



**Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee
held on Tuesday, 4 April 2023 at 6.30 pm
Council Chamber, Council Administration Centre
245 Sturt Road, Sturt**

PRESENT

Councillor Ian Crossland (Chair)
His Worship the Mayor Kris Hanna
Councillor Matt Taylor
Councillor Jana Mates
Councillor Amar Singh

In Attendance

Councillor Sarah Luscombe
Councillor Luke Naismith
Chief Executive Officer - Tony Harrison
General Manager Corporate Services – Angela Allison
Manager Office of the CEO - Kate McKenzie
Executive Officer to General Manager City Services - Colleen Madsen
Manager Community Connections - Merran Fyfe
Unit Manager Engineering - Carl Lundborg
Unit Manager Open Space Operations - Brett Jaggard
Open Space & Recreation Planner - Rebecca Deans
Water Resources Coordinator - Glynn Ricketts
Coordinator Biodiversity - Jacob Lemon

1 Open Meeting

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.33pm.

2 Kaurna Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the Kaurna people, the traditional custodians of this land and pay our respects to their elders past and present.

3 Elected Member Declaration of Interest (if any)

The Chair asked if any member wished to disclose an interest in relation to any item being considered at the meeting.

The following interests were disclosed:

- Nil

4 Confirmation of Minutes

4.1 Confirmation of Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 7 February 2023

Report Reference IC230404R4.1

Moved Mayor Hanna

Seconded Councillor Taylor

That the minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 7 February 2023 be taken as read and confirmed.

Carried unanimously.

5 Business Arising

5.1 Business Arising Statement - Action Items

Report Reference IC230404R5.1

Moved Councillor Taylor

Seconded Mayor Hanna

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Notes the business arising statement, meeting schedule and upcoming items.

Carried unanimously.

6 Confidential Items - Nil

7 Reports for Discussion

7.1 Open Space / Irrigation Biodiversity

Report Reference IC230404R7.1

The Open Space & Recreation Planner, Water Resources Coordinator and Coordinator Biodiversity provided the Committee with an overview on the Open Space Plan, the Irrigation Management Plan and Biodiversity Plan.

Open Space Plan

- It is a holistic plan that captures all renewal in open space.
- Living document updated yearly, capturing state and federal funding etc.
- Captures hierarchy, primary classifications, recommended works and years current irrigation area and irrigation score.
- Incorporates natural landscaping.

Irrigation Management Plan

- The Plan was first presented to Council in 2014 and has gone through some iterations over the years. It is a Policy and Planning document and is underpinned by an Irrigation Decision Support Tool.
- Irrigation is done based on functional benefit.
- Scoring is a multiple criteria analysis.
- There is a Public Value Score, which allows Elected Members to bring a motion to the Chamber to score a reserve 4, which triggers irrigation on that reserve.
- Irrigation is triggered when the scores combined are 12 or above or a public value of 4.
- A listing of reserves being upgraded within the Open Space Plan was provided to the Committee, including options and costs on those reserves that score 11, 10, 9 and 8 (Table was updated and provided after the meeting due to a question taken on notice). That were not currently planned for upgrade via the Open Space Plan.

Biodiversity Plan

- Remnant Vegetation Plan endorsed by Council in 2018. (5-year plan)
- Currently up for renewal and will be taken to the Environment Committee for review and feedback later this year.
- There are opportunities to expand the sites, and some of those sites are now being funded and will move to the priority sites i.e., large sections of the coastal vegetation through Marino and Hallett Cove, Trott Park creek line linking up to the Field River and Glenthorne Park precincts, and the Heron Way foreshore.
- Creates better monitoring for our Flora and Fauna.

The Committee discussed the following:

Irrigation

- Technology enhancements with our irrigation capabilities, ageing infrastructure that requires updating. Smart meters are installed on our larger water demand sites i.e., ovals and larger reserves, connected via a modem, brought back to a central PC where staff can adjust the requirements as needed. Staff are investigating costs to bring more sites on with smart irrigation.
- Savings in water usage by using smart irrigation. It is difficult to measure the \$ savings, however it is maximising the efficiency of our irrigation teams. i.e., should a sprinkler be damaged overnight, the system will shut down that section, setting off an alarm that staff will attend to the next morning to investigate the damage, thus also saving on any water that may be gushing out of the broken sprinkler.
- A handout was provided to give the Committee an indication of how many additional reserves there are on top of the ones that are going to be improved in the Open Space Plan should they wish to consider lowering the score that triggers irrigation. The whole life cost for watering and capital/renewal was presented for Members to consider.

Question taken on notice.

We have costing for scores of 11, 10 and 9, could we have the Capex and ongoing cost for reducing the score to 8?

- A turf management assessment has been undertaken. Water alone does not improve the sites, it needs to be supplemented with scarifying, coring, topsoil etc. There is an additional cost to increase the water, but the additional maintenance, which also comes at a cost, needs to be considered.

ACTION

The mayor queried what the yellow line on the handout means.

Staff will check with the maintenance and open space operations team and circulate to the Committee an updated printout with additional information.

- The Committee queried over what period are the shaded ones coming on the system, and if we are considering an additional 13 sites, are we pushing it too far?
 - Staff advised that some dates are included in the table, but the irrigation upgrades have been included in the Open Space Plan, which goes to 2029.

Open Space Plan

- What is the staff recommendation on how a secondary and lower netball ring in Hugh Johnson Reserve could be obtained?
 - The Open Space & Recreation Planner advised there is a pool of money available each year to do minor reserve upgrades and they can be done via Ward Briefings. More expensive upgrades can be included in the mid-life review of the Plan, scheduled for mid-2024 or an endorsed motion with Council.

Biodiversity

- The Committee noted that the Field River Valley is not currently included in the Remnant Vegetation Plan, however it needs to be on our radar and should be included in the new Plan.
- Other sites are less used than the coast or Sturt River, such as Trott Park creek line and Waterfall Creek.
 - Staff are on a working group with the City of Onkaparinga, DEW and Green Adelaide for Field River, looking for a holistic approach on the Field River catchment. The new Plan will have a section on the Field River and how we can contribute and maximise that space.
 - Staff advised that although Waterfall Creek and the Trott Park creek line are not as utilised by the public as some other sites, they are important in connecting our wildlife. They are good sites/trails for increasing biodiversity and connecting the biodiversity sites.

- Ongoing weed control, why not give up on olives and Aleppo and let a monoculture establish on our reserves?
 - Staff responded that these are declared weed species and have a legal obligation to control them. Monocultures will choke out anything else that tries to grow and if we allow a single species to overtake the reserve it does not provide healthy biodiversity to attract wildlife and allow us to re-introduce threatened species into our reserves.
- The Committee discussed the possibility of having one of the Plans include reserves that are not irrigated to include a combination of some irrigated green grass with some biodiversity and natural landscaping around it, which Plan would that be aimed at?
 - Staff responded that natural landscaping currently sits on its own. As part on the renewal of this Plan we would like to capture natural landscaping into the Biodiversity Plan to enable a lens over the natural landscaping. There is opportunity in the Open Space Plan as it works heavily with biodiversity to capture all of those on one site.

Further comments and discussion by the Committee were:

- How is the ongoing maintenance of the reserves considered?
 - Staff advised that once reserves are upgraded the ongoing maintenance is passed onto the Open Space Operations. Upgrades that come through, staff maintain the current levels, however at times there is a need to contract out other parts of the sites. In the past it has been a struggle, however, there have been improvements in the recent upgrades. Once more sites are upgrades and we are using more contractors we will be able to determine whether it would be more cost-effective to bring it all in house.
- How do we ensure in the costing there is provision for the ongoing maintenance?
 - The CEO advised that a review with the 3 councils has been undertaken in the last 12 months to look at a balance in contractor engagement and internal staff. Over the last 6-8 years there may have been a push towards engagement of labour towards contractors and unfortunately did not have the contractor management in place to ensure we had the quality and return in what we were buying in the contracts. Looking at rebalancing by having additional staff internally where we have greater levels of agility to deploy them where the greatest need is. Hybrid models are still being weighted.
 - Tree maintenance is a burgeoning issue due to the number of trees that have been planted over the last few years and the number we intend to plant in the next 2-3 years. When the program for mature tree planting was established, resourcing was not considered. There is an ongoing issue to get the right resource capacity.
- Prefer to see us maintaining our current level of irrigation and get the maintenance and upkeep costs correct before we increase our irrigation.
- Irrigation - about 13 to come on stream in the next 6 years so would tend to leave it at that.
- Remnant Vegetation - we should focus on strength on the larger areas such as the Field River, Coast etc. and cost, and should have in our plan or policy not just the connectivity but how many people can walk and enjoy the native vegetation.

- With infill development there needs to be a big focus on our reserves, watering, and maintenance schedules. Noted it is hard to get the balance right. Residents take it for granted that the reserves will be green. How do we balance their needs and expectations? Will placing technology enhancements into those reserves without it assist? During winter, is there a switch to lessen water than in summer that may need to be monitored closely.
- Can we irrigate biodiversity sites?
 - Water Resources Coordinator advised that we irrigate biodiversity sites for establishment either by direct irrigation or water trucks. The first 2 years are important. We expect a 10% loss even with irrigation. We spend a lot of resources watering street trees using Oaklands Water.
- Open Space Plan – when it is up for review, can consideration be given around disability access, first nations consultation also keeping in mind Waterfall Creek etc. has significant first nation's history.
 - Noted by staff.

Moved Mayor Hanna

Seconded Councillor Mates

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Notes the Open Space, Irrigation and Biodiversity Plans and the feedback given by Committee Members.

Carried unanimously.

7.2 Preliminary Draft Parking Management Guidelines

Report Reference

IC230404R7.2

Unit Manager Engineering introduced the Draft Management Guidelines and the journey undertaken on creating these guidelines.

Purpose of the Guidelines:

- Looking for a consistent approach across the network.
- Seeking guidance for staff, Elected Members and the community.
- Transparency around decision making.

To guide the content of the Guidelines, several questions were put to the Committee.

Question 1 Should road widths above 7.2m have no full-time parking restrictions (if no safety concern, or other major competing needs)?	
Committee response /question	Staff response
Yes, however there need to be some exceptions. For example, if next to a major activity such as shopping, or train stations etc. people may not wish to have no full-time restricted parking during peak times.	
Train stations, some have surrounding streets wider than 7.2m where residents may wish to ban parking on those roads, what are the staff views?	There may be other options available, user-based and /or time-based restrictions can be put into place during peak periods.
	Confirmed the Australian Road Rules state that 7.2m road can have cars parked either side without a need to restrict parking in those streets.
Do we know how many streets we have with parking restricted at that width?	We know the number of streets that meet the 7.2m criteria, however a city-wide exercise has not been undertaken to determine what parking restrictions we have on those streets. We won't be actively looking for those streets with restrictions - once the guidelines are endorsed, we would start from there adhering to those guidelines.
Noted a lot of people like a 2-way access on their roads.	

Question 2

Should road widths less 7.2m & greater than 5m have parking restrictions on one side (typically staggered)? If self-managing isn't working.

This would allow for parking on one side of the road and still allow for a 3m carriageway to allow the service vehicles to move through.

Committee response /question	Staff response
What would be the plan to manage the staggered approach?	Staff would look at each side of the street to work out the number of driveways and then work out what the best options to maximise the amount of car parks on street.
Do we implement this when residents complain about parking, or do we do random checks on roads/streets and make assumptions that we put restrictions on them?	When a parking request is made by a resident regarding an issue in the street - we try to educate first, i.e., letter drop and signage but if that doesn't work the self-management option is taken away. We will then apply for the safest way forward to allow service vehicles and garbage trucks and then consult with the street providing information on where the yellow lines will be in a staggered approach. If consultation rate is not higher than 60%, we cannot do anything.

Question 3

Should road widths less than 5m have parking restrictions on both sides?

Committee response /question	Staff response
The initial answer is yes. Although not knowing the law is no excuse, there is value of putting yellow lines even though it's illegal to park there and not leave a 3m carriageway.	Staff clarified that even if there were no yellow lines on these streets, if you park and there is less than the 3m carriageway of passage, the Australian Road Rules state you can be fined.
The exception is if we said these streets will get yellow lines, but for example a primary school is nearby, the guidelines need to be flexible enough to say there may be an opportunity to put in a few indented parks. It is good to have a rule as a starting point but there do need to be exceptions/flexibility depending upon the surrounding traffic and parking demand.	

Question 4

Should on-street parking infrastructure only be applied in high priority areas with high parking demand?

Committee response /question	Staff response
Some formula or guide to make it demand driven. It is noted that yellow lines are a relatively cheap way of managing, however once you start talking about indents and attractive footpaths, they are quite expensive treatments, so we need to get the right wording, right definition, right formula to say yes to this question.	
At what point do staff make that decision and when would it come back to Council, especially if there is a significant loss of trees?	Due to the major infrastructure needs, this would need to be worked quite closely with the Ward and Elected Members.

Question 5

When should we consult?

Who should we consult with – Owner or the Occupier?

Consultation rate greater than 50% or 60%

Committee response /question	Staff response
If self-managing isn't working should staff be able to come in and decide?	<p>Staff would decide once all avenues are exhausted. If due diligence has been undertaken with community engagement and the situation is still not resolved, we should have the right to make the call for public safety.</p> <p>The decision would depend upon the complexity of the matter. If our engagement on the recommendations has been unsuccessful, we then have guidelines in place to support the recommendations. In the case of a new housing estate where there are several issues in that development, there would be greater involvement with Elected Members to be briefed.</p>

<p>If there is parking in front of a house with room for two cars to be parked and residents find others are parking in the middle of that space, can they have a split line so that two cars can park?</p> <p>Do we have to consult, or could we just mark out where the two spaces are?</p>	<p>The question would be raised, do you do the whole street or only this one instance? We would like to look for consistency.</p>
<p>How to deal with residents who want a yellow line outside their house when cars are being parked in front of their homes during peak times. This has been raised by a resident to a Committee Member.</p>	<p>Unit Manager Engineering has suggested to the Committee Member this can be discussed further off-line.</p>
<p>The Committee commented that it would be good to discuss in a Forum whether a yellow line can be painted at the kerb to indicate where cars can park.</p>	<p>This may create a maintenance issue.</p>
<p>A yellow vertical line or arrow could be placed where the kerb meets the driveway invert to ensure cars do not encroach across the driveway in problem areas. The encroachment would be a breach of the road rules.</p>	<p>We could potentially include this. We would need to be consistent with all roads.</p> <p>If there was something in the guidelines that states if a resident has persistent problems, it can be done. It can be reactive to those residents that would like it, does not need to be done on all roads.</p> <p>Should one resident request the yellow line, often others in the street will see it and place a request, therefore it would make sense to do the whole street at the time of the initial request.</p>
<p>Consultation should be undertaken when there is a significant impact on residents.</p>	<p>Take to a Ward Briefing first.</p>
<p>Consult the occupier rather than the owner.</p>	
<p>Consultation rate for a whole street should be 60%.</p>	
<p>Why does a whole street need to be consulted on if there is only one resident that wants a yellow line outside their home?</p>	

Would this be an operational decision and, in this scenario, inform residents but include please provide feedback on why they would not do it. Give staff the ability to take the commonsense approach.	
Page 133 table of community engagement needs to be reviewed and re-written.	
Pictures on pages 120 and 121 - have not seen these types of roads in City of Marion. Possibly the word example is not right, and it should be component?	
Table of investigation requests, with over 600 per year, how many of those lead to changes on the street? If it's less than 10% then we need to look at how to do this differently.	This question can be answered via an email exchange with feedback to the Unit Manager Engineering, Carl Lundborg.

Question 6 Should we provide Business Permits to a business within the City of Marion (1 per business when parking within a timed zone)	
Committee response /question	Staff response
Permit system does assist businesses and should be an option for businesses to access.	

Moved Councillor Mates

Seconded Mayor Hanna

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Notes the report and provides feedback on the draft Parking Management Guidelines for the City of Marion (Attachment 1)
2. Supports the Revised Draft Parking Management Guidelines with additions to be presented at a Council Member Forum.

Carried unanimously.

7.3 Community Centres Utilisation and futures discussion

Report Reference

IC230404R7.3

The report was taken as read.

The Committee discussed the following:

- Encourage a view that we are trying to get people into all our council facilities and seen as part of one team to boost utilisation in spaces even if we don't have staff at all facilities. This should be inclusive of City of Marion run facilities as well as those operated by independent organisations (e.g., Marino Hall, Cosgrove, etc.)
- Trott Park NHC is not in the ideal place, - what is the progress about looking at alternative venues for a Southern Community Centre?
 - Staff advised that no significant work has been taken from an operational level to consider Trott Park relocation as a facility and acknowledge it is not on an arterial road.
- In terms of booking system, are we exploring if a single system can be utilised across all our assets?
 - Staff commented that the booking system is a key focus for 2023. Staff are currently looking at the possibility of an upgrade to the existing system and exploring new systems with a focus on customer journey. Many appointments with LG users in SA and interstate have taken place.
 - Staff are also aiming to include those sites not managed by CoM in the scope of this booking system project, however this is complicated by those groups having their own systems in place (resource, skills, financial, etc.) and are not currently bound through lease to come on board with a CoM system so this outcome in full is not guaranteed.
- Is the focus purely community use or can we broaden that to small businesses or is that a separate piece of work?
 - Staff advised that we can and do currently include business hire and there is a fee/charge for that. Confirmation that the Community Connections team is focussed on attracting user groups aligned to community services outcomes which align with NHC purpose, but do not exclude commercial businesses.

The Committee was encouraged to forward any further comments or questions via email to Ms Fyfe.

Moved Mayor Hanna

Seconded Councillor Taylor

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Provided feedback on the opportunities to increase utilisation of community centres.

Carried unanimously.

8 Reports for Noting - Nil

9 Workshop / Presentation Items - Nil

10 Other Business

11 Meeting Closure

The meeting shall conclude on or before 8.00pm unless there is a specific motion adopted at the meeting to continue beyond that time.

The meeting was declared closed at 8.02pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 6 DAY OF JUNE 2023

CHAIRPERSON