

## **COUNCIL MEETING**

**Minutes of the Corporation of the City of Unley  
Council Meeting  
Held on Monday 22 August 2011 at 7.00pm  
In the Civic Centre  
181 Unley Road Unley**

### **PRESENT**

His Worship the Mayor Mr L Clyne (Presiding Member)

Councillors	M Hudson	J Koumi
	R Sangster	M Saies
	J Boisvert	D Palmer
	A Lapidge	P Hughes
	D Tipper	R Schnell
	R Salaman	M Hewitson

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

Chief Executive Officer, Mr R Pincombe  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Ms C Umapathysivam  
General Manager City Services, Ms M Bonnici  
Acting General Manager City Development, Ms C Luya  
Manager Governance & Strategic Projects, Ms V Minenko  
Manager Transport & Traffic, Mr C Mountain  
Project Manager, Mr A Johns  
Policy & Grant Attractions Coordinator, Ms D Horton  
Manager Community Development, Ms D Richardson  
Executive Assistant City Development, Ms K Jaensch  
Executive Assistant to Deputy CEO, Ms C Gowland

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The Presiding Member opened the meeting with the Aboriginal Acknowledgement.

### **PRAYER**

Members stood in silence in memory of those who had made the Supreme Sacrifice in the service of their country, at sea, on land and in the air.

## **WELCOME**

The Presiding Member welcomed Members of Council, Senior Staff, members of the gallery and the media to the August 2011 meeting of the Unley City Council.

## **APOLOGIES**

Nil

## **ITEM 208** **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

MOVED Councillor Palmer  
SECONDED Councillor Lapidge

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday 25 July 2011, as printed as circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

## **ITEM 209** **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – SPECIAL COUNCIL**

MOVED Councillor Salaman  
SECONDED Councillor Sangster

That the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on Monday 15 August 2011, as printed and circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The Presiding Member, with two thirds majority of the Council, advised that he would bring forward all the Motions on Notice and the Deputations, at the conclusion of the confirmation of the Committee Minutes.

**ITEM 210**  
**CEO PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

MOVED Councillor Lapidge  
SECONDED Councillor Schnell

That

1. The minutes of the CEO Performance Review Committee meeting held on Thursday 28 July 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Item 1 be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 211**  
**CEO RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

MOVED Councillor Sangster  
SECONDED Councillor Lapidge

That:

1. The minutes of the CEO Recruitment Committee held on Monday 1 August 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 1 – 4 inclusive, be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 212**  
**CITY OF UNLEY ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE MINUTES**

MOVED Councillor Tipper  
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

That:

1. The minutes of the City of Unley Road Safety Committee meeting held on Wednesday 10 August 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 27 – 32 inclusive, be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 213**

**CITY STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES**

MOVED Councillor Schnell  
SECONDED Councillor Saies

That Item 56 Kelvin Avenue Clarence Park - Proposed Road Closure, be adjourned to the City Strategy and Policy Committee Meeting to be held in September 2011 to enable further consideration by Members.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

MOVED Councillor Schnell  
SECONDED Councillor Hewitson

That:

1. The minutes of the City Strategy and Policy Committee meeting held on Monday 15 August 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 57 – 59 inclusive, be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 214**

**UNLEY BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

MOVED Councillor Salaman  
SECONDED Councillor Koumi

That:

1. The minutes of the Unley Business and Economic Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 August 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 19 – 21 inclusive, be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 215**

**CEO PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

MOVED Councillor Schnell

SECONDED Councillor Lapidge

That:

1. The minutes of the CEO Performance Review Committee special meeting held on Thursday 18 August 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 3 – 5 inclusive, be adopted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**DEPUTATIONS**

Mr Danny Tsimiklis, proprietor of Free – The Best Things in Life, made a deputation to the Council on Culvert Street Unley.

Councillor Palmer left the meeting at 7.29pm after the above deputation.

Mr Daniel Pritchard made a deputation to the Council on Culvert Street Unley.

Councillor Palmer returned to the meeting at 7.30pm during the above deputation.

**ITEM 230**

**NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR SALAMAN RE CULVERT STREET UNLEY**

MOVED Councillor Salaman  
SECONDED Councillor Hudson

That:

1. The resolution of Council on 27 April 2011 (Item 126):

That:

1. *The report be received.*
2. *Proceed with the construction of the DTEI approved and contracted design of a one way (western end only) Culvert Street (as per Attachment 1 to report 125/11).*

be varied.

2. Culvert Street, from the junction with Unley Road, to a point approximately 65 metres east (opposite No 28 Culvert Street) revert to two way traffic operation.
3. The slow point adjacent to the shared path crossing point remain a half road closure.
4. Minor modifications to the northern footpath at the western end of Culvert Street be made, as shown on Attachment 1 to allow eastbound vehicles to store while westbound vehicles pass.
5. This section of Culvert Street remain two way until the pedestrian activated lights on Unley Road are activated, at which time the shared path be completed, and one way working be reinstated.

**FORMAL MOTION**

MOVED Councillor Hewitson  
Seconded Councillor Lapidge

The debate on this matter be adjourned until the next Council Meeting to enable the Administration to undertake design works and obtain formal quotations from the contractor.

**CARRIED ON CASTING VOTE OF MAYOR CLYNE**

Councillor Boisvert left the meeting at 8.07pm returning at 8.08pm during discussion on the above Item.

Councillor Palmer left the meeting at 8.24pm returning at 8.26pm during discussion on the above Item.

Councillor Koumi left the meeting at 8.33pm returning at 8.34pm during discussion on the above Item.

Councillor Hudson left the meeting at 8.36pm returning at 8.37pm during discussion on the above Item.

## **DIVISION**

Those voting in the affirmative:

Councillors Saies, Lapidge, Hughes, Tipper, Schnell, Hewitson and Mayor Clyne.

Those voting in the negative:

Councillors Hudson, Koumi, Sangster, Boisvert, Palmer and Salaman.

The Motion was declared **CARRIED**

Councillor Salaman left the meeting at 8.48pm.

Councillor Hudson left the meeting at 8.48pm returning at 8.49pm.

## **ITEM 231**

### **NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KOUMI REGARDING CODE OF PRACTICE MEETING PROCEDURES.**

MOVED Councillor Koumi

SECONDED Councillor Saies

That:

Council endorse the following clauses to be included in the Code of Practice – Meeting Procedures under the heading of:

#### *Division 2 – Prescribed Procedures*

#### *9. Setting of Agenda*

- (5) Decisions of Council not yet completed are to be listed at the beginning of the agenda with a very brief indication of their status and estimated time of completion, or instigation, in the case of ongoing activities.*
- (6) At the end of the agenda there be provided a list and a précis of officer's reports currently being prepared by the administration for the next meeting of the Council or Committee (ie if to be dealt with at a committee level then they are listed in that committee's agenda).*

*Clause (5) and (6) do not apply to items that are, or likely to be, confidential.*

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Councillor Salaman returned to the meeting at 8.50pm during discussion on the above Item.

**ITEM 232**

**NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR BOISVERT RE DEPUTY MAYOR**

MOVED Councillor Boisvert  
SECONDED Councillor Hewitson

That:

1. Councillor Lapidge be elected as Deputy Mayor from 22/8/2011 until 14/12/2012.

**LOST**

**DIVISION**

Those voting in the affirmative:

Councillors Saies, Boisvert and Tipper.

Those voting in the negative:

Councillors Hudson, Koumi, Sangster, Palmer, Lapidge, Hughes, Schnell, Salaman and Hewitson.

The Motion was declared **LOST**



**ITEM 216**  
**MAYOR'S REPORT**

MOVED Councillor Schnell  
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

That:

1. The report be received.

**CARRIED**

Copy attached.

## **MAYOR'S REPORT**

FOCUSED COUNCIL .....	11
CEO SELECTION PROCESS .....	11
CEO REVIEW PROCESS.....	11
STRATEGIC PLANNING .....	11
COUNCIL'S BUDGET.....	12
BUSINESS IN UNLEY .....	12
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION.....	12
RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE CITY OF UNLEY .....	12
RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MEDIA.....	13
PUBLIC DIARY .....	13

## **FOCUSED COUNCIL**

There have been some unfortunate distractions for the Elected Member (EMs) body this month. It is heartening to see that overall this Council maintains its ability to focus on the important issues at hand such as the recruitment process for our new CEO. We must deal with setting our new strategic plan, dealing with our Strategic Building Review, developing our Ageing Strategy and ensuring that the services we deliver in the community reflect those services which the community will use now and into the future.

## **CEO SELECTION PROCESS**

The City of Unley completes its first nine months and heads into the tenth month of this four year term. The CEO selection process is underway with the CEO Selection Panel having since the last Council meeting selected a recruitment company and overseen the Action Plan, and facilitation of communication between the Elected Members and consultants as we work towards finalizing Key Result Areas for our new CEO. Overall the tempo of this process is high. There have been procedural issues in relation to identifying what constitutes a meeting and who can attend and also the timing of the advertisement for the position. I thank the EMs on the committee as much as I thank those EMs not on the committee who have attended along with the recruitment consultant and members of staff for ensuring that these issues have been overcome. The process this change will generate naturally generates discussion within the entire organization and we must as a whole remain confident in the immediate tasks at hand and focus on our own roles and responsibilities without getting swept away in distractions of which we have no control.

## **CEO REVIEW PROCESS**

This process draws nearer to a successful conclusion. A warm thanks to the CEO Review Panel and the external consultants who carried out the work along with all EMs who contributed to the process. This is the first time an external consultant has conducted a review and I congratulate the Council for being strong enough to ensure it happened. There were many issues which came out of this process which will make good grist for the new CEO. It was good to see the review process show that, overall, our organization has a competent CEO leaving the City of Unley and local government at the top of their game.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING**

For good governance to occur we need money allocated to the areas we believe will best benefit the ratepayers. To achieve this we need to achieve a Strategic Vision and Strategic Plan. The development of a Strategic Plan is considered by many on this Council as the most important guiding document we will create. We need to feel comfortable that the way we are forming this Strategic Plan is heading in the right direction.

## **COUNCIL'S BUDGET**

Whilst many EMs have expressed their frustration with the last budget not having delivered on a number of specific areas of interest, as a group it is good to know we are aware of two factors which played a significant role in this outcome. The first being consideration that a major portion of funds had to be allocated towards the potential purchase of an asset and the second being that there are a number of projects which were in the pipeline and needed to be funded for the sake of continuity.

There were EM grumblings in relation to the process used to create the 2011-12 budget. I agree with some of these grumblings. Importantly, there have been some good ideas bantered around in relation to how we can improve the process. The meeting scheduled for next Friday to discuss this is likely to be canceled due to the possibility of a Special Council Meeting but will be rescheduled as a matter of priority.

## **BUSINESS IN UNLEY**

Congratulations to Hyde Park Rotary for the way they continue to organize the Unley Business Breakfast. These are great ways for the business community to meet new people. The next Business Breakfast will be on Tuesday morning at 7am on the 7<sup>th</sup> of September in the Civic Centre.

There have been reports of increases in vacancies on some of our Main Streets. As a Council we look to the leadership of the Main Street Trader Associations to give us guidance and advise on what strategies we can assist them to achieve and what we ourselves may need to do in order to ensure Unley remains at the pinnacle and front of mind to all shoppers in South Australia.

## **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Until we can implement successful engagement strategies and see them working successfully through projects from inception to completion there will remain to be a level of discontent within the EM body which undoubtedly reflects the mood of the community. I am heartened by the desire of the Council to reflect the desires of the community through the decisions of this Council which I am sure will remain to be subjective and contested until we can effectively gauge the mood of the community through consultation.

## **RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE CITY OF UNLEY**

This organization must work hard to ensure that we have good working relationships between Councillors as a group, between Councillors and Senior Staff, between Councillors and the Community and between staff and the community. No breakdown is irreparable and it is in the best interests of the Unley Ratepayers that we strive to have good relations.

## RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MEDIA

I am heartened to see there is a growing profile of many EMs in the local Eastern Courier Messenger and I encourage the Eastern Courier Messenger to continue in raising the profile of all EMs.

## PUBLIC DIARY

### JUL

Tue	26	The Magna Carta Lecture 2011
Wed	27	Bank of Cyprus Australia Business Forum (Crs Koumi, Hewitson, Sangster)
Thu	28	CEO Performance Review Meeting
Fri	29	Photo with Sandy Schultz (Mrs/Ms Australia Quest). Unley Digital Strategy. Cr Schnell attends exhibition at The Xi Gallery
Sat	30	
Sun	31	

### AUG

Mon	1	CEO Recruitment Committee
Tue	2	
Wed	3	Official opening by Hon Kelly Vincent - artworks by Community Bridging Services (David Pisoni MP, Rachael Sanderson MP). SA Road Runners Club and St Spyridons (Cr. Hughes). Where Business meets Art. Meeting with George Karzis, CEO and Council re: Mayor's legal rights. Informal discussion with Stillwell Management Consultants (Crs Hughes, Koumi, Lapidge, Boisvert and Hudson)
Thur	4	Georgia Woods - present Mayor with her ideas on how to keep the environment clean (following the Mayor's talk at Goodwood Primary). Mayor's morning tea with Cottage staff. Meet with President/CEO/Project Managers of Adelaide Showground. Mayoral Reception to celebrate 30th Anniversary of Safer Communities Australia Inc (Governor Kevin Scarce, Mark Goldsworthy MP, Crs Lapidge, Sangster, Boisvert, Koumi, Tipper, Hudson, Palmer, Hughes, Saies, Salaman, Hewitson)
Fri	5	Meet with Sturt FC CEO Matt Benson and President Jason Kilic with CEO Ray Pincombe. Mayor/Cr Saies catch up. Meet Peter Photakis re Book launch. Mayor to officially open SALA exhibition featuring artists of Latvian background
Sat	6	Pre game luncheon - Centrals v. Sturt and game with Mayor of Playford Glenn Docherty
Sun	7	Unley Symphony Orchestra (Crs Palmer and Koumi)
Mon	8	Drinks and Nibbles with Adelaide Potters Committee Members (Cr Hughes)
Tue	9	Strategic Building Review (Crs Salaman and Palmer). Mayor/Cr Sangster catch up. Urban Myth (Cr Sangster). King William Rd Traders Association Inc AGM
Wed	10	Sturt Football club business breakfast. Mayor/Cr Lapidge catch up. Meet the author Fiona McCallum - author of Paycheque.

		Road Safety committee meeting.
		Rotary Club of Hyde Park meeting (Cr Sangster).
		CEO Recruitment Committee meeting.
Thu	11	Culvert Street site meeting (Crs Salaman, Hudson). Official blessing and opening of the refurbished Pre School facilities - St Thomas School (Kate Ellis MP)
Fri	12	Sturt Football Club "drinks with the council". Mainstreet Australia marketing strategy with East End Trader's Association.
Sat	13	Launch of the Variety Bash on King William Rd. Glenelg v Sturt (Cr Hughes and Mayor Roland)
Sun	14	Opening of Adelaide Potters Club 2011 SALA exhibition (Crs Schnell, Palmer, Hughes)
Mon	15	Libraries Board Tour. Special Meeting of Council. City Strategy and Policy Committee Meeting.
Tue	16	Unley RSL general meeting. Unley Business and Economic Development committee meeting.
Wed	17	DPA 3A - Elected Member workshop. Unley Concert Band AGM
Thu	18	CEO Performance Review Committee
Frid	19	Urban Myth, (Cr Lapidge, Hughes). Sturt v Magpies.
Sat	20	
Sun	21	
Mon	21	Council Bus Tour. Full Council Meeting.

The following months will remain a busy time for this Council as we continue to deal with the issues that are most important to the residents at large.

Councillor Palmer left the Chambers at 9.32pm.

**ITEM 217**  
**REPORTS OF MEMBERS**

**Items of Particular Interest, Concern or Urgency**

MOVED Councillor Hewitson  
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

Councillor Hudson's Matter of Concern be included in the Minutes.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

A copy of Councillor Hudson's statement appears as Attachment 1 to these Minutes.

Councillor Salaman – concerned regarding late information on Culvert Street.  
Councillor Schnell – legal advice – plain speak. Can LGA use information received. Street meeting with Federal and State Government representatives to address resident's concerns, including freight train diversion.  
Councillor Hewitson – Culvert Street, crossing and bikeway.  
Councillor Saies – Freight train diversion.

**Centennial Park Cemetery Authority**

Councillor Lapidge provided Members with information from the last Board meeting. New website for Centennial Park Cemetery Authority has been created, easier to access information. Open day on 23 October.

**Development Matters**

Nil.

Councillor Hewitson left the meeting at 9.30pm returning at 9.31pm during discussion on the above Items.

Councillor Saies left the meeting at 9.42pm returning at 9.43pm during discussion on the above Items.

Councillor Salaman left the meeting at 9.52pm returning at 9.53pm during discussion on the above Items.

**ITEM 218**

**EASTERN REGION ALLIANCE (ERA) – FEDERAL INITIATIVES GROUP**

MOVED Councillor Schnell  
SECONDED Councillor Hughes

1. The report be received.
2. An amount of \$10 000 be allocated from the City Management Budget for the operational costs associated with the ERA Federal Initiatives Group.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 219**

**OUTDOOR DINING – PROVISION OF DISCOUNTED RATES FOR NON SMOKING AREAS**

MOVED Councillor Boisvert  
SECONDED Councillor Saies

That:

1. The report be received.
2. A 50% reduction in the annual fees be available to those outdoor dining permit holders who are prepared to ban smoking in their outdoor dining permit area in accordance with the conditions shown in Attachment 3 to Item 219/11.
3. The City of Unley Schedule of Fees and Charges be amended to include the rates shown in Attachment 4 to Item 219/11 for non smoking outdoor dining areas.
4. All current outdoor dining applicants be advised of the decision.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**



**ITEM 220**  
**INNER METRO RIM STRUCTURE PLAN**

MOVED Councillor Boisvert  
SECONDED Councillor Hewitson

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The 'Inner Metro Rim Structure Plan (16 August 2011)' be endorsed, subject to
  - a) 'high streets' being designated on the sector Plans for the activity centre nodes on Unley , Goodwood and Glen Osmond Roads; and
  - b) the strategic transport priority implications for the future development and centres to the south on Fullarton Road being recognised.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 221**  
**AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION'S ROADS TO RECOVERY SUPPORT CAMPAIGN**

MOVED Councillor Tipper  
SECONDED Councillor Lapidge

That:

1. The report be received.
2. Support for the Australian Local Government Association's campaign for increased and ongoing funds for the Federal Government's Road to Recovery Funding Program (R2RP) be provided in writing to the Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition, Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and all South Australian Federal House of Representatives and Senators calling for:
  - 2.1 recognition of the successful delivery of the R2RP by Local Government since its inception;
  - 2.2 the continuance of the R2RP on a permanent basis to assist Local Government to meet its responsibilities of providing access for its communities;
  - 2.3 the provision for an increased level of funding under a future R2RP that recognises the shortfall of funding on local roads of \$1.2 billion annually.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 222**  
**END OF MONTH FINANCIAL REPORT**

MOVED Councillor Schnell  
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

That:

1. The report be received.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ITEM 223**  
**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR SALAMAN RE GLEN**  
**OSMOND CREEK UPGRADE AND LINEAR PATH**

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Salaman and the answers are provided:

**Questions**

1. *Regarding the Unley Road PAC north of Culvert Street, when was the decision made to install?*

Answer:

Council endorsed the report at the meeting held on 26 July 2010 which referred to the installation of a PAC on Unley Road, as shown in Attachment 3 to report 335/10.

2. *Who made this decision?*

Answer:

The installation of a pedestrian actuated crossing was a feature of a report to the City Strategy and Policy Committee (Item 335/10) that was subsequently endorsed by Council in July 2010.

3. *Were elected members consulted at that stage, or was the PAC included in later consultation documents without comment?*

Answer:

In the report to Council on 26 July 2010, reference was made to the pedestrian crossing in Table 1 Glen Osmond Creek Linear Trail Improvement Opportunities which summarized the issues raised as part of the consultation process and the Administration's proposed response.

4. *Following the failure to obtain Black Spot funding, what alternative sources of funding are being explored?*

Answer:

Discussions have been held with DTEI regarding other possible funding options and also the Department of Planning and Local Government.

5. *Concerning the costs of the Glen Osmond Creek upgrade, there have been variations, including the Contaminated Soil blowout. What have been the variations to date, and what is the projected project cost, and how does it compare to budget?*

Answer:

A summary of the Budget will be provided prior to the Council meeting.

Availability of Project Management staff has prevented the answer from being provided prior to the deadline for collation of the agenda.

6. *Regarding the changed traffic conditions, when is the traffic impact mitigation report on the changed conditions and traffic volumes on Culvert and adjoining streets to be presented to council?*

Answer:

A summary of the report prepared by Tonkin Consulting entitled Culvert Street - One Way Street Traffic Impact Assessment was included in a report to Council on 27 April 2011.

7. *Will major parking restrictions have to be considered in Whittam Street and part of Porter Street?*

Answer:

No. Parking is already restricted to one side of the road only in order to maintain access through the street.

8. *Will the proposed Rugby-Maud-Porter Streets Cycle Route have an impact, or be impacted on by increased traffic travelling east along Culvert Street?*

Answer:

The proposed Rugby-Maud-Porter Street Cycle Route will continue to use Porter Street to provide a link to Greenhill Road as does the current bicycle route. It is not expected that the changes to traffic conditions in Porter, Whittam or Dunks Street as a result of the introduction of one way traffic conditions in the western end of Culvert Street will impact upon the operation of this part of the cycle route.

The operation of these junctions will be investigated following a recommendation from the City of Unley Road Safety Committee at its meeting held on 10 August 2011.

9. *How many cyclists and pedestrians use the Charles Lane linear path?*

Answer:

We are unable to provide any information as we have not undertaken any pedestrian or bicycle counts on this route.

10. *How many cyclists and how many pedestrians are expected to use the completed shared path once the PAC is in operation?*

Answer:

It is expected that once the section of the shared path between the Windsor Linear Trail and Unley Road is completed, pedestrians and cyclists will use it. However, as this is a new facility, it is not possible to accurately predict the level of usage.

11. *How many parking spaces have been lost as a result of the reconstruction of Culvert Street?*

Answer:

While there has been a loss of some parking spaces at the slow point and also as a result of the no stopping area, located east of the slow point to allow vehicles to turn around, parking has been created on the southern side of Culvert Street.

12. *At completion of the project, will there be a net loss or gain in on street parking places?*

Answer:

There has been a net increase of approximately 10 car parking spaces in Culvert Street.

13. *How many will be lost on Unley Road once the PAC is commissioned?*

Answer:

The installation of a PAC would result in the loss of 4 spaces, 2 on the eastern side, north of Culvert Street and 2 on the western side, south of the access to the car park.

14. *Elected Members and the Public had been assured on several occasions that the shared way would be "meandering" which is visually more appealing than the gunbarrel straight part from Unley Road to the Depot. This would encourage cyclists to keep to a reasonable speed. Every version of the landscape plan showed this to be so. Windsor Street award-winning linear path is meandering and is very attractive. Why were Members not advised that its extension, would now be straight?*

Answer:

The shared path is not straight, but it does meander less than was indicated on the early consultation sketches.

The "meandering" of the path was reduced during the final design and construction phases of the project as a result of receiving advice that showed a very high potential risk of premature cracking of the path at each location where the path steps off of the culvert.

Staff did consider alternate solutions but each achievable option came at significant cost variation potentially.

Additionally, where the path meanders into the "garden area" it left a section of exposed culvert that becomes a dead spot where planting cannot occur.

As a result of both of the above issues, the path has become "straighter" than initially expected. The section between Henry Codd Reserve and George Street is the "straightest" of the three, so may appear more prominent until we achieve fuller growth of the new trees and lower level plantings.

Elected Members were not advised of the changes because they were considered to be minor (rightly or wrongly) and were agree after consideration of relevant technical and engineering advice.

Members may wish to also note that for similar reason the paved leaf motives will be painted on the bitumen. This work will occur in conjunction with and compliment the artwork design and installation.

15. *When was the decision to straighten the path made?*

Answer:

On or about 26 May 2011.

16. *Who made the decision, and why?*

Answer:

Project Management staff, in consultation with engineering consultants, made this decision considering it to be a minor technical matter resulting in a change to the scope of works.

17. *The Windsor Street path meanders on and off the box culvert alignment on Windsor Street, yet the plants are flourishing, why cannot the same approach be adopted here?*

Answer:

Differing engineering concerns and levels resulted in different solutions between projects.

Windsor Street has a different path construction methodology. The downside to Windsor Street is that the watering need for the gardens is very high and the nature of the planting are restricted by the shallow nature of some portions of the gardens.

The culverts in Windsor Street are also lower (ie deeper underground) than the garden beds, thus providing a soil base (albeit shallow). This is

not possible to achieve in the case of the Glen Osmond Creek project due to the height of the culverts.

18. *What is the dollar value of savings by straitening out the path, bearing in mind that the Tender would have been for the design on the plan is shown to Elected Members?*

Answer:

There are no savings resulting from this minor realignment.

19. *Were holes bored in the box culverts to accept storm water pipes from the rear of Maud Street properties?*

Answer:

Yes. For some properties at the eastern end of the lane.

20. *If so, why were these pipes not installed to avert the minor flooding problems now occurring?*

Answer:

These works have not been completed as yet.

Storm water run-off from some Maud Street properties were not intended to connect individually to the culvert drain but rather to a parallel connector pipe with a single connection located further west.

Once these works are completed, the minor 'flow-back' will be rectified.

21. *Were pipes installed, then removed? If so, why?*

Answer:

The work was temporary to ensure minimized periods of disruption to residents during recent expected rains.

22. *As the box culvert sections were installed the sides and top each junction were sealed, in fact a significant tree had to be removed to allow working space for sealing. Since the seal must have been considered important, will the tops of ALL the still exposed (9 August), where the seal has been destroyed be replaced? Will the repairs be completed before the landscaping begins?*

Answer:

The contractor will replace those sections with appropriate seals where required, where the seal has been damaged by traffic movements prior to laying the geo-matting and bitumen.

23. *Please confirm that a turning bay will be installed just east of the slow point / half road closure.*

Answer:

A turning bay will be installed in Culvert Street.

24. *The PAC preliminary designs show concrete raised medians north and south of the PAC. Does the Department have a strong preference to ban right hand turns from Unley Road into Culvert Street?*

Answer:

It is the preferred option of DTEI to ban right turns for northbound traffic on Unley Road turning into Culvert Street however it was the request of the City of Unley that this turning movement be retained.

25. *Please confirm right turns into Culvert /street will still be permitted when the PAC is in operation.*

Answer: The retention of the right turn movement from Unley Road into Culvert Street is the subject of ongoing discussions with DTEI.

26. *Has the issue of the concrete spoon drain and bitumen placed on private property south of the new box culvert has been satisfactorily resolved to the owners satisfaction.*

Answer:

These works were identified in the Concept and Final plans for the project.

Discussions commenced in late 2010 at which time the owner verbally agreed for the works to occur.

Last week a meeting was held with the owner who remains committed to either selling this small strip of land or entering an agreement so that Council assumes care and control. This cost is factored into the budget and will be approximately \$5 000 plus legal costs.

27. *What efforts are being made either to obtain funding for the box culvert replacement under Unley Road, or to encourage the Department to undertake the work themselves without delay, with or without a contribution from Council?*

Answer:

Negotiations with DTEI are on-going.

These negotiations have been progressed alongside of discussions about the funding for the Pedestrian Crossing on Unley Road.

28. *Were any of the objections to the transformation of Culvert Street passed on to DTEI during, or after the consultation period?*

Answer:

Yes. DTEI have been requested to review their decision on three occasions.

**ITEM 224**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR SALAMAN RE  
CROSSOVER AT CULVERT STREET**

I have been advised that a collision occurred last week when a car reversing out of the Free Shop car park collided with a car reversing out of the Kitchen Shop car park opposite, causing property damage only. (See Attachment 1.)

1. *Since the road has been narrowed to about half its previous width, is it probable this type of collision become a frequent occurrence?*

Answer:

Although the roadway has been narrowed, the effective distance between the parking areas is unchanged. The introduction of one way traffic at the western end of Culvert Street eliminates west bound traffic movements, therefore it is not considered that there will be an increase in the frequency of collisions at this location.

Motorists, however, have a duty of care when reversing out of any property onto a roadway to ensure that they can do so without endangering pedestrians, cyclists or other colliding with other vehicles.

2. *Has the potential conflict at the crossover been taken into consideration at the planning stage?*

Answer:

Yes.

3. *If so, please provide details.*

Answer:

The western end of Culvert Street is unobstructed to ensure there are clear lines of sight for motorists reversing out of the parking bays. Also motorists turning in from Unley Road are able to see any vehicles reversing out of the angle parking bays.

4. *What is planned to reduce the risk of conflict between traffic entering and leaving the Kitchen Shops five parking spaces to pedestrians and in particular, cyclists speeding along the "shared path"?*

Answer:

Pavement markings will be installed indicating it is a shared zone.

5. *Is there any option other than declaring the "one way" section of Culvert Street between Unley Road and the slow point to the east a shared zone with a 10 km/h speed limit?*



Answer:

No because it was not possible to meeting DTEI minimum kerb radius requirements and to successfully accommodate a complying kerb ramp within the existing road alignment. This could only be achieved by widening the northern footpath.

6. *Should the present situation remain unchanged, what liability will Council or the Consultants have in the event of an accident in this location?*

Answer:

The level of liability would be dependent upon on the circumstances in which an accident occurred and would be determined through an independent legal process representing the parties involved.

7. *When (if) the PAC is installed will the situation become potentially worse as cyclists speed up in front of the Kitchen Shop car park to catch a green light at Unley Road?*

Answer:

Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians have a duty of care to be aware of their environment and drive, cycle or walk accordingly.

8. *Regarding the meandering path, which was to be a highlight of the landscaping of the shared way, I am aware that a plan submitted as an attachment to Item 7 of the May 2011 DAP, by Swanbury Penglase Plan 08517 WD15 marked "FOR CONSTRUCTION, REVISED DOCUMENT, REPLACES EARLIER ISSUE". This plan clearly shows a meandering and landscaped path west of Henry Codd reserve. Is this plan part of the Contract Documents? (Attachment 2.)*

Answer:

This contract change was made on or about 26 May 2011.

9. *Did the landscaping tender include provision of the meandering path?*

Answer:

Yes

10. *If yes, would this work have been allowed for in the contract, and the tender priced accordingly?*

Answer :

Yes

11. *How much credit has been allowed for deleting the meandering path? If none, why?*

Answer:

There will be no credit requested for this design amendment which was relatively minor.

12. *Who authorized this departure from the design plans which had gone out to Public Consultation, and generally met with Public approval?*

Answer:

Project Management staff, in consultation with engineering consultants, made this decision considering it to be a minor technical matter resulting in a change to the scope of works.

13. *Can the proposed "gunbarelling" of the path feature in special edition of Project News or will a newsletter be distributed in the area to keep residents informed of the change, and the reasons for it?*

Answer:

Yes it can.

**ITEM 225**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR HUDSON RE CULVERT UNDER UNLEY ROAD**

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Hudson and the answers are provided:

**Questions**

**Unley Road culvert**

1. *Who initiated the "guaranteed verbal agreement" with DTEI over the cost of the alteration of the culvert under Unley Road?*

Answer:

The following is an excerpt from the December 2010 Report (Item 32/10)

*The Administration had previously received a verbal undertaking from DTEI that they would commit the required funds. This funding relates to the replacement of the culvert under Unley Road and subsequent reinstatement of the road. When a written commitment was sought DTEI informed the Administration that they were unable to provide this until the 2011/2012 budget cycle. Recent discussions with DTEI indicate they are still committed to this project but that the funding is not guaranteed and would still not occur until the following financial year. This would result in any contribution being received after the project is completed.*

The Manager Assets initiated negotiations with DTEI in early 2010 following on from negotiations in 2007.

2. *On what date?*

Answer:

Earlier telephone discussions and emails were formalised in correspondence dated 8 August 2010.

3. *With whom?*

Answer:

DTEI – Mr J Goode.

4. *Is there any record of this matter?*

Answer:

There are records of formal correspondence August 2010 and January 2011.

5. *When did Administration know that DTEI had reneged on the funding?*

Answer:

The negative outcome of the 2010 negotiations of funding was indicated by DTEI in December 2010.

In February 2011 negotiations were escalated to a more senior level and DTEI agreed at that time to review their position in consultation with Council staff. The outcome of this review is not yet known.

Negotiations have continued and we still await the outcome.

An extract of the February Report (Item 78/11) is provided to clarify this:  
*Negotiations have been escalated with DTEI to determine their commitment to funding this infrastructure. During negotiations DTEI have indicated:*

- *The culvert is schedule for replacement in 2030/31.*
- *No budget proposal has been submitted by them for the upcoming financial year; and*
- *that they are prepared to review the need to upgrade the culvert as it relates to flood potential. The review will commence soon and will involve staff of the Council.*

*Relocation of Telstra services is required to facilitate the culvert upgrade and replacement. Telstra have indicated that they cannot proceed as previously thought and that a delay of 9 months will be required. In essence this delay means that the upgrade of the Unley Road Culvert cannot occur within the timeframe of this project ie for completion by August 2011.....It is suggested that negotiations*

*with DTEI about this culvert upgrade continue, however the emphasis being on DTEI taking full responsibility for its replacement and its cost.*

6. *When were Elected Members informed of this?*

Answer:

Elected Members were informed in a workshop and Council Report in December 2010 and again after negotiations were escalated in accordance with Council resolution on this matter in February 2011.

7. *If there was a delay, why?*

Answer:

There was no delay.

8. *Is flooding caused by the restricted flow beneath Unley Road?*

Answer:

Flooding is caused by a number of factors not this single factor. It is correct that the restriction under Unley Road is one of the factors.

As previously advised to Council we are unable to 'shift' any flooding downstream regardless of whether the culverts are upgraded or not.

When the culverts are upgraded a 'flow restrictor' will be required to be installed until such time as the upstream and downstream flood mitigation works are done.

9. *If so, is this the primary cause or only cause of past flooding?*

Answer:

The Unley Road culverts are only one causal factor of local flooding, others include the severity and duration of storm events, drain condition and obstructions. Prior to the upgrade of this section of the creek the open nature of the drain and its lower capacity also contributed to flooding.

10. *If so, does this need to be addressed to avoid future flooding?*

Answer:

Yes - Subject to the completion of flood mitigation works both up and downstream of Unley Road, culvert replacement will ultimately be required to achieve system wide 1:100 capabilities.

11. *Is the continued inability of the culvert under Unley Road to handle floodwaters the reason for the appearance of 20 "eyelids" towards the western end of Culvert Street?*

Answer:

The Crown units are required as a result of the inability of the downstream system to cope with a greater than 1:5 event.

12. *When did these "eyelids" first appear on the plans for Culvert Street?*

Answer:

Pre construction detail design tender drawings dated 13 August 2010 show the Crown units and lintels.

13. *Were residents informed of the reason for the "eyelids"?*

Answer:

No specific information relating to the crown units and lintels was provided.

14. *If not, why not, given their only purpose would seem to be to project storm water into Culvert Street?*

Answer:

Because they were minor detail design features.

15. *How often is it predicted that the "eyelids" will need to be operational?*

Answer:

In greater than a 1:5 event.

16. *Why were the "eyelids" engineered such that they posed a perceived risk to children/pets?*

Answer:

They are not engineered to pose a threat.

17. *Why was it that an Elected Member (Councillor Schnell) had to identify the risk, rather than the responsible Council staff member?*

Answer:

The risk concerns were identified by staff and Cr Schnell soon after the lintels were installed.

Refer Memo 15 August 2011 for further information.

18. *What remedial action was taken?*

Answer:

A bar has being installed across the width of the openings to minimise any incursion risk.

19. *When?*

Answer:

Works completed on 16 August 2011..

20. *The profile of Culvert Street towards the western end of Culvert Street has, we have been told, treated for a "spoon" profile to accommodate floodwaters directed into the street by the "eyelids". Is this "spoon" sufficient to protect residential properties on the northern side of Culvert Street from flooding?*

Answer:

These works will not 'flood proof' Culvert Street but, in conjunction with greater culvert 'holding' capacity will minimise the effects in any given significant event.

21. *What has happened to the proposal for a concrete slab to be inserted in the culvert towards the western end, to inhibit the flow under Unley Road?*

Answer:

The restrictor has not been installed as the current configuration of the Unley Road (DTEI) culverts achieves close to the same effect.

22. *Has this proposal gone ahead?*

Answer:

Refer # 21.

23. *If it has been abandoned, why?*

Answer:

Refer # 21

24. *If it is still to occur, when?*

Answer:

Refer # 21

25. *To what extent does the work required to the creek near the Showgrounds have an effect on the effectiveness of our flood mitigation program?*

Answer:

Works both up and downstream are critical to the effectiveness of our flood mitigation program. The Keswick and Brownhill Creek project proposes significant projects at Ridge Park and downstream diversions to ensure the whole system achieve the required outcomes.

26. *Is it a fact that the electric cabling beneath the culvert area near Unley Road is given as one reason why it is not possible (in the short term) to implement changes to the culvert?*

Answer:

Yes (you refer to Telstra fibre optic cable) – Telstra advised the necessary lifting and re-routing of the cables to allow the installation of culverts under Unley Road would have a 9 month lead time.

27. *Has any estimate been given for the cost of this?*

Answer:

A verbal indicative cost of up to \$150 000 to \$200 000 was indicated.

28. *Will Council be required/requested to contribute to this cost when it eventually occurs?*

Answer:

Council resolved in February 2011 (Item 78/11) that *"the upgrade of the Unley Road culvert not be undertaken by Council"*.

It is not known whether DTEI will require a cost contribution should the funding eventuate.

**One-way project**

29. *Was the one way component part of the original plan?*  
No.

30. *If not, when was it first introduced?*

Answer:

The issue of crossing Unley Road safely was raised in the first round of community consultation in May and June 2010. A number of options were investigated, including an underpass and a pedestrian refuge but these were not considered practical. A pedestrian crossing, located immediately north of Culvert Street was the preferred option and this required the installation of a shared path on the northern side of the western section of Culvert Street to align with the proposed crossing. The widening of the northern footpath to accommodate the shared path reduced the width of the roadway, necessitating the introduction of one way traffic.

31. *When were local residents made aware?*

Answer:

This was part of the information distributed prior to the community meeting held on 14 September 2010.

32. *When were the Elected Members made aware?*

Answer:

Yes, via the report to the City Strategy and Policy Committee (335/10) on 19 July, 2010

33. *Was a formal traffic impact study done to assess the impact of converting Culvert Street to partial one-way?*

Answer:

Yes

34. *By whom?*

Answer:

Tonkin Consulting (report provided to Council on 27 April 2011)

35. *What were the findings?*

Answer:

The westbound traffic that currently uses Culvert Street to access onto Unley Road (approximately 350 vehicles per day) would likely use Whittam Street and Dunks Street.

36. *When were the possible effects on traffic transference to other streets the subject of a survey?*

Answer:

This issue was considered in the report prepared by Tonkin Consulting.

37. *When were the results of the survey made available to local residents?*

Answer:

The results have not been made available directly to the local residents, however the report prepared by Tonkin Consulting was included as an attachment to the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 27 April 2011.

38. *Ditto Elected Members?*

Answer:

The report prepared by Tonkin Consulting was included as an attachment to the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 27 April 2011.

39. *Before or after the joint Salaman/Hudson newsletter?*

Answer:

Information was provided during the April round of meetings, prior to the Salaman / Hudson local newsletter.

40. *What steps were suggested by Administration to ameliorate the potential problems?*

Answer:

No additional changes were recommended as the redistribution of the traffic to Whittam and Dunks Streets represent low overall numbers.



However further traffic data will be collected in these streets when the construction works have been completed.

41. *Have these steps been instigated?*

Answer:

No

42. *If not, when will this happen?*

Answer:

This will take place when the construction works have been completed.

43. *Will there be resident consultation on any proposed parking restrictions?*

Answer:

Yes prior to any proposed changes to parking, consultation would be undertaken.

44. *If so, when?*

Answer:

Upon completion of the Glen Osmond Creek Redevelopment Project.

45. *Has the switch from two-way to one-way been formalized and endorsed by Council?*

Answer:

Yes, it was endorsed by Council at the meeting held on 27 April 2011 (Item 126).

46. *What is the process for formalizing a directional change to road such that members of the public and emergency services are fully aware of the change?*

Answer:

Signs have been installed to establish the one-way traffic conditions at the western end of Culvert Street together with "no through road" signs at the eastern end at the junction with Porter Street.

47. *It is asserted by residents that there was no accompanying written reference or explanation about the one-way aspect in the original consultation documents to them. If this is NOT the case, can we please be supplied with the documentation to residents about the proposal?*

Answer:

Specific advice was not promulgated but consultation plans showing the one-way aspect was included in Item 335 of the Council Agenda for July 2010 (Item 335) and a similar plan was included in the August 2010 Project News.

## **Lights**

48. *What is the estimated cost of the lights/pedestrian refuge on Unley Road?*

Answer:

The estimated cost of the PAC installation is approximately \$190,000.

49. *When did Council Administration first enter into negotiations with DTEI into costing negotiations?*

Answer:

There were discussions with DTEI from June 2010 about the concept of a signalised crossing at this location. A funding application was submitted to DTEI under the Black Spot Program in November 2010.

50. *Why should Council be asked to contribute to what is a DTEI responsibility?*

Answer:

The crossing for Unley Road was applied for under the State Black Spot funding whereby 2/3 funding is supplied by the government for successful projects and 1/3 from the relevant council.

51. *Where did the idea of a two-third contribution from DTEI come from?*

Answer:

State Black Spot Funding requirement as discussed above.

52. *When did Administration first become aware that there would be no DTEI funding?*

Answer:

A letter was received from DTEI on 18 July 2011.

53. *When were Elected Members informed of this (non) development?*

Answer:

An email was sent to all Elected Members on Friday 22 July 2011.

54. *If there was a delay, why?*

Answer:

A delay of a few days occurred to enable follow up with DTEI about the rationale for the unsuccessful funding application and to determine what options were open to the Council.

55. *Was the installation of a crossing the sole reason for the one-way project?*

Answer:

Yes. It was recognised that some form of safe crossing was required in order to get pedestrians and cyclists across Unley Road so that the shared path project could reach its full potential.

56. *If not, what other reasons are there for the one-way component?*

Answer:

The one way option was necessary to provide the shared path on the north-west section of Culvert Street to get pedestrians and cyclists safely across Culvert St to Unley Road. The crossing on Unley Road was to be located just north of Culvert St to avoid undue loss of parking and maintain access on Unley Road to the nearby businesses. Importantly, this location would line up with the existing shared path on the western side of Unley Road, which would allow a crossing perpendicular to the traffic on Unley Road reducing the crosswalk distance.

57. *Is there the possibility of the one-way aspect being put on hold until the lights situation is eventually solved?*

Answer:

Two way traffic cannot be re-introduced with the road conditions that are currently in place.

The reintroduction of two way traffic at the western end of Culvert Street would require alterations to the northern kerb to provide a minimum of 5.5 metres of road width to allow two way traffic. It would also require alterations to the drainage

58. *If not, why not?*

Answer:

Unless the road at the western end of Culvert Street is widened sufficiently to allow two way traffic, there would be a safety issue.

59. *If the answer is yes, what will be the cost to Council?*

Answer: The cost will be provided prior to the Council meeting.

60. *Similarly, what would be the cost to Council to return to the new one-way sector now in place?*

Answer:

Refer # 59.

61. *What financial contribution did Unley make to the pedestrian lights on Goodwood Road?*

Answer:

A one third contribution totalling approx \$60,000 with the remainder paid under the State Black Spot Program.

62. *Was the cost of the lights on Goodwood Road on a par with the probable cost of lights on Unley Road?*

Answer:

Goodwood Road signals cost \$172,000. The cost of the PAC on Unley Road may be slightly more expensive because of the need for special signal footings to bridge the existing Telstra cables. It is estimated that the cost would be in the vicinity of \$190,000.

**Trees**

63. *How many under-sized trees were planted in the section of the pathway between Henry Codd Reserve and Porter Street?*

Answer:

Between 12 and 20.

64. *How much time would this have taken (approximately)?*

Answer:

Estimate several hours.

65. *When was the error brought to Administration's attention?*

Answer:

The defect was noticed by staff during a regular site visit.

66. *Have the trees been replaced?*

Answer:

Yes.

67. *At what cost?*

Answer:

Costs associated with these remedial works are unknown.

68. *At whose expense?*

Answer:

These works were at the Contractor's expense.

**Miscellaneous**

There appears to be a dramatic difference in observations about the work hours on the project.

69. *Is the owner of the Gluten Free Shop (who states he has photographic evidence) correct in his assertion that work nearest his premises*

*stopped early on Friday evening, July (at approximately 6.00pm) and was not recommenced until after the weekend?*

Answer:

No. Works did continued after-hours on the Friday evening and during Saturday until the available base material was exhausted

70. *If he is correct, why did:*

(a) *the foreman of the gang tell me on Friday, July, that his staff would be working back late and have the mesh and large metal in place up to Unley Road by that evening?*

Answer:

N/A.

(b) *why did the Project Manager send an email to various people claiming that work had been carried out until late that day?*

Answer:

N/A

71. *When were the foundations at the western end of Culvert Street up to Unley Road finally completed?*

Answer:

On or around 25 July 2011.

72. *Has the owner of Gluten Free claimed a dramatic drop in trade during the prolonged excavations outside his property?*

Answer:

The owner of Gluten Free has made this claim in correspondence to the Council.

73. *Is Council indemnified against any claim for financial loss due to Council works?*

Answer:

Council is empowered to undertake road construction works which may have an impact on local residents and traders.

Council has Civic Liability Insurance for matters resulting from Council negligence.

In this instance should a claim for financial loss be made the Contractors may be implicated.

74. *If not, why not?*

Answer:

Refer # 73.

75. *Why, given the long lead-up time to the alteration to a one-way street, were the necessary "No exit to Unley Road" signs not ordered ready for immediate placement at the Porter Street entrance when appropriate?*

Answer:

As the area is still a worksite and works are ongoing, the site is technically in the control of the contractor. Temporary signage and access / egress points have been provided to minimise further full road closures.

76. *Is the Administration/Project Manager aware that up to 100 illegal journeys the wrong way up the one-way section were undertaken in the first three and a half days of the roadworks being completed? And that these were done in some cases under the guidance of site workers?*

Answer:

We have heard this from a local business proprietor.

77. *Is the Project Manager also aware that on one occasion a vehicle carrying three males in yellow safety jackets exited Unley Road by traversing the one-way section the incorrect way, when there was no work being undertaken on the road and a legal exit eastwards could have been made to Porter Street?*

Answer:

We have heard this from a local business proprietor.

78. *What parking restrictions have been put in place at the western end of the two-way section to ensure that:*

- (a) *vehicles from Unley Road end can negotiate the chicane safely;*  
*and*
- (b) *that vehicles approaching the one-way section from Porter Street are able to undertake a three-point manoeuvre to retrace their steps?*

Answer:

A no stopping restriction has been installed to provide an area for vehicles to turn around and to ensure that access is maintained for eastbound vehicles through the slow point.

79. *What steps are contemplated to ensure that large commercial vehicles entering Culvert Street from the Porter Street end are made aware of the possible problems of being able to retrace their steps?*

Answer:

The installation of all appropriate signage was completed on 11 August 2011.

**ITEM 226**

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR HUDSON RE CULVERT STREET**

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Hudson and the answers are provided:

A tall steel pole on the northern side of Culvert Street at its junction with Unley Road carried a sign of a black arrow pointing skywards on a white background.

1. *What was this meant to indicate?*

Answer:

This sign was installed incorrectly.

2. *When was it removed?*

Answer:

It was removed on 11 August 2011.

3. *Why?*

Answer:

Appropriate signage replaced this incorrect item.

4. *How is it proposed to indicate clearly to northward bound traffic on Unley Road that in turning right into Culvert Street they are entering a one-way street?*

Answer:

Approved signage has been installed to ensure vehicles travelling either north or south are aware Culvert Street is one-way only from Unley Road.

**ITEM 227**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR HUDSON RE HENRY CODD RESERVE**

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Hudson and the answers are provided:

**Questions**

Extensive footpath work has been undertaken in Henry Codd Reserve.

1. *When were Elected Members, in particular the Parkside Ward Councillors, made aware, by the Administration, of this work?*

Answer:

These works have featured in documents since May 2010 and formed part of Item 335/10 endorsed by Council in July 2010.

2. *If not, why not?*

Answer:

N/A

3. *Was it included in the works programme for the covering of the Glen Osmond Creek?*

Answer:

Yes. These works were included.

4. *Why has a pleasing, moderate-width paved footpath been replaced with a drab tarmac path double the width?*

Answer:

The path is in accordance with the Australian Standards and Codes of Practice for shared pedestrian and bike facilities. It achieves the standard 3 metre wide shared path in line with concept and construction specifications.

5. *Is this to accommodate a shared pathway (pedestrians and pedallists)?*

Answer:

Yes

6. *If so, what work will be undertaken to ensure the safety of children using the existing play equipment only a few feet away from the new footpath?*

Answer:

Fencing adjacent to the park is included (refer August 2010 Project News – concept landscaping sketches).

7. *If so, will there be a need to either relocate the equipment (only recently installed) or erect a safety fence?*

Answer:

A fence will be installed. No play equipment will be relocated.



8. *What has been the cost of the new footpath work?*

Answer:

The works are not new, they formed an element of the contract and tender for the works.

9. *Was it included in the overall cost of the Glen Osmond Creek programme?*

Answer:

Yes

10. *Given the current status of the park with regard to dog exercising, will the new footpath and the necessary removal of the gateway leading in to the Glen Osmond Creek reserve have any affect on that status?*

Answer:

Henry Codd Reserve is currently designated as a "Dogs on Leash Area at All Times". In addition, dogs are not permitted within 3 metres of the playground equipment. It is expected that the status of the park would not change.

The Glen Osmond Creek area is currently designated as a "Dogs on Leash Area at All Times" and it is expected this would also not change.

#### **ITEM 228**

#### **QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR SAIES RE MEDIA MONITORS**

1. *To what extent does the Administration control and/or monitor the information which "Media Monitors" disseminates to Elected Members?*

Answer

Administration do not control or monitor the information disseminated to Elected Members from Media Monitors. All media articles that have been identified by Media Monitors are distributed direct to a Council email address then automatically distributed to Elected Members and identified Administration via an electronic email database.

2. *Is the Administration aware that since the Mayor's arrest on Monday 1 August 2011 no information about the arrest or related events (including opinions expressed in the media on the subject) has been disseminated by "Media Monitors" to Elected Members?*

Answer

Administration was not aware, prior to receiving this question on notice of the claim that all Elected Members were not receiving Media Monitor emails regarding the Mayor's arrest.

Further investigation has however revealed that on the 27 - 28 July 2011 the virus detection server that handles the media monitoring emails failed. When the server was restored, the email distribution list was manually updated from a previous email distribution list and as a consequence some email addresses were not registered and did not receive Media Monitoring notifications.

The Media Monitoring notification email list has been updated (on the 16 August 2011) to include all Elected Members. The back-log of Media Monitors emails from 27 July - 16 August will be sent direct to all Elected Members by the Communications Officer.

3. *Having regard to the significance of the arrest and related events to Council, why has no such information been disseminated to Elected Members?*

Answer

Please refer to question 2.

**ITEM 229**

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

**ITEM 230**

**NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR SALAMAN RE CULVERT STREET UNLEY**

See page 6 of these Minutes.

**ITEM 231**

**NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR KOUMI REGARDING CODE OF PRACTICE MEETING PROCEDURES**

See page 7 of these Minutes.

**ITEM 232**

**NOTICE OF MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR BOISVERT RE DEPUTY MAYOR**

See page 8 of these Minutes.

## **MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

Nil.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

## **ITEM 233**

### **UNRESOLVED ITEMS**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Status</b>
Council 27/10/08	Item 363  Notice of Motion from Councillor Hewitson re Sturt Football Club.	The question remain laid on the table.
Council 22/3/10	Item 622 (UBED Item 46  Adjourned Debate – Item 46 – Unley Business and Economic Development Committee – Glen Osmond Road Separate Rate Negotiation.	The Item lay on the table.

## **CLOSURE**

The Presiding Member closed the meeting at 10.23pm.

.....  
**PRESIDING MEMBER**

.....

**Matter of concern.**

**Later this evening, Mr Mayor, we will have to receive -- without comment -- the various questions on notice submitted by Councillor Salaman and myself on the subject of the flood prevention program along the Glen Osmond Creek.**

**Protocol dictates that we are only able to do that, and not discuss the issues. All we can do is to ask supplementary questions without notice.**

**As such, the only course left for me to express my views on the apparent mishandling of this \$5.3million project is to bring the matter up now, under "matters of concern".**

**In doing so I realize that there is there is absolutely NO way in which I can compress my anger over this debacle within the five-minute limit, or even if I were to be granted an extension of time for several hours!!**

**What I will say is that, in my opinion, there needs to be a searching independent inquiry into the handling of this project.**

**In my opening paragraph I refer to a "prevention scheme", as it is the term used in the very first line of the public consultation document issued by the Administration in August 2010.**

**“Prevention” is described in the Chambers English Dictionary as, among other things “to keep from coming to pass”.**

**Of late the Administration has subtly preferred the word “mitigation”, possibly in deference to the fact they now admit that the scheme will not effectively stop flooding. The Chambers definition of “mitigation” is merely “to lessen the severity of”. Not QUITE the same, I think you will agree.**

**Meanwhile, Councillor Salaman and I did not just pick our questions out of the air. They all have basis in fact and frustration. Sadly, but not unexpectedly, in many instances he and I have received “responses” rather than answers. Responses that are unacceptable.**

**As a result I will consider placing on notice for the September meeting both a call for an independent inquiry, and a list of supplementary questions that seek to set the record straight on :-**

**\*\* a \$5.3million flood prevention scheme which just doesn't work,**

**\*\* a one-way traffic system whose introduction has caused confusion, financial loss and dangerous traffic situations through the unacceptably delayed provision of suitable signage**

**\*\* the unannounced alteration to the linear park between the Henry Codd Reserve and Porter Street which has changed a planned meandering attractive linear park into a potential gun-barrel speedway for cyclists, and has also deleted essential features.**

**In addition it has been an example of how NOT to conduct public consultation.**

**This matter and cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged.**

**If my inquiries continue to go unanswered or merely “responded to”, I serve notice that I WILL formally move for the above-mentioned independent inquiry and will seek Councillors’ support on an issue of major importance.**