

Campbelltown Boundary Change Proposal Information session

Summary report



Adelaide Hills
COUNCIL

Purpose

A community information session was planned to support residents during the consultation process surrounding the Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change Proposal that is being undertaken by BDO Australia on behalf of the South Australian Local Government Boundary Change Commission (the Commission).

The purpose of the information session was to provide answers to key questions and concerns from residents of our foothills suburbs and to provide our community with an opportunity to ask questions of council staff and Elected Members about the boundary change proposal.

Campbelltown Boundary Change Proposal Information Session

- Location: The Summit Community Centre
- Date: Thursday 29 May 2025
- Time: 6.30pm to 8pm

Attendance

The information session was attended by approximately 50 community members including representatives from Morialta and Woodforde Residents Associations, along with Adelaide Hills Council Elected Members and staff.

Presentation overview

Welcome and introductions	Acknowledgement of Country. Welcome to Elected Members and community representatives
Purpose of the information session	• Explain the boundary change proposal • Outline Adelaide Hills Council’s position • Provide key facts and clarify misinformation • Clarify the impact of council boundaries on rates and property value • Outline how you can have your say • Clarify the roles and responsibilities in the Hamilton Hill development • To hear directly from you •
Boundary Change Proposal	• Campbelltown City Council (CCC) proposes transferring 738 properties in Woodforde and Rostrevor from Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) • Lodged: December 2019 • Inquiry approved: February 2024 • BDO appointed as Investigator: July 2024 • Public Consultation: 7 May - 20 June 2025 • Final decision: Minister for Local Government
Councils Position	• AHC opposes the proposal • Divisive, expensive, and unnecessary, • Not community supported • No demonstrated benefit for affected residents

Councils Position (continued)	We have identified twelve key reasons for rejecting the proposal: 1. The Subject Areas have a special 'Hills' character that must be protected. 2. The proposed boundary change has been rejected by our community. 3. The boundary change proposal would fracture relationships within our community. 4. The Subject Areas are demographically more similar to the Adelaide Hills than the Campbelltown area. 5. The Subject Areas are already well serviced by the Adelaide Hills Council. 6. The boundary change would materially financially disadvantage Adelaide Hills and Campbelltown ratepayers. 7. Claims by the Campbelltown City Council that Adelaide Hills residents cannot have a say in Campbelltown City Council matters are both false and misleading. 8. As society has changed, so too has the concept of a 'community of interest'. 9. Daily routines are a matter of convenience and choice, not council boundaries. 10. Public facilities are for the use and enjoyment of all. 11. 'Quicker response times' by Campbelltown City Council is an unsubstantiated promise. 12. Campbelltown City Council makes long-term promises based on a short-term perspective
Rates and property values: what to know	• Rate structures differ: CCC vs AHC • Rates depend on property values (average property value CCC: \$774,441 and AHC \$889,381) • Across the years both Councils have had higher total rate increases than the other • Future rates may change – past/current rates are not a reliable guide • Other factors matter: property density, services, bushfire protection, property values, and community identity
Roles and responsibilities in the Hamilton Hill development	• Developer responsible for construction (homes, roads, drains) • Council checks compliance and takes over assets • Rezoning by State Government • Some CCC claims about AHC service levels, stormwater, and road maintenance are misleading
How to have your say	Public consultation opened on 7 May and will close on 20 June. You may get involved through the following means: YourSAy survey • yoursay.sa.gov.au/Campbelltown-boundary-review/surveys/survey Written feedback • Send to CampbelltownBoundaryReview@bdo.com.au In-person forum • Wednesday 4 June, 6:30pm-8:30pm • University of South Australia, Magill Campus, Room D1-20, St Bernards Road, Magill Online forum • Thursday 5 June, 12pm-1:30pm 

Facts vs misinformation

Claim	What the facts show
AHC has failed to manage stormwater infrastructure	AHC is working with Hamilton Hill residents and neighbouring areas to ensure this community is well serviced. Neighbouring councils work together all the time to manage shared issues at their boundary and Campbelltown is welcome to approach us with any specific concerns. A divisive and disruptive boundary change does not need to be part of the solution.
Verge and road maintenance is substandard	Verge maintenance is a shared responsibility between Council and residents. Council provides annual maintenance for road safety and fire mitigation. All Councils only maintain some verges across their districts.
CCC can deliver better service from a closer depot	AHC, like most rural and semi-rural Councils, services a large area. This makes us different to metro councils, but it does not make us less efficient. AHC uses local contractors based nearby. Proximity alone doesn't equal better service delivery. In the extremely rare circumstances that urgent on-site attendance is required, AHC can have a team member in Rostrevor or Woodforde in 25 - 30 minutes.
Rates will be lower under CCC	Rate comparisons are misleading. Different rate models reflect different services and land use types. Some residents may end up paying more.
Council approved the Kelso apartment with insufficient parking	These plans were approved by the State Government. Council provided a submission at the time raising concerns about insufficient car parking.

Questions received from community members

Community questions and comments	Council response provided
Concerns about Adelaide Hills Council's financial status, working capital deficit, high debt load, whether increasing our rates will result in decreased borrowing and long-term council sustainability.	CEO directed community members to view our draft Annual Business Plan 2025-26 (ABP) and draft long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP) that are both currently open for community feedback. Throughout the 2024-25 Financial Year, Council conducted a comprehensive review of the assumptions and methodologies used in its financial planning and reporting. It also considered core assumptions used in its asset management planning processes in depth. These reviews have led to a reassessment of Council's financial sustainability, with Council reporting material deficits in 2023-24 and 2024-25, and forecasting additional deficits in future years. This LTFP sets out the path to a more financially sustainable Council. A reduction in expenditure especially around the development of new assets and infrastructure was required to avoid higher rate increases. Maintaining the investment in existing assets and ensuring that they are maintained appropriately, whilst reducing expenditure on building new assets is fundamental to improving Council's financial strength.
Why aren't Campbelltown City Council interested in the suburb of Teringie and whether this suburb could later be incorporated into the boundary change and/or be requested by another council such as Burnside.	We are unsure why Campbelltown City Council did not include Teringie in their original proposal however, Teringie cannot be brought into this proposal by the Commission as part of this investigation. Any future proposals by other councils such as Burnside would need to be presented to the Commission.
What is council doing to improve traffic issues on Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) roads at the bottom of foothills, are council currently advocating for improvements?	CEO spoke about how we have committed to undertaking a Local Area Traffic Management Plan once the development has settled. This study would look at a number of different factors that affect traffic flow, pedestrian safety and livability of the foothills, to understand any current challenges and propose traffic treatments to make improvements. Ideally we would let the development settle before we undertake this study so that we can fully understand the issues at hand, however it would be possible to undertake a progressive traffic study while the development is being completed.

	We are in regular conversations with DIT about current traffic issues and concerns.
What more direct action can residents who are against this proposal take? E.g. rallies, petitions	Acting Mayor directed residents to firstly and most importantly make sure they had completed the formal feedback process with BDO Australia and to encourage neighbours to do the same. Even if residents have completed previous stages / rounds of engagement, it is important to be part of this final stage as the results of engagement currently being undertaken by the Commission, will ultimately assist them with making their final decision on the proposal.
Questions about the 60-65% of residents who have previously voted against the change proposal and how this number would look now with new residents established in Hamilton Hill. What percentage of total residents these initial engagements included and if it could really be a consensus if not all residents had participated.	Acting Mayor reiterated the importance of everyone contributing to the current engagement through BDO Australia as this is the final stage and previous contributions during other stages of the investigation will not be considered as of these findings. Both previous engagements undertaken on behalf of AHC and CCC were dropped to individual properties within the affected area and posted to property owners not residing within the area. Participation in this engagement (as with previous rounds) is voluntary and while we can do our best to promote the information needed to participate through various avenues, we cannot make people provide their feedback.
How does AHC proposed to support and service residents when we have 57 townships/suburbs to care for spread over 795kms and Campbelltown only has an area of 24km to cover.	Our service model at AHC is very different to the service model of CCC as most rural or semi-rural councils differ from metropolitan councils. We carefully plan our programmed works to align on different days within different townships and suburbs and have staff with different levels of expertise to suite our environment. We need to ensure that our yearly works align with our strategic goals, Long-Term Financial Plan and Asset Management Plans to make sure we can maintain and upgrade our various community infrastructure and service our residents across our various townships, suburbs and localities.
When will the Minister make the final decision on this boundary change proposal? What is the process if the request is successful? What would this mean for residents in the affected areas?	Unfortunately, we cannot provide this information as it hasn't been shared with us yet. We will share any updates with residents as soon as they are available to us.

Not enough works scheduled in the foothill suburbs within the draft 2025-26 Capital Works Program. What are residents getting for their rates?	The focus of this year's budget is on developing a responsible budget which recognises our unique limitations and is geared towards delivering essential services, practical resource management, and sustainability. This means that there are fewer capital projects included than there have been in previous years, while we work toward strengthening our financial sustainability. While capital projects make up one component of how residents' rates are spent, there are also a multitude of business as usual activities that rate funds support, including ,but not limited to: • Maintenance, management and replacement of roads, bridges, signage, stormwater, kerbs and footpaths • Provision of community centres and libraries • Parking and by-law enforcement • Managing and maintaining parks, reserves, trails and biodiversity sites • Animal management • Waste collection and recycling services • Positive aging home and social support programs • Inspections of food businesses, wastewater and public swimming pools • Management and maintenance of cemeteries • Community events, grants, engagements and programs • Emergency management
Safety for pedestrians vs rural look and feel of suburbs, need to find the right balance. What are council doing to improve pedestrian safety within Woodforde, there are not enough footpaths? Importance of keeping rural feel, enjoying large trees, peoples garden stretching out to the road, native animals.	As a semi-rural council area, there are many townships and suburbs within our region that do not have footpaths on all streets. We have a new footpath program which provides a schedule and priority matrix for consideration of new footpaths. We are currently reviewing this priority process.
Others specific comments and concerns were raised about particular roads or properties. These included request for footpaths and yellow parking lines on specific roads as well as bush fire track clearing within state government managed national park land.	

Thank you

Thank you very much for getting involved in the boundary change community information session. We hope that we were able to provide you with information that answered some of your questions regarding the Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change Proposal and how you can provide your feedback.

If you would like to find out more about the Campbelltown City Council Boundary Change Proposal, you can visit our Adelaide Hills Engagement Hub to view our AHC Submission and the latest information from council.

engage.ahc.sa.gov.au/boundaryreviewahc



To provide your feedback on the boundary change proposal, please visit YourSAy to view the range of ways you can share your feedback.

yoursay.sa.gov.au/campbelltown-boundary-review





08 8408 0400
mail@ahc.sa.gov.au
ahc.sa.gov.au

