



**Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee
held on Tuesday, 5 September 2023 at 6.30 pm
Council Chamber, Council Administration Centre
245 Sturt Road, Sturt**

PRESENT

Mayor Kris Hanna
Councillor Ian Crossland (Chair)
Councillor Matt Taylor
Councillor Jana Mates

Apology

Councillor Amar Singh

In Attendance

Chief Executive Officer - Tony Harrison
Acting General Manager City Services - Angela Allison
Chief Financial Officer - Ray Barnwell
Manager Engineering, Assets and Environment – Mat Allen
Executive Officer to General Manager City Services - Colleen Madsen
Councillor Sarah Luscombe
Councillor Joseph Masika
Environmental Sustainability Partner - Anna Haygreen
Infrastructure Engineer - Daniel Chan
Unit Manager Asset Solutions - Brendon Lyons
Water Resources Coordination - Glynn Ricketts

1 Open Meeting

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.31pm.

2 Kaurua Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the Kaurua 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 6 June 2023**

Report Reference	IC230905R4.1
-------------------------	--------------

Moved Councillor Taylor**Seconded Mayor Hanna**

That the minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 6 June 2023 be taken as read and confirmed.

carried

5 Business Arising

5.1 Business Arising Statement - Action Items

Report Reference	IC230905R5.1
-------------------------	--------------

Moved Mayor Hanna**Seconded Councillor Taylor**

That the Infrastructure Committee:

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

carried

6 Confidential Items - Nil

7 Reports for Discussion

7.1 Community Gardens Policy

Report Reference	IC230905R7.1
-------------------------	--------------

The Environmental Sustainability Partner, Anna Haygreen presented the draft Community Gardens Policy for feedback prior to the final draft being presented to General Council for endorsement.

The City of Marion currently has 5 community gardens.

Feedback and discussion from the Committee included:

- We have the process right in asking for substantial community interest before initiating a community garden.
- If a requirement is that a group must be incorporated, should we have a model constitution with a small committee? Staff confirmed that the requirement is the group is incorporated themselves or under the umbrella of an incorporated group.
- Discussion on Council's position on a garden requirement to be fenced or unfenced. Staff advised that we do not have a formal position; it is up to the groups to propose what model they want. Planning approval is required for a fenced garden. Current recommendation to

groups with individual plots is to consider fencing as leased plots as they should have access to that produce.

- Under the list of criteria, 'compatibility with surrounding land uses,' the real sensitivity is the adjacent residents, are we able to give this more weight in either the policy or internal procedures?
- Page 72 under site selection and assessment, instead of saying site criteria, could we make it site selection considerations?
- Should Council's pre-selected sites be stated in the policy so that people could consider those prior to going through the process of site selection? The amount of site criteria that people need to address may prohibit them starting a community garden.
- It has become apparent to staff in going through this process that site selection criteria is more about how council assesses the sites. This could be made clearer in the guidelines.
- There was discussion on the challenges we see with each site and whether this new policy foreshadows some of those potential problems and challenges before we install a new site, i.e., signage, fencing etc.? The list under the Site Selection Criteria hopes to reduce those issues such as toilets and storage sheds for the larger gardens.

The chair invited Councillor Luscombe to provide feedback.

- Councillor Luscombe queried whether council could take more of a pro-active approach in pre-selecting suitable sites for community gardens so that people coming to council do not need to address as much of the site criteria, thus reducing the time taken to start up the garden (including community consultation).
- Could council manage more community gardens? The committee commented that if the garden is community initiated, the community will have more sense of ownership and we would need to consider the risks and financial implications if council managed.
- Are there opportunities to link up with playgrounds, irrigations, neighbourhood centres etc. as we develop our reserves, we are possibly reducing potential future sites.
- The Committee queried whether the new policy and procedures will reduce the time taken to establish the gardens. In response, staff advised that the intent of the policy has not changed. Although no changes have been made to the procedure they can be changed. There is no simple way to fast track the garden set up, it depends on the individual group and the site, however the comments regarding earlier community engagement will be considered.
- Staff are identifying potential sites, in conjunction with the Open Space Review.

The chair invited Members to email any further comments on the policy through to staff.

Next steps Policy will come to Council at the October meeting.

Staff clarified that only the policy not guidelines are going to Council, however they will be updated following feedback.

Moved Councillor Taylor**Seconded Councillor Mates**

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Provides feedback on the Community Gardens Policy (Attachment 1).
2. Subject to the inclusion of feedback in this meeting, recommends that the draft Community Gardens Policy is referred to General Council for endorsement.

carried

7.2 Footpath Strategic Review

Report Reference IC230905R7.2

The Manager Engineering, Assets and Environmental Sustainability, Mat Allen introduced Infrastructure Engineer, Daniel Chan who provided the Committee with a background of footpath management strategies relating to new footpath creation and provided options for strategic improvement.

Discussion from staff included:

- The main focus for tonight's meeting is driver 1. One footpath per road, and 2. Customer requests.
- Construction price increases from the tender schedules and for specific asset classes have increased between 15-30%.
- With the increased demands on budgets, how would we manage the increase in construction costs while maintaining our service levels?
- We need to consider refinement of current footpath strategies.
- Site constraints have inflated the cost of construction on some roads.
- Are we achieving value for money and are these assets critical, what is the risk for Council?
- Would Council like to set minimum and maximum services level?
- Is a Footpath Policy an item Council would consider, to provide consistency and transparency?

Discussion from the Committee included:

- Confirmed that \$710k per year is for new footpaths not renewal.
- Legislation does not state that we must provide any footpaths, however if we are putting in a footpath, the disability act states it should be at least 1.2 meters.
- If we went to have a policy to provide 1 footpath per street as a standard, when a renewal comes up would it be within the council's right to consider removing one of the footpaths if it was not required. Staff commented that community consultation would need to be considered.
- In a Policy, the type of language used needs to be considered.

- As we have virtually achieved the target of 1 footpath per street, why do we continue to have the same budget per year? Is it possible to see a reduction of 5% each year?
- A survey of cul-de-sacs indicated many residents did not want a footpath. An exception was if it is a way to the train station etc. That is a completely acceptable service standard.
- New developments where their gardens extend to the gutter, consideration should be given to exempting those streets from the 1 footpath policy.
- Like the idea of 1 footpath is enough policy at least for public consultation to determine the response.
- Include in the policy that the argument from residents 'because other streets have 2 footpaths, they should also have two footpaths', is not a valid argument.
- Include in the policy that if there has been community consultation where the community has said no, or not exceeding 50%, that there is a 10-year freeze on going out to consultation again.
- Confusion with some of the language and intent. Need to be clear and not subject to interpretation when used in the Policy.
- Governance and a clear strategy on what we can roll out. Setting expectations for our residents will help steer what we do in the future.
- Make it easier to approve/disapprove.
- If it is clearly stated in the policy and the information easily found, a service standard could consider that low traffic areas have 1 footpath maintained and the other side of the road reevaluated for potential uses.
- How would this policy link into the walking and cycling strategy? If saying no to the second footpath, will we be reducing access to the community and limiting those with mobility issues? Staff advised the walking and cycling guidelines is aimed more at the wider community and linking shared use paths and connectivity with train stations etc. The footpath policy is not aimed at inclusivity as such, but more to give residents value for money.
- How do we respond to disability access? Staff advised that the general response is that unfortunately a footpath may not be considered due to financial restraints and usage. It is a difficult question as we want to be inclusive, but it is important for the council to consider a balance for sustainability.

The chair invited Councillor Masika to provide feedback.

- Councillor Masika asked if the number of vehicles per day outlined in the presentation (3,000 per day) is provided by the Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) or City of Marion? Staff responded that there is not a specific standard from DIT, the figure has been taken from other councils that have adopted that figure. This also aligns with our road hierarchy.
- The chair supported a policy which saves staff revisiting problems, providing criteria for when a 2nd footpath is considered.

- As with all policies, if a Council Member wishes to help a resident with a disability and the needs are greater than the majority they can come to Council with a Motion with Notice.

Moved Mayor Hanna

Seconded Councillor Taylor

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Notes the report and provides feedback on the Footpath Strategic Review presentation.

carried

7.3 Draft Asset Management Strategy 2023-2033

Report Reference	IC230905R7.3
------------------	--------------

Unit Manager Asset Solutions, Brendon Lyons presented the Draft Asset Management Strategy 2023-2033 and the Community Engagement Plan for Committee feedback.

The Asset Management Strategy forms part of Council's Strategic Management Framework and designed to enable Council's Asset Management Policy.

The chair advised that the report will be taken as read and invited comments from the Committee.

Councillor Mates noted there is no mention of the value of our assets and could that be included at the beginning of the Strategy.

The chair invited Members to provide any additional feedback to staff.

Moved Mayor Hanna

Seconded Councillor Mates

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Notes and provides feedback on the draft Asset Management Strategy 2023-2033 (Attachment 1) and the Community Engagement Plan (Attachment 2).
2. Recommends the draft Asset Management Strategy 2023 –2023 and the Community Engagement Plan (with associated feedback addressed) is presented to the General Council Meeting on 12 September 2023 for consideration.

carried

8 Reports for Noting

8.1 Marion Water Project Update

Report Reference IC230905R8.1

The Water Resources Coordinator, Glynn Ricketts, provided the Committee with an update on the progress of Marion Water's current distribution project.

Marion Water is the name given to the water scheme in City of Marion, which is a public facing business, and we have progressed from just servicing our water needs to also supplying water to third parties. It is a financially self-sustained business unit and we have spent the last twelve months improving governance.

The main topic covered in the update was the distribution network extension project, including the location and pipe construction, and the electrical and mechanical contract, the injection and extraction well, the project timeline and budget and the Marion Water Structure.

Discussion by the Committee included:

- Should council consider extending this pipeline in the future, are we easily able to do a cost benefit analysis on where it is going and what the payback would be? Staff advised that we have future proofed the sites, pipes, pressure, and flow for extension such as the golf club, the Villawood land division, additional pipelines to our sports clubs on Majors Road and further north from Oaklands Wetland.
- It was noted the graph in attachment 8.1.1 on total water usage across CoM shows the SA Water usage and the Committee queried whether it is possible to show the increased usage of Oaklands water. Staff advised the green line shown on the graph is what we injected in the winter and orange is what we extracted in the summer.
- Staff will re-do the graph to make the water usage clearer.
- Comment made on the Marion Water Business was that it is an exciting project, having a business that will be self-funding in the long term and not having the reliance on SA water, that also the Water Business has a lot of scope for improvement.

Moved Councillor Taylor

Seconded Councillor Mates

That the Infrastructure Committee:

1. Notes the Reports and provides feedback on the progress of the distribution network extension project.

carried

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 8.00pm

CONFIRMED THIS 7 DAY OF NOVEMBER 2023

CHAIRPERSON