Inquiry Plan

South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
Campbelltown City Council General Proposal – Outline of matters to be investigated

The following five areas will form the basis of the inquiry:

1. Financial matters
2. Land use and planning matters
3. Council employee matters
4. Representation matters
5. Community and service matters

The Commission must also design and deliver an engagement plan in accordance with Guideline 9 as part of the inquiry. The engagement plan will take the five above mentioned areas into consideration to ensure that the affected councils and communities are provided with the opportunity to make their views known on all relevant matters.

The matters detailed below will be fully investigated in relation to the affected councils. The role and performance of similar (but not affected) councils may be included or referenced in the inquiry, so far as it informs the Commission's recommendations to the Minister for Local Government.

1. Financial Matters

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Financial implications	S 31(3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential impact on operating revenue for affected councils, analysing impact on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ general rates○ service charges○ other fees and charges○ grants (particularly Financial Assistance Grants).○ any other relevant operating revenue• Potential impact on operating expenses for all affected councils.• Future financial impacts (short and long-term) on all affected councils' operating budgets if a boundary change was implemented.• Analysis of estimated total revenue against estimated total expenditure for affected councils.

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
2	Division of assets and liabilities: land and buildings, plant & equipment, cash, investments, interests in any 'business activities', debtors	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of all council owned assets and liabilities and those in the care, control and management of each affected council. • Identify impacts that the division/loss of these assets may have both financially and in service provision for the affected councils. • Identify any issues for the affected communities that would remain as a result of the division/loss of assets. • Identify any impacts of the transfer of these assets on affected councils, including operating budgets / asset management in the context of each council's Long-term Financial Plan.
3	Impact of any significant contracts (e.g. waste management)	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify all significant contracts held by the affected councils, and any impacts of the proposal on them.
4	Assessment of any significant differences in rating policies of the councils involved, the impacts on ratepayers and how these are to be addressed in both the short and longer term.	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify changes in rates that may apply to rateable properties within the affected areas based on the affected councils' current rating policy. • Identify any impact of rating changes on ratepayers, and any suitable measures to address impacts in the short to medium term if necessary.
5	Assessment of any significant differences in fees and charges of the councils	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify all fees and charges currently in place for affected councils, and the impact on councils and ratepayers from any necessary changes to these.
6	Existing grant arrangements relevant to affected area (including both Financial Assistance Grants and specific grants)	General Refer 31 (3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify any existing grant agreements that would be affected by this proposal. • Identify any infrastructure or general projects that have received grant funding and are not yet completed, and propose measures to transfer acquittal or reporting requirements if necessary.
7	Impact on any property based services (eg CWMS)	General Refer 31 (3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify property based services offered by affected councils, and the impact that a boundary change may have on the management of these services (including consideration of any applicable service charge or rate).

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
8	Assessment of any significant differences in service levels provided by the councils	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the service levels provided by affected councils and identify any impact that a boundary change may have on the delivery of services to ratepayers and councils. Propose any measures to address differences in service provision across affected areas in the short to medium term.

2. Land use and planning matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Potential conflicts that may arise from existing patterns of land use if the proposal was implemented	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any significant conflicts in land use patterns, including any potential interface issues with future or existing growth areas. Identify any land management issues that may arise with a transfer of areas– e.g. open space, stormwater, significant easements. Review and identify any significant differences in planning policies between the affected councils Identify any variances in development controls that may impact on development/growth if a council boundary change was implemented. Identify current or previous planning studies and outcomes that are relevant to the affected councils/areas, including demographic, growth projections, infrastructure needs/demands. Identify any existing or potential environmental impacts that should be considered. Assess the capacity of the affected councils to manage significant future growth areas. Identify any existing infrastructure deeds that may be affected by a boundary change. Assess how the affected councils could facilitate effective and sustainable planning, development and protection of the environment if a boundary change was implemented, having particular regard to the Adelaide Hills Face Zone management. Consider the impact of any existing land management agreements.

3. Council Employee Matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	The impact on the various rights and interests of any council employees affected by the general proposal	Section 31(3)(b)(v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify the rights and interests of council employees affected by the proposal.• Identify any significant difference in any work place agreements or conditions such as an enterprise bargaining agreement.• Propose arrangements that may need to put in place in the short to medium term to manage any impact on employees.
2	Implications for council employees, including any proposed transfer of staff and conditions of employment	Guideline 4 Refer 31(3)(b)(v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify any workforce or human resourcing issues that may result from a boundary change, including any need for transfer of staff.• Assess conditions of employment in affected councils, identify any impact of a boundary change and propose any arrangements that may be necessary to manage this.

4. Representation Matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Impact on internal structure and representation of councils, and how this will be dealt with in the short and longer term	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify the current representation for all areas impacted by the proposal• Recommend the future of representation of all areas that may be affected by a boundary change, with particular attention to any impact on ward quotas within affected councils• Consider any previous structural changes or reviews relating to the affected councils, and whether these have any impact or relevance to potential change arising from this Proposal.• Consider the most recent representation review completed for each council.

5. Community and Services

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Community of interest	S 26(vii) and related s 26 principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise on community members' identification as members of a particular local and/or regional community • Identify any economic communities of interest that may be affected if a boundary change was implemented and what impact this might have • Assess whether a council boundary change would result in a significant division within an existing community
2	Ability of communities to access council services and relevant communication issues between councils and communities	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess how community members in affected areas access and use services and facilities provided by their own or nearby councils • Identify any impact on this access that may arise from a boundary change • Assess current activities and engagement between affected communities and councils, including participation in local decision making, and identify any impact that a boundary change may have on these relationships • Identify existing relationships between affected councils and social, recreational and sporting groups, and the impact that a boundary change may have on this relationship or the operation of the group. • Determine if all affected councils would be in a position to offer its communities a reasonable range of services delivered on an efficient, flexible, equitable and responsive basis if a boundary change was implemented

Engagement requirements

The Commission must undertake engagement into the inquiry to meet both the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act) and Guideline 9.

Legislative and Guideline requirements

Section 31(3)(b) of the Act requires the Commission to consider—

- The extent of support for the general proposal within the affected community
- The extent of support for the general proposal of any council affected by the general proposal

Section 27(3)(b) of the Act requires that the Commission's guidelines must specify requirements relating to consultation that must be undertaken for the purposes of inquiries, including consultation with the community, councils affected by the proposal and entities that represent the interest of council employees affected by the proposal.

Accordingly, the Commission's Guideline 9 outlines the Commission's approach to consultation and engagement. This requires the Commission to design an Engagement Plan aligning with the engagement principles in the Guideline, and that is tailored to the engagement necessary to each Proposal.

Requirements for the inquiry

To meet the Commission's requirements, it is proposed that an investigator will be appointed to—

1. Design an Engagement Plan for the Commission's approval in relation to the Campbelltown City Council's proposal. This Engagement Plan must be in accordance with Section 31(3) of the Act and Guideline 9. This will be designed in consultation with affected councils and based on the four Engagement Principles.
2. Deliver the approved Engagement Plan and provide a report to the Commission, in accordance with s 31(4)(b) of the Act.

26 August 2022

Mr Rob Donaldson
Chair
South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001
E: boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Dear Mr Donaldson

Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal – Proposed Investigation Matters

I refer to your correspondence dated 29 July 2022 (received 30 July 2022) advising that the Boundaries Commission has determined that an inquiry into the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) General Proposal may progress in accordance with Section 31 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the 'Act') and *Guideline 4 – Investigations of General Proposal initiated by Councils* (the 'Guideline 4').

While the Adelaide Hills Council ('AHC') is familiar with the provisions of the boundary change legislation it is with some considerable concern to recognise that, notwithstanding that CCC's proposal has been in train for over 3.5 years, and with three opportunities to put their case, this is the first time that AHC has been formally invited to provide comment on the process.

As you could reasonably anticipate, your advice was met with deep disappointment from the AHC and residents of the affected area. The decision appears to set a concerning precedent within the sector that a predatory council can undertake a poorly conceived and protracted boundary change process and yet still be entertained into the Inquiry stage of the process thereby perpetuating the uncertainty and angst experienced by the affected residents.

Upon reading your advice I turned to s 29(3) of the Act, which sets out the grounds upon which the Commission may refuse to inquire into a proposal. Of particular relevance is s29(3)(b) which states that the Commission can refuse to inquire into a proposal if it considers that it is not in the public interest to inquire into the proposal.

Information provided by CCC in their April 2022 Proposal Submission and by AHC on a number of occasions has identified that two community surveys have been undertaken (one by each council) and on both occasions an overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they were not in favour of the proposal. It leaves both my Council and the affected residents puzzled as to how the Commission has weighed the public interest under subsection (3)(b) when there is core evidence to strongly suggest that an inquiry is not in the affected communities' interest.

Your correspondence of 29 July 2022 also provides information on the inquiry process including the draft *Outline of Matters to be Investigated* (the 'Inquiry Plan'). I would like to thank you for providing the Inquiry Plan and affording AHC the opportunity to make comments in relation to its contents.

However, prior to contemplating the individual matters that are in the Inquiry Plan and providing suggestions for refinements, along with comments on the appointments of suitable investigators, Council wishes to highlight two fundamental omissions, in the Inquiry Plan.

Section 31(3)(b) of the Act requires an inquiry into a general proposal (in addition to the principles set out in s26) to consider the following:

- (ii) the extent of support for the general proposal (in particular) and boundary reform in the area (in a general sense) within the community affected by the general proposal; and
- (iii) the extent of support for the general proposal of any council affected by the general proposal.

The Inquiry Plan itself does not contemplate in any manner how the above two subsections will be investigated (acknowledging that it is referred to in relation to Engagement Requirements). This is extremely concerning particularly given the apparent lack of attention given to the results of the two aforementioned surveys which have both concluded an absolute majority of respondents are not in favour of the Proposal. As such, Council would prefer these requirements are contained within the Inquiry Plan.

In addition to the above, Council's feedback in relation to the individual items in the Inquiry Plan is at **Appendix A**.

Given the points identified by Council we believe that the Inquiry Plan will require significant augmentation to address this deficiency and we would appreciate being provided with the revised Plan prior to its adoption.

Council also has a deep interest in the knowledge, skills and experience of the investigators to be appointed to conduct the investigation as we believe that this is a complex undertaking and a broad range of specialist skills will be required. As such, we look forward to the Commission's further consultation on the proposed investigators prior to their appointment.

Your correspondence advises that the Commission will be preparing an Engagement and Communications Plan (the 'Engagement Plan'). The AHC has considerable expertise in relation to these fields as evidenced by our interactions with the residents affected by the Proposal. Our actions stand in stark contrast to the efforts of CCC in this matter. Again, we look forward to being consulted on the contents of the draft Engagement Plan prior to its approval.

You have asked for Council to nominate a staff member who can act as the primary contact person for the Commission and I am pleased to nominate Mr Lachlan Miller, Executive Manager Governance and Performance. He can be contacted on 8408 0400 or lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au.

Notwithstanding Council's concern that this Proposal has progressed to the Inquiry stage and the specific matters identified in Council's feedback associated with the draft Inquiry Plan, I would like to again thank the Commission for the opportunity to provide formal feedback. Finally the AHC continues to hope that the incoming Campbelltown City Council will demonstrate prudence and respect by ceasing this process when they consider it post-election.

Yours sincerely



Dr Jan-Claire Wisdom
Mayor

In relation to each of the sections contained in the Inquiry Plan, Council has the following feedback:

1. Financial Matters

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover	Adelaide Hills Council Response
1	Financial implications	S 31(3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impact on operating revenue for affected councils, analysing impact on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> general rates service charges other fees and charges grants (particularly Financial Assistance Grants). any other relevant operating revenue Potential impact on operating expenses for all affected councils. Future financial impacts (short and long-term) on all affected councils' operating budgets if a boundary change was implemented. Analysis of estimated total revenue against estimated total expenditure for affected councils. 	<p>The matters listed appear to be comprehensive and consistent with the Act and Guidelines.</p> <p>In terms of an appropriate investigator(s) to undertake this element of the inquiry in accordance with s31(2)(a), considerable acumen will be required in local government strategic and operational financial management, asset management and service provision across the broad portfolio of council services.</p>
2	Division of assets and liabilities: land and buildings, plant & equipment, cash, investments, interests in any 'business activities', debtors	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of all council owned assets and liabilities and those in the care, control and management of each affected council. Identify impacts that the division/loss of these assets may have both financially and in service provision for the affected councils. Identify any issues for the affected communities that would remain as a result of the division/loss of assets. Identify any impacts of the transfer of these assets on affected councils, including operating budgets / asset management in the context of each council's Long-term Financial Plan. 	
3	Impact of any significant contracts (e.g. waste management)	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify all significant contracts held by the affected councils, and any impacts of the proposal on them. 	
4	Assessment of any significant differences in rating policies of the councils involved, the impacts on ratepayers and how these are to be addressed in both the short and longer term.	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify changes in rates that may apply to rateable properties within the affected areas based on the affected councils' current rating policy. Identify any impact of rating changes on ratepayers, and any suitable measures to address impacts in the short to medium term if necessary. 	
5	Assessment of any significant differences in fees and charges of the councils	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify all fees and charges currently in place for affected councils, and the impact on councils and ratepayers from any necessary changes to these. 	
6	Existing grant arrangements relevant to affected area (including both Financial Assistance Grants and specific grants)	General Refer 31 (3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any existing grant agreements that would be affected by this proposal. Identify any infrastructure or general projects that have received grant funding and are not yet completed, and propose measures to transfer acquittal or reporting requirements if necessary. 	
7	Impact on any property based services (e.g. CWMS)	General Refer 31 (3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify property based services offered by affected councils, and the impact that a boundary change may have on the management of these services (including consideration of any applicable service charge or rate). 	

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover	Adelaide Hills Council Response
8	Assessment of any significant differences in service levels provided by the councils	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the service levels provided by affected councils and identify any impact that a boundary change may have on the delivery of services to ratepayers and councils. Propose any measures to address differences in service provision across affected areas in the short to medium term. 	As above

2. Land Use & Planning Matters

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover	Adelaide Hills Council Response
1	Potential conflicts that may arise from existing patterns of land use if the proposal was implemented	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any significant conflicts in land use patterns, including any potential interface issues with future or existing growth areas. Identify any land management issues that may arise with a transfer of areas– e.g. open space, stormwater, significant easements. Review and identify any significant differences in planning policies between the affected councils Identify any variances in development controls that may impact on development/growth if a council boundary change was implemented. Identify current or previous planning studies and outcomes that are relevant to the affected councils/areas, including demographic, growth projections, infrastructure needs/demands. Identify any existing or potential environmental impacts that should be considered. Assess the capacity of the affected councils to manage significant future growth areas. Identify any existing infrastructure deeds that may be affected by a boundary change. Assess how the affected councils could facilitate effective and sustainable planning, development and protection of the environment if a boundary change was implemented, having particular regard to the Adelaide Hills Face Zone management. Consider the impact of any existing land management agreements. 	<p>While the matters listed appear to be comprehensive and consistent with the Act and Guidelines, additional matters to be considered should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the applicable CFS bushfire regions and the implications of the boundary change on these regions. Review the By-laws of each council and the implications of the differing provisions to the affected residents. Assess the disaster preparedness, response and recovery arrangements of each council in terms of their ability to adequately respond to emergency events susceptible in the affected area. Assess the biodiversity and environmental management requirements of the affected area and each councils' level of expertise. <p>In terms of an appropriate investigator(s) to undertake this element of the inquiry in accordance with s31(2)(a), considerable acumen will be required in local government infrastructure and asset management, strategic planning policy, development assessment, regulatory services, biodiversity and conservation, property management and emergency management.</p>

3. Council Employee Matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover	Adelaide Hills Council Response
1	The impact on the various rights and interests of any council employees affected by the general proposal	Section 31(3)(b)(v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the rights and interests of council employees affected by the proposal. Identify any significant difference in any work place agreements or conditions such as an enterprise bargaining agreement. Propose arrangements that may need to put in place in the short to medium term to manage any impact on employees. 	<p>Note: the reference to s31(3)(b)(v) is incorrect as it should be (iv), also Guideline 4 should be included.</p> <p>The matters listed appear to be comprehensive and consistent with the Act and Guidelines.</p> <p>In terms of an appropriate investigator(s) to undertake this element of the inquiry in accordance with s31(2)(a), considerable acumen in the interpretation of the applicable Awards and corresponding enterprise agreements for each of the councils and in industrial relations more generally will be required.</p>
2	Implications for council employees, including any proposed transfer of staff and conditions of employment	Guideline 4 Refer 31(3)(b)(v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any workforce or human resourcing issues that may result from a boundary change, including any need for transfer of staff. Assess conditions of employment in affected councils, identify any impact of a boundary change and propose any arrangements that may be necessary to manage this. 	

4. Representation Matters

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover	Adelaide Hills Council Response
1	Impact on internal structure and representation of councils, and how this will be dealt with in the short and longer term	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the current representation for all areas impacted by the proposal Recommend the future of representation of all areas that may be affected by a boundary change, with particular attention to any impact on ward quotas within affected councils Consider any previous structural changes or reviews relating to the affected councils, and whether these have any impact or relevance to potential change arising from this Proposal. Consider the most recent representation review completed for each council. 	<p>While the matters listed appear to be comprehensive and consistent with the Act and Guidelines, additional matters to be considered should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the current and proposed federal and state electorate boundaries impacted by the proposal. <p>In terms of an appropriate investigator(s) to undertake this element of the inquiry in accordance with s31(2)(a), considerable acumen will be required in relation to federal, state and local government electoral legislation.</p>

5. Community and Services

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover	Adelaide Hills Council Response
1	Community of interest	S 26(vii) and related s 26 principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise on community members' identification as members of a particular local and/or regional community Identify any economic communities of interest that may be affected if a boundary change was implemented and what impact this might have Assess whether a council boundary change would result in a significant division within an existing community 	<p>Section 26(1)(c) is very specific that the Commission should have regard to a series of principles when making recommendations for the purpose of Chapter 3.</p> <p>The matters to be investigated, while addressing economic communities of interest, do not adequately recognise the provisions of subsection (1)(c)(vii) with respect to recreational, social, regional, or any other kind, of communities of interest. These communities of interest are fundamental to the person's sense of place and belonging. Further, there does not appear to be sufficient recognition of the balance of subsection (3)(c)(vii) with respect to how the aforementioned communities of interest contribute to the 'community structures, values, expectations and aspirations.'</p> <p>In terms of an appropriate investigator(s) to undertake this element of the inquiry in accordance with s31(2)(a), considerable acumen will be required in relation to social and cultural anthropology and sociology.</p>
2	Ability of communities to access council services and relevant communication issues between councils and communities	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess how community members in affected areas access and use services and facilities provided by their own or nearby councils Identify any impact on this access that may arise from a boundary change Assess current activities and engagement between affected communities and councils, including participation in local decision making, and identify any impact that a boundary change may have on these relationships Identify existing relationships between affected councils and social, recreational and sporting groups, and the impact that a boundary change may have on this relationship or the operation of the group. Determine if all affected councils would be in a position to offer its communities a reasonable range of services delivered on an efficient, flexible, equitable and responsive basis if a boundary change was implemented 	<p>While the matters listed appear to be comprehensive and consistent with the Act and Guidelines, additional matters to be considered should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident accessibility to geographically (or regionally) based federal and state government funded support services (often provided through councils, e.g. HomeAssist). <p>In terms of an appropriate investigator(s) to undertake this element of the inquiry in accordance with s31(2)(a), considerable acumen in local government community need's assessment, service design, implementation and evaluation.</p>

18 October 2022

Mayor Jan-Claire Wisdom
Adelaide Hills Council
PO Box 44
WOODSIDE SA 5244

By email: jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au

Dear Mayor Wisdom

Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

Thank you for your correspondence received on 26 August 2022 providing feedback on the South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission's (the Commission) draft Inquiry Plan for the Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal.

As you are aware, the process by which the Commission deals with boundary change proposals under Chapter 3 Part 2 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act) is set out in the relevant guidelines published by the Commission.

At its meeting on 7 October 2022, the Commission considered feedback received from both your council and Campbelltown City Council (the affected councils) on the draft Inquiry Plan. As a result, the Commission adopted the Inquiry Plan with amendments to address most of the matters identified by the affected councils.

The Commission noted your council's views that the draft Inquiry Plan did not outline how section 31(3)(b) (ii) and 31(3)(b) (iii) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act) will be implemented. These provisions require consideration of the extent of support for the Proposal from the relevant communities and the affected councils. The Commission believes that these requirements will be appropriately addressed through the Inquiry Plan engagement arrangements and in turn all relevant views will be considered holistically in the Inquiry.

The affected councils will be consulted on the development of an engagement plan before its finalisation and implementation as part of the Inquiry.

The Commission appreciated the feedback from the affected councils enabling it to finalise the Inquiry Plan. The adopted Inquiry Plan is attached for your information.

In accordance with *Guideline 8 - Costs*, the Commission will provide Campbelltown City Council (CCC) with a cost estimate for the Inquiry based on the Inquiry Plan scope of works. A formal tender process will be undertaken seeking quote/s from suitably qualified consultancies. Section 32B of the Act provides for the Commission to recover reasonable costs of an inquiry in relation to a general proposal referred to the Commission by a council.

It is anticipated that the cost estimate will be provided to CCC for its consideration following the conclusion of the 2022 periodic local government elections. The Inquiry will only proceed if CCC provides a clear direction to do so, after considering the cost estimate.

If CCC decides to proceed based on the cost estimate, in accordance with section 31(2)(b) the Commission will consult with the affected councils on the appointment of an investigator/s.

I advise that, under the Commission's publication policy, the information about the Proposal has been made available at— www.dit.sa.gov.au/local-government/boundaries-commission.

If you have further questions, please contact the Commission on 7133 1311 or boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rob Donaldson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Rob Donaldson

CHAIR

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Attachment: Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change General Proposal Inquiry Plan

South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
Campbelltown City Council General Proposal – Outline of matters to be investigated

The following five areas will form the basis of the inquiry:

1. Financial matters
2. Land use and planning matters
3. Council employee matters
4. Representation matters
5. Community and service matters

The Commission must also design and deliver an engagement plan in accordance with Guideline 9 as part of the inquiry. The engagement plan will take the five above mentioned areas into consideration to ensure that the affected councils and communities are provided with the opportunity to make their views known on all relevant matters.

The matters detailed below will be fully investigated in relation to the affected councils. The role and performance of similar (but not affected) councils may be included or referenced in the inquiry, so far as it informs the Commission's recommendations to the Minister for Local Government.

1. Financial Matters

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Financial implications	S 31(3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential impact on operating revenue for affected councils, analysing impact on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ general rates○ service charges○ other fees and charges○ grants (particularly Financial Assistance Grants).○ any other relevant operating revenue• Potential impact on operating expenses for all affected councils.• Future financial impacts (short and long-term) on all affected councils' operating budgets if a boundary change was implemented.• Analysis of estimated total revenue against estimated total expenditure for affected councils.

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
2	Division of assets and liabilities: land and buildings, plant & equipment, cash, investments, interests in any 'business activities', debtors	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of all council owned assets and liabilities and those in the care, control and management of each affected council. • Identify impacts that the division/loss of these assets may have both financially and in service provision for the affected councils. • Identify any issues for the affected communities that would remain as a result of the division/loss of assets. • Identify any impacts of the transfer of these assets on affected councils, including operating budgets / asset management, Statement of Financial Position, and capital works programs in the context of each council's Long-term Financial Plan. • Identify any impacts of the transfer of these assets on affected councils and their communities with respect to servicing and managing assets during emergencies, e.g., flooding, fire, trees across roads, closing roads
3	Impact of any significant contracts (e.g., waste management)	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify all significant contracts held by the affected councils, and any impacts of the proposal on them.
4	Assessment of any significant differences in rating policies of the councils involved, the impacts on ratepayers and how these are to be addressed in both the short and longer term.	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify changes in rates that may apply to rateable properties within the affected areas based on the affected councils' current rating policy. • Identify any impact of rating changes on ratepayers, and any suitable measures to address impacts in the short to medium term if necessary.
5	Assessment of any significant differences in fees and charges of the councils	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify all fees and charges currently in place for affected councils, and the impact on councils and ratepayers from any necessary changes to these.
6	Existing grant arrangements relevant to affected area (including both Financial Assistance Grants and specific grants)	General Refer 31 (3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify any existing grant agreements that would be affected by this proposal. • Identify any infrastructure or general projects that have received grant funding and are not yet completed and propose measures to transfer acquittal or reporting requirements if necessary.

Item number	Requirement	Reference in the Local Government Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
7	Impact on any property-based services (e.g., CWMS)	General Refer 31 (3)(b)(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify property-based services offered by affected councils, and the impact that a boundary change may have on the management of these services (including consideration of any applicable service charge or rate).
8	Assessment of any significant differences in service levels provided by the councils	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the service levels provided by affected councils and identify any impact that a boundary change may have on the delivery of services to ratepayers and councils. Propose any measures to address differences in service provision across affected areas in the short to medium term.

2. Land use and planning matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Potential conflicts that may arise from existing patterns of land use if the proposal was implemented	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any significant conflicts in land use patterns, including any potential interface issues with future or existing growth areas. Identify any land management issues that may arise with a transfer of areas– e.g., open space, stormwater, significant easements. Review and identify any significant differences in planning policies between the affected councils Identify any variances in development controls that may impact on development/growth if a council boundary change was implemented. Identify current or previous planning studies and outcomes that are relevant to the affected councils/areas, including demographic, growth projections, infrastructure needs/demands. Identify any existing or potential environmental impacts that should be considered. Assess the capacity of the affected councils to manage significant future growth areas. Identify any existing infrastructure deeds that may be affected by a boundary change. Assess how the affected councils could facilitate effective and sustainable planning, development, and protection of the environment if a boundary change was implemented, having particular regard to the Adelaide Hills Face Zone management. Consider the impact of any existing land management agreements.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the applicable CFS bushfire regions, other regional bodies or structures and the implications of the boundary change on these regions. • Review the By-laws of each council and the implications of the differing provisions to the affected residents. • Assess the disaster preparedness, response, and recovery arrangements of each council in terms of their ability to adequately respond to emergency events susceptible in the affected area. • Assess the biodiversity and environmental management requirements of the affected area and each councils' level of expertise.
--	--	--	---

3. Council Employee Matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	The impact on the various rights and interests of any council employees affected by the general proposal	Guideline 4 Section 31(3) (b)(iv)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the rights and interests of council employees affected by the proposal. • Identify any significant difference in any workplace agreements or conditions such as an enterprise bargaining agreement. • Propose arrangements that may need to put in place in the short to medium term to manage any impact on employees.
2	Implications for council employees, including any proposed transfer of staff and conditions of employment	Guideline 4 Refer 31(3)(b)(v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify any workforce or human resourcing issues that may result from a boundary change, including any need for transfer of staff. • Assess conditions of employment in affected councils, identify any impact of a boundary change and propose any arrangements that may be necessary to manage this.

4. Representation Matters

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Impact on internal structure and representation of councils, and how this will be dealt with in the short and longer term	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify the current representation for all areas impacted by the proposal• Recommend the future of representation of all areas that may be affected by a boundary change, with particular attention to any impact on ward quotas within affected councils• Consider any previous structural changes or reviews relating to the affected councils, and whether these have any impact or relevance to potential change arising from this Proposal.• Consider the most recent representation review completed for each council.• Consider the current and proposed federal and state electorate boundaries impacted by the proposal.

5. Community and Services

Item number	Matter	Reference in the Act/ Guideline	Matters that the investigation must cover
1	Community of interest	S 26(vii) and related s 26 principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advise on community members' identification as members of a particular local and/or regional community• Identify any economic, recreational, social, regional, or other kind of communities of interest and how these communities of interest contribute to the community structures, values, expectations and aspirations that may be affected if a boundary change was implemented and what impact this might have• Assess whether a council boundary change would result in a significant division within an existing community
2	Ability of communities to access council services and relevant communication issues between councils and communities	Guideline 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assess how community members in affected areas access and use services and facilities provided by their own or nearby councils• Identify any impact on this access that may arise from a boundary change• Assess current activities and engagement between affected communities and councils, including participation in local decision making, and identify any impact that a boundary change may have on these relationships

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify existing relationships between affected councils and social, recreational, and sporting groups, and the impact that a boundary change may have on this relationship or the operation of the group. • Determine if all affected councils would be in a position to offer its communities a reasonable range of services delivered on an efficient, flexible, equitable and responsive basis if a boundary change was implemented • Resident accessibility to federal and state government funded support services (often provided through councils, e.g., HomeAssist).
--	--	--	--

Engagement requirements

The Commission must undertake engagement into the inquiry to meet both the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1999* (the Act) and Guideline 9.

Legislative and Guideline requirements

Section 31(3)(b) of the Act requires the Commission to consider—

- The extent of support for the general proposal within the affected community
- The extent of support for the general proposal of any council affected by the general proposal

Section 27(3)(b) of the Act requires that the Commission's guidelines must specify requirements relating to consultation that must be undertaken for the purposes of inquiries, including consultation with the community, councils affected by the proposal and entities that represent the interest of council employees affected by the proposal.

Accordingly, the Commission's Guideline 9 outlines the Commission's approach to consultation and engagement. This requires the Commission to design an Engagement Plan aligning with the engagement principles in the Guideline, and that is tailored to the engagement necessary to each Proposal.

Requirements for the inquiry

To meet the Commission's requirements, it is proposed that an investigator will be appointed to—

1. Design an Engagement Plan for the Commission's approval in relation to the Campbelltown City Council's proposal. This Engagement Plan must be in accordance with Section 31(3) of the Act and Guideline 9. This will be designed in consultation with affected councils and based on the four Engagement Principles.
2. Deliver the approved Engagement Plan and provide a report to the Commission, in accordance with s 31(4)(b) of the Act.

27 January 2023

Mr Rob Donaldson
Chair
South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission
GPO Box 2329
ADELAIDE SA 5001
E: boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Dear Mr Donaldson

Campbelltown City Council – Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal – Status of Inquiry

I refer to your correspondence dated 18 October 2022 advising that the Boundaries Commission (the Commission) had finalised the Inquiry Plan for the Campbelltown City Council (CCC) Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal following the receipt of feedback from Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) and the CCC.

I was pleased to see that the Commission has taken the majority of AHC's feedback into consideration and incorporated into the final Inquiry Plan.

I note your advice that the Commission will provide CCC with a cost estimate for the Inquiry based on the Inquiry Plan scope of works and that this was anticipated to occur following the conclusion of the 2022 periodic local government elections.

Based on the above, can you please advise the following:

1. Has a cost estimate been determined and what is the estimate?
2. Has the cost estimate been communicated to CCC and can a copy of that correspondence be provided to AHC?
3. Subject to point 2 above, what timeframe has been set for CCC to respond to the Commission advising whether they wish to proceed with the Inquiry?

As I have advised the Commission on multiple occasions, the spectre of a boundary change is distressing to many residents in the affected area and they (and AHC) are keen to understand the current status of this process.

I look forward to receiving your timely advice.

Yours sincerely



Dr Jan-Claire Wisdom
Mayor

Lachlan Miller

From: DIT:Boundaries Commission <DIT.BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 14 February 2023 5:38 PM
To: Jan-Claire Wisdom
Cc: Lachlan Miller
Subject: Letter from Mayor Wisdom (AHC) - Campbelltown City Council - Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

[EXTERNAL]

OFFICIAL

Dear Mayor Wisdom,

I refer to your letter dated 27 January 2023 regarding the current status of the Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal (the Proposal). I am pleased to provide the following information in response to your questions:

1. A cost estimate for the Inquiry into the Proposal has not yet been determined. An open tender has just been advertised on the South Australian Tenders and Contracts website. Following the evaluation of consultant responses, the Commission will seek agreement from Campbelltown City Council (CCC) on the cost estimate. I will seek direction from the Commission about the release of that information (at that time) to Adelaide Hills Council.
2. Further to point 1 above, in the absence of a cost estimate, CCC has received no further advice on this matter.
3. A timeframe for CCC response will be determined by the Boundaries Commission when the cost estimate is known.

I confirm that the Commission is committed to a thorough Inquiry into the Proposal in accordance with the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1999* and the Commission's Guidelines, including appropriate consultation with affected residents and other stakeholders.

Should you have any further queries, please contact me on 7133 1311 or by email to boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Regards

Peter Ilee

Executive Officer

SA Local Government Grants Commission / SA Local Government Boundaries Commission
Office of Local Government
Legal, Commercial and Assurance Services



Government of South Australia
Department for Infrastructure
and Transport

T 08 7133 1414 • M 0401 719 083

Kaurna Country

Leve 11, 83 Pirie Street ADELAIDE SA 5000 • GPO Box 2329, Adelaide SA 5001 • DX 171

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
In the Office	In the Office	In the Office	Working from Home	Working from Home
Best Contact				
08 7133 1414	08 7133 1414	08 7133 1414	0401 719 083	0401 719 083
Peter.ilee@sa.gov.au				



The Department for Infrastructure and Transport acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the Country throughout South Australia and recognises their continuing connection to land and waters. We pay our respects to the diversity of cultures, significance of contributions and to Elders past, present and emerging.

We are committed to creating a diverse and inclusive culture where everyone is valued and respected.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.

Lachlan Miller

From: DIT:Boundaries Commission <DIT.BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 24 May 2023 5:00 PM
To: Lachlan Miller; Jan-Claire Wisdom
Cc: Lachlan Miller
Subject: RE: Letter from Mayor Wisdom (AHC) - Campbelltown City Council - Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

[EXTERNAL]

Good afternoon Lachlan,

Thank you for your email.

Further to Peter's advice below, I can advise that the submissions received from the procurement process are being reviewed and assessed by the tender evaluation panel.

In due course, and after satisfying the evaluation and procurement process requirements, the Commission will be able to provide the Campbelltown City Council with the cost estimate.

Regards,

Doug Roberts
Senior Policy Officer Boundaries
Office of Local Government



Government of South Australia
Department for Infrastructure
and Transport

T 7133 2725
Karna Country
Level 4, 83 Pirie Street, Adelaide SA 5000 • GPO Box 2329, Adelaide SA 5001 • DX 171



The Department for Infrastructure and Transport acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the Country throughout South Australia and recognises their continuing connection to land and waters. We pay our respects to the diversity of cultures, significance of contributions and to Elders past, present and emerging.

We are committed to creating a diverse and inclusive culture where everyone is valued and respected.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.

From: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 3:36 PM
To: DIT:Boundaries Commission <DIT.BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au>; Jan-Claire Wisdom <jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Cc: lmiller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Subject: RE: Letter from Mayor Wisdom (AHC) - Campbelltown City Council - Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

Good afternoon Peter

I hope that this email finds you well.

In relation to your email below, can you please provide an update on the status.

Many thanks in anticipation.

Regards

Lachlan Miller
Executive Manager Governance & Performance
Adelaide Hills Council

p 08 8408 0516
e lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au
w ahc.sa.gov.au

Visit me at: 63 Mount Barker Road, Stirling SA 5152
PO Box 44 Woodside SA 5244

From: DIT:Boundaries Commission <DIT.BoundariesCommission@sa.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 5:38 PM
To: Jan-Claire Wisdom <jcwisdom@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Cc: Lachlan Miller <lmiller@ahc.sa.gov.au>
Subject: Letter from Mayor Wisdom (AHC) - Campbelltown City Council - Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal

[EXTERNAL]

OFFICIAL

Dear Mayor Wisdom,

I refer to your letter dated 27 January 2023 regarding the current status of the Campbelltown City Council Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal (the Proposal). I am pleased to provide the following information in response to your questions:

1. A cost estimate for the Inquiry into the Proposal has not yet been determined. An open tender has just been advertised on the South Australian Tenders and Contracts website. Following the evaluation of consultant responses, the Commission will seek agreement from Campbelltown City Council (CCC) on the cost estimate. I will seek direction from the Commission about the release of that information (at that time) to Adelaide Hills Council.
2. Further to point 1 above, in the absence of a cost estimate, CCC has received no further advice on this matter.
3. A timeframe for CCC response will be determined by the Boundaries Commission when the cost estimate is known.

I confirm that the Commission is committed to a thorough Inquiry into the Proposal in accordance with the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1999* and the Commission's Guidelines, including appropriate consultation with affected residents and other stakeholders.

Should you have any further queries, please contact me on 7133 1311 or by email to boundaries.commission@sa.gov.au

Regards
Peter Ilee
Executive Officer
SA Local Government Grants Commission / SA Local Government Boundaries Commission
Office of Local Government
Legal, Commercial and Assurance Services



T 08 7133 1414 • M 0401 719 083

Kaurna Country

Leve 11, 83 Pirie Street ADELAIDE SA 5000 • GPO Box 2329, Adelaide SA 5001 • DX 171


Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
In the Office	In the Office	In the Office	Working from Home	Working from Home
Best Contact				
08 7133 1414	08 7133 1414	08 7133 1414	0401 719 083	0401 719 083
Peter.ilee@sa.gov.au				



The Department for Infrastructure and Transport acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the Country throughout South Australia and recognises their continuing connection to land and waters. We pay our respects to the diversity of cultures, significance of contributions and to Elders past, present and emerging.

We are committed to creating a diverse and inclusive culture where everyone is valued and respected.

Information contained in this email message may be confidential and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege or public interest immunity. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this document is unauthorised and may be unlawful.



Council acknowledges that we undertake our business on the traditional lands and waters of the Peramangk and Kaurna people. We pay our respects to Elders past, present and emerging as the Custodians of this ancient and beautiful land.

This email (including any attachments) is confidential and intended only for use by the addressee. It has been sent by Adelaide Hills Council. If you are not the intended recipient of this document, you are advised that any use, reproduction, disclosure or distribution of the information contained in this document is prohibited. If you have received this document in error, please advise us immediately and destroy the document. It is noted that legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email or its attachments. Any loss or damage incurred by using this document is the recipient's responsibility. Adelaide Hills Council's entire liability will be limited to resupplying the document. No warranty is made that this document is free from computer virus or other defect.