

# OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Gawler



Contact: Mayor Karen Redman

Ref: KR:kd  
CC16/772  
CR21/58199

Town of Gawler Administration Centre

43 High Street  
Gawler East SA 5118  
PO Box 130  
Gawler SA 5118  
Phone: (08) 8522 9211  
council@gawler.sa.gov.au  
gawler.sa.gov.au

16 August 2021

Mr Bruce Green  
Chair - SA Local Government Boundaries Commission  
GPO Box 2329  
ADELAIDE SA 5001

*Bruce*  
Dear Mr Green

## Re: Town of Gawler Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal – supplementary information

Council thanks the South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission (the Commission) for commencing its assessment of Town of Gawler's Stage 2 Boundary Change General Proposal and acknowledges that the initiating Council must address the requirements of Guideline 3 as far as it can be reasonably aware of them.

Please find attached a response to the Commission's request for further information.

In developing Council's General Proposal emphasis was placed on the outcomes, advantages and disadvantages for the Communities of Interest and individuals within the community. Council still sees these community outcomes as the highest priority. However, as requested by the Commission, Council has applied the lens of the possible "impacts of the Proposal on the Local Government organisations" to provide its response.

It should be noted that, Town of Gawler has requested further information from the affected Councils in respect to their financial and asset data in an attempt to have a greater understanding of the possible impacts of the Proposal. All three affected Councils have not been forthcoming at this time, so the information provided comes from a limited knowledge base, being collated only with high level information that can be publicly obtained.

I trust that this information provided will meet with the Commission's needs. Should the Commission require any additional information or wish to discuss this proposal in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact myself (contact details below) or Henry Inat, Chief Executive Officer on (08) 8522 9221 or via email at [Henry.Inat@gawler.sa.gov.au](mailto:Henry.Inat@gawler.sa.gov.au).

Kind regards

*K Redman*

**Karen Redman**  
**Mayor**

Direct line: (08) 8522 9221  
Email: [Mayor@gawler.sa.gov.au](mailto:Mayor@gawler.sa.gov.au)

Attached: Town of Gawler, Boundary Change Proposal – Stage 2 General Proposal.

Town of Gawler provides the following information in response to the questions posed by the South Australian Local Government Boundaries Commission.

# 1. Section 26 principles, 26(c)(iii) –councils’ resource base

Guideline 3 requires councils to ‘describe the proposal with reference to the principles set out in section 26 of the Act’. The Commission is seeking further information from the Council on how the Proposal addresses section 26(c)(iii) – that ‘a council should have a sufficient resource base to fulfil its functions fairly, effectively and efficiently’.

The Commission notes that the Proposal includes attachments that provide a high level financial analysis of the Proposal. However, the Commission requests that the Council also provides further information on the impact of changes to affected councils’ resource base along with inclusion of a summary of the financial analyses from Attachments 2 and 6, with reference to section 26(c)(iii).

## 1. Financial Analysis

### a) Operating Result analysis

The ‘high-level’ financial analysis provided to the Commission in December 2020 as part of the Stage 2 General Proposal (as Attachment 2 to the proposal), reflected an indicative overall break-even operating result relating to the proposed Communities of Interest incorporated within the Proposal.

The initial ‘high-level’ financial analysis reported to the 10 September 2019 Council meeting reflected an indicative net variable revenue positive position in the order of \$500,000 p.a. – however, when increased indicative fixed costs (e.g. IT costs, ‘back-office’ administrative staffing costs (estimated at 4.0FTE), etc.) were taken into consideration it was envisaged that a break-even operating consequence would result.

The Administration noted the following in the report to the 15 December 2020 Council meeting:

*‘Since Council’s Stage 1 Proposal was assessed in January 2020 by the Commission and approved to proceed to Stage 2 of the boundary change process, Council wrote to its neighbouring Councils that are affected by the Proposal seeking further information to allow a more in-depth financial analysis to be undertaken*

*However, Light Regional Council declined to provide further information and The Barossa Council advised they did not currently have resourcing available to provide Council with the information it needed but would at a future date if resourcing allowed. City of Playford did not respond to the request. Not having access to the next level of financial information such as infrastructure and assets in the Areas of Interest and the general state of the assets (i.e. stage of life) has meant that further financial analysis could not be considered accurate due to the level of assumptions that would have to be made.*

*It should be noted that it is the role of the Commission to undertake the financial analysis during the investigation to ascertain the financial impacts for all Councils affected by the Proposal and have appropriate powers under the legislation to compel a Council to provide information required as part of their investigation’.*

Nonetheless, to assist the Commission in its financial analysis of the Proposal, supplementary indicative financial information (based on previous financial modelling), relative to the anticipated financial operating impact on the affected Council’s has been suggested and is outlined in Table 1 below:

**Table 1- Indicative financial impact on Operating Result for affected Councils’ \***

	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
Council	Net <i>Variable</i> Inc/Exp impact Surplus / (Deficit) \$	Attribution of indicative <i>Fixed</i> Costs \$	Indicative Operating impact (A+B) Surplus / (Deficit) \$	Adopted 2021/22 Operating Budget Surplus / (Deficit) \$	Adjusted 2021/22 Operating Budget (C+D) Surplus / (Deficit) \$
Gawler **	432,000	(432,000)	-	(344,000)	(344,000)
Barossa***	(74,000)	108,000	(34,000)	(847,000)	(881,000)
Light	(358,000)	324,000	34,000	(395,608)	(361,608)

*\*City of Playford excluded, as impact from a net reduction in Rateable properties of 20, compared to their current number of Rateable properties of approximately 42,000 is deemed immaterial.*

*\*\*Adopted Budget excludes 'one-off' COVID-19 Rate relief and economic stimulus measures*

*\*\*\* Data is based on the current undeveloped nature of Concordia and not it's future developed potential.*

It is important to reiterate that the financial modelling provided is very 'high-level' and indicative, and that more accurate and reliable financial analysis can only be undertaken with the provision of appropriate financial data from both The Barossa Council and Light Regional Council.

#### b) Rating analysis

As previously reported at the 15 December 2020 Council meeting, the disparity between the average Residential General Rates across the four related Councils' has considerably reduced in 2021/22, such that there is currently only a nominal \$110 disparity across the four Councils' as per Table 2 below:

**Table 2 - 2021/22 Average Residential Rates**

<b>Council</b>	<b>Average Residential Valuation</b>	<b>Average Residential General Rates</b>	<b>\$ Variance to Town of Gawler</b>
Light Regional Council	\$355,700	\$1,593.32	(\$110.06)
The Barossa Council	\$365,000	\$1,668.45	(\$34.93)
Town of Gawler	\$322,000	\$1,703.38	-
City of Playford*	\$250,000	\$1,620.94	(82.44)

*\*Due to 2021/22 data not available for City of Playford, the data for 2020/21 has been used.*

In terms of the ongoing viability of each Council, as represented by the number of rateable allotments, the indicative adjustment is outlined in Table 3 below:

**Table 3 - Indicative impact on number of Rateable allotments**

<b>Council</b>	<b>2021/22 Rateable allotments</b>	<b>Indicative adjustment</b>	<b>Indicative Adjusted Rateable allotments</b>
Light Regional Council	8,159	-1,235	6,924
The Barossa Council	13,124	-211	12,913
Town of Gawler	12,081	+1,446	13,547
City of Playford*	41,688	-20	41,668

Whilst there is no definitive guideline as to what represents a financially sustainable Council (relative to the number of Rateable allotments), 25 of the current 68 Councils in the State have less than 6,800 rateable allotments – i.e. 37% of Councils' have less rateable allotments than the indicative adjusted rateable allotments for Light Regional Council. This predominantly includes small rural Councils, but notably includes Adelaide Plains Council and the City of Walkerville.

The Light Regional Council is currently forecasting an increase of approximately 2% in its number of allotments for the 2021/22 financial year, as informed by the report tabled to their 18 May 2021 Special Council meeting.

## Section 26 principles, 26(c)(ix) – community participation

The Commission is also seeking further information from the Council on how the Proposal addresses section 26(c)(ix) – ‘the importance within the scheme of local government to ensure that local communities within large council areas can participate effectively in decisions about local matters’.

The Proposal includes a response to this principle stated within the response to section 26(c)(x) – ‘residents should receive adequate and fair representation within the local government system, while over-representation in comparison with councils of a similar size and type should be avoided’.

The Commission notes that the Proposal includes a summary of current elector and councilor numbers for the affected and similar councils for each part of the Proposal; however, does not include the Council’s view on how the proposed boundary changes could impact elector numbers, and the resultant impact on this ratio.

The Stage 2 General Proposal provided a brief statement regarding representation for each of the Communities of Interest identified within the Proposal, largely assessing the impact by applying the lens of the residents within each of the identified areas in the first instance.

The Commission’s response indicates that Council’s General Proposal should have also provided further commentary on the perceived impacts of the Proposal on the representation of the affected Council’s as well as Town of Gawler and not solely as it pertained to the resident’s representation across the nine identified areas of interest.

Town of Gawler, with its limited understanding/viewpoint on the levels of representation of other local government areas and why the other Councils’ representation has been established in a particular manner, has been asked to address the perceived impacts of the Proposal on each affected Council’s representation and provides the following:

### A. Perceived Impacts on Representation in the Town of Gawler:

Current Representation Ratio: 1:1628

The current Population of Town of Gawler is approximately 24,416. Growth in population if the Proposal proceeded in full would increase to 29,251 (Concordia development to impact significantly in future with 20,000 people projected over the next 20 years).

Town of Gawler is currently undertaking a Representation Review and the final report is being provided as part of this agenda, for Council’s consideration. The outcome of the review after the consultation phase, proposes no changes to the representation at this time. Feedback from Council Members to date has been that while they are happy with the current structure of Council being an Area Council, if boundary reform were to proceed some would like to give consideration as to whether a ward structure would be suitable for a period of time to ensure any areas joining the Town of Gawler as a result of boundary reform were well engaged and felt appropriately represented during a transition period.

### B. Perceived Impacts on Representation in the Light Regional Council:

Current Representation Ratio: 1:1040

The current population of Light Regional Council is approximately 15,501. The approximate population of the Communities of Interest identified in the Proposal that currently lie within Light Regional Council local government area is approximately 4,280: being Hewett 2,933, Gawler Belt 942 and Reid 405 residents.

Currently Hewett forms part of the Mudla Wirra Ward which has a population 3,016. Light Regional Council’s representational ratio is currently 1:1040 across the Council. Mudla Wirra Ward has a current ratio of 1:1005 which is -3.34%. If Hewett were removed it would significantly affect the Council’s current representation. Mudla Wirra Ward would essentially cease to exist and the remaining 83 people could be absorbed into another ward.

The Roseworthy Township Expansion Development Plan Amendment was gazetted on 10 November 2016. The land rezoned through this amendment is likely to accommodate the following over a 20 to 25 year period:

- I. A residential area to the west of Horrocks Highway of 4210 allotments, with a population of 11,400 people and associated retail and a primary school (Trinity College).
- II. Mixed use commercial and industrial land to the east of Horrocks Highway, including bulky goods and retail, with an employment target of 4,500 jobs.

Roseworthy is located in the Laucke Ward currently comprising of 1,958 electors (ratio 1:979). The additional 11,400 proposed population would in itself trigger a representation review.

Light Regional Council is currently undertaking a Representation Review and is consulting during July 2021 on a proposal to reduce from 5 wards to 3 wards resulting in Hewett moving to Ward 3 which would consist of 3,497 residents. Removing Hewett with a population of 2,933 would result in the ratio being greater than a 10% change and would trigger a representation review.

#### C. Perceived Impacts on Representation in the Barossa Council:

Current Representation Ratio: 1:1495

The current population of The Barossa Council area is approximately 25,245. The approximate population of the Proposal's Communities of Interest that are currently within the Barossa local government area is 545 residents; with Concordia being 162 residents and Kalbeeba 383. Due to the low population based in Concordia and Kalbeeba in The Barossa Council area currently, Town of Gawler believes that there would be no impact to the Barossa Council's Ward ratios and the current representation ratios.

However, looking to the future growth indicated for Concordia of 9,785 homes (potentially 20,000 people over 20 years – slightly less than the entire current Gawler Local Government Area) within the new development, this predicted growth has the potential to create a significant impact requiring consideration for future representation reviews however, until the rate of development is known it is difficult to estimate at what time in the future a representation review may be triggered or need to be considered by The Barossa Council.

However, it should be noted that with the growth indicated for Concordia, if it remains in The Barossa Council, at some point it will trigger a representation review for The Barossa Council. Importantly, even within a Ward structure such as that currently used by The Barossa Council, the risk is that the high number of new urban residents may create an imbalance of power and possible discord between the priorities of the regional/rural council area and servicing the needs of such a large urban development with a large population.

The challenge for The Barossa Council in the future may well be managing a large urban community on the very edge of its boundary which will not identify as part of The Barossa at all. The positioning statements promoted by the Concordia development clearly demonstrate this to the case, showing itself where the heart of the new community will naturally fall:

- "... blended with the unique, historic and community identity of the existing Gawler Township." And;
- "Concordia will form a logical, natural and sequential extension to the existing Gawler Township, will maintain and enhance the primacy of the Gawler town centre to fulfill its latent potential as a true regional city..."

#### D. Perceived Impacts on Representation in the Playford City Council:

Current Representation Ratio: 1:3893

The current Population of the City of Playford is approximately 96,547. The population of the Communities of Interest captured in the Proposal which would be removed from Playford if the Proposal was supported are considered minor and 'administrative' in nature with only 47 properties that are affected within the Hillier and Evanston Park areas.

The Communities of Interest that are currently within the Town of Gawler Local Government Area but are suggested to move to the City of Playford Local Government Area, being Bibaringa and Uleybury, affects 27 properties.

With some properties moving to Playford and some moving to Gawler providing for a net loss of 20 properties from the City of Playford Local Government Area, the Proposal represents only minor change to numbers when looking at population as many are rural properties without residences. Consequently, Town of Gawler believes that this would have no impact on representation ratios of either the City of Playford or Town of Gawler.

### 3. Advantages and disadvantages

The Proposal, read in its entirety, highlights a number of advantages and disadvantages from the proposed boundary changes in the Overview and Summary sections, information on the views held by the community and other affected Councils' views, and in the results of the community consultation work that have been included in the proposal. However, the Commission invites the Council to provide specific comments on the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed changes, both for the Town of Gawler and all affected councils.

Town of Gawler's comments on the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed changes both for the Town of Gawler and all affected Councils are contained within the subsequent pages.



### **Advantages for Affected Communities outside existing Town of Gawler Local Government Area (Communities of Interest we believe should be part of Town of Gawler)**

Able to participate and be appropriately represented in decision making within the community that they engage with and participate in. For example, where they participate in things such as sports, education, recreation (swimming pool) and services (library) and where they generally use community infrastructure and facilities.
Town of Gawler provides a more local and accessible service centre for these communities than their current Council's provide.
Ability to provide service delivery efficiencies via economies of scale. This can result in improved service levels and / or reduced cost for existing service levels for ratepayers.
Development adjacent to existing Town of Gawler boundaries requires supporting regional infrastructure to be funded by existing Town of Gawler ratepayers. Achieving the proposed boundary realignment will reduce this burden on existing ratepayers by amortising the cost of delivering such infrastructure across an increased number of rateable properties.
Affected communities are closer to Town of Gawler service centres and community facilities than they are to their current Council's. Implementing the boundary realignment proposal provides these communities with easier access to physical services and facilities used to participate in and engage with local events, activities, programs, and public consultations.
Affected communities within Light Regional and The Barossa Councils are directly connected to Gawler via local transport services. They are not connected to Council services, facilities, and infrastructure within their existing Council areas by such services.
Existing and proposed urban areas within Light Regional and The Barossa Councils identified within Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal will be able to contribute to the facilities and infrastructure that they do and will use, allowing for an appropriate level of community infrastructure provision rather than contributing to / subsidising infrastructure in a country town 10-30km away.
Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal removes delays and frustrations that can occur when developers are required to deal with two Councils with respect to the one development area.
Affected communities will receive access to concession rates for the use of Town of Gawler facilities (such as the Gawler Civic Centre, Gawler Sport and Community Centre and Gawler Aquatic Centre) that they currently frequent. These rates are only available to community groups, service clubs and residents who are located within the Town of Gawler Local Government Area.
Affected communities will be able to access financial and other benefits that are currently being received by Town of Gawler residents from Council's subsidiaries. For example, NAWMA provides cheaper waste fees, security of service, innovative environmental outcomes and circular economy opportunities.
The Boundary change will provide Council and the newly included communities the opportunity to lobby and advocate for an extension of the State Governments Regional Boundary which denotes the Urban Service Boundary, therefore the community of interest could potentially receive an extension of state government services eg public transport

### **Disadvantages for Affected Communities outside Town of Gawler Local Government Area (Communities of Interest we believe should be part of Town of Gawler)**

Transitioning affected communities to Town of Gawler will take time and this transition period may be complex to navigate.
Services may vary between councils. Transitioning affected communities from one service delivery system to another may require a few "steps" for the residents. For example, waste collection services may occur on a different day than was previously the case for affected residents.
Business operators currently within The Barossa Council local government area may lose the ability to leverage "Barossa Valley" branding
Residents from affected communities may currently have a lower residential rate in the dollar than Town of Gawler residents. This will need to be transitioned to parity over time.

### **Advantages for Town of Gawler as a Council**

Ability to provide a more coordinated approach to infrastructure planning and delivery for built up and future urban growth areas. E.g. Open Space, Stormwater, Traffic, Roads, Footpaths, etc.
Growth in rates revenue coming to Town of Gawler when boundary realignment occurs.
Growth in infrastructure and assets that come under Town of Gawler ownership when boundary realignment occurs.

Enables a beneficiary pays principal in future infrastructure planning/provision.
Town of Gawler ratepayers will receive better value from Council as supporting community infrastructure and services will be funded from a larger rate base.
Whilst consolidation of assets, management plans, service delivery models, etc. may present initial challenges for Council, over the longer term it will provide for a more rationalised and streamlined service provision.
Ability to fund greater resourcing by virtue of increased rates revenue.
Communication with the true community of Gawler will be simplified as Council will not have to reach across boundaries.
Implementing Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal now, while large areas of future urban development within affected communities remain undeveloped, makes financial and economic sense. The burden on ratepayers will be less if changes occur now than once development of these future urban areas occurs.
Town of Gawler is already being financially impacted by neighbouring developments. Implementing Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal will provide Council with appropriate levels of income to deliver services to people living and working within the identified communities of interest.
Town of Gawler ratepayers will receive greater community environmental improvements and innovations through economies of scale resulting from a broadened rate base.

#### **Disadvantages for Town of Gawler as a Council**

Existing strategic infrastructure and asset management plans will need to be comprehensively reviewed to account for infrastructure and assets onboarded within affected communities.
Likely need for additional staff across multiple teams to deliver services to onboarded affected communities.
Increased expenditure associated with maintenance and depreciation resulting from assets onboarded within affected communities.
Inheriting infrastructure within an affected community that may be at end of life and/or in need of major repair without having had the financial benefit of receiving past rates income from these affected communities that funds such works.
Increased resources required to manage increased workload within existing processes such as budgeting, servicing etc.
Some residents within affected communities may feel aggrieved by the change requiring Council to invest resources in dealing with these grievances and any reputational damages that may result.
Council will need to invest in service delivery integration within affected communities, as well as adapting, adjusting, and transitioning the affected community and effectively communicating its processes.
There are unknown risks with respect to infrastructure delivery backlogs in more rural areas (such as Gawler Belt). For example, Council has limited information on the status of stormwater and road infrastructure delivery in such areas until it is able to access the relevant infrastructure and asset management plans.
Council's fee to be a member of the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority would increase.
Council will need to fund the administrative costs associated with the Stage 3 investigation and then, if the General Proposal is supported and the boundary realignment is enacted, Council will need to fund the cost of transitioning affected communities to Town of Gawler.

#### **Advantages for The Barossa Council as a Council**

Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal seeks to remove a future large scale urban development that will create a satellite township within the existing Barossa Council area from the care and control of The Barossa Council. This benefits The Barossa Council as it will not need to deploy resources away from already established townships and rural areas within The Barossa Council area to service a community that has no relationship or connection with The Barossa Council's communities of interest.
Urban communities generally require higher levels of servicing than rural/regional communities. Removing the future Concordia urban development from The Barossa Council allows The Barossa Council to focus on delivering services to its communities of interest at more consistent and equitable levels than it could if it was required to service such a large urban community at its fringe.
Removing Concordia and other urban growth areas from The Barossa Council as identified within Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal means that The Barossa Council will not need to revisit its existing representation.



If the Concordia urban growth development remains within The Barossa Council then this will cause a political imbalance within The Barossa Council as it attempts to service the needs of an urban community as well as its extensive, existing rural communities. Removing Concordia and other urban growth areas from The Barossa Council as identified within Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal removes this future political imbalance.
Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal serves to strengthen the identity of the Barossa Brand. Having a large-scale urban development within a predominantly rural landscape impacts on the tourism and economic development objectives being championed by Brand Barossa. Removing Concordia and other urban growth areas from The Barossa Council as identified within Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal eliminates this issue and reinforces Barossa's brand and identity.
If the Concordia urban growth development remains within The Barossa Council it will have to establish a major service centre (including a remote depot, community centres and libraries) to meet the needs of the densely populated area. Removing Concordia and other urban growth areas from The Barossa Council as identified within Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal eliminates this requirement.
Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal removes complications in co-managing development areas (for example Springwood). It removes the need for The Barossa Council to engage with these developments and enables one Council (Town of Gawler) to be responsible for infrastructure design, implementation, and funding. It removes delays and frustrations that can occur when developers are required to deal with two Councils with respect to the one development area.
Reduced impact resulting from growth pressures for The Barossa Council as it does not need to adjust and provide for large-scale urban development.
Implementing Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal now, while large areas of future urban development within affected communities remain undeveloped, makes financial and economic sense. The burden on The Barossa Council's ratepayers will be less if changes occur now than once development of these future urban areas occurs.
Allow the Barossa Council to remove any land from within their Local Government Boundary which is not within the Environment and Food Production Area, the Character Preservation District or an existing township. Further reinforcing the Barossa Council as a regional council.
Positive change may be triggered for The Barossa Council through a review of the Barossa GI to ensure it captures the actual wine growing areas not built-up, urban areas such as parts of Gawler and the future Concordia development that are currently captured within the GI.
Removes the need for The Barossa Council to artificially create an environment of Communities of Interest by connecting Nurioopta to Concordia instead of this community connecting to Gawler, its actual community of interest.

<b>Disadvantages for The Barossa Council as a Council</b>
Loss of a significant future revenue stream resulting from the transfer of urban growth areas to Town of Gawler and a small amount of current rates revenue from existing rateable properties within these areas.
Loss of area within the recognised Barossa GI zone
Loss of the ability for The Barossa Council to directly influence the Concordia development to integrate with the existing Barossa Character Preservation Zone.
The Barossa Council would need to fund any administrative costs that it incurs because of Stage 3 investigation and then, if the General Proposal is supported and the boundary realignment is enacted, The Barossa Council will need to fund the administrative costs that it incurs in transitioning the various affected communities.

<b>Advantages for Light Regional Council as a Council</b>
Urban communities generally require higher levels of servicing than rural/regional communities. Removing developed areas such as Hewett and parts of Gawler Belt from Light Regional Council allows Light Regional Council to focus on delivering services to its communities of interest at more consistent and equitable levels than it currently does by having to service these urban communities at its fringe.
Transitioning the communities of interest identified within the General Proposal to Town of Gawler decreases the level of service delivery that Light Regional Council must provide. This results in cost savings for Light Regional Council.

Handing over infrastructure within an affected community that may be at end of life and/or in need of major repair having received the financial benefit of past rates revenue allocated to funding such works without the need to outlay this funding or deliver the works.
Light Regional Council's fee to be a member of the Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority would decrease.
Enables Light Regional Council to strengthen its identity as a "Regional Council" by focussing on servicing their rural communities rather than diverting services to urbanised communities.
Removes the need for Light Regional Council to artificially create an environment of Communities of Interest by connecting Kapunda to Hewett and Gawler Belt instead of these communities connecting to Gawler, their actual community of interest.

<b>Disadvantages for Light Regional Council as a Council</b>
Decrease in rates revenue resulting from the transfer of urbanised areas to Town of Gawler.
Reduced service level requirements resulting from the transfer of urbanised areas to Town of Gawler may create a temporary consequence of excessive staff within Light Regional Council's administration. However, this may be balanced out by the Roseworthy development that is underway that will require future servicing. Also, Town of Gawler will require additional staff to service the affected communities of interest, thereby presenting an opportunity for displaced Light Regional Council staff.
Urban rates income may have been subsidising development and administration for more regional towns/areas. The loss of this revenue stream may adversely affect ratepayers in the remaining areas of Light Regional Council.
Town of Gawler's boundary realignment proposal will trigger a representation review for Light Regional Council its current Mudla Wirra Ward would be left with too few residents to be sustainable.
Light Regional Council would need to fund any administrative costs that it incurs because of Stage 3 investigation and then, if the General Proposal is supported and the boundary realignment is enacted, Light Regional Council will need to fund the administrative costs that it incurs in transitioning the various affected communities.

<b>Advantages for City of Playford as a Council</b>
Town of Gawler's General Proposal removes part suburbs from within the City of Playford's boundary as well as giving other part suburbs to City of Playford. The Proposal also creates a local government boundary between the two Councils that aligns with a road corridor rather than passing through an arbitrary line. These changes will deliver administrative efficiencies for the City of Playford.
The proposed boundary realignment would have a negligible consequence on the City of Playford due to it being a large Council and the changes result in a net loss of only 5 properties. The advantages in not having to service these properties outweighs the loss in revenue that results.

<b>Disadvantages for City of Playford as a Council</b>
Small loss in rates revenue. However likely to be negligible with the proposed land which is to transfer to the City of Playford (net change of approximately 5 properties).
City of Playford would need to fund any administrative costs that it incurs because of Stage 3 investigation and then, if the General Proposal is supported and the boundary realignment is enacted, City of Playford will need to fund the administrative costs that it incurs in transitioning the various affected communities.