

Welcome to our new look LG Matters, covering a snapshot of current legal issues affecting Local Government in South Australia presented to you by the Team at Wallmans Lawyers.

In this edition you will find the following articles:

- What is a Review?
- Appointing a Public Officer - Two may be better than one!
- Elected Member Expenses – Mandatory or Discretionary Reimbursement?
- Applications to Vary Authorisations and Changes in Land Use – *Eliza Jane Investments Pty Ltd v City of Playford [2009] SASC 260 (1 September 2009)*
- Take Care in Calling for Resignations
- 1 September 2009 – Form 1 Requirement Searches under Section 7 of the *Land and Business (Sale & Conveyancing) Act 1994*
- Public and Environmental Health Reform
- Six of the Best: The Real Application!
- Copyright Delegations
- *Cases in Brief* – Recent Law from the Courts
- Council's Ticket to a Successful Licence Objection/Intervention
- Loans to Community Organisations
- Thinking of co-operating?
- Welcome Renae Leverenz, Associate, Local Government
- Upcoming Seminars: Register Now

What is a Review?

It has come to our attention that in a number of instances Councils are undertaking legislative reviews in a manner that unnecessarily consumes significant resources. For instance, under Section 44(6) of the *Local Government Act 1999* a Council should, at least once in every financial year, review the delegations in place under Section 44. Further, under Section 91(9) of the Act a Council (or a council committee) must review, at least once in every year, every confidentiality order that operates for a period exceeding 12 months.

These obligations to review do not require a Council, in the case of delegations, to revoke and remake those delegations in their entirety and do not require a Council to make new confidentiality orders on a 12 month basis. A clear understanding of these review obligations will assist Councils in meeting their legislative obligations whilst, at the same time, saving on the sometimes significant resources which are often currently employed to satisfy the perceived (as opposed to the real) legal obligation.



For further information please contact Michael Kelledey, Partner on 8235 3091 or, michael.kelledey@wallmans.com.au or Natasha Jones, Partner, on 8235 3039 or, natasha.jones@wallmans.com.au

Appointing a Public Officer - Two may be better than One!

As readers will be aware, under section 56A(22) of the *Development Act 1993*, Councils are required to appoint a public officer who is responsible for ensuring the proper investigation of complaints about the conduct of members of Council Development Assessment panels. Recently, the question has been raised as to whether another member of Council staff can, in the absence of the person appointed as the Public Officer, fulfil the functions of that role (i.e. receive and manage complaints, including liaising with the complainant).

The Act does not expressly provide direction to Councils in regards to managing circumstances where the Public Officer is absent or is otherwise unable to fulfil his/her functions. Section 56A(23) of the *Development Act 1993* indicates that the appointment of a Public Officer is a personal appointment. That is, the appointment must be made to a person and not to a position. This means that the role of the Public Officer cannot be delegated to another person. However, the Act does not preclude the appointment of another officer to act in the absence of the Public Officer.

Therefore, to assist Public Officers in carrying out their duties effectively and expeditiously, Councils may appoint an additional officer (in person) who is able to act in the role of Public Officer when the Public Officer is absent or otherwise unable to exercise his/her functions. Of course, any appointment of a secondary public officer must also be Gazetted in accordance with the requirements of section 56A(23) of the Act.

For more information please contact Cimon Burke, Solicitor, on 8235 3084 or, cimon.burke@wallmans.com.au

Elected Member Expenses – Mandatory or Discretionary Reimbursement?

First consider - does the expense require mandatory reimbursement? An appropriate expense (in accordance with Section 77 of the Act), ensures that a Council member can receive reimbursement as prescribed in the *Local Government (Members Allowances and Benefits) Regulations 1999*. Reimbursement of prescribed expenses is mandatory (Section 77(1)(a)). However, whilst the Council has no say with respect to reimbursement, some claim and proof from the elected member showing the expense has actually been incurred should be provided.

Secondly consider – when is reimbursement discretionary? It is at the discretion of the Council to reimburse certain prescribed expenses that do not require mandatory reimbursement. Such expenses need to be approved for reimbursement by the Council either through resolution or, more appropriately, in accordance with an adopted policy position (Section 77(1)(b)). It is unnecessarily burdensome to deal with reimbursements on a case by case basis and the expedient approach is by virtue of a policy position. Again, proof of the expense being incurred should be provided.

The key in assessing any reimbursement is whether the expenditure relates to a function or duty of the Council (as set out in Section 7 of the *Local Government Act 1999*) and has been incurred by the Council member in performing or discharging their official functions and duties. In addition, the Council can reimburse or pay such expenses direct. However, it is only quantified expenses that fall within the scope of Regulations 5 and 6 of the *Local Government (Members Allowances and Benefits) Regulations 1999* which can reasonably be paid or reimbursed by the Council. As such incidental expenses claimed by or on behalf of a spouse or partner of a member may only be paid or reimbursed if there is a legislative basis to do so.

For further information please contact Natasha Jones, Partner on, 8235 3039 or natasha.jones@wallmans.com.au or Michael Kelledey, Partner, on 8235 3091 michael.kelledey@wallmans.com.au



Applications to Vary Authorisations and Changes in Land Use – *Eliza Jane Investments Pty Ltd v City of Playford [2009] SASC 260 (1 September 2009)*

The Supreme Court recently delivered a judgement of an appeal from the ERD Court concerning an application to vary an existing development authorisation.

The appellant, Eliza Jane Investments Pty Ltd, applied to the City of Playford to vary an existing authorisation (for use as a retail plant nursery shop for the sale of seedlings grown on the subject site, garden supplies and garden accessories) to include the sale of fruit and vegetables not grown on the subject site. The subject site was located in the Horticultural Zone. PDC 48 for the Horticulture Zone included "Shop, other than a shop involving the retail sale of products grown on the same site as the shop" as a *non-complying development in the Zone*. The Council treated the application to vary as an application for a development (i.e. a change in land use), classified the application to vary as a non-complying application and refused to grant Development Plan Consent. The appellant appealed to the ERD Court, which concurred with the Council. The appellant appealed to the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court identified that not all applications to vary existing authorisations will constitute development but where it does involve development the lodging of the application does not preclude the application of section 33 of the *Development Act* requiring that the development be assessed (amongst other things) against the provisions of the relevant Development Plan (by virtue of section 39(7)(b) of the *Development Act*). The question for the Supreme Court was, therefore, whether the appellant's application to vary was for a development – more specifically, whether the appellant's application was for a change in land use.

The Supreme Court examined several case law authorities regarding changes in land use and held that the activity of fruit and vegetable selling could not be brought within the genus of the existing land use, namely a retail plant nursery shop and incidental/ancillary uses. On that basis, the Supreme Court agreed with the Council and the ERD Court that the application was for a change in land use (and, therefore, comprised development to which section 33 of the *Development Act* applied). The Supreme Court also agreed that the proposed change in land use development was a non-complying development by virtue of PDC 48. The appeal was dismissed.

This case is a useful reminder of the way in which applications to vary should be processed, and is a good example of the application of change in land use principles.

For further information please contact Nicole Harris, Senior Associate, on 8235 3017 or nicole.harris@wallmans.com.au or Victoria Shute, Associate, on 8235 3078 or victoria.shute@wallmans.com.au

Take Care in Calling for Resignations

As this edition of LG Matters goes to print there is a prosecution underway in the New South Wales courts of a Councillor who is alleged to have tried to blackmail the Council Mayor into resigning, so the Councillor could nominate for the Mayoral position.

The demand for the resignation of the Mayor of Strathfield Council in Sydney's inner west was made upon the basis of a threat to publish a recording alleged to evidence the Mayor engaging in corrupt conduct. The unwarranted threat was made by a Councillor with the intention of securing, for the Councillor, the office of the Mayor of Strathfield. The recording in question has been explained as a secretly recorded video footage showing the Mayor receiving \$2,500 in \$100 notes from a property developer over lunch in July 2004.

It is reported that the Councillor suggested that if the Mayor resigned he would be "*saving himself*" and if the Councillor were then to be elected as Mayor he would nominate the then former Mayor as the Deputy Mayor. The case is currently continuing.

The former Mayor has already served 4 months periodic detention after pleading guilty to receiving a corrupt payment! This fact does not detract from the alleged threat made by the Councillor.

For further information please contact Michael Kelledy, Partner, on 8235 3091 or michael.kelledy@wallmans.com.au or Natasha Jones, Partner, on 8235 3039 or natasha.jones@wallmans.com.au



1 September 2009 – Form 1 Requirement Searches under Section 7 of the *Land and Business (Sale & Conveyancing) Act 1994*

On 1 September 2009, the remainder of the *Land and Business (Sale & Conveyancing) Variation Regulations 2009* came into force.

Amongst other things, these Regulations varied the Form 1 requirements for searches conducted under Section 7 of the Act.

If your Council has not done so already, you will need to review the standard forms used when vendors request information from the Council that is required to be disclosed under Section 7 of the Act.

As detailed in previous editions of LG Matters, the new Form 1 requires Councils to disclose information which was not previously required before 1 September 2009.

For further information please contact Victoria Shute, Associate on 8235 3078 or victoria.shute@wallmans.com.au

Public and Environmental Health Reform

The *Public Health Bill 2009* was recently released for public consultation by the Minister for Health, the Honourable John Hill. The Bill proposes to replace the current *Public and Environmental Health Act 1987* and, in doing so, will impact upon the role of Councils in managing public health matters. To that end, some of the more noteworthy changes proposed that will impact upon Councils are:

- the conferral of a number of functions relating to the management of public health (see clause 37 of the Bill). Where a Council fails to exercise one of its functions, if the Minister considers the Council's failure is significant, after consultation with that Council, the Minister may direct the Council to perform that function;
- under clause 40(5), if the Council fails to comply with any direction from the Minister, the Minister may withdraw the powers of the Council and transfer them to the Chief Public Health Officer (a new position created under the Bill). The Bill proposes that any act of the Chief Public Health Officer in exercising a power transferred to him/her by the Minister under this clause, will be taken to be an act of the Council, in which case any liability stemming from such action will rest with the Council;
- an obligation upon Councils to prepare and maintain a Regional Health Plan (which can be undertaken as part of a Council's preparation and adoption of its Strategic Management Plans under section 122 of the *Local Government Act 1999*). In preparing the Regional Health Plan, Councils will be required to consult with the Minister for Health, the Chief Public Health Officer and the public. Every Council must report to the Chief Public Health Officer bi-annually in regards to the implementation of its Regional Health Plan;
- at present, section 12A(13) of the *Public and Environmental Health Act 1987* (which sets out the duties of Council under that Act) provides that a breach of a Council's duty under the Act does not give rise to any civil liability. The proposed Bill contains no equivalent protection in respect of the functions of a Council under clause 37. This means that where a Council fails to fulfil a function conferred upon it, it may be liable;
- the imposition of additional reporting requirements upon Councils. For example, the Minister will have power to require a Council to provide a report on any matter relevant to the administration or operation of the proposed Bill;
- as is the case under the *Public and Environmental Health Act 1987*, the Bill provides that Councils may continue to appoint authorised officers to exercise powers in the interest of promoting and protecting public health. Clause 97 of the Bill provides that immunity from personal liability will attach to an authorised officer in



prescribed circumstances (i.e. for an honest act or omission in the performance, exercise or discharge of a function, power or duty under the Bill).

For more information please contact Renae Leverenz, Associate, on 8235 3041 or, renae.leverenz@wallmans.com.au or Cimon Burke, Solicitor, on 8235 3084 or cimon.burke@wallmans.com.au

Six of the Best: The Real Application!

A recent case determined in the New South Wales Land and Environment Court has had cause to consider the decision of the Council to introduce a rating subcategory for a local shopping centre that was alleged not to be within its powers under the *Local Government Act*.

In the case of *Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre P/L v Marrickville Council* the Court considered a judicial review action by the Shopping Centre against the Council wherein it had cause to consider the above issue and, also, whether there was a reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of the Council in making this decision to introduce and levy the subcategory of rates. This is a particularly interesting case in light of the finalisation of our recent 'Six of the Best Good: Decision Making' seminars which, amongst other things, specifically considered challenges by way of judicial review and the risks of challenge arising from circumstances where it is asserted that the decision maker is biased either in reality or by perception.

In New South Wales there is a discretion for a council, after following due process, to create a subcategory within any of the available four land use categories. The Court examined in detail, the process followed by the Council for the purpose of determining the business use subcategory and then declaring a differential rate at 20% above the usual business rates. The Council's decision making processes withstood scrutiny and the grounds of challenge were considered by the court as seeking to elevate form over substance. This ground of challenge was, therefore, unsuccessful.

The challenge also asserted an apprehension of bias on the part of Councillors which arose from an assertion that some Councillors had interests in small businesses in the Council area. As such, the imposition of the high differential rate on the Shopping Centre would operate to subsidise the other business rates collected within the Council area thereby creating a perception that those Councillors could benefit from imposing the greater financial burden on the Shopping Centre owners. In considering this ground of challenge, the Court had regard to pecuniary interests under the local government legislation and other interests of a non pecuniary nature. The Court found that any interest which may have existed, was too remote or tenuous to be the basis of a conflict of interest under the Act. It compared these legal obligations against the roles and responsibilities of Councillors both as set out in the Act and generally, together with the voting patterns of those Councillors who had small business interests. The Court found that there were no grounds to successfully argue an apprehension of bias.

This case is particularly interesting because it examines the role of the Council as a primary decision maker. That is, it assessed all aspects of the Council's decision making processes over a number of years in terms of all of those matters covered in the recent *Six of the Best* Series. In short, the judgment considers, and makes observations in relation to the application of legislative powers, the scheme and the interpretation of the *Local Government Act*, the Council's decision making processes, relevant considerations, irrelevant considerations, whether the Council's actions were manifestly unreasonable (in the *Associated Provincial Picture Houses Limited v Wednesbury Corporation* sense), the use of powers for an improper purpose, and concerns regarding bias within the decision making process.

In this regard, a further condensed two day program of the *Six of the Best* Series is being run, upon request, in Adelaide at the Pavillion on 12 & 13 November. For more information & registration details, please visit <http://www.wallmans.com.au/SixOfTheBestSeries09.pdf> or refer to the final article in this LG Matters edition.

For further information please contact Michael Kelledy, Partner, on 8235 3091, or michael.kelledy@wallmans.com.au or Natasha Jones, Partner, on 8235 3039, or natasha.jones@wallmans.com.au



Copyright Delegations

Did you know that there is copyright in reports, policies, forms and precedents, computer software, databases, logos and other documents which are created by Councils?

Did you know that your Council as the owner of these copyright works is entitled to "sell" them to other parties who may wish to copy or use them?

Did you know that your Council can compel persons who copy or use these copyright works without permission to compensate the Council for a copyright infringement?

Copyright law protects a vast amount of digital, written, designed and artistic material, and provides a legal mechanism by which the owners of copyright in protected works can draw an income from the reproduction, copying, using or "taking" of their work.

Every day, Councils are involved in the creation of a large number of copyright works. A number of Councils have, in recent times, become interested in asserting their intellectual property rights and drawing an income, or simply recouping the expenses related to the creation and development of their copyright works. In these situations, Councils may wish to assign ownership of copyright to third parties or licence third parties to use the copyright material in a certain way, for a fee.

However, as copyright is owned by the Council as a corporate entity, in the absence of a delegation to staff, copyright in a work can only be assigned or licenced to a third party by the elected body, as the governing body of the corporate entity.

Councils which are interested in asserting their copyright may wish to consider, if they have not done so already, delegating the power to assign or licence copyright works to third parties to the CEO, to ensure that such assignments or licences can be granted quickly and efficiently. It may also be worthwhile considering a specific policy to assist the CEO in the exercising the delegated powers

For more practical tips considering Copyright and how it affects your Council and your role, register for our upcoming *Copyright Not Copywrongs Seminar*- 8th October at the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters. Further details are provided at the end of this LG Matters Edition.

For further information please contact Victoria Shute, Associate on 8235 3078 or victoria.shute@wallmans.com.au

Cases in Brief – Recent Law from the Courts

Leighton Contractors Pty Ltd v Fox & Others [2009] HCA 35

- the facts** sub-contractor injured on the job – principal contractor sued for failure to train sub-contractor's employee.
- the finding** principal has no common law obligation to train sub-contracted workers in specialised areas of works.
- the message** a contract principal still owes a duty of care – discharged by reasonable steps to engage competent contractors capable of applying safe work systems and training.
- the warning** contract principals still need comply with relevant contractual and statutory obligations (eg OH&S Act).



Central Goldfields Shire Council v Haley [2009] VSCA 101

- the facts** pedestrian injured when tripped on mesh netting installed by adjacent property owner under authority of Council permit to use the footpath– Council sued for failure to inspect and fix loose netting
- the finding** the netting did not form part of the "road" and the statutory immunity did not apply; the council was not an occupier of the footpath at the time of the fall and in any event had no duty to warn of risks which were obvious to pedestrians exercising reasonable care.
- the message** the immunity contained in the *Civil Liability Act* 1936 provides SA Councils with a broad statutory defence; even without the immunity, pedestrians are under a duty to take reasonable care to detect and avoid obvious risks posed by footpaths.
- the warning** control over footpaths in exercise of statutory authority and/or by permitting use (eg under ss221-222 of the *LG Act* 1999) does give rise to a duty to take "*reasonable action*" to avoid risk of injury to road-users taking care for their own safety. While the immunity provides a safety-net, a risk management approach toward road networks is of primary importance.

Lacey v City of Burnside [2009] SASC 136

- the facts** Council refused an application by a property owner to remove a "significant tree" on private property on the basis of unacceptable risk to personal safety. Applicant appealed (to ERD Court and then) to the Supreme Court.
- the finding** the applicant had not given enough evidence to support the contention that all other reasonable measures to address the risk had been considered as required by the Council's Development Plan. Council's refusal was upheld.
- the message** The *Development Act* 1993 and Council's Development Plan provide the framework within which Councils are required to assess applications. The evidentiary onus is on the applicant to satisfy the statutory requirements. In absence of any breach of duty in considering the application (eg by way of error or provision of incorrect advice) Councils will not be held liable for any subsequent loss caused by the relevant tree simply because it had been the subject of an application for removal.
- the warning** like any application for development, approving authorities must take reasonable care in adopting and applying Development Plans (and any policies or guidelines) to ensure statutory compliance, consistency and managing the risk of erroneous assessment.

For further information please contact Melanie Burton, Partner, on 8235 3029, or melanie.burton@wallmans.com.au

Council's Ticket to a Successful Licence Objection/Intervention

The *Liquor Licensing Act* 1997 requires that Councils be notified of certain applications. Once Council receives such notification, it should first note the last day to object then determine if all approvals, consents, or exemptions required under the law are in place – planning, building, development etc.

If all is in order, this ought to be communicated to the Licensing Authority and the Applicant. Council may still consider intervening with a view to requesting the Commissioner to impose relevant conditions on the Licence. These may include planning conditions, trading hours etc.

If all approvals are not in place then Council should communicate this to the Licensing Authority and the Applicant, then lodge a Notice of Objection before the last day to object.



Take care with the intervention/objection process. While an intervention can be lodged at any time up to grant of Licence, an objection must be filed and served not less than seven days before the Application first comes before the Licensing Authority.

For contested applications, the Commissioner will usually conduct a conciliation (similar to the ERD Court conference) and is required to act without undue formality. Council should be represented and be in a position to advise the Commissioner of the premises' current approvals and what conditions Council may seek to impose. These may reflect planning conditions or conditions which are more appropriate on a Liquor Licence eg. as to security and style of entertainment.

If the parties reach an agreement at conciliation, orders can be made on the day noting the resolution. If the parties cannot reach agreement then the application will proceed to a hearing before the Commissioner (or one of his delegates) or the Licensing Court. Such hearings may occupy 2-3 days of the Authority's time.

For further information please contact Peter Hoban, Partner, on 8235 3001, or peter.hoban@wallmans.com.au or Ben Allen, Partner, on 8235 3018, or ben.allen@wallmans.com.au

Loans to Community Organisations

We recommend a Council considering a loan to a community organisation (**Club**) think about these following issues:

- **Creditworthiness** - is the Club able to repay – bearing in mind “whole of life” costs of new capital assets;
- **Conditions precedent** (e.g., proof of insurance, building plans) before the loan is available;
- **Advance** - when and in what amounts the loan is to be advanced;
- **Use** to be made of the money – with any not so used to be promptly repaid;
- **Security** over tangible assets on offer, if any;
- **Insurance** the Club must maintain;
- **Interest** as a fixed / variable rate, and when payable (stated calendar dates are best);
- **Repayment** - when and in what amount/s the loan is repayable (again, stated calendar dates are best);
- **Early repayment** if the Club comes to have surplus cash;
- **Publicity** of the Council's financial support;
- **Information flows** - an acquittal report / quarterly cash flow statements / annual business plans & budgets / year-end accounts;
- **Access** by the Council to the Club's premises and books for audit purposes;
- **Negative pledge** forbidding / limiting security the Club's grant of security to third parties / its ability to dispose of key assets / its ability to borrow from third parties;
- **Events of default** might include (i) Council believes the Club has ceased to trade, or is insolvent; (ii) the Club has unfilled office-holders; (iii) the Club's financial members / revenues fall below stated levels; (iv) the Club ceases to host some community event or activity; or (v) the Club amalgamates with another organisation.

For further information please contact Mark Sallis, Special Counsel, on 8235 3006 or mark.sallis@wallmans.com.au



Thinking of Co-operating?

There seems to be a growing trend by Councils to enter into what are known as "Joint Use Agreements", (JUA's) which cover the use of facilities such as gymnasiums, ancillary space and even classrooms. Members of the community, can then access these areas, by virtue of the JUA entered into between the Council and the relevant State entity. The facilities are used, for example, for organised league sports, for instructional and casual sport, recreational and educational activities.

The JUA is the formal instrument between two government entities - quite often a school and a Council – which sets out the terms and conditions for shared use of the public property or facilities. They can range in scope from being relatively simple to more complex, depending on the facility and the proposed use.

The benefits are obvious. Council expands the services to its community and reserves access to the instantly available and previously existing infrastructure (usually constructed or owned by a Minister) thereby maximising the use and benefit to the community at large. The parties to the Agreement will generally share the costs of the maintenance, repair and upgrades to the facility. However, Councils need to be aware of all the usual risk management requirements.

Successful JUA's require a lot of thought, effort and cooperation to reach a successful outcome on a range of issues.

For further information please contact Michael Kelledy, Partner, on 8235 3091, or michael.kelledy@wallmans.com.au or Mark Sallis, Special Counsel, on 8235 3006 or mark.sallis@wallmans.com.au or Trevor Gormley, Senior Associate, on 8235 3010 or trevor.gormley@wallmans.com.au

Welcome Renae Leverenz, Associate, Local Government



We are delighted to announce that Renae Leverenz has joined the Local Government Team as a generalist advisor, with a specific focus on providing advice regarding regulatory and compliance matters.

Renae will represent Councils in all jurisdictions under a wide range of Local Government legislation, as well as advise on all aspects of Councils' regulatory and compliance functions, including summary procedure, conduct of investigations, by-laws, the powers and functions of authorised persons, and order making. Additionally, Renae will advise on issues in relation to governance and policy issues, as well as general Administrative Law.

Joining Wallmans with over 6 years experience, Renae previously worked in the Administrative and Environment Section of the Crown Solicitor's office and the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, undertaking a range of regulatory prosecutions in the Magistrates' Court, and disciplinary proceedings and administrative appeals in the District Court.

Renae can be contacted on 08 8235 3041 or renae.leverenz@wallmans.com.au

Seminar: Copyright Not Copywrongs! New Session Announced. Register Now.

Thursday 8th October 2009, 9.30am-1pm, City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters

'The seminar answered a lot of the questions that I had. It was well presented and very professional'

'Clear and concise explanations, well prepared and questions were well answered'



A seminar covering what you need to know about copyright law and how it affects your Council. Don't miss this informative , practical session developed to provide Council staff with the knowledge to identify and address the specific copyright issues that affect them in the performance of their functions and duties.

Who should attend?

Any officer who:

- ❑ Handles or otherwise uses architectural or engineering plans, technical drawings, maps or charts:
- ❑ Commissions or uses Expert Reports
- ❑ Works in a library or community centre
- ❑ Handles Freedom of Information Act applications
- ❑ Has involvement in community art or performance programmes
- ❑ Uses graphic design or logos, or generally produces marketing materials for Councils
- ❑ Engages artists, designers or members of the public to create artworks, murals, designs etc for Council.

For the full program or to register, please contact Anna- Maria Palma, Marketing Assistant, on 08 8235 3093 or anna-maria.palma@wallmans.com.au

Wallmans would like to thank The City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters for kindly hosting this seminar.

Six of the Best-Good Decision Making: Consolidated Conference

Register Now- 12 & 13th November, The Pavilion, Veale Gardens

'Finally, a program designed to provide an insight into the importance of good governance processes and how they relate to the local government decision-making environment. The six modules offer a comprehensive and relevant overview of how to make sound decisions. The sessions have been tailored to suit the South Australian context, providing a real opportunity to raise the bar within local government to ensure we can stand the test of scrutiny and inspire confidence in our governance practices.'

Lisa Mara, Manager, Governance and Civic Affairs, City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

Due to the overwhelming feedback and ongoing enquires regarding the *Six of the Best Seminar Series- Good Decision Making: What You Need to Know*, Wallmans Lawyers and LGMA are running the full 6 module program as a 2-day consolidated Conference, on the 12th and 13th November 2009 at the Pavilion Function Centre, Veale Gardens, South Terrace.

Over 400 Local Government Staff and Elected Members have taken part in the module program over the past 7 months. The two-day program has also been run in rural locations, with a great degree of success, so if you missed out, or are interested in attending, please register today.

The program and registration form is available at the Wallmans Lawyers Home Page at:
<http://www.wallmans.com.au/SixOfTheBestSeries09.pdf>

Disclaimer: The contents of this newsletter is for information only and should not be regarded as formal legal advice.



WALLMANS
LAWYERS