

Glenside Urban Corridor (Living) Code Amendment
23ADL-0391
19 August 2024

Engagement Plan

Glenside Urban Corridor (Living) Code Amendment

Contents

1.	Introduction	2
1.1	What is the Scope of the Proposed Code Amendment?	2
1.2	What is the Purpose of the Code Amendment?.....	3
1.3	What Community Engagement is Happening?	3
2.	Engagement Approach.....	4
2.1	Purpose	4
2.2	Objectives.....	4
2.3	Community Engagement Charter	4
2.4	Scope of Influence	6
3.	Key Messages	8
4.	Stakeholder Mapping	10
4.1	Community Profile.....	13
5.	Engagement Activities	16
5.1	Engagement Activities	18
6.	Reporting and Evaluation	21
6.1	Reporting.....	21
6.2	Closing the Loop.....	21
6.3	Evaluation.....	21
	Appendix A - Engagement catchment area for letter box drop and mail out	23
	Appendix B - Charter engagement evaluation and tools for measuring success	24

© URPS. All rights reserved; these materials are copyright. No part may be reproduced or copied in any way, form or by any means without prior permission. This report has been prepared for URPS' client. URPS and its associated consultants are not liable to any person or entity for any damage or loss that has occurred, or may occur, in relation to that person or entity taking or not taking action in respect of any representation, statement, opinion or advice referred to herein.

1. Introduction

1.1 What is the Scope of the Proposed Code Amendment?

Cedar Woods is the proprietor of the Glenside development located on 16.5 hectares of land on the corner of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads, Glenside.

Cedar Woods is proposing to undertake a Code Amendment to change the maximum building heights on 9,049sqm of land located in the northwest corner of the Glenside development. A Technical and Numeric Variation (TNV) for a maximum building height of 20 levels / 73 metres is proposed to facilitate the construction of high-quality residential buildings. This TNV will only apply to the 9,049sqm of land, known as the Affected Area.

In addition to the increase in building heights, the Code Amendment also proposes changes to the Glenside Concept Plan. This plan outlines the location of proposed buildings, their heights and where interface treatments are proposed to be applied (i.e. building height transitions).

See **Figure 1** for the Affected Area which is outlined in red below.



Figure 1: Code Amendment Affected Area

1.2 What is the Purpose of the Code Amendment?

The Code Amendment seeks to make a change to the Planning and Design Code (the Code).

The Code includes the policies used by planning authorities to assess proposals for development. It applies zones, subzones and overlays to specific areas of land each with their own requirements. There is also a range of general policies and Technical Numeric Variations (TNVs) that apply to the Affected Area (for example building heights).

The Glenside development is currently zoned Urban Corridor (Living) and has been identified as a key area for urban infill development. No change to the zone is proposed.

Cedar Woods is seeking to develop residential buildings of up to 20 levels / 73 metres on the Affected Area. To achieve this an increase in the maximum building height TNV, which is currently 8 levels, is required. The change in TNV will enable the development of residential buildings on the Affected Area that are above 8 levels.

Four buildings are proposed for the Affected Area, designed in a cascading format, with only one building reaching a maximum height of 20 levels. The Concept Plan outlines proposed heights for the remaining buildings between 14-17 levels and 11-13 levels. A small café and restaurant are also proposed on the ground floor of one of the buildings.

This proposal is consistent with the *30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide* which seeks to increase densities around key transport corridors. When completed, the Glenside development will provide approximately 1,200 homes less than 3km from the Adelaide CBD.

1.3 What Community Engagement is Happening?

The Code Amendment process includes engagement with the local community and key stakeholders to ensure everyone can have a say about the proposed change to the Planning and Design Code.

Planning consultancy URPS have been engaged by Cedar Woods to prepare the Code Amendment and undertake early community engagement as well as formal consultation on the Code Amendment.

See Section 5 for details of the engagement activities to be undertaken.

2. Engagement Approach

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of engagement is to ensure that individuals, businesses, organisations and communities interested in and/or affected by the proposed Code Amendment are able to provide feedback and influence particular elements of the proposed Code Amendment prior to its finalisation.

Specifically, the engagement will:

- Raise awareness that a Code Amendment has been proposed.
- Provide information about what is proposed by the Code Amendment (including specific details of the proposed changes).
- Allow community and stakeholders to understand the future development implications that the proposed Code Amendment may facilitate, and any impacts this may have on them.
- Provide the opportunity for stakeholders and community to identify issues and opportunities early, so that they can be considered in the preparation of the Code Amendment.
- Enable stakeholders and community to provide feedback on the Code Amendment prior to it being finalised and submitted to the State Planning Commission and Minister for Planning.
- Close the loop with stakeholders and community to inform them of the outcomes of the engagement process, and how they can access the final version of the Code Amendment.
- Meet statutory requirements as they relate to engagement on a Code Amendment.
- Build relationships to support future activities (i.e., construction) at the site.

2.2 Objectives

Stakeholders and community will be engaged at four key stages in the preparation of the Code Amendment:

- Early Engagement – To gain early feedback and address enquiries relating to the proposal (CONSULT) before formal consultation on the Code Amendment
- Formal Consultation – To gain formal feedback on the proposed Code Amendment during the consultation period (CONSULT)
- Decision – To be informed of the final Code Amendment and Minister’s decision (INFORM)
- Evaluation – To close the loop with participants and evaluate the engagement process (INFORM/CONSULT).

2.3 Community Engagement Charter

The preparation of the Code Amendment is required to comply with the principles of the Community Engagement Charter under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

The Community Engagement Charter sets out best practice guidelines for community engagement in relation to the preparation and amendment of planning policies, strategies and schemes.

The table below outlines the ways in which this engagement plan supports the five principles of the Charter and how success will be defined and measured.

The approach to measuring the success of the engagement associated with the Code Amendment against the principles of the Community Engagement Charter is described more fully at section 5 and at Appendix B.

Table 1: Community Engagement Charter principles and measures

Charter Principle	Performance Outcome	Engagement Measure
Engagement is genuine	People had confidence in the engagement process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted at a wide range of stakeholders using a range of channels • Timelines sufficient for people to hear/see the opportunity to provide feedback • Easy to understand information to help audiences understand why it is relevant to them and how they provide feedback • An Engagement Report will be prepared in accordance with section 73(7) of the Planning Development and Infrastructure (PDI) Act, outlining what was heard and how it was responded to and the evaluation of engagement. This will be published on the SA planning portal
Engagement is inclusive and respectful	Affected and interested people had the opportunity to participate and be heard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted at a wide range of stakeholders using a range of channels (based on Stakeholder Mapping to identify who may be impacted/interested and specific engagement needs/techniques) • Timelines sufficient for people to hear/see the opportunity to provide feedback • Easy to understand information to help audiences understand why it is relevant to them and how they can provide feedback
Engagement is fit for purpose	<p>People were effectively engaged and satisfied with the process</p> <p>People were clear about the proposed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A broad range of activities offered in a mix of ways, to reach a wide pool of stakeholders

Charter Principle	Performance Outcome	Engagement Measure
	change and how it would affect them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders directly impacted will be targeted directly by the engagement (e.g., invited to one-on-one meetings) • Stakeholders with specific interests will be directly communicated with
Engagement is informed and transparent	<p>All relevant information was made available and people could access it</p> <p>People understood how their views were considered, the reasons for the outcomes and the final decision that was made</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information clearly articulates key areas of interest, what we are gathering feedback on, how participants can get involved and how feedback will be used • Submissions will be acknowledged and advised of next steps in the process • An engagement report will be provided to participants and made publicly available
Engagement processes are reviewed and improved	The engagement was reviewed and improvement recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of success are identified and will be evaluated at the conclusion of the engagement, and at each stage of engagement if required • Any issues raised about the engagement during the process will be considered and action will be taken if appropriate

2.4 Scope of Influence

The Planning and Design Code utilises standardised policies for zones, to ensure consistency across the state in how they are applied and interpreted. This means that once a zone is proposed through a Code Amendment, there is limited scope to tailor individual land use policies to suit a site.

2.4.1 Elements that are possible to be influenced in this Code Amendment

Even though there is limited scope to influence land use policies within a Code Amendment, it is possible to influence the following for this Code Amendment:

- Technical and Numerical Variations (TNVs) – can enable the zone to be tailored to shape site specific outcomes. In this instance a change to the Building Height TNV is proposed.
- Concept Plans – can enable site-specific requirements such as building heights and locations to be articulated. The Planning and Design Code currently uses these sparingly, and usually only for very large sites with complex future development outcomes. In this instance, an update to Concept Plan 24 Glenside is proposed.

If community members are not supportive of the overall objective of the Code Amendment, they have the opportunity to object to this Code Amendment in its totality.

2.4.2 What is Out of Scope for the Community to influence

Aspects which stakeholders and the community cannot influence include:

- The creation or amendment of new policy content within the Overlays, Zones, Subzones or General Policies contained within the Planning and Design Code.
- Changes to the geographical area of the proposed Code Amendment or the Affected Area.

These components are therefore not within the scope of what the community can influence in this proposed Code Amendment.

3. Key Messages

The following key messages will underpin the engagement regarding the Code Amendment:

- Cedar Woods is developing a thriving, contemporary residential development on 16.5 hectares of land on the corner of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads, Glenside.
- The land is zoned Urban Corridor (Living) and has been identified in the State Government's *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide* as a key area for infill development. No change to the zone, which supports higher density living, is proposed.
- The Planning and Design Code is a State Government document that sets out the rules that determine how land can be used and what can be built on it. Changing the rules in the Code is called a 'Code Amendment'.
- A change to the Planning and Design Code (the Code) is proposed for 9,049sqm of land within the Glenside development. This land is known as the 'Affected Area'.
- As part of this development, Cedar Woods is seeking to build several significant residential buildings on the Affected Area.
- The current residential building height of the Affected Area is 8 levels. In order to facilitate this development a change to the building height technical numeric variation (TNV) of the Affected Area is required.
- The Code Amendment proposes to increase the maximum building height TNV of the Affected Area from 8 levels to 20 levels / 73 metres.
- The Code Amendment also proposes changes to the Glenside Concept Plan which outlines specific aspects of the development such as the location of proposed buildings, their heights and where interface treatments are proposed to be applied (i.e. building height transitions).
- The Concept plan outlines that four buildings are proposed for the Affected Area, designed in a cascading format, with only one building reaching a maximum height of 20 levels. Proposed heights for the remaining buildings are between 14-17 levels and 11-13 levels.
- An Affordable Housing Overlay currently applies to the Glenside development with Cedar Woods entering into a legally binding Land Management Agreement (LMA) with the State Government which requires the delivery of 15% affordable housing provisions across the development site as a whole and is not specific to the Affected Area.
- Preliminary designs of the residential buildings have been prepared. However these are illustrative in nature and may change. They are provided to show how the buildings could sit within the broader Glenside development.
- This proposal is consistent with the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide which seeks to increase densities around key transport corridors.
- When completed, the Glenside development will provide approximately 1,200 homes less than 3km from the Adelaide CBD.
- Any new buildings will need a development application to be lodged and approved by the relevant Planning Authority under a separate, later process.

- Engagement on this Code Amendment is required to comply with the Community Engagement Charter. This includes engagement that is genuine and fit for purpose.
- We will use a range of ways to communicate information and collect feedback on the proposed Code Amendment in ways that are inclusive and easy to understand.
- All feedback will be collated and included in an Engagement Summary Report which is provided to the Minister for Planning.
- The Minister for Planning is the decision maker and may choose to approval, refuse or change the proposed Code Amendment.
- The Minister will consider the feedback received during the engagement period and will determine whether the engagement was carried out in accordance with the Community Engagement Charter.
- The Minister may also seek the advice of the State Planning Commission prior to making a decision.

Additional key messages will be created for specific stakeholder communication collateral as required.

4. Stakeholder Mapping

There are a range of key stakeholders identified for this project. The engagement will be tailored to respond to each stakeholder's level of interest in the project, the extent to which they are impacted and the level of influence they could have on the successful delivery of the project.

Table 2: Stakeholder mapping

Stakeholder	Level of interest in the project (high, medium or low)	Interest/Concern	Level of engagement (i.e. inform, consult, involve, collaborate)
Minister for Planning	High	The Minister for Planning will be the approval authority for the Code Amendment.	Inform
State Member for Bragg (Jack Batty MP)	High	Interest in development of land in MPs electorate. Interest in the views of their constituents.	Consult
Federal Member for Sturt (James Steven MP)	Low	Interest in development of land in MPs electorate. Interest in the views of their constituents.	Consult
City of Burnside – Mayor (Anne Monceaux), Eastwood and Glenunga Ward Councillors (Cr Di Wilkins and Cr Ted Jennings)	High	Interest in development of land in Burnside and Councillors' Ward. Interest in the views of their constituents.	Consult
City of Burnside – CEO (Chris Cowley) and Council Staff	High	Local Government Area of proposed Code Amendment. Ensure that engagement period aligns with Council reporting period so that the Code Amendment can be considered by Council members. Planning policy that supports good development in their LGA that is supported by the community.	Consult
Adjacent Councils - City of Adelaide and City of Unley	Medium	Interest in development in neighbouring government areas	Consult
Local Government Association	Low	Interest in development in local government areas	Consult

Stakeholder	Level of interest in the project (high, medium or low)	Interest/Concern	Level of engagement (i.e. inform, consult, involve, collaborate)
Residential property owners and occupiers within the Glenside development. Business owners/staff within the Glenside development.	High	Concerns with density and scale of development, overshadowing and overlooking, traffic and parking, impact on local infrastructure, neighbourhood amenity, heritage and character, construction noise/dust/ duration and property values (increase or decrease, real or perceived).	Consult
Residential property owners and occupiers on adjacent and surrounding land. Business owners/staff on adjacent and surrounding land.	High	Concerns with density and scale of development, overshadowing and overlooking, traffic and parking, impact on local infrastructure, neighbourhood amenity, heritage and character, construction noise/dust/ duration and property values (increase or decrease, real or perceived).	Consult
Future Glenside development property owners (e.g., prospective buyers, people who have entered into contractual agreements to purchase within the development)	High	Concerns with lack of certainty about outcome of Code Amendment and future of the development.	Consult
Broader Glenside Community	Medium	Concerns with impact on local infrastructure and services	Consult
Adelaide Airport Limited	Medium	Interest in all aspects of airport planning, aircraft operations and safety.	Consult
SA Housing Authority (Affordable Housing Unit)	Medium	Interest in the provision of affordable housing via a LMA.	Consult
Department of Environment and Water (DEW)	Medium	Interest in how the proposed development is designed and located to minimise impacts on heritage, natural waterways and trees.	Consult
Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)	Medium	Interest in how the proposed development will interact with existing infrastructure, roads and public transport – noting that is on a major transport corridor.	Consult

Stakeholder	Level of interest in the project (high, medium or low)	Interest/Concern	Level of engagement (i.e. inform, consult, involve, collaborate)
Department of Education	Medium	Interest in how the proposed development will interact with local education services.	Consult
Office of Design and Architecture SA	Medium	Interest in how the proposed development is designed.	Consult
Kadaltilla/Adelaide Park Lands Authority	Medium	Interest in impact of future development in relation to Adelaide Park Lands located nearby.	Consult
Office for Ageing Well, SA Health	Medium	Interest in provision of health services and support for older South Australians.	Consult
Environment Protection Authority (EPA)	Low	Interest in how the proposed development is designed and located to minimise impacts on the environment, human health and amenity.	Consult
Kaurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation.	Low	Prescribed Body Corporate for the Traditional Owners and Native Title holders for the land. Outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Opportunities for storytelling and truth telling through design. Impacts on Country.	Consult
Utility providers - SA Power Networks - Electranet Pty Ltd - APA Group - SA Water - EPIC Energy - NBN - Telstra and other telecommunication providers	Low	Interest in number of residential dwellings to be serviced and interaction/impact on any existing utility infrastructure.	Consult

4.1 Community Profile

A high-level community profile has been outlined below with the use of Australian Bureau of Statistics Census Data¹ to better understand the needs of the community in proximity to the Affected Area. The following presents a demographic snapshot for the suburb of Glenside.

The Glenside community appears to be a mix of professionals, families and retirees who have higher education levels but lower weekly incomes (potentially due to retirement) than the wider South Australian community. Nearly half of Glenside residents are born overseas and over a third speak another language other than English at home.

This data is useful to determine who the community we are engaging is, and what additional measures or engagement tactics may need to be considered.

Age, Population and Martial Status

Glenside
Population of 2,852, with a median age of 43.
Higher proportion of women (53.6%) to men (46.4%).
Higher proportion of people aged 35-44 and over 70 compared to SA.
Higher proportion of people never married, separated, divorced or widowed (53.2%) than married (46.8%)

Education

Glenside
Slightly lower proportions of people attending primary school compared to SA (26.9% primary and compared to 30% primary).
Slightly higher proportions of people attending secondary school compared to SA (21.1% secondary compared to 20.6% secondary for SA).
More people attending university (24.4%) compared to 16.7% for SA.
Significantly higher proportions of people who attained a bachelor degree level or above compared to SA (44.2% for Glenside, 22.7% for SA).

¹ Using 2021 Census data for the Waterloo Corner/Bolivar suburbs - accessed 09/01/24
<https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL40133>

Cultural and Language Diversity

Glenside

English is the most commonly spoken language in Glenside, with 60.3% of households only using English and 31.5% using a non-English language.

Of the languages used at home other than English, Mandarin was most spoken in 9.7% of households.

Lower proportion of Glenside residents were born in Australia compared to the rest of South Australia (56.8% compared to 71.5% for SA).

Higher proportion of Glenside residents were born in China (8.0%) and India (5.9%) compared 1.4% and 2.5% in SA.

Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people comprise 0.7% of the Glenside population, compared to 2.4% in SA.

Employment

Glenside

Lower proportions of people that reside in Glenside are in the labour force compared to SA (51.8% compared to 60.0%).

The number of people in full and part time work in Glenside (54.1% and 35.5%) is similar to people who work full and part time in SA (54.1% and 35.0%).

Professionals comprise 38.1% of Glenside's occupations which is higher than in SA (21.5%).

Health, Aged Care, Hospitality, Accounting and Government were the top 5 employment industries.

The median weekly household income for Glenside is slightly lower than in SA (\$1,363 compared to \$1,455).

Vehicle Ownership/Usage

Glenside

The average number of motor vehicles per dwelling is 1.3.

A higher proportion of people do not own a vehicle in Glenside (14.6%) than in SA (7.1%).

59.6% of Glenside residents travel to work by car which is 10% lower than in SA (69.7%).

Family/Household Composition

Glenside

Of the 2,852 people residing in Glenside, the average number of people per household is 2.1

Glenside has a slightly higher number of couple families without children (44.4%) than with children (41.8%).

The proportions of families with both couples not working is slightly higher (25.9%) compared to SA (23.4%).

A much higher proportion of Glenside residents live in a flat or apartment (36%) compared to SA (6.8%)

The average number of bedrooms per dwelling in Glenside is 2.5, with significantly more people in Glenside residing in a 2-bedroom home (41.1%) compared to SA (18%).

Summary

Based on this community profile, our engagement approach is adapted to better meet this community's needs:

- Our engagement materials will be written in plain English, removing jargon and providing easy to understand explanations.
- We will provide a range of ways that people can submit their submissions – including written submissions, in person and by phone.
- Due to the high proportion of retirees, engagement opportunities will be conducted during the day as well as in the early evening to cater for those that are working.
- Due to the high percentage of residents that speak Mandarin in the community, a translated statement will be included on the fact sheet advising residents to call us if they need any material translated.

5. Engagement Activities

The ways in which we will provide information and engage, and receive feedback are varied to meet the needs of stakeholders and be fit for purpose. The features of these activities include:

Early Engagement

- **PlanSA Portal** – the Portal is used as the ‘one stop shop’ webpage for all Code Amendment information and engagement collateral. During the early engagement period, information can be found on the Code Amendment ‘on-consultation’ webpage: www.plan.sa.gov.au/en/code_amendments
- **Fact sheet / FAQs** – our plain English fact sheets are designed to explain what a Code Amendment is, and why it is relevant to stakeholders. It clearly explains the proposed change and the potential future impacts of the Code Amendment, so that stakeholders are well informed and understand the process. These are available on the PlanSA Portal and distributed via letterbox drop and direct mail.
- **Briefings/Presentations** – we undertake online or face to face briefings/presentations with key stakeholders such as the Local MP and Council ensure they are appraised of the proposed Code Amendment.
- **Meetings by request** – providing an opportunity to discuss the Code Amendment is important. We offer face to face by request at a time that is convenient to the stakeholder.
- **Phone and email enquiries** – our planning and engagement staff are available to receive feedback or enquiries by phone and email throughout the early engagement period.

Formal Engagement

- **PlanSA Portal Submission Form** – an online submission form is available on the webpage to provide feedback on the Code Amendment. During the formal engagement period, information can be found on the Code Amendment ‘on consultation’ webpage: www.plan.sa.gov.au/en/code_amendments
- **Fact sheet / FAQs** – our plain English fact sheets are designed to explain what a Code Amendment is, and why it is relevant to stakeholders. It clearly explains the proposed change and the potential future impacts of the Code Amendment, so that stakeholders are well informed and understand the process. These are available on the PlanSA Portal and distributed via letterbox drop and direct mail.
- **Direct Mail** – letters will be sent to affected and adjacent landowners, relevant state and local government agencies, members of parliament, and utility providers.
- **Online survey** – the online survey gathers feedback specifically about the elements of the Code Amendment that can be influenced. This ensures that feedback is more useful and targeted in consideration of the Code Amendment and any changes that may need to be considered. It also allows for some evaluation questions to be posed – increasing the chance of participation in the evaluation. Experience shows that lower participation rates can be expected from follow up evaluation surveys after the engagement.
- **Face to Face Briefings/Meetings by request** – providing an opportunity to discuss the Code Amendment is important. We offer online meetings or face to face by request at a time that is convenient to the stakeholder. This is considered a more genuine and fit for purpose activity rather than hosting a public meeting, that may be intimidating or inconvenient for some stakeholders.

- **Drop-In Sessions** – up to four sessions will be held at a local community facility i.e., Glenunga Hub to enable members of the broader community to ask questions and discuss the Code Amendment directly with members of the project team.
- **Onsite Signage** – these are used to capture local community attention. Signs are displayed on or near the site to build awareness of the Code Amendment and clearly promote how feedback can be provided.
- **Phone and email enquiries** – planning and engagement staff are available to receive feedback or enquiries by phone and email throughout the engagement period.
- **Multiple feedback points** – we will receive, count and report on feedback received in all ways, to reflect genuine engagement that is convenient to stakeholders. This includes phone conversations, meetings, emails, written submissions, submission forms and survey responses.

The engagement period will run for 6 weeks from **30 August 2024 to 11 October 2024**.

5.1 Engagement Activities

Table 4: Engagement activities by stakeholder

Stakeholder	How we will provide information/engage	How we will receive feedback
Minister for Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Correspondence • Via PlanSA Portal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Via decision making process (in writing)
Local Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Member for Bragg • Federal Member for Sturt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emailed letter and fact sheet • Via PlanSA Portal • Enquiries via phone or email • Face to face or online meeting (by request) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written submission – received by email or hard copy letter • Online submission form or survey via PlanSA Portal • Face to face or online meeting (by request)
City of Burnside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Council staff • Emailed letter to Mayor, CEO and Ward Councillors • Face to face or online meeting for Elected Members (by request) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face to face or online meeting (by request) • Written submission – received by email or hard copy letter • Online submission form or survey via PlanSA Portal
LGA and adjacent Councils: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Adelaide • City of Unley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emailed letter to CEO/Mayors • Via PlanSA Portal • Enquiries via phone or email 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written submission received by email or hard copy letter • Online submission form or survey via PlanSA Portal
Government agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adelaide Airport Ltd • SA Housing Authority • Department for Environment and Water (DEW) • Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) • Department for Education • Office for Design and Architecture SA (ODASA) • Kadaltilla/Adelaide Park Lands Authority (APLA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emailed letter and fact sheet • Via PlanSA Portal • Enquiries via phone or email • Face to face or online meeting (by request) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written submission (letter) – received by email or hard copy • Online submission form or survey via PlanSA Portal • Face to face or online meeting (by request)

Stakeholder	How we will provide information/engage	How we will receive feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office for Aging Well, SA Health Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) Kaurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation 		
Utility providers, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA Power Networks Electranet Pty Ltd APA Group SA Water EPIC Energy NBN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed letter and fact sheet Via PlanSA Portal Enquiries via phone or email Face to face or online meeting (by request) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written submission (letter) – received by email or hard copy Online submission form or survey via PlanSA Portal Face to face or online meeting (by request)
Property owners and occupiers (commercial and residential) – refer to catchment area shown in Appendix A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter box drop of early engagement and consultation factsheets and FAQs to explain the Code Amendment process, proposed changes and ways to provide feedback. Direct mail letter and fact sheet to absent owners² and potential purchasers³ Via PlanSA Portal Hard copies of fact sheet and Code Amendment available at City of Burnside and/or Cedar Woods onsite office Community drop-in sessions at a local community facility. Face to face or online meeting (by request) Enquiries via phone or email Signage on or near the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written submission – received by email or hard copy letter Online survey (linked to fact sheet and PlanSA Portal) Online submission form via PlanSA Portal Attendance at community drop-in session Face to face or online meeting (by request) Phone call

² Subject to name and address data being obtained from the City of Burnside

³ Subject to name and address data being obtained from Cedar Woods

Stakeholder	How we will provide information/engage	How we will receive feedback
Broader community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Drop-In Sessions at a local community facility. • Signage on or near the site • Via PlanSA Portal • Hard copies of fact sheet available at City of Burnside and/or Cedar Woods office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written submission – received by email or hard copy letter • Online survey (linked to fact sheet and PlanSA Portal) • Online submission form via PlanSA Portal • Attendance at community drop-in session • Phone call

6. Reporting and Evaluation

6.1 Reporting

An Engagement Report will be prepared in accordance with section 73(7) of the PDI Act at the conclusion of the engagement period and will summarise:

- How the engagement was communicated
- What engagement was undertaken
- Feedback received across all mechanisms
- What was heard
- How feedback influenced final Code Amendment
- Evaluation of engagement process

6.2 Closing the Loop

Closing the loop will comprise:

- A letter/email sent to those involved in the engagement following the conclusion of the formal engagement period with a link to an evaluation survey.
- A Close the Loop Report sent to those involved in the engagement once a decision has been made by the Minister on the Code Amendment communicating:
 - The Minister's decision
 - A summary of the engagement undertaken and what was heard
 - Changes made to the Code Amendment in response to the issues raised
 - Website link to the PlanSA Portal providing the final Code Amendment and full Engagement Summary Report.

6.3 Evaluation

A link to an evaluation survey will be sent by email (or posted) to participants following the completion of the engagement.

In addition, the project manager(s), with assistance from communications and engagement specialists, will assess the success of the engagement against criteria five to nine:

1. Engagement is genuine
2. Engagement is inclusive and respectful
3. Engagement is fit for purpose
4. Engagement is informed and transparent
5. Engagement processes are reviewed and improved
6. Engagement occurs early

7. Engagement feedback was considered in the development of planning policy, strategy or scheme
8. Engagement includes 'closing the loop'
9. Charter is valued and useful

Refer more detail regarding the approach to measuring success at **Appendix B**.

Results will be reported in the Engagement Summary Report.

Appendix A - Engagement catchment area for letter box drop



Appendix B - Charter engagement evaluation and tools for measuring success

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
Principle 1: Engagement is genuine	People had faith and confidence in the engagement process.	Community	1. I feel the engagement genuinely sought my input to help shape the proposal	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Percent from each response.
	Engagement occurred before or during the drafting of the planning policy, strategy or scheme when there was an opportunity for influence	Project Manager or equivalent	2. Engagement occurred early enough for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme	Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping	Project Manager or equivalent
	Engagement contributed to the substance of a plan or resulted in changes to a draft	Project Manager or equivalent	3. Engagement contributed to the substance of the final plan		Project Manager or equivalent

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
Principle 2: Engagement is inclusive and respectful	Affected and interested people had the opportunity to participate and be heard.	Community	4. I am confident my views were heard during the engagement	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Per cent from each response.
		Project Manager or equivalent	5. The engagement reached those identified as community of interest. Note: The Community of Interest are those Community groups identified in the stakeholder analysis in the engagement plan.	Representatives from most community groups participated in the engagement Representatives from some community groups participated in the engagement There was little representation of the community groups in engagement.	Provide chosen answer

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
<p>Principle 3: Engagement is fit for purpose</p>	<p>People were effectively engaged and satisfied with the process.</p> <p>People were clear about the proposed change and how it would affect them.</p>	<p>Community</p>	<p>6. I was given sufficient information so that I could take an informed view.</p> <p>Note: Sufficient information includes whether the information was understood i.e., in plain English language, another language, visuals in addition to the extent of information.</p>	<p>Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree</p>	<p>Per cent from each response.</p>
			<p>7. I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard</p>	<p>Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree</p>	<p>Per cent from each response.</p>

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
Principle 4: Engagement is informed and transparent	All relevant information was made available and people could access it. People understood how their views were considered, the reasons for the outcomes and the final decision that was made.	Community	8. I felt informed about why I was being asked for my view, and the way it would be considered.	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Per cent from each response.
	Engagement includes 'closing the loop' Engagement included activities that 'closed the loop' by providing feedback to participants/ community about outcomes of engagement.	Project Manager or equivalent	9. Engagement provided feedback to community about outcomes of engagement	Formally (report or public forum) Informally (closing summaries) No feedback provided	Provide chosen answer

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
Principle 5: Engagement processes are reviewed and improved	The engagement was reviewed and improvements recommended.	Project Manager or equivalent	10. Engagement was reviewed throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement	Reviewed and recommendations made Reviewed but no system for making recommendations Not reviewed	Provide chosen answer
Charter is valued and useful	Engagement is facilitated and valued by planners	Project Manager or equivalent	Identify key strength of the Charter and Guide Identify key challenge of the charter and Guide	General Comments	

Example Community Evaluation Survey to Meet Minimum Performance Indicators

Activity: e.g. stakeholder workshop, submission, open day

Date:

I am a: resident, stakeholder, etc

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

(1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)

Evaluation statement		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I feel the engagement genuinely sought my input to help shape the proposal	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comment:</i>						
2	I am confident my views were heard during the engagement	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comment:</i>						
3	I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comment:</i>						
4	I was given sufficient information so that I could take an informed view.	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comment:</i>						
5	I felt informed about why I was being asked for my view, and the way it would be considered.	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comment:</i>						

Example Project Manager Evaluation Exercise To Meet Minimum Performance Indicators

This exercise can be completed by the engaging entity (planner, proponent or engagement manager) following an engagement activity or at the end of the entire engagement process.

It may be completed online or in hard copy.

Please consider your engagement process as a whole and provide the most appropriate response.

Evaluation statement		Response options
1	The engagement reached those identified as the community of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Representatives from most community groups participated in the engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Representatives from some community groups participated in the engagement <input type="checkbox"/> There was little representation of the community groups in engagement
<i>Comment:</i>		
2	Engagement was reviewed throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed and recommendations made in a systematic way <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed but no system for making recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed
<i>Comment:</i>		
3	Engagement occurred early enough for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme	<input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for input into first draft <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for minor edits to final draft <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was no real opportunity for input to be considered
<i>Comment:</i>		
4	Engagement contributed to the substance of the final plan	<input type="checkbox"/> In a significant way <input type="checkbox"/> In a moderate way <input type="checkbox"/> In a minor way <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all
<i>Comment:</i>		

Evaluation statement		Response options
5	Engagement provided feedback to community about outcomes of engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Formally (report or public forum) <input type="checkbox"/> Informally (closing summaries) <input type="checkbox"/> No feedback provided
	<i>Comment:</i>	
6	Identify key strength of the Charter and Guide	<input type="checkbox"/> Provide drop down list with options based on charter attributes (in future)
	<i>Comment:</i>	
7	Identify key challenge of the charter and Guide	<input type="checkbox"/> Provide drop down list with options based on charter attributes (in future)
	<i>Comment:</i>	

SHAPING
GREAT
COMMUNITIES

