

Item

City Culture & Community Services Committee on 04/03/2014

Status: Public

By-law 12 - Miscellaneous Variation By-law [2012/00061]

Strategic Outcome:

Outcome 4 - Liveable City

Program & Value Proposition:

City Safety and Customer Services - The City Safety and Customer Services Program will facilitate safer places for all to enjoy and support the delivery of brilliant service by Council

Program Contact No:

Joanna Beaumont, A/PM City Safety and Customer Services 8203 7664

Approved:

Sandy Verschoor, City Culture and Community Services

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Culture & Community Services Committee recommends to Council that:

1. Pursuant to Section 246 of the Local Government Act 1999:
 - 1.1 there being at least two-thirds of the member of Council present; and
 - 1.2 having considered By-law No. 12 – Miscellaneous Variation By-law 2013 (the By-law) (reproduced at **Attachment A** to item 6 on the agenda for the meeting of Council held on 11 March 2014) in light of the National Competition Policy and the Report prepared on the National Competition Policy with respect to the By-law (reproduced at **Attachment A** to item 6 on the agenda for the meeting of Council held on [11 March 2014]); and
 - 1.3 having considered all submissions and recommendations made on the By-law, Council makes the By-law in exercise of the powers contained in the Acts Interpretation Act 1915, the Local Government Act 1934.
2. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign the By-law as made by Council.

3. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to publish notice of the making of the By-law in Advertiser and City Messenger.
4. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to arrange for the By-law to be published in the Government Gazette.
5. The report to the Legislative review Committee on the By-law (reproduced at **Attachment A** to item 6 on the agenda for the meeting of Council held on [11 March 2014]), be adopted by and be signed by the Chief Executive Officer on Council's behalf.
6. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to arrange for the By-law and all other necessary documentation to be provided to the Legislative Review Committee.

BACKGROUND

1. By-Law 12 Miscellaneous Variation 2013 (**Attachment A**) was developed to amend the current by-laws in line with the result of the High Court decision in February 2013.
2. In September 2013 Council approved the release of By-Law 12 - Miscellaneous Variation By-law for public consultation. The By-Law included proposed changes to By-Law 1 – Permits and Penalties; By-Law 3 – Local Government Land; By-Law 4 – Roads; By-Law 5 – Waste Management; and By-Law 9 – Lodging Houses.
3. This consultation proved to be successful as we received an unprecedented number of responses (84), with an overwhelming number of responses to one proposed amendment in particular 'bikes tied to infrastructure' (76) (see **Attachment B** for complete list of responses and the Corporations reply).
4. As a result the initial consultation, further amendments were proposed to satisfy community expectation and Community Consultation was undertaken a second time in line with the requirements set out in *Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1999*.
5. These amendments led to eleven (11) responses and of these, nine (9) related positively to the inclusion of *Clause 8 Food Business Notification Confirmation*. Clauses pertaining to waste management, climbing on structures and distribution of literature were the focus of the remaining three (3) responses (see **Attachment C** for complete list of responses and the Corporations reply).

DISCUSSION

6. This report recommends that the amended By-Law be adopted by Council and sent to the Legislative Review Committee (LRC) for approval.
7. Changes have been made to the *Variation By-law* in line with community feedback through two separate consultation processes. The main areas of change relate to the following:
 - **By-law 1 – Permits and Penalties**
 - 7.1 Include a requirement for the proprietor of a food business to display confirmation that they have complied with their obligations under the *Food Act 2001* by displaying their notification in a prominent position (Clause 8).
 - **By-law 3 – Local Government Land**
 - 7.2 Include a revised requirement pertaining to the tethering of bicycles to structures (amended Clause 18) in order to explain that bicycles will only be removed if they are an obstacle; and

- 7.3 Removed restriction on tethering animals to trees (amended Clause 29).
8. The following process must now be undertaken as stipulated in Chapter 12 of the *Local Government Act 1999*:
- 8.1 The Council must obtain a Certificate of Validity in the prescribed form, signed by a legal practitioner certifying that, in the opinion of the practitioner:
- 8.1.1 Council has the powers to make the amendments by virtue of statutory power specified in the certificate, and;
- 8.1.2 The amendments are not in conflict with the Local Government Act.
- 8.2 The amended by-laws must also contain a report prepared by a legal practitioner on the National Competition Policy.
- 8.3 A resolution from Council will be required at this time which requires a minimum of two thirds of the members (i.e. eight (8) members) and must be supported by an absolute majority of the Members of Council (i.e. seven (7) Members).
- 8.4 Sixteen (16) copies of the proposed amendments to the By-laws are then sent to the LRC of the State Government within six sitting days of that House, after the by-laws has been resolved by Council.
- 8.5 The By-law will be gazetted and if not disallowed by the LRC of the State Government, it will come into force four months from the date of gazettal.
9. The issues raised previously by the LRC have been incorporated into the changes proposed to satisfy their concerns.
10. Should the LRC not support any one of the proposed amendments, the whole By-Law will fail. Therefore it is important to satisfy the LRC with the proposed amendments.
11. The process from the time of this report until the formal adoption of the amendments to by-laws is estimated to take approximately six months. The majority of this time is spent in meeting the statutory requirements including a four month period from the time that the By-laws are gazetted.

IMPLICATIONS

Implication	Applicable	Comment
Policy	YES	Amended by-laws will result in new/updated Policies/By-Laws
Business Plan Objectives / Outcomes or Services	YES	This fulfils City Safety's Program Plan requirement to review the by-laws
Consultation	YES	Undertaken in accordance with the <i>Local Government Act 1999</i> and Councils Consultation policy.
Resource	NO	
Risk / Legal / Legislative	YES	These by-laws are written under the head powers contained in the Local Government Act 1999 & 1934

Budget / Financial Implications

13/14 Budget Allocation	13/14 Budget Reconsideration	Proposed 14/15 Budget Allocation	Ongoing Costs (eg maintenance)	Life of Project / Life Expectancy of Asset
NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – By-law No. 12 – Miscellaneous Variation By-law 2013

Attachment B – Complete list of responses through Your Say Adelaide website to the first consultation

Attachment C – Complete list of responses through Your Say Adelaide website to the second consultation



CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF ADELAIDE

By-law made under the Local Government Act 1999

By-law No. 12 – Miscellaneous Variation By-law 2013

To vary the Council's by-laws and for related purposes.

Part 1 - Preliminary

1. **Short title**

This by-law may be cited as the *Miscellaneous Variation By-law 2013*.

2. **Commencement**

This by-law will come into operation four months after the day on which it is published in the Gazette in accordance with Section 249(5) of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

3. **Variation provisions**

In this by-law, a provision under a heading referring to the variation of a specified by-law varies the by-law so specified.

Part 2 - Variation to By-law No. 1 – Permits and Penalties

4. **Variation of Long Title**

Long title - delete the long title and substitute:

To repeal by-laws, provide for a permit system, set penalties for breaches of by-laws, provide for certain matters pertaining to liability and evidence, set regulatory requirements, clarify the construction of Council's by-laws and for related purposes.

5. **Insertion of Clause 2.4**

After clause 2.3 insert:

2.4 In this by-law:

2.4.1 **Approved Form** means the form approved from time to time by the Chief Executive Officer of the Council;

2.4.2 **Authorised Person** has the same meaning as in the *Local Government Act 1999*;

2.4.3 **Drive** and **Driver** have the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961*;

2.4.4 **Food Business** has the same meaning as in the *Food Act 2001*;

- 2.4.5 **Local Government Land** has the same meaning as in the Council's *By-law No. 3 – Local Government Land*;
- 2.4.6 **Owner** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961*;
- 2.4.7 **Premises** has the same meaning as in the *Food Act 2001*;
- 2.4.8 **Prescribed Offence** means an offence against a by-law of the Council relating to the Driving, parking or standing of vehicles;
- 2.4.9 **Proprietor** has the same meaning as in the *Food Act 2001*;
- 2.4.10 **Road** has the same meaning as in the *Local Government Act 1999*;
- 2.4.11 **Vehicle** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961* and the *Australian Road Rules 1999*.

6. Insertion of Clause 6

After clause 5 insert:

6 Liability of vehicles owners and expiation of certain offences

- 6.1 Without derogating from the liability of any other person, but subject to this clause, if a Vehicle is involved in a Prescribed Offence, the Owner of the Vehicle is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence and the expiation fee that is fixed for the principal offence applies in relation to an offence against this clause.
- 6.2 The Owner and Driver of a Vehicle are not both liable through the operation of this clause to be convicted of an offence arising out of the same circumstances, and consequently conviction of the Owner exonerates the Driver and conversely conviction of the Driver exonerates the Owner.
- 6.3 An expiation notice or expiation reminder notice given under the *Expiation of Offences Act 1996* to the Owner of a Vehicle for an alleged Prescribed Offence involving the Vehicle must be accompanied by a notice inviting the Owner, if he or she was not the Driver at the time of the alleged Prescribed Offence, to provide the Council or officer specified in the notice, within the period specified in the notice, with a statutory declaration:
- 6.3.1 setting out the name and address of the Driver; or
- 6.3.2 if he or she had transferred Ownership of the Vehicle to another prior to the time of the alleged offence and has complied with the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* in respect of the transfer—setting out details of the transfer (including the name and address of the transferee).
- 6.4 Before proceedings are commenced against the Owner of a Vehicle for an offence against this section involving the Vehicle, the complainant must send the Owner a notice:
- 6.4.1 setting out particulars of the alleged Prescribed Offence; and
- 6.4.2 inviting the Owner, if he or she was not the Driver at the time of the alleged Prescribed Offence, to provide the complainant, within 21

days of the date of the notice, with a statutory declaration setting out the matters referred to in clause 6.3.

6.5 Clause 6.4 does not apply to:

6.5.1 proceedings commenced where an Owner has elected under the *Expiation of Offences Act 1996* to be prosecuted for the offence; or

6.5.2 proceedings commenced against an Owner of a Vehicle who has been named in a statutory declaration under this section as the Driver of the Vehicle.

6.6 Subject to clause 6.7, in proceedings against the Owner of a Vehicle for an offence against this clause, it is a defence to prove:

6.6.1 that, in consequence of some unlawful act, the Vehicle was not in the possession or control of the Owner at the time of the alleged Prescribed Offence; or

6.6.2 that the Owner provided the complainant with a statutory declaration in accordance with an invitation under this clause.

6.7 The defence in clause 6.6.2 does not apply if it is proved that the Owner made the declaration knowing it to be false in a material particular.

6.8 If:

6.8.1 an expiation notice is given to a person named as the alleged Driver in a statutory declaration under this clause; or

6.8.2 proceedings are commenced against a person named as the alleged Driver in such a statutory declaration,

the notice or summons, as the case may be, must be accompanied by a notice setting out particulars of the statutory declaration that named the person as the alleged Driver.

6.9 The particulars of the statutory declaration provided to the person named as the alleged Driver must not include the address of the person who provided the statutory declaration.

7. Insertion of Clause 7

After clause 6 insert:

7 Evidence

In proceedings for a Prescribed Offence, an allegation in a complaint that:

7.1 a specified place was a Road or Local Government Land; or

7.2 a specified Vehicle was driven, parked or left standing in a specified place; or

7.3 a specified Vehicle was parked or left standing for the purposes of soliciting business from a person or offering or exposing goods for sale; or

- 7.4 a specified place was not set aside by the Council for the purposes of the Driving, parking or standing of vehicles; or
- 7.5 a specified person was an Authorised Person; or
- 7.6 a specified provision was a condition of a specified permit granted under clause 3 of this by-law; or
- 7.7 a specified person was the Owner or Driver of a specified vehicle; or
- 7.8 a person named in a statutory declaration under clause 6 of this by-law for the Prescribed Offence to which the declaration relates was the Driver of the Vehicle at the time at which the alleged offence was committed; or
- 7.9 an Owner or Driver of a Vehicle for a Prescribed Offence was given notice under clause 6 of this by-law on a specified day,

is proof of the matters so alleged in the absence of proof to the contrary.

8. Insertion of Clause 8

After clause 7 insert:

8 Food Business Notification Confirmation

- 8.1 Upon receipt and processing of a written notice received from the Proprietor of a Food Business in accordance with Section 86 of the *Food Act 2001* the Council will issue the Proprietor with a food business notification confirmation, in the Approved Form, evidencing that the Proprietor has complied with their obligations pursuant to Section 86 of the *Food Act 2001*.
- 8.2 The Proprietor of a Food Business must, at all times, keep a copy of the food business notification confirmation issued to them by the Council displayed in a prominent position on the Premises of the Food Business that is clearly visible from the outside of the Premises to potential customers, members of the public and passers-by.

Part 3 - Variation to By-law No. 3 – Local Government Land

9. Substitution of Clause 2.1

Clause 2.1 – delete the clause and substitute:

2.1 Alteration of Local Government Land

make an alteration to the Land, including:

- 2.1.1 altering the construction or arrangement of the Land to permit or facilitate access from an adjacent property; or
- 2.1.2 erecting or installing a structure (including pipes, wires, cables, fixtures, fittings and other objects) in, on, across, under or over the Land; or
- 2.1.3 changing or interfering with the construction, arrangement or materials of the Land; or
- 2.1.4 changing, interfering with or removing a structure (including pipes, wires, cables, fixtures, fittings or other objects) associated with the Land; or

2.1.5 planting a tree or other vegetation on the Land, interfering with the vegetation on the Land or removing vegetation from the Land.

10. **Removal of Clause 2.20**

Clause 2.20 - delete the clause.

11. **Variation of Clause 2.35**

Clause 2.35 - at the end of the clause delete '.' and substitute ';'.

12. **Insertion of Clause 2.36**

After clause 2.35 insert:

2.36 Vehicles

drive or propel any vehicle on local government land unless on an area or road that is constructed or set aside by the Council for that purpose.

13. **Removal of Clause 3.1**

Clause 3.1 - delete the clause.

Part 4 - Variation to By-law No. 4 – Roads

14. **Variation of Clause 1.6**

Clause 1.6 - at the end of the clause delete '.' and substitute ';'.

15. **Insertion of Clause 1.7**

After clause 1.6 insert:

1.7 **Wheeled Recreational Device** has the same meaning as in the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

16. **Substitution of Clause 2.1**

Clause 2.1 – delete the clause and substitute:

2.1 Advertising

2.1.1 display any sign other than a Moveable Sign which is displayed on a Road in accordance with the Council's Moveable Signs By-law;

2.1.2 place or maintain any goods or sign on the Road or park or stand a Vehicle on the Road for the purpose of:

2.1.2.1 soliciting any business from any person; or

2.1.2.2 offering or exposing goods or services for sale.

provided that this subparagraph 2.1.2 shall not apply to a person who is simply travelling along a Road.

17. **Substitution of Clause 2.2**

Clause 2.2 – delete the clause and substitute:

2.2 Amplification

use an amplifier or other device whether mechanical or electrical for the purpose of amplifying sound;

18. **Insertion of Clause 2.2A**

After clause 2.2 insert:

2.2A Bicycles

chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road where the bicycle may cause an obstruction or damage the structure, other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;

19. **Insertion of Clause 2.2B**

After clause 2.2A insert:

2.2B Bridge Jumping

jump or dive from any bridge or other structure;

20. **Insertion of Clause 2.2C**

After clause 2.2B insert:

2.2C Distribute

give out or distribute to any bystander or passer-by any handbill, book, notice or other printed matter, provided that this restriction shall not apply to any handbill or leaflet given out or distributed by or with the authority of a candidate during the course of a Federal, State or Local Government Election or to a handbill or leaflet given out or distributed during the course and for the purposes of a Referendum;

21. **Insertion of Clause 2.3A**

After clause 2.3 insert:

2.3A Fires, Firearms and Fireworks

2.3A.1 subject to the *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005*, light any fire except in a place provided by the Council for that purpose;

2.3A.2 use, discharge or explode any firearms or fireworks;

22. **Insertion of Clause 2.3B**

After clause 2.3A insert:

2.3B Handbills on Vehicles

place on any Vehicle, or cause to be placed on any Vehicle (without the consent of the owner of the Vehicle), any handbill, book, notice, leaflet, or other printed matter except any handbill, book, notice, leaflet or other printed matter:

- 2.3B.1 that is related to a Commonwealth or State election and is placed, given out or distributed during the period commencing on the issue of the writ or writs for the election and ending at the close of polls on polling day; or
- 2.3B.2 that is related to an election under the *Local Government Act 1999*, or the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999* and is placed, given out or distributed during the period commencing four weeks immediately before the date that has been set (either by or under either Act) for polling day and ending at the close of voting on polling day; or
- 2.3B.3 that is related to and placed, given out or distributed during the course of and for the purpose of a Referendum;

23. Insertion of Clause 2.5A

After clause 2.5 insert:

2.5A Model Aircraft and Cars

fly or operate a model aircraft or model/remote control car on any Road to which the Council has resolved this subparagraph applies;

24. Insertion of Clause 2.9A

After clause 2.9 insert:

2.9A Rubbish

remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging etc) that has been discarded in a Council bin;

25. Substitution of Clause 2.10

Clause 2.10 – delete the clause and substitute:

2.10 Tents and Camping

- 2.10.1 camp or remain overnight whether in the open, a building, a vehicle or otherwise;
- 2.10.2 erect any tent or other structure;

26. Insertion of Clause 2.10A

After clause 2.10 insert:

2.10A Touting for Business

tout for business;

27. **Variation of Clause 2.12**

Clause 2.12 - at the end of the clause delete '.' and substitute ';'.

28. **Insertion of Clause 2.13**

After clause 2.12 insert:

2.13 Wheeled Recreational Devices

use a Wheeled Recreational Device on a footpath.

29. **Insertion of Clause 2A**

After clause 12.13 insert:

2A Prohibited Activities

A person must not on a Road:

2A.1 Birds

feed any bird;

2A.2 Climbing

climb on or over any fixture, fitting, plant, object or building;

2A.3 Damaging or Defacing Property

2A.3.1 deface, damage, paint, write, cut names or make marks on any tree, rock, gate, fence, building, sign or other property of the Council;

2A.3.2 attach any object to any tree, gate, fence or other fixture;

2A.4 Glass

wilfully break any glass, china or other brittle material;

2A.5 Interference with Permitted Use

interrupt, disrupt or interfere with any other person's use of the Road which is permitted or for which Permission has been granted;

2A.6 Missiles

throw, roll or discharge any stone, substance or missile to the danger of any person, property or animal;

2A.7 Playing Games

play or practice a game:

2A.7.1 which is likely to cause damage to the Road or anything on it or in the vicinity of the Road; or

- 2A.7.2 which endangers the safety or interferes with the comfort of any person;

2A.8 Public conveniences

- 2A.8.1 urinate other than in a urinal or pan or defecate other than in a pan set apart for that purpose, in a public convenience;
- 2A.8.2 deposit anything in a pan, urinal or drain in a public convenience which is likely to cause a blockage;
- 2A.8.3 use a public convenience for a purpose for which it was not designed or constructed;
- 2A.8.4 enter any public convenience that is set aside for use of the opposite gender except:
- 2A.8.4.1 if the person is under the age of eight years accompanying an adult; or
- 2A.8.4.2 to provide assistance to a disabled person; or
- 2A.8.4.3 in the case of a genuine emergency;

30. Insertion of Clause 4A

After clause 4.3 insert:

4A Removal of Objects

If any goods, materials, object or substance has been left on a Road in breach of this by-law an authorised person or her or his agent may remove the item and dispose of it in a manner that authorised person thinks fit and may recover the costs of so doing from the person responsible as a debt.

31. Insertion of Clause 6

After clause 5 insert:

6 Application of Paragraph

Subparagraph 2.5A of this by-law shall apply only in such portion or portions of the area as the Council may by resolution direct in accordance with Section 246(3)(e) of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

Part 5 - Variation to By-law No. 5 – Waste Management

32. Variation of Long Title

Long title - delete the long title and substitute:

FOR the prevention and suppression of nuisances, obstructions and risks to public health by regulating and controlling the management of public places, kerbside removal of domestic, recyclable and green organic waste from premises, for regulating the management of Council property and otherwise for the good rule and government of the area and for the comfort, convenience and safety of its inhabitants.

33. **Insertion of Clause 1.10A**

After clause 1.10A insert:

1.10A **Private Thoroughfare** means a private street, road, lane, footway, alley, court or thoroughfare that the public is allowed to use and have access to;

34. **Insertion of Clause 3.7.4**

After clause 3.7.3 insert:

3.7.4 An occupier of premises must facilitate the collection and removal of Hard Waste from his or her premises by placing the Hard Waste out for collection:

3.7.4.1 on the day of or the night before (and not before these times) the scheduled collection day;

3.7.4.2 on the Footpath Area in front of and on the same side as the premises, abutting the edge of (but not on) the carriageway, or in another position as approved or permitted by the Council; and

3.7.4.3 not so as to impede the passage of pedestrian traffic.

35. **Insertion of Clause 5**

After clause 4 insert:

5 Private Thoroughfare

The owner or occupier of a Private Thoroughfare shall keep the thoroughfare clean and free of refuse, rubbish and waste material.

36. **Insertion of Clause 6**

After clause 5 insert:

6 Posting of Bills on Buildings

A person shall not, without the permission of the owner or occupier of a building or structure visible from or adjacent to a Road, post, allow or cause to be posted on the building or structure any bills, advertisements or other papers or items.

Part 6 - Variation to By-law No. 9 – Lodging Houses

37. **Substitution of Clause 1.2**

Clause 1.2 – delete the clause and substitute:

1.2 **Building** has the same meaning as in the *Development Act 1993*;

38. **Removal of Clause 3.2**

Clause 3.2 - delete the clause.

39. **Removal of Clause 3.3**

Clause 3.3 - delete the clause.

40. **Substitution of Clause 3.4**

Clause 3.4 – delete the clause and substitute:

3.4 A fire safety audit of the Lodging House shall be undertaken:

3.4.1 prior to the issuing of a Licence pursuant to this by-law; and

3.4.2 each year that the Lodging House is Licensed under this by-law,
in order to determine the current fire safety standard of the Lodging House.

41. **Substitution of Clause 5.4.2**

Clause 5.4.2 – delete the clause and substitute:

5.4.2 if the Council has reasonable cause to believe that the Licence holder has committed an offence against this by-law, the *Local Government Act 1934*, the *Local Government Act 1999*, the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011*, the *Food Act 2001*, the *Development Act 1993*, or the *Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992*;

42. **Substitution of Clause 6**

Clause 6.1 – delete the clause and substitute:

A person must not, without the permission of the Council or an Authorised Person:

6.1 add to or alter any Lodging House; or

6.2 use any part of a Lodging House in any other manner contrary to its permitted use or the terms of the Licence.

The foregoing by-law was duly made and passed at a meeting of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide held on 2013 by an absolute majority of the members for the time being constituting the Council, there being at least two thirds of the members present.

.....
Mr Peter Smith
Chief Executive Officer

Complete list of responses through Council's Your Say Adelaide web site

Name	Comments	Response
C Baxter	<p>Why on earth do you call them 'expiations'? That is sooo Spanish Inquisition or German Calvinist; the overtones are so severely religious, i.e. expiating your sins.</p> <p>I can confirm I have read around 100 Council fees & charges schedules and nowhere else in Australia do they call them expiations.</p> <p>Aside from religiosity and absurd obscurity, the word must be quite alienating to non-Anglos.</p> <p>Why not use plain English. They are fines or penalties. End of story.</p>	<p>If a breach of a By-Law is alleged, the alleged offender is issued with an expiation notice. That is, they are not necessarily guilty of an offence, nor does paying the expiation fee admit guilt. If the matter proceeded to Court and they were found Guilty, a fine would then be imposed by the Courts for being proven to have committed an offence.</p>
P John Kirkwood	<p>Re item 16 Insertion clause 2.2a.....affixing bicycles to structures other than those provided for the purpose.</p> <p>Comment: This is an unreasonable demand in areas where bike parking/securing facilities are not located within a reasonable walking distance from the place where the bike rider requires to visit. The By-law does create a disincentive to bike riders, which seems to fly in the face of councils wish to encourage city bike use. Some appropriate modification to this proposed change needs to be considered.</p> <p>Re Item 32 Insertion clause 3.7.4Collection & removal of hard waste.</p> <p>Whilst I have no disagreement with the proposed By -law. It strikes me that it is not always practical for certain residents who might be leaving their abode outside the council hard waste collection days.</p> <p>It is my observation that in certain short term rental areas, departing renters dump their hard rubbish on the street, in the knowledge that council will come & collect it in due course & are unwilling to pursue the owner for any penalty. If council maintain the resources to collect errant rubbish makers. Why don't they offer a chargeable collection service & advertise that to residents & rate payers.</p> <p>Whilst this submission is obviously a separate issue to the By-law, it is indirectly related.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Hard Rubbish</p> <p>The idea of charging for the service in addition to normal collections is worthy of consideration. This will be passed on to our cleansing area for consideration</p>
Claude Baxter	<p>The consultation invitation does not indicate the actual proposed changes. I am now advised that the Local Law review includes a proposition for bike riders to be penalised for tethering their bikes anywhere other than a bike rack.</p> <p>Interesting to know how this would be enforced. More importantly, in terms of</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p>

Attachment B

	<p>policy, this is a significant discouragement. There are simply not enough racks around. Speaking on behalf of the Market, we want people to tether their bikes to a pole if the small number of racks available is full.</p>	<p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Rebecca Powell	<p>Add - Food businesses (who must notify Council under the Food Act) to display evidence (to be decided - i.e. sticker/certification) of notification (not currently legislated). This will assist Council EHOs to know if we are / are not aware of food businesses. New, businesses that are taken over occur frequently. If there is some sort of display it will be easily recognisable by the EHO, even CPO, parking officers, general public to note if a business is operating without notifying Council. A public display may encourage businesses to do the right thing. Also we may get advice from the public of businesses that we are not aware of.</p>	<p>To be referred to our legal providers for input to confirm if it can be incorporated.</p>
Marjon Martin	<p>On reading the By-Law variations I am deeply concerned that they are excessive and even depriving us of rights that I thought were stock standard in our country eg meet in groups in public places.</p> <p>I will mention a few of the possible examples that I think will create more problems and issues than those they are trying to resolve eg cannot chain bike to any structure other than a designated cycle parking rack; can't hand out advertising material except as part of election campaign; no handbills on vehicles except....no feeding of birds on road, climbing structures, playing etc etc no taking items out of bins...</p> <p>Roads are shared spaces, recycling goods from bins provides income for many, promotion of activities can be very effective through passing on leaflets. Giving people some choice as to how they do things is part of creating a vibrant community. By trying to stop some specific behaviours by certain people and groups you are creating a strait jacket for everyone. I think other strategies are to be tried to engender greater cooperation between interest groups so as not to overwhelm and annoy others who have different views or interests.</p> <p>It does not seem feasible to me that the by-laws proposed could be universally enacted but would be used to STOP particular people. While in some instances I may be delighted to have some activities stopped but nevertheless I think these are not wise by-laws and are an overreaction to issues in the city.</p> <p>The hype is about wanting Adelaide to be lively, diverse, edgy, really out there, but these by laws appear to want to make us anything but. We won't even be</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Pamphlets on vehicles</p> <p>There have been a number of situations over the past twelve months where inappropriate flyers have been placed on vehicles. As a consequence Councillors and staff have received a number of complaints. This particular inclusion brings the Roads By-Law in line with the Local Government Land By-Law so Authorised Officers can take action if the offender does not cease when requested.</p> <p>Feeding of Birds</p> <p>Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are</p>

	able to cycle as there is nowhere enough cycle parking.	<p>vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.</p> <p>Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>Playing games</p> <p>In addressing the concern regarding playing games, as an example, if some people were out playing cricket in the street and were not damaging property or causing a disturbance to the public, then we have no issue with that.</p> <p>However if there was a disturbance and/or damage was being caused, or if someone was kicking a soccer ball around in a high traffic area like Rundle Mall and needed to stop, the proposed changes give us the ability to ask them to stop.</p> <p>The changes being recommended around this sort of activity are consistent with what already exists for local Government Land By-laws.</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p>
Jennie Boisvert	<p>Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to respond to the proposed by-laws.</p> <p>It is my opinion it is not largely the by-laws that need changing but the way in which they are administered. At the last review a few changes were made one of which allowed for expiation for putting bins out too early or failing to return them to the correct property the day of collection. There are some streets where the bins are left in the street all day, every day. I have seen then</p>	<p>Your concerns pertain to the Policing aspect as opposed to the content; consequently your comments have been noted.</p>

	<p>stickered once in the last 3 years. If the Council is serious about this ugly, smelly and dangerous to pedestrian hazards the expiation notices need to be issued regularly to be effective as a deterrent.</p> <p>Another area of concern about which the by-laws are silent but should not be is the regulation of bins that businesses contract for use on a private basis. Increasingly, these are put out at different times of the week and left out for days at a time. It is my belief that these should be collected from and returned to the private property at every collection and has no purpose in a residential street other than to reduce the amenity of residents.</p>	
Robert Slape	<p>What is the point in banning locking bikes to structures other than bike racks? My thinking is that most people only use other structures because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There are a lack of bike racks 2 There are no bike racks 3 The bike racks offer poor access/are inconvenient. <p>For instance I go to UniSA where the lockers are poorly located and annoying to get to, while on the stretch between Frome and Pulteney on North Terrace there is parking for 5 4 maybe five bikes at the one rack. Every single day the fence is lined and the poles have bikes. This bylaw would only force them to....where? There are not enough racks.</p> <p>I appreciate that the council has made efforts to install more parking but in certain areas it will likely never be enough as there will always be over demand. In other places there may not be enough demand to warrant installing a rack so in a pinch a pole may be your only option.</p> <p>Maybe ban them at key places like the footpath along the north side of Gouger street or other spots where they get in the way. An outright ban seems over-reaching.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Julie Jordan Chair: South West City Residents Assoc	<p>Submission re By-law Amendments – South West City Residents Association (SWCRA)</p> <p>It is SWCRA's view that many of Council's by-laws are unnecessary or overly restrictive. They reflect an obsession with risk management, which is stifling spontaneity, creativity and freedom, the very things that make a city appealing and liveable, supposedly the goal of Adelaide City Council.</p> <p>While it may be the case that some of the by-laws are rarely enforced, it's still disturbing that Council is continually availing itself of more and more control over every aspect of our public lives.</p> <p>From the perspective of the SW residential community, there are two clauses in the draft Miscellaneous Variation By-law that stand out as potentially</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Tying up a dog</p>

	<p>problematic:</p> <p>Clause 2.2A by-law 3: which prohibits cyclists securing their bikes to anything but a Council bike rack.</p> <p>Many SW residents are cyclists and this rule will only serve to make their choice of transport less convenient. It's hardly supportive of the Smart Move Strategy, which aims to increase cycling in the city.</p> <p>There are far too few bike racks in the city to cater for the cyclist population, and if chaining to posts and fences is outlawed, more bikes will be left unsecured and liable to be stolen. Where there are bicycle racks, outside the Central Market for example, these can be full, particularly at peak times such as Saturday morning.</p> <p>We are not sure what perceived threat to safety or convenience prompted inclusion of this clause, but we believe common sense should prevail and it should be removed.</p> <p>Clause 2A.3.2 by-law 3: which prohibits tying a dog leash to a tree, fence, etc. Again, this goes against common sense. Surely it's safer and more humane to tie a dog up than allow it to potentially roam, annoy or harass members of the public, get injured, and break a dozen other by-laws? This clause should also be removed.</p> <p>We might also have commented on clause 2A.1 re feeding birds, but this one seems so ludicrous that we didn't know where to start.</p>	<p>The part relating to an animal on a leash will be removed as this could be addressed if the animal is distressed by contacting the RSPCA.</p>
Trevor Matthews	<p>While the majority of the bylaws appear appropriate to me, I object quite strongly to clause 2.2A. I commute regularly into and through both Adelaide CBD and North Adelaide, and while I do use a "a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose" to secure my bike, there are times where I am forced to use other options (especially outside the north/east end of town i.e. outside of the North tce. East tce, Grenfell st, King William st block of the CBD) when doing so, I will try and choose a suitable location which is causing the least disruption to other users of that space.</p> <p>I believe this clause needs to be removed, or at least re-worded so that it is possible to use poles/fences etc where necessary but in some way describe using specific structures in preference and if we were to use a pole fence etc to do so in a way to cause minimal disruption.</p> <p>I find this clause in conflict with the councils desire to reduce motor vehicle traffic, as by restricting bicycle security, people will leave them at home and drive instead - or just go elsewhere wherever possible - reducing trade in the CBD/North Adelaide area and impacting on the businesses set up in your</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>

	council district. Thank you for considering this submission.	
Anna Day	<p>I write regarding the proposed by-law amendment which would make it illegal to lock a bicycle to anything other than a Council bike rack (clause 2.2A). While I'm not opposed to the principle behind this proposed amendment, there are simply nowhere near enough Council bike racks to cater for the number of bicycles that are parked around the city every day.</p> <p>One of the reasons people cycle is for convenience. Cyclist will always find the shortest, smoothest path. Cyclists will always find the easiest, safest place to park and lock their bike, and if there are not enough Council bike racks available in convenient locations, cyclist will simply not adhere to this by-law. Cyclists don't want to park across the street and around the corner from their destination; they want to park directly adjacent to their destination. I firmly believe that if Council understands this and places enough bike racks in MEANINGFUL and USEFUL locations around the city, there would be no need for this by-law amendment - cyclists would simply use the readily available, convenient Council bike racks.</p> <p>If Council thinks about cyclists' desire paths and provides sufficient infrastructure to support these paths, Adelaide would become a city that make cycling easy and attractive as a low impact, sustainable transport option.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Jeremy Ryder	<p>Many of the proposed changes make sense, however there are some which seem to over-regulate the freedoms that city residents and visitors have to interact with each other and the city.</p> <p>Proposed amendment 2.2A - I am a cyclist and I think this proposal is ridiculous. It seems to fly in the face of all that ACC is supposedly trying to do to encourage people to ride bikes. The city is cluttered with cars, a healthy city is cluttered with bikes. One of the advantages of riding a bike is the ability to lock your bicycle close to where you are going, preferably within eyesight. I have been coming and going from the city all my life, I have been a resident in the city for the last 5 years and NEVER have I been obstructed by bikes locked to fences or poles, and I walk around the city with a pram carrying my 17-month-old. What obstructs me the most is BINS. Rubbish bins left out by residents because they are too big and impractical to store on people's small properties where space is a premium.</p> <p>Proposed clause 2.2B - I can see why this is dangerous but this is so vague, jump from any structure?! I don't agree.</p> <p>2.2C/2.3B - I disagree, Australians enjoy the freedom of political communication and this is not limited to official election campaigns so I'm</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p>

	<p>pretty sure this regulation is unconstitutional seeing as it has been established that this is an implied right under the Australian constitution. People should be able to distribute and communicate with each other freely by words or by printed material without having to get permission from an authority. People have the freedom NOT to take material. And flyers left on cars are not very difficult to recycle.</p> <p>2.13 - I disagree, I think wheeled recreational devices should be allowed on footpaths. The majority of people using these 'devices' I think would actually be responsible and careful. Most people are pretty good at looking out for others. Those that don't, I'm not sure give a toss about regulations.</p> <p>12.13 2A.1 and 12.13 2A.2 - I'm not aware of any problems or any bird feeding in the street. Is this targeting specific places? Climbing an basically any structure?! You're trying to GRID the city and make it an offence to do anything but walk in straight lines along the footpath. If people are engaged in criminal vandalism, they're not going to be put off by these regulations. And what of the parkour people? Are you trying to put a stop to this? What kind of boring regulated city is the ACC trying to create?!</p>	<p>Pamphlets on vehicles</p> <p>There have been a number of situations over the past twelve months where inappropriate flyers have been placed on vehicles. As a consequence Councillors and staff have received a number of complaints. This particular inclusion brings the Roads By-Law in line with the Local Government Land By-Law so Authorised Officers can take action if the offender does not cease when requested.</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices have and do cause damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose.</p> <p>Feeding of Birds</p> <p>Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.</p>
Paul Armour	<p>I strongly object to the following proposed changes:</p> <p>2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose; You are basically discouraging people to cycle in the city, there is not enough provided places to lock bike to.</p> <p>and</p> <p>2.9A Rubbish remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging etc) that has been discarded in a Council bin. You then need to provide a recycling bin next to every rubbish bin.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is</p>

		not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.
Robert Heathwood	<p>The bike parking rule is insane, inane and unenforceable, And the no sleeping in cars is basically encouraging drink driving.</p> <p>The only way these rules could and should be introduced is if bike parking is added to the entrance of every building in the CBD or city businesses are forced to allow bicycles inside their foyers and late night public transport becomes something functional.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Camping - Sleeping in cars</p> <p>This By-Law is part of the By-Law that relates to Camping. This is already covered in By-Law 3 for the Park Lands, this brings the road By-Law inline. Whenever someone is found to be camping in the City, with their agreement, they are put in contact with the appropriate Government Agency to assist them.</p>
Lee-Anne	<p>changes in reaction to 2.2A</p> <p>Many places do not have enough bike facilities as it is, fining and making it illegal for bike to be chained or affixed to 'non' bike racks flies in the face of all the good that ACC is doing trying to get the city to be one of the great cycling cities -</p> <p>This will go down a storm at the conference next year!!!!</p> <p>making riders go and park in a car park takes the idea of cycling as an efficient and easy form of transport out of the minds of the public - not the way I believed ACC was heading.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Tony Marshall	<p>Please do not make it illegal to "chain lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose".</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>

David Hughes	<p>I strongly oppose amendment 2.2A. Lock bicycles in any place other than purpose built council bike lock racks.</p> <p>This amendment will only serve to discourage bicycle use in the CBD, and penalise those making an effort to reduce traffic congestion and pollution in Adelaide.</p> <p>Given councils significant investment in bicycle infrastructure and with initiatives like the free city bike hire scheme, parking day, and in hosting events such as the Tour Down Under, this amendment is instead working against the good work ACC has done in providing a bicycle friendly city.</p> <p>Locking bikes to non-council approved infrastructure is only an issue when not enough bicycle parking infrastructure is provided and there is a very high demand. So instead of creating this by-law I would like to see council provide more accessible bicycle parking in the CBD. It is perfectly acceptable to lock a bicycle to a non-council approved structure in many situations, and it is therefore unreasonable to outlaw and punish many responsible bike users in this way.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council’s position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council’s intention to “ban” this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Sophia Simmons	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am very concerned about clause 2.2A Bicycles. There are simply not enough bike racks in the city, nowhere near enough, to justify penalizing someone for locking their bike to a structure that is not specifically designed for bikes. What harm does locking a bike to a pole do anyway? It's usually out of the way of pedestrians and takes up less space than if there was a bike rack anyway.</p> <p>Please consider seriously looking at the infrastructure that is set up for bike use in the city before implementing such a ridiculous bi-law. Bringing in better systems and services for bike users would be much better than restricting what we can do in an already limited environment.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council’s position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council’s intention to “ban” this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Andrew Dearman	<p>Regarding the proposal to make it illegal to chain bikes to poles (as described in the media today). While I acknowledge certain safety issues for passing pedestrians, the dramatic increase in the use of bikes used by commuters and the relatively slow increase in the number of appropriate bike locking facilities renders the proposed changes problematic.</p> <p>Making it illegal to hand out pamphlets is also possibly of itself illegal under the Australian constitution--re the implied right of free speech and freedom of expression. Making it so that people need to apply for permits for such activities suggests that this is primarily a money grab on the part of the council.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council’s position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council’s intention to “ban” this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>

		<p>Pamphlets on vehicles</p> <p>There have been a number of situations over the past twelve months where inappropriate flyers have been placed on vehicles. As a consequence Councillors and staff have received a number of complaints. This particular inclusion brings the Roads By-Law in line with the Local Government Land By-Law so Authorised Officers can take action if the offender does not cease when requested.</p>
Sam Young	<p>Proposed insertion of 2.2a into bylaw 4 seems to be a pretty poor idea. The council seems to be trying to promote cycling in the city, but preventing bicycles from safely parking except where the council has placed racks will make it unsafe and inconvenient to use a bicycle around town, due to the risk that bicycles may be stolen. Allowing bicycles to be locked to poles etc is rarely an inconvenience to passers-by, unless they are left for extended periods of time (say, over 24 hours). The only way in which this insertion would be in line with the strategy to encourage more cycling in the city would be to dramatically increase the number of bicycle parking racks throughout the city. The amendment to 2.2 also is problematic. It will make busking illegal even where it is exempt from 2.8 if an amplifier is being used. The clause as it stands seems more appropriate.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amplification</p> <p>This would not affect buskers as suggested as the busking permit permits appropriate use of amplification.</p>
Shane McIntyre	<p>"2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;"</p> <p>This is a bit ridiculous that bicycles cannot be on anything other than council sanctioned bike racks, is this something that needs to be monitored when there are larger issues at hand (i.e. making Adelaide a more accessible and cyclist friendly city)? Don't go penalizing cyclists!</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Nicholas Filsell	<p>As a keen cyclist I can only suggest that such legislation would be further discouragement for me to ride to the city which I currently do daily. Facilities need to be improved for cyclists throughout the city as it is an penalizing those that are creating less congestion less greenhouse gas emissions is not the answer. Please re think this policy.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which</p>

Attachment B

		<p>unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Amanda Morony	<p>If people will not be allowed to lock bikes to poles there needs to be at least 50 000 more bike racks in the city. If that happens then the by law is fine, but there is no way there are enough bike racks in the city. There's hardly ever even enough poles. I don't want my bike confiscated, it's my means of transport, please fix this with more bike racks before the by law comes into effect.</p> <p>The bike racks at the Adelaide TAFE are great, there needs to be a set up like this on every street!</p> <p>Sell your car and ride a bike, then tell me this by law will keep everyone safe.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Daniel Purvis	<p>As a cyclist who spends much of their time in the Adelaide City for both recreation and work it is ridiculous to confiscate, or provide expiation notices, for cyclists using various objects around the city to affix and secure their bicycles. In many situations, it is simply not possible to find a good, secure location for a bicycle. Further, it is already possible for the council to provide expiation and confiscation notification if bicycles are placed in awkward or unsafe places. Most cyclists already use their own sense of good judgement to ensure their bicycles are safe and will infringe on the public in general.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Amanda King	<p>This new Bike locking up On Council Racks by law cannot be passed unless Council plans on putting bike racks in from of EVERY building in Adelaide. Otherwise there is nowhere for us to park! There is not enough bike racks to go around! Not nearly enough!</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Heath Miller	<p>I strongly oppose the insertion of clause 2.2A relating to the locking of bicycles to poles and fences, Convenient bicycle specific parking is not always available,</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in</p>

	or may be full. Should this by-law be implemented, significantly more bicycle storage must be provided by the council.	that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.
Tony Kearney	This is rubbish. There isn't enough infrastructure installed in the city to cover the bikes that are out there and that that there is, is often inadequate. Take for example the piece of bike rack art that sits out the front of the market in Grote Street. My office is in Grote St and I pass this rack most days. Not once have I seen a bike attached to it since it was installed. Why? Because you are asking people who might have spent more than \$1000 on their bikes and have more sense to attach it to a sharp, paint chipping, tube scratching piece of infrastructure, great as a piece of art, shit as a bike rack. Give me a round pole any day. Time for a rethink guys.	Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.
Kristin Pedder	Re: making it illegal to chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;" 1) How is having a bicycle chained to non-regulation pole/fence/other structure "dangerous" to anybody? 2) This works against the increasingly progressive and environmentally conscious community of Adelaide by discouraging people from riding to their destinations in the city. 3) This will mean that more bicycle structures will be needed in the city, increasing council costs and reducing public walking space - one structure needed per two bicycles if we look at the facilities that already exist. Also increased need for security measures for these facilities as people may have to place their bicycles out of their sight. 4) Again, this means more people relying on cars = pollution, traffic congestion and need for more parking OR more people relying on public transport, which is a service already struggling in Adelaide (a 30 minute go zone really isn't a go zone) and needing investment. Very disappointed in this step backward by the ACC! We should be following in the footsteps of the more progressive cities of the world if we want to increase tourism and attract a younger generation to our city.	Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.

Erin Green	<p>Clause 2.2A: re. Locking bicycles to designated structures.</p> <p>This amendment is not a good idea. There are simply not enough places with designated bike parking and, where there is bike parking, such as the Central Markets or Rundle Mall, there is often not enough for the level of bike traffic we have currently (let alone the numbers the Council is trying to encourage through use of the free bike program, new bike paths etc). Chaining your bike to a pole or fence is often the only option.</p> <p>I understand there may be some places where bicycles should not be chained (handrails for disability access etc). But this amendment is too broad and doesn't fit in with the Smartmove agenda the Council itself is backing.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Jane Howard	<p>On 2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose; If this by-law is to go into effect, the council will need to install many more bicycle racks. For example, the Adelaide Festival Centre contains three theatres that, collectively, can seat in excess of 3000 people at a time, but the building only provides racks that can accommodate for up to ten bikes, at a stretch. During festivals, the building can accommodate as many as nine performance spaces, not including use of the plaza and/or elder park.</p> <p>Some questions which should be considered: How does the ACC propose calculation of the number of bike racks required for various locations around the city, and account for seasonal variances, such as during Festival time? Is the insertion and maintenance of these racks the duty of the ACC or property owners? How will the ACC monitor usage and black spots? What is the maximum distance the ACC will require people to travel from their bike to their destination on foot? What about those who are using their bike for transport of goods and/or small children? How does this fit in to the ACC wanting to encourage and accommodate cyclists? Or is this no longer a priority?</p> <p>On 2.2C Distribute give out or distribute to any bystander or passer-by any handbill, book, notice or other printed matter, provided that this restriction shall not apply to any handbill or leaflet given out or distributed by or with the authority of a candidate during the course of a Federal, State or Local Government Election or to a handbill or leaflet given out or distributed during the course and for the purposes of a Referendum.</p> <p>Some questions to consider: How does this affect the many hundreds of local, national, and international artists that come to Adelaide during the Fringe and see flyering an essential part of their marketing strategy? How will this damage the international reputation of the Adelaide Fringe as the second biggest fringe festival in the world to the Edinburgh Fringe, where flyering is a celebrated,</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Distribute</p> <p>Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p> <p>Tying up a dog</p> <p>The part relating to an animal on a leash will be removed as this could be addressed if the animal is distressed by contacting the RSPCA.</p> <p>Public convenience</p> <p>This By-Law is addressed at people entering toilets inappropriately when the toilet is for those people of the opposite sex.</p>

	<p>necessitated, and internationally renowned facet of the Festival? Has the ACC spoken to artists and relevant stake holders?</p> <p>2.9A Rubbish: remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging etc) that has been discarded in a Council bin. How does the ACC propose that homeless people are not unduly burdened by this law, its enforcement, and law officials?</p> <p>On 2A.3 Damaging or Defacing Property</p> <p>2A.3.2 attach any object, including an animal on a leash to any tree, gate, fence or other fixture. Some questions to consider: what will the ACC provide to allow responsible pet owners to briefly tie their animals up to enter shops? Or is it assumed that, for example, dog walking should be completely separate to all other activities, and dog owners shouldn't purchase coffees - or otherwise contribute to the local economy - while walking their dog?</p> <p>On 2A.8 Public conveniences 2A.8.4 enter any public convenience that is set aside for use of the opposite gender.</p> <p>How does the ACC propose that transgender people are not unduly burdened by this law, its enforcement, and law officials?</p>	
Dieter Streich	<p>I am a bicycle courier in Adelaide please don't make it illegal to lock on to poles!</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Genevieve Brandenburg	<p>Regarding Clause 2.2 Amplification: use an amplifier or other device whether mechanical or electrical for the purpose of amplifying sound; will this affect buskers in Rundle Mall and the city streets? If so, this will discourage Adelaide's street busking culture and the liveliness that spontaneous live music provides, turning Adelaide into a concrete jungle. Highly inadvisable.</p> <p>Regarding Clause 2.2A Bicycles: chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose; I feel this will negatively affect cyclists and drive people away from using their bicycles in the city, hence encouraging car and bus use and further traffic congestion. If this by-law is to be enforced, it should be done only AFTER</p>	<p>Amplification</p> <p>This would not affect buskers as suggested as the busking permit permits appropriate use of amplification.</p> <p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that</p>

	<p>more than adequate bike parking is provided around all of the CBD.</p> <p>Regarding Clause 2.2C Distribute: give out or distribute to any bystander or passer-by any handbill, book, notice or other printed matter, provided that this restriction shall not apply to any handbill or leaflet given out or distributed by or with the authority of a candidate during the course of a Federal, State or Local Government Election or to a handbill or leaflet given out or distributed during the course and for the purposes of a Referendum; what about during protests and marches that are of concern to the wider community? Providing information and free speech is a basic human right and should not be banned.</p> <p>Regarding Clause 2.13 Wheeled Recreational Devices: use a Wheeled Recreational Device on a footpath; what about children and families riding on footpaths, or learning cyclists who, rather than endanger themselves, will ride on the footpath at risky roads and intersections? I would like to see more bike lanes that actually protect cyclists from traffic and that are available to people of all ages and skills.</p> <p>Regarding Clause 2A.1 Birds: feed any bird; feeding birds is a childhood past time that gives joy to a great many people, young and old. I highly doubt it is done regularly enough that it needs to be outlawed. Signs that say 'Do not Feed the Birds' may suffice.</p> <p>I would also advise including a clause that prevents discriminatory demonstrations in Rundle Mall, the case example being the fundamentalist Christian protesters who have before gathered in the Mall most Friday nights and have upset countless members of the public, myself included.</p>	<p>considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Distribute Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices Inappropriate use of these devices have and do cause damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>Feeding of Birds Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.</p> <p>Christian Protesters in Rundle Mall It is not Councils intention to limit people's right to free speech.</p>
Jonathan Richard Mills	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>I object to proposed by-law 2.2A.</p> <p>Some areas do not have any purpose built bicycle racks.</p> <p>I work on Wright St, there are no nearby racks. My PA likes to chain her bicycle to a fence near the office where it can be seen by our receptionist.</p> <p>The effect of this by-law would prohibit landowners from securing their own bicycles to their own fence!</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Katie Hannan	<p>I can understand the need for a safe city for everyone, but there are still not enough bicycle parking places for all of the bikes in the city. Please reconsider</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in</p>

Attachment B

	<p>clause 2.2A. Thanks!</p>	<p>that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Steven Mann	<p>Clause 7 and its guilty until proven innocent implications are atrocious and should not be implemented. The due process of law should be followed, with a clear presumption of innocence. If an offence has been committed - prove it. Clause 2.2A should also not be implemented - what a terrible disincentive for people to ride bicycles into the city.</p>	<p>Vehicles on Park Lands The inclusion of clause 7 relates to vehicular offences and clarifies the position that if an offence is proven, then the owner of the vehicle is responsible.</p> <p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Patrick Lockwood	<p>I am in opposition to the following changes; 2.2A: Bicycles Unless council wishes to provide a large number of additional bike racks throughout the entire city, this is an unfeasible option even for the current cycling population. 2.9A: Rubbish The unofficial removal of bottles from bins by individuals is doing an unofficial environmental service to both the lazy public who fail to put their recyclable items in designated recycling bins, and the lazy council that fails to provide enough recycling bins to the public in areas that reasonably require them. 2.13: Wheeled Recreational Devices Wheeled recreational devices are often not road worthy, but never-the-less provide commuters with an alternative to using motor vehicles to travel into and about the city. The danger to pedestrians on footpaths from wheeled recreational devices is vastly over-rated verses the danger of motor vehicles to wheeled recreational devices on roads. 2A.7: Playing of games This clause is the height of mean-spirited</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Taking items out of bins It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p>

	<p>overregulation. We safely ran games of handball along a side-alley off Hindley St for years. The games were a celebration of community and shared use of public space. Games actively increased the public safety of those locations during late-nights when other streets took on a much more menacing feel.</p> <p>6: Posting of Bills on Buildings Perhaps the best use that can be achieved for many of our city's vacant buildings that fail to meet basic building code compliance for 'activation' is to be used as poster boards for entertainment events happening elsewhere in 'activated' building locations. This clause would likely further the monopoly of poster distribution in Adelaide to private organisations such as Mad Promo.</p> <p>In summary, each of these clauses are mean-spirited in nature, and denying the public of the right to decide on the correct, shared use of public spaces in favour of strict regulation.</p>	<p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>Playing games</p> <p>In addressing the concern regarding playing games, as an example, if some people were out playing cricket in the street and were not damaging property or causing a disturbance to the public, then we have no issue with that. However, if there was a disturbance and/or damage was being caused, or if someone was kicking a soccer ball around in a high traffic area like Rundle Mall and needed to stop, the proposed changes give us the ability to ask them to stop.</p> <p>The changes being recommended around this sort of activity are consistent with what already exists for Park Land By-laws.</p>
Piers Mussared	<p>RE: Insertion of Clause 2.2A</p> <p>After clause 2.2 insert: 2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose; "</p> <p>Unless the council plans to install a huge amount of "structures specifically designed" for chaining a bicycle to, prior to this clause being implemented it seems extremely counterproductive. The ACC should be encouraging more people to ride in the CBD for congestion, health and environmental reasons and this is yet another factor that will discourage people from doing so. While I am aware that there are quite a few dedicated bicycle locking facilities provided around the city, I believe that they are currently simply not abundant enough for a clause such as this to be realistic. Myself and a huge amount of people I know will be very disappointed if this goes through in its current form. I sincerely hope it is reviewed and modified.</p> <p>Kind regards, Piers</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Jessica Stevens	<p>CHAINING bicycles to poles, fences or anything else along a road other than a council bike rack;</p> <p>TYING a pet by leash to any tree, gate or fence, or feeding birds along a road;</p> <p>HANDING out leaflets to passers-by or placing them on car windscreens, except for authorised election material.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to</p>

I think these are ridiculous. I understand why you are wanting to 'clean things up' but in terms of all your rhetoric about vibrancy and bringing people to the city, this is absurd. People will not want to come from the city. People will not be able to ride bikes. Are you going to have specific pet tie trees? How will people flyer for fringe and festival shows? Come on ACC, you can do better than this.

take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.

Tying up a dog

The part relating to an animal on a leash will be removed as this could be addressed if the animal is distressed by contacting the RSPCA.

Pamphlets on vehicles

There have been a number of situations over the past twelve months where inappropriate flyers have been placed on vehicles. As a consequence Councillors and staff have received a number of complaints. This particular inclusion brings the Roads By-Law in line with the Local Government Land By-Law so Authorised Officers can take action if the offender does not cease when requested.

Distribute

Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.

Feeding of Birds

Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.

Brendan Moyse

I want to be allowed by law to lock my bike to any pole. I don't wish to have to ride to where there are few designated bike lock stations to do so. It's that simple, don't change the laws, allow bike riders to lock up anywhere.

Bikes attached to Infrastructure

Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.

It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which

		<p>unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Holly Owen	<p>Hello,</p> <p>As a resident of Adelaide I am very disappointed by and strongly reject the following proposed By-law Amendments:</p> <p>2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;</p> <p>17. Insertion of Clause 2.2B After clause 2.2A insert: 2.2B Bridge Jumping jump or dive from any bridge or other structure;</p> <p>18. Insertion of Clause 2.2C After clause 2.2B insert: 2.2C Distribute give out or distribute to any bystander or passer-by any handbill, book, notice or other printed matter, provided that this restriction shall not apply to any handbill or leaflet given out or distributed by or with the authority of a candidate during the course of a Federal, State or Local Government Election or to a handbill or leaflet given out or distributed during the course and for the purposes of a Referendum; - 6</p> <p>22. Insertion of Clause 2.9A After clause 2.9 insert: 2.9A Rubbish remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging etc) that has been discarded in a Council bin; 23. Substitution of Clause 2.10 Clause 2.10 – delete the clause and substitute: 2.10 Tents and Camping - 7 - 2.10.1 camp or remain overnight whether in the open, a building, a vehicle or otherwise; 2.10.2 erect any tent or other structure; 24. Insertion of Clause 2.10A After clause 2.10 insert: 2 26. Insertion of Clause 2.13 After clause 2.12 insert: 2.13 Wheeled Recreational Devices use a Wheeled Recreational Device on a footpath.</p> <p>27. Insertion of Clause 2A After clause 12.13 insert: 2A Prohibited Activities A person must not on a Road: 2A.1 Birds feed any bird; 2A.2 Climbing climb on or over any fixture, fitting, plant, object or building; 2A.3 Damaging or Defacing Property 2A.3.1 deface, damage, paint, write, cut names or make marks on any tree, rock, gate, fence, building, sign or other property of the Council; 2A.3.2 attach any object, including an animal on a leash to any tree, gate, fence or other fixture.</p> <p>What a sad and mean spirited place Adelaide would be if these proposed clauses were accepted.</p> <p>Clauses that target homeless and vulnerable people forced to sleep rough, whether in cars or in tents, are appalling and I would urge the council to show</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council’s position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council’s intention to “ban” this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Bridge Jumping</p> <p>Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure, this By-Law will allow Council’s authorised officers authority to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council’s authorised officers authority to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>Distribute</p> <p>Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is</p>

compassion to our residents of no fixed address.

The clause preventing people facing financial hardship, or anyone for that matter, from collecting bottles, cans and other containers that attract a deposit refund or wasted yet edible food and drink from council bins is possibly the most abhorrent.

The clause preventing people from locking up their bicycles on anything other than the very few existing bike racks would make the city unliveable. The clause would discourage riding in the city which is the opposite of what Adelaide needs.

The clause preventing street art goes against all attempts at encouraging vibrancy and the clause that would prevent people partaking in the timeless joy of street cricket has made us a national laughing stock.

Adelaide City Council does so many wonderful things for residents but the proposed By-law Amendments listed above are scary.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.

Camping - Sleeping in cars

This By-Law is part of the By-Law that relates to Camping. This is already covered in By-Law 3 for the Park Lands, this brings the road By-Law inline. Whenever someone is found to be camping in the City, with their agreement, they are put in contact with the appropriate Government Agency to assist them.

Wheeled recreation devices

Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.

Feeding of Birds

Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.

Climbing structures

Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised officers authority to ensure the illegal activity ceases.

Tying up a dog

The part relating to an animal on a leash will be removed as this could be addressed if the animal is distressed by contacting the RSPCA. Propose removal of this reference

Paul Rees	I understand that ACC is looking at making it illegal for bike riders to secure their bikes to anything but the council provided back racks. This is frankly ridiculous and highly inconvenient. I commute into the city on my bike and I often ride my bike around the city attending meetings. There are many spots in the city that do not have secure bike racks. Do you really want to issue fines to people that secure their bike to a pole, a tree or anything that is not sanctioned by ACC? This is daft. And it goes against all the work that is being done to promote the city as a bike-friendly one.	Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.
Ian Bell	If the proposed idea of making it illegal to chain a bicycle to a stobie pole, etc is to be enforced, Adelaide City council will need to provide substantial new 'legal' bike parking all over the city and suburbs. People riding bicycles do a great service to the city, your council, the environment, and the general health of both the riders and everybody else. By not driving to work or Uni, they are easing congestion of our roads, helping keep pollution low, adding physical exercise to people's daily routine. Obviously chaining bikes to private property or causing actual damage is a different matter, but please reconsider this action.	Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.
Julia Kaminski	Cyclists choose to use environmentally friendly means of transport and take the strain off of roads and public transport; I sincerely hope that the ACC will not punish cyclists for doing a good thing. The ACC should be providing cyclists with more bike facilities, not signing this amendment.	Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.
Matthew Whittington	I am opposed to the new by-law Clause 2.2A, Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose. Being a family of 6 that regularly ride into the city instead of driving, for different events and shows it is not always convenient to lock up our bikes to a "structure specifically designed" for it as these are not always available and in a convenient location. I understand that you want to stop bike riders from locking bikes in places that are a hazard to pedestrians but stopping it all together is just ridiculous, I	Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.

	thought ACC wanted to encourage more bike riders into the city but if they risk getting a fine or having their bikes removed because of this new by law it will just push more people to drive their cars again.	
James Szabo	<p>"Use of any wheeled recreational device on a footpath – proposed clause 2.13"</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>This proposed by-law is far to general, particularly given the popularity of 'cruiser' style skateboards that use larger polyurethane wheels that are less noisy and relatively fast for city travel.</p> <p>In fact, in some instances I find that skating around the city on this style of board, from destination to destination is far more efficient than both driving and cycling.</p> <p>As I see many commuters of all ages using similar style boards within the city, it seems ignorant to cover all wheeled recreational devices with a blanket rule, as it fails to take into account the diversity of efficient transport options that the public utilise.</p> <p>I would bring it to your attention that under the Road Safety Act a similar law has been introduced for some time. This law shares similar wording and as a result board-riding commuters are after forced to use the footpath due to the threat of penalties from SAPOL.</p> <p>As such if this by-law is passed anyone including local residents who commute between destinations (quite often work) on their skateboards will have no place in the public realm to do so without the threat of fines from both SAPOL and potentially Council.</p> <p>It would be easy to pass this as a blanket rule citing safety concerns for pedestrians, but it would be interesting to see how many/ if any recorded accidents have actually occurred.</p> <p>In closing to adopt this general by-law forfeits many users their right to commute around the city in an efficient and safe manner, given our realisation that car dependency is crippling are roads it seems counter-intuitive to enact such a by-law.</p>	<p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p>
Paul Gallasch	<p>I strongly advise that bicycles should continue to be allowed to be locked to parking signs etc. It is in the cities interest to make bicycling as easy and useful a mode of transport as possible. If a bike is continually left in front of a thoroughfare, residents or business owners can contact council and have it removed or ticketed. There is no need to fine people who are not only not infringing on anyone else, but in fact benefiting the city by riding their bike instead of driving.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that</p>

	<p>On that note. Laws about scooter and motorcycle parking should also be relaxed. Many similar sized cities in Europe (Milan for example) allow scooters and motorbike to be parked on most footpaths, and any other nook and cranny a rider can find that, importantly, does not infringe on any nearby business or resident. But this does not include visual pollution infringement. It means real infringement, like blocking a doorway or access to the premises. Loosening these laws would in fact strengthen businesses in the city, allowing people with scooters (an increasing number if these laws are changed) to park near their intended destination will encourage visits to the city and will reduce traffic congestion.</p> <p>If the cities priorities are about improving the livability of the city and encouraging bicycles and scooters as forms of transport then the laws should reflect that.</p>	<p>considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>The remaining comments regarding motorcycle parking relate to the Road Traffic Act and Australian Road Rules and are unable to be addressed through By-Laws</p>
Luke Penman	<p>Aside from how difficult it is to understand what a lot of this is referring to, it seems to be simply outlawing things that some people might turn their nose up at - people collecting bottles and cans from bins, buskers using amplifiers, dancers practising in laneways - rather than things which actually negatively affect anyone. Please get over yourselves.</p>	<p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p> <p>No further action proposed</p> <p>Amplification</p> <p>This would not affect buskers as suggested as the busking permit permits appropriate use of amplification.</p>
Greg Martin	<p>2.2A Bicycles</p> <p>The proposed changes to 2.2A Bicycles is highly impractical. To insist that all bicycles be affixed to a bike rack flies in the face of Council's plans to encourage cycling in the city. Even where there are sufficient bike racks, such as at the Central Market, there's never enough at peak times such as Saturday morning. I've often come to the Market and found all bike racks full. What am I to do? Go home, because Council isn't providing sufficient bike racks for peak times? A little common sense is required. And due respect for the vast majority of cyclists who chain their bikes so they are not an obstacle to others. Council can't be expected to provide bike racks at every street corner. Nor should it have to when there are sufficient parking signs and other posts where a cyclist can easily chain his or her bicycle. Council may want to look at what is done in Sydney where a simple circular tube is bolted to existing parking and street signs to turn them inexpensively into bike racks.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity</p>

	<p>2.9A Rubbish</p> <p>Many people on fixed and low incomes rely on the refund from cans and bottles to supplement their income. To deny them the right to remove "bottles, cans, containers" from Council bins is being petty. The reason for and the success of the refund on containers in SA is because it encourages recycling. To refuse to allow people to recycle is counterproductive to Council's expressed aim of encouraging recycling.</p>	<p>causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p> <p>No further action proposed</p>
Tammy Whittington	<p>I am opposed to the new by-law Clause 2.2A, Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose. Being a family of 6 that regularly ride into the city instead of driving, for different events and shows it is not always convenient to lock up our bikes to a "structure specifically designed" for it as these are not always available and in a convenient location. I understand that you want to stop bike riders from locking bikes in places that are a hazard to pedestrians but stopping it all together is just ridiculous, I thought ACC wanted to encourage more bike riders into the city but if they risk getting a fine or having their bikes removed because of this new by law it will just push more people to drive their cars again.</p> <p>Regards Tammy</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Trish Hansen	<p>Re:</p> <p>Insertion of Clause 2.2A /After clause 2.2 insert:</p> <p>2.2A Bicycles</p> <p>chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;</p> <p>This is in direct conflict with encouraging our beautiful city as a cycling city. One of the wonderful and remarkable aspects of cycling is accessibility. One can jump on and off a bike to easily access and navigate the city, especially between business meetings etc . As a cyclist I always endeavour to always use a bike rack where one is available, however, there are times when I need to secure my bike and there isn't a bike rack nearby or the bike rack is full so I've had to resort to a sign post or fence. Prohibiting the securing of bikes to poles and fences would mean that I would no longer feel confident to ride between meetings concerned that I wouldn't find a free bike rack space.</p> <p>This also conflicts with the intention of the by-laws 'to promote a physical and social environment free</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>

	<p>from hazards' as parked bikes also play a significant role in creating a sense of place, a sense that others are around - it's one of the few elements that makes a place feel safe even when there are very few people around. It gives the city soul.</p> <p>Some of the most beautiful small cities in the world have bikes secured to tree barriers , bridges, fences, poles, gates, stairwells, anything.</p> <p>More and more and more bike racks would be great, and well signed 'no bike parking' areas fine - but please don't make a blanket law - it sucks out the soul and randomness essential for social wellbeing and safety.</p>	
Patrick Dupont	<p>2.2A Bicycles</p> <p>chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;</p> <p>2.2A is rubbish. There aren't enough places to lock up a bike safely and conveniently at the moment which is why people lock up all around the city. I thought council wanted to encourage people to cycle? This amendment appears designed to clamp down on and discourage cyclists. Daily commuter cyclists aren't going to spend half an hour trying to find a council approved structure every morning potentially kilometres away from where they work nor are they going to be impressed if council fines them or removes their bikes because they don't comply with a pointless technicality. If you want people to cycle you need to make it easier to cycle not harder.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Will ABK	<p>No! Pedestrian traffic is never disrupted and damage is never done by locking bicycles to poles! If you are serious about protecting said pole replace roads with bike racks in front of all buildings. You can't expect to reduce traffic in the city and support cycling by taking away their convenience to the user.</p> <p>Banning people from recycling and reusing trash from council bins is promoting wastage and landfill. Does the ACC really represent that?</p> <p>People sleeping in the park, their car, or somewhere similar is usually because of understandable reasons. Like they don't want to drink drive and kill someone, Or they are homeless, or traveling to the city(thus boosting the local economy), etc. Harassing and fining these people who usually have little or no income causes depression and desperation locally thus adding to crime and health costs to the city. Negative views towards the council will follow which will probably cost the council a lot more in the long run.</p> <p>I don't have time to type all day but there are dumb reasons for all of these proposed changes. ACC should take a look at what they want to achieve.</p> <p>Improve lifestyle quality and accessibility then peace and good economy will</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing</p>

	<p>follow. You cannot change people's ways with force and negativity, you must give them a choice of something better.</p> <p>Will (representing cyclists, the youth, the arts, and the desperate)</p>	<p>containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Camping - Sleeping in cars</p> <p>This By-Law is part of the By-Law that relates to Camping. This is already covered in By-Law 3 for the Park Lands, this brings the road By-Law inline. Whenever someone is found to be camping in the City, with their agreement, they are put in contact with the appropriate Government Agency to assist them.</p> <p>No Changes proposed</p>
Marcus Schmerl	<p>The following proposals really do seem over the top with regard to the stereotypical 'nanny state' opinion of governments that are foisted upon us in South Australia these days. I bring particular attention to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The feeding of birds on a street – proposed clause 12.13 2A.1" Really, is this absolutely necessary? - "chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;" This will cost much more for you if you are intending to provide numerous bike racks (that are protected from weather) in a grid spanning the city. What if I need to park my bike quickly to go to the bank or the shop? Perhaps, if this must be included, give a time limit (eg 1 or 2 hours), but even then this is over the top. Is this being considered just to protect against liability for potential injuries? How many kids or old people might this affect? What if all immediately accessible bike racks are full? - "2.9A Rubbish remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging etc) that has been discarded in a Council bin;" Will this criminalise the homeless or the socially conscious who recycle the vast amount of recyclable material that's just binned? A ridiculous suggestion. - "Give out a handbill, book or notice unless part of an authorised political campaign person to person or put on a vehicle – proposed clause 2.2C and 2.3B" Nanny state type stuff again. Agreed this causes rubbish, perhaps make sure all materials handed out are recyclable. Are you really trying to sanitise the CBD this much? If I don't want something, I don't take it. No problem. - "Sleep overnight in a vehicle – proposed clause 2.10.1" Extreme nanny state stuff again. What if an intoxicated but otherwise sensible person chooses to sleep in their vehicle? Ridiculous. - "Use of any wheeled recreational device on a footpath – proposed clause 	<p>Feeding of Birds</p> <p>Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p> <p>No further action proposed</p>

	<p>2.13" This old chestnut has been going on since the 80s. I've not once had a problem with skaters (for 30 odd years) or bike riders (back in the day) using the footpath. Consider much more packed cities like Tokyo or Kyoto (which has similar population to here), both of which I've spent considerable time, where all manner of pedestrians share the footpath and are mostly considerate of each other. Would you prefer skateboarders and roller skaters/bladers use the roads? Other than certain areas (like the Mall), relegating to them to roads or backstreets is both unnecessary and dangerous.</p> <p>I was in Melbourne last week. Bikes parked on footpaths, skaters in amongst it, people feeding birds in the CBD, homeless collecting recyclables. What a vibrant bustling space. Do we really want to sterilise our city further, especially when more progressive things with restaurants and licensed venues are currently moving forward (the lockdown notwithstanding).</p> <p>On one hand we're moving forward, on the other there's things like this which are generally ill thought out at best, and unenforceable, restricting civil liberties, and potentially dangerous at worst.</p> <p>As a mid/late 30s person who still loves the vibrancy of this city (and has resisted the temptation to permanently leave for bigger cities), many of these proposals are retrograde and embarrassing.</p>	<p>Distribute</p> <p>Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Camping - Sleeping in cars</p> <p>This By-Law is part of the By-Law that relates to Camping. This is already covered in By-Law 3 for the Park Lands, this brings the road By-Law inline. Whenever someone is found to be camping in the City, with their agreement, they are put in contact with the appropriate Government Agency to assist them.</p> <p>No Changes proposed</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
Joseph Fagan	<p>Concerning these proposed by-laws I am again disappointed in the ACC's conservative stance regarding a number of individual freedom and community activities.</p> <p>I completely agree there is a responsibility to ensure safety by controlling firearms and use of public toilets but the clauses regarding distribution, amplification, games, climbing, dog walking and bird feeding create the desired impression that of a sterile business district. Furthermore I especially take offence to the proposition securing a bicycle to any other a council rack an offence. As a cyclist I can say this is extremely unpractical due to the current lack of infrastructure. As an advocate for cycling I see this move as counterproductive to what I understood to be a major part of the councils transport to greatly increase the modal share of cycling.</p> <p>It is no wonder we have an exodus if young talent when rules prohibiting any creativity or autonomy in the city limits without being council approved continue to be passed. Behind all the rhetoric of "vibrancy" when will you realise that you cannot manufacture culture. Thriving cities are more than commerce and residents and business owners need to respect the density of</p>	<p>Distribute</p> <p>Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Amplification</p> <p>This would not affect buskers as suggested as the busking permit permits appropriate use of amplification.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Playing games</p> <p>In addressing the concern regarding playing games, as an example, if some people were out playing cricket in the street and were not damaging property or causing a disturbance to the public, then we have no issue with that.</p> <p>However if there was a disturbance and/or damage was being caused, or</p>

other users, rather than be coddled by council regulation. After extensive travelling I find the Adelaide CBD after 6 pm akin to a ghost town, except to Hindley st which more resembles a war-zone. The best you can do is provide enabling environments for Adelaide to express its existing cultures and be permitted sufficient room to grow.

I implore you to relax regulations regarding cycling, distribution and public performance to give current generations the chance to shape this city.

Regards,

Joseph Fagan.

if someone was kicking a soccer ball around in a high traffic area like Rundle Mall and needed to stop, the proposed changes give us the ability to ask them to stop.

The changes being recommended around this sort of activity are consistent with what already exists for Park Land By-laws.

No changes proposed

Climbing structures

Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.

No changes proposed

Tying up a dog

The part relating to an animal on a leash will be removed as this could be addressed if the animal is distressed by contacting the RSPCA.

Propose removal of this reference

Feeding of Birds

Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.

No changes proposed

Bikes attached to Infrastructure

Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.

It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which

		<p>unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Lucinda Wojt	<p>The proposed clause 2.2A is definitively counter to the concept of Adelaide as a bike-friendly city. Bike racks are fantastic when adequately provided. However, on the occasion that a rack is already full or is far from one's destination, cyclists should not be punished by this proposed by-law amendment.</p> <p>This amendment may be less damaging if it were changed to punishing cyclists that leave their bikes unattended in ways that could cause injury to others.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Barbara Mussared	<p>Regarding the insertion of point 2.2A making it illegal to affix a bike to any pole etc. - this is ridiculous, we call Adelaide a bike friendly city, yet cyclists can't protect their property by locking it to a pole, except in prescribed areas designated for the locking up of bicycles! This really does make it difficult to ride bikes in the city and use more environmentally friendly forms of transport. I think this clause should go!</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Lily Ellis-Gibbings	<p>To whom it may concern within the council,</p> <p>I am concerned by a proposed amendment to the ACC bylaws. The amendment 16. Insertion of 2.2A prohibiting a person to 'chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose' is unnecessary and will contribute to traffic within the CBD by limiting the number of cyclists who are able to park in town. Having not sufficiently studied the numbers of patrons who ride and will ride into the city (post completion of Rundle mall development this number will increase) the current or proposed bike related infrastructure cannot be said to cover the expected patronage and will likely cause bike parking 'hotspots' which will potentially be a traffic hazard. Cyclists use common sense when securing a bicycle, ensuring it is</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>

	<p>A. Not blocking roads B. Not blocking pathways C. Affixed only to permanent structures D. Affixed to council, rather than private property unless given permission by the owner</p> <p>A bicycle attached to a street sign does not obscure that sign and bicycles do not damage poles.</p> <p>Please email me the reasoning behind this amendment, as at this stage it seems like a non-sensical adjustment aimed at increasing the chance of fining cyclists for parking close to their destination.</p> <p>Kind regards, Lily</p>	
Melissa Waters	<p>As a resident of Bowden I have no need for a car and travel by Bicycle (you can thank me later)</p> <p>However with this new by-law this will make my journey even more painful as currently the ACC region do not offer enough bicycle parking infrastructure. ACC are trying to become a world class bicycling city as would like to show this off in 2014 for Velo City.</p> <p>This law is not the way to show off, this only makes for a frustrating journey, My example is Rundle Mall.. There are not enough bike racks in the street peeling off, some none present at all. Nor is there enough in front of busy cafes and pubs. To put forward such a law- I strongly suggest ACC increase its number of bike racks</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Alan Bindig	<p>My understanding is that this amendment makes it illegal to "chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;" - how disgusting that the Council is even considering such an amendment in this day and age. As a pedestrian and frequent driver in the city I've never once experienced any meaningful obstruction or damage by bicycles ever, which shows that obviously this is just an attempt to raise revenue from the growing number of cyclists in the city now that CBD car parking has become scarce and ludicrously price-inflated with inflation rates far outstripping the national average for other goods and services. BUT I BET THERE'S NO PLANS BY YOU TO REGULATE THAT. I suppose charging for use of bicycle racks in the city is next, hmmm? Perhaps I shouldn't have written that, I'm probably giving you greedy</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>

	people more ideas. Anyway - tsk tsk.	
Dr Gail Higginbottom	<p>Dear Adelaide Council representatives,</p> <p>I have read the by-law amendments: 2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;</p> <p>The main issue with this by-law is that you have not yet installed enough bike racks in the city yet, especially in those areas where there are a greater number of bike users (like the market or Rundle Mall) or indeed to encourage more users in those areas which have but a few. Naturally there are times when they may appear empty or unused - the point is that there should be plenty whenever lots of people are going to be bringing their bikes into town like in summer on the weekends or during the festivals - of which we have many. I do not see that you can pass this amendment until at least you have installed a far greater number of safe bike racks.</p> <p>With best wishes, Dr. Gail Higginbottom.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Craig Flanigan	<p>Encouraging cycling I'm sure is the aim of the Council overall, as it is in the State Strategic Plan. Whilst I understand that some riders abuse the current lack of regulation by tying up bikes obstructing footpaths and damaging painted poles with chains, which I am assuming the bylaw is designed to combat, as a way of compromising I propose going ahead with the new bylaw but;</p> <p>Provide more places for bikes to be legally chained up, perhaps by mounting racks on public buildings, and providing some poles/fences that aren't likely to be damaged as alternatives. Maybe even paint them or place a sign on them, or use a system of line markings on the pavement similar to roads, to designate safe bike parking areas.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Rod Williams	<p>This is an act of insanity. As cities collapse under more and more cars putting through such an archaic by law as this will put people off seeking the alternative and healthy alternative of cycling to work or social outing. Sounds like a money raising initiative to me.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>

		Amendment to wording proposed
Dr Stuart Johnson	I would like to strongly object to Clause 2.2A regarding bicycles. I am a cyclist who works, shops and goes out in the city on a daily basis. Where possible I prefer to use proper bike racks however there are times when this is simply not possible. The main problem is when going out at night, past experience in having bike parts stolen and bikes vandalised has taught me to be very careful about choosing where to lock up my bike, in particular it always has to be in a busy area, and when possible close to a business that's open such as a pub or club, preferably with security outside. This clause could lead to situations where there is no safe, legal place to lock a bike.	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Sari Yong	<p>Dear Council Members,</p> <p>My feedback as follows:</p> <p>With respect to Item 16, it is highly unfair to implement such a change if sufficient purpose-built structures are not readily available nor placed with greater frequency throughout the city. Most cyclists find that there are insufficient structures designed for this purpose in any location.</p> <p>With respect to Item 26, and specifically as it might pertain to bicycles, the infrastructure as is currently available to cyclists looking to share the road is insufficient with bicycle lanes disappearing without warning and/or in crucial and high risk locations such as through intersections etc. Improved bike infrastructure designed to improve safety and flow will encourage commuters in their respectful use of the roads and encourage other casual riders to consider cycling instead of driving..</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Anna MYCKO	<p>Regarding 16.</p> <p>2.2A Bicycles</p> <p>chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;</p> <p>this is an unworkable and unfair proposal that will cause undue hardship for people who use bikes to access the city - there are not enough structures provided by council to chain bikes to and it is hard to imagine any council ever being able to provide enough dedicated structures to cover the needs of cyclist who must leave a bike to conduct their business and at times when there are</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>

	<p>more bikes than usual - festivals summer weekends and market nights etc. It would be far more useful to say Bicycles should not be chained and left on poles fences or other structures on a road in a manner that causes any obstruction to footpaths, stairs or roads or impedes access to premises or in a manner that causes any damage to said structures.</p> <p>Unless and until you can ensure bike riders will have enough dedicated bike racks to use it is not reasonable to include this proposal and I request it be struck from the amendments</p> <p>Yours sincerely Anna Mycko</p>	
Ross Hubbard	<p>With reference to proposed bylaw amendment 2.2a. Locking of bicycles. Please reconsider until sufficient bicycle infrastructure is in place to allow cyclists to do so. If this law is implemented now, the council will be giving out a very mixed and confusing message and attitude to the cyclists who use your city. I get the impression that the council is heavily involved in and promotes cycling events such as the tour down under. Is this council really serious about cycling and the benefits it brings to the city or just public / touristy events? If this law is implemented the city will be seen to be out of touch with its own residents and users.</p> <p>Ross Hubbard.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Daniel Pham	<p>I was notified of these today. Please Revise the following amendments.</p> <p>Lock bicycles in any place other than purpose built council bike lock racks – proposed amendment 2.2A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jump of a bridge or other structure – proposed clause 2.2B - Give out a handbill, book or notice unless part of an authorised political campaign person to person or put on a vehicle – proposed clause 2.2C and 2.3B - Sleep overnight in a vehicle – proposed clause 2.10.1 - Use of any wheeled recreational device on a footpath – proposed clause 2.13 - The feeding of birds on a street – proposed clause 12.13 2A.1 - Climbing on anything basically – proposed clause 12.13 2A.2 	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Jumping off structures and Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it, or jumping off it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised officers authority to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p>

		<p>Distribute Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>Camping - Sleeping in cars This By-Law is part of the By-Law that relates to Camping. This is already covered in By-Law 3 for the Park Lands, this brings the road By-Law inline. Whenever someone is found to be camping in the City, with their agreement, they are put in contact with the appropriate Government Agency to assist them.</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>Feeding of Birds Feeding birds has been an offence in By-Law three for Park Lands and Squares for some time, it is also in the By-Law proclaimed by the Governor for Pedestrian Malls. We have brought the Roads By-Law in line with these other two By-Laws by including roads. Pigeons in particular are vermin and their droppings foul buildings, statues, vehicles, trees, shrubs, lawns and fountains which cause significant cleansing issues. Health concerns include carrying such diseases as Salmonellosis (salmonella) and the fungal infection, Cryptococcosis, which may lead to meningitis.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
Jessica Surtherland	I ride my bike every day to work in the CBD. I ride my bike to meet friends at night all the time. I like the fact that I can shorten the distance (and decrease the risk to myself) between my meeting place and my mode of transport due to riding my bike. Public Transport is	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p>

	<p>great, but the drop offs are pre-determined. Driving a car is convenient but the location of a park varies with your luck and capacity to pay for a car park. This by-law is pointless and will do nothing but increase expiation income and increase risks to people who travel alone.</p> <p>If this does pass, please (please please) increase the number of bike racks, make them in highly visible areas, and under surveillance (many of us do not leaving our bikes far away - there are too many thefts - even with secure locks - Adelaide Uni is notorious for it).</p> <p>Thank You</p>	<p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Stephen Queen	<p>A lot of these proposed amendments are frankly too severe and controlling. They attempt to turn Adelaide into some sort of stepford wives town. So someone who is in no condition to drive, after a few beers, must now wander the streets as they cannot sleep in their car? People cannot climb over plants, or any fixtures? Not use facilities for any purpose other than which they have been constructed. Many of these proposed amendments will move such promising endeavours such as parkour away from the city and move potential business interests and public gatherings away to more amenable locations- meaning less revenues, less investment, and less tourism, which ALSO corresponds to less revenues. Local businesses will suffer because the council appears to be opposed to a city where young people can come and thrive. Do not shoot Adelaide's potential in the foot. Embrace its weirdness. Positive developments in our culture have not come from the bogan Clipsal and the like, but have come from the openings of many different cafes in the city centre which all have a high standard of coffee- from establishments in little nooks and cranny's like burger theory, or chocolate bean- or new up-and-comers like experience cafe and Nordburger- things that encourage youths to gather in a SAFE AND STRUCTURED environment free of alcohol, which is what you want, right- places like Point A. but if you implement these laws, you will be strapping Adelaide's legs together as it tries to run towards a better, more diversified future, not just one that hopes for the cash influxes of the weekly crows game and the Clipsal 500.</p> <p>Adelaide is looked down upon for its 'bogan' culture that stems from the Clipsal and other related events. It does not inspire tourism, nor make Adelaide seem a safe place to visit.</p> <p>The Adelaide fringe is world-renowned as the southern hemisphere's greatest fringe festival bar none. Internationally renowned performers flock to our city. People the world over hear from them about our nice city.</p> <p>And yes, I did decline to comment on how both events are close to each other, and the negative effect one has on the other.</p>	<p>Camping - Sleeping in cars</p> <p>This By-Law is part of the By-Law that relates to Camping. This is already covered in By-Law 3 for the Park Lands, this brings the road By-Law inline. Whenever someone is found to be camping in the City, with their agreement, they are put in contact with the appropriate Government Agency to assist them.</p> <p>Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised officers authority to ensure the illegal activity ceases</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>

Laura Bottrill	<p>As a bicycle rider I strongly object to 2.2A regarding its being an offence to affix a bicycle to any structure not specifically designed for this purpose. In general I believe that bike riders are thoughtful and sensible about where they leave their bikes and do not leave them in places where they become an inconvenience or are in the way. Because in many parts of the city there are few bike rails available I believe that without a large amount of additional rails being installed prior to this law taking effect it will lead to (a) discouraging the riding of bikes into town rather than taking cars, thus leading to greater congestion and (b) a greater likelihood of damage to bikes as people try to crowd theirs onto existing structures. Please reconsider this addition as I think unless there are plans to greatly increase the number and distribution of bike rails around town, this amendment will have negative consequences for bicycle riders who are doing the environmentally responsible thing and reducing traffic congestion in town by using this alternative form of transportation. Thanks.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
David Kettle	<p>Wow, a great deal of this seems a bit ridiculous.</p> <p>In particular much of item 27 - specifically 'climb on or over any fixture, fitting, plant, object or building;' If people aren't allowed to move freely through the city, engage in creative play etc you're contributing to/responsible for sedentary lifestyles, increased health issues and a greater burden on the health care system. Climbing on/over things isn't a problem, damaging things is a problem, climbing high (buildings) is a problem.</p> <p>I also have concerns about item 26 which seeks to prevent 'use a Wheeled Recreational Device on a footpath.' Footpaths are generally unused most of the time so why would you want to force people to either ride their scooters/skateboards/bikes on the road or not at all - either way it's not good for people's health. As a parent I don't want my young children to have to ride their scooters on the road - they're much safer up on the footpath and as a responsible adult I'm happy to A - walk around/be aware of other footpath users and B - encourage my children to be respectful towards the rights and safety of others using the footpath and stop to let people pass.</p>	<p>Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised officers authority to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
Satchi Riehl	<p>The proposed amendments regarding locking bicycles are absurd and further reinforce the perception of a city that wants to make cyclists feel unwelcome. Please don't amend the current laws.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no</p>

		<p>chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Sandy Pulsford	<p>Please remove the by-law regarding fixing of push bikes to poles and railings. It is very necessary to fix bikes in order to avoid them being stolen.</p> <p>It is not practical for council to provide bike racks in all necessary locations. It is important that council support the use of bicycles in the city and this will be a major disincentive.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Damon Pearce	<p>I disagree with the following amendments:</p> <p>2.2A (Bikes cannot be locked anywhere other than bike racks) - Why? This is more of a common sense thing; restricting this restricts access to many areas of the city</p> <p>2.2C and 2.3B (People cannot give handouts or notices without a political campaign) - This would damage the ability of a lot of small organisations and companies to promote themselves or circulate notices to relevant people. I don't see the advantage of this</p> <p>2.2A.1 (Climbing) and 2.2B - There are already restrictions enforced by private property, for obvious reasons. A road is a public area; this could damage movement cultures in Adelaide such as Parkour practitioners (These people are not vandals or delinquents; even so, we need some support from the council to throw off this mistaken impression)</p> <p>2.13 (Unable to use wheeled recreational vehicles on the footpath) - This would damage skating movements for no good reason, but it is also ambiguous, applying equally to skaters and bike riders who simply need to get from A to B.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>Distribute</p> <p>Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Pamphlets on vehicles</p> <p>There have been a number of situations over the past twelve months where inappropriate flyers have been placed on vehicles. As a consequence Councillors and staff have received a number of complaints. This particular inclusion brings the Roads By-Law in line with the Local Government Land By-Law so Authorised Officers can take action if the offender does not cease when requested.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>

		<p>Jumping off structures and Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it, or jumping off it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
Edwina Virgo	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed by-law which forbids bicycles being chained/locked to any object other than a designated bike rack. While I appreciate that bicycles should not be in the way, create clutter, or bring down the appearance of an area due to inappropriate placement, I believe this by-law is an overly draconian way to achieve this. Mostly people use common sense when placing bicycles in locations other than on a bike rack, so I suggest the wording be toned down so that it is not illegal to lock up a bike in places other than a bike rack, so long as certain conditions are met.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>
Dr Andrew Lloyd	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am STRONGLY against the suggested amendment to By-law No. 4, 2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose;</p> <p>Adelaide should be trying to further encourage the riding of bicycles for the huge economic, environmental, and health benefits riding bikes provides to the city, not to mention the savings in infrastructure costs brought about by reducing the number of cars entering the city. The suggested amendment does the opposite.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p>

	<p>There is simply not the coverage and availability of structures 'specifically designed and set aside by the Council' for the purpose of locking up bikes for such an amendment to be tenable. I find it truly worrying that the council, while putting on the face of being bike friendly, is considering such an amendment.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the suggested amendment is not passed.</p> <p>Regards, Dr Andrew Lloyd</p>	
Anna MYCKO	<p>I object to</p> <p>27. Insertion of Clause 2A</p> <p>After clause 12.13 insert:</p> <p>2A Prohibited Activities</p> <p>A person must not on a Road:</p> <p>2A.3 Damaging or Defacing Property</p> <p>2A.3.2 attach any object, including an animal on a leash to any tree, gate, fence or other fixture;</p> <p>attaching an animal on a leash does not damage or deface property</p> <p>and I object to the following clause which seems draconian - passers-by are always at liberty to refuse handbills and many performers and artists have no other means of publicity than to give out a flier</p> <p>18. Insertion of Clause 2.2C</p> <p>After clause 2.2B insert:</p> <p>2.2C Distribute</p> <p>give out or distribute to any bystander or passer-by any handbill, book, notice or</p> <p>other printed matter, provided that this restriction shall not apply to any handbill or</p> <p>leaflet given out or distributed by or with the authority of a candidate during the</p> <p>course of a Federal, State or Local Government Election or to a handbill or leaflet</p> <p>given out or distributed during the course and for the purposes of a Referendum;</p> <p>Why should people be allowed to do for an election what they are prohibited from doing at all other times?</p> <p>yours sincerely Anna Mycko</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>Tying up a dog</p> <p>The part relating to an animal on a leash will be removed as this could be addressed if the animal is distressed by contacting the RSPCA.</p> <p>Propose removal of this reference</p> <p>Distribute</p> <p>Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>

Pascal Opitz	<p>"2.2A Bicycles chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose; "</p> <p>I think criminalising bike parking like this is a bad idea, and I am strongly against it.</p> <p>There is not enough cycling in Adelaide. Lack of bike parking is part of the problem, but getting fined for locking up close to a business when there is none would make it worse.</p> <p>"2.2B Bridge Jumping jump or dive from any bridge or other structure;"</p> <p>"2A.2 Climbing climb on or over any fixture, fitting, plant, object or building; "</p> <p>Is it seriously necessary to micro-manage this? I don't think so. Next thing you know is there will be fines for people that are fit and active, because they use the urban environment for sports?</p> <p>As long as there's no damage this should not be chased.</p> <p>Also, wheeled devices on footpath are not an issue that needs policing.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Amendment to wording proposed</p> <p>Jumping off structures and Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it, or jumping off it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
Alice C	<p>It has come to my attention that By-law Amendment 2.2A is not at all helpful for cyclists unless the Adelaide City Council plans to exponentially increase the number of designated places to chain up bicycles. If this is not the case I oppose the inclusion of this amendment. I do not think that there is a current problem with cyclists chaining up bikes to structures other than designated bicycle racks - sometimes they need to use signposts or other structures. The safety of cyclists to lock up their bike in a safe area and ensuring they are less likely to have their bicycle stolen is more important than bikes being attached to structures other than those intended for bikes.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
James Bentley	<p>Dear Council,</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p>

	<p>Please reconsider your current proposed change to the current by-laws. They would destroy the availability of city activities like skateboarding, bike riding and parkour/free running. This would essentially be crippling one's own city activity, and mean that less people would be able to do what they enjoy as certain more obscure sports and activities do not have dedicated sites at which they would be performed. As a member of the parkour community I would plead you change your stance. This is all I have time to write but please, PLEASE, reconsider these silly, petty changes that would cripple a sports minority.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Jumping off structures and Climbing structures</p> <p>Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it, or jumping off it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p> <p>Wheeled recreation devices</p> <p>Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p>
Craig Schubert	<p>The new by-laws have just been brought to my attention and I have a few issues to take up...First, #22 - removing rubbish. Allowing people to collect cans etc serves two purposes -first it allows them to help get themselves through hard times with a little money, and it reduces the amount that the council has to deal with. Please don't implement this change!</p> <p>Second, #16 - bicycles... There are currently not enough 'structures specifically designed' for bike parking for it to be as convenient to ride. Allowing people to secure their biked to poles etc. allows them reduce the traffic and parking from cars.</p> <p>Third, #27 - 2A.2 – Climbing; People should be able to freely move through the city and engage in the environment in fun and playful ways. It is not a problem to climb on things - it is only a problem to break things!</p> <p>There are more things I take issue with but for now I will get this in before the deadline.</p>	<p>Taking items out of bins</p> <p>It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p> <p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no</p>

		<p>chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Climbing structures Council invests significantly in public infrastructure and fauna to meet the needs of its stakeholders. Much of this infrastructure is not designed to withstand inappropriate use such as climbing on or over it. Where an action is undertaken that may endanger the safety of the participant or the general public, or cause potential damage to the infrastructure or fauna, this By-Law will allow Council's authorised to ensure the illegal activity ceases.</p>
Recco O'Connor	<p>2.2A Bicycles: Chain, lock or affix a bicycle to any pole, fence or other structure on a Road other than on a structure specifically designed and set aside by the Council for that purpose; Idiot rule is idiot rule because there are no complete differentiation between what is actually a bicycle structure since architects and designers often have creative differences.</p> <p>2.9A Rubbish remove, disperse or interfere with any rubbish (including bottles, newspapers, cans, containers or packaging etc) that has been discarded in a Council bin; What are homeless to do? Far out, you aren't looking smart missiles.... what on earth?</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues. It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p> <p>Taking items out of bins It has been an offence for many years to remove rubbish from rubbish bins in other By-Laws and will continue only be enforced when the activity causes a spreading of rubbish about the site where the bin is located. It is not intended to stop those who are less fortunate from removing containers that can be returned to obtain a refund.</p>
Jake Jenkins	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>As a student in the CBD I commute daily on my long board skateboard, avoiding high foot traffic areas and acting responsibly. The proposed by laws would make my commute to and from Uni have to be by bus or train. For a council trying to aim for a healthier society this is a negative effect and over-controlling of free citizens. I'm not sure as to how handing out of flyers negatively affects people. For example I have handed out charity flyers in the past and people are not forced to take them in any way. No negative impact whatsoever. Please reconsider. This was kept brief only to meet deadlines. I can elaborate via email. Thanks for your consideration.</p>	<p>Wheeled recreation devices Inappropriate use of these devices can and has caused damage to Council infrastructure as well as inconvenience and safety concerns for pedestrians. These devices can be used in the skate park provided for this purpose. A Bicycle is a vehicle so is not covered by this By-Law.</p> <p>Distribute Pamphlets can be distributed with permission, permission is required to enable the balance of the significant number of activities requested to occur in the City on a daily basis to be maintained.</p>

Jesse Reynolds	<p>The proposal to disallow bicycles from being locked up to poles and other street objects commonly used for this purpose is short-sighted. There are far too few dedicated bicycle racks for securely locking bikes to. Preventing cyclists from using poles etc would be a big discouragement for people coming into the City of Adelaide by bicycle and therefore would increase traffic congestion as people are forced to drive.</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>
Emily Humphreys	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am an Adelaide city resident and frequent bike rider. I believe that the proposed amendment to the by-laws 2013 2.2A Lock bicycles in any other place than purpose built council bike racks" are a real disincentive to ride and park your bike within the CBD. Bike riding is a primary form of transport for me and my family around the city. When parking my bike I frequently either cannot find a bike lock up station or in the rare cases there is one, it is completely full because it is either too small or the only one in the area. I often have to use safe alternatives to lock up my bike. Coupled with the increased car park tax, this potential to fine people for locking up their bike against a sign post (for example) will only discourage visitation to the CBD. Isn't the city trying to attract people to the CBD? Don't we have a Strategic Priority to "create a vibrant city"? Until the council can provide bike racks as plentiful as car parks on the street I strongly feel that by-law amendment works again.</p> <p>Perhaps before amending the by-laws the council should prioritise more bike racks?</p>	<p>Bikes attached to Infrastructure</p> <p>Changes to wording will be proposed to better reflect Council's position in that this By-Law will only be enacted when the placement of a bike is causing access or potential safety issues.</p> <p>It is not Council's intention to "ban" this activity but to have the ability to take action if and when a Bicycle is left in an inappropriate place which unfortunately happens from time to time. Cyclists can be assured that considerate use of infrastructure will not be affected. Where there is no chance of danger or damage, we would have no concerns.</p>

Phase 2 - Complete list of responses through Council's Your Say Adelaide web site

Name	Comments	Response
Kate	I support the requirement for a food business to display proof they have submitted and maintained up to date information about their food business with Council.	Food Business Notification
Donna Capurso	Response to section regarding display of food business notification. I am an EHO at the City of Tea Tree Gully. I think it is a good idea because it's a way of knowing if the business has notified or not, but I would be concerned that customers may look at it as a sign that Council thinks the business is satisfactory.	Food Business Notification
Paula Matters	I am an EHO at the City of Tea Tree Gully. In relation to Clause 8, displaying food business Notification forms, I think it is a good thing if it encourages businesses to actually notify. However I am hoping the registration system may be coming in and I think this may be a better system but I guess this may still be some time away. The other thing I would be concerned about is that the public would see this and consider it an endorsement by council of the food business. I would think there would need to be some education of the public letting them know it is a notification only.	Food Business Notification
Louise	I think this is a fantastic and innovative approach to educating consumers about food safety. As a regular customer of city eateries, I often find myself concerned with pop-up eateries, wondering if they are known to the Council. In this day and age, with rapid business turnover, it would be reassuring to know which businesses the Council is aware of. The EHO at Adelaide City Council have a great reputation for fair and equitable food inspections, and I would feel reassured to know the EHO's are aware of the business and perform inspections of the business.	Food Business Notification
Justine Sulda	I support the support the proposed By-Law with the requirement of food businesses to display proof of notification in the public.	Food Business Notification
Cathy Isbester	I wish to comment on clause 8 – Food Business Notification Confirmation. This initiative is an excellent example of Council taking proactive steps to better safeguard the public's health and well-being. As a regular visitor to the City of Adelaide (and an environmental health professional), it is reassuring to know that a food business I purchase food from is known to Council. If they have	Food Business Notification

	<p>notified, I know they are inspected regularly and receive information promoting safe handling of food. These are necessary preventable measures to reduce the incidence of food-borne illness.</p> <p>To better guarantee the desired outcome and create efficiencies for Council, it would be preferable for the 'approved form' to contain the name of the proprietor in addition to the trading name of the business. This is likely to motivate a new proprietor to contact the council and enquire how to update the form. It avoids the current reliance on council staff to inform a proprietor of their notification obligation, thereby encouraging individual responsibility. The imposition of this new By-law does not create a significant burden upon business and encourages compliance with existing legislation. I consider the benefits to greatly outweigh any costs.</p>	
Dr Fay Jenkins	<p>The Department of Health and Ageing fully supports the modifications and adoption of the proposed By-law 12 Miscellaneous Variations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that adopting these changes will result in no increased burden on food businesses in meeting the requirements of the Food Act 2001 (SA). • The insertion of clause 8 will assist Adelaide City Council to enforce the Food Act requirements to ensure safe and suitable food provision to the public by easily and accurately identifying that all food businesses have notified the council of their operation according to Part 8, Section 86 of the Food Act. 	Food Business Notification
Damon Pearce	<p>Regarding clauses concerning private thoroughfares and roads, it's important to have by-laws that actively support the activities of 'movement culture' groups like parkour practitioners, free-running, skating, tricking etc.</p> <p>The parkour group with which I am involved respects the city and would like to promote movement and a healthy lifestyle (For a good summary of parkour in Adelaide and our intention, please view the video clip linked below).</p> <p>We need laws that allow responsible activity. Currently, a preventative clause like 'climbing over objects' can easily apply to parkour practice, where an 'object' could be nothing more than a square structure like those in the Hajek plaza (which were designed for the public to interact with them). Under current by-laws we can be removed from premises or fined for practicing healthy exercise in private thoroughfares such as plazas or grass reserves anywhere in the city.</p> <p>Few changes to the by-laws are needed, and they don't have to be</p>	Climbing Structures

	<p>unreasonable; for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throwing missiles and climbing on buildings can still be illegal; • Climbing on objects should be changed to allow for parkour, free-running and other physical training; • Irresponsible use of 'objects', e.g., breaking stuff, would be covered under damaging property, which is against the values of the movement culture groups. <p>Ultimately council would know the law and know what actions can be taken. Hopefully something good for all can be worked out. Thank you!</p> <p>Video mentioned: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LY8RTqEdSEs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travis Ranson on the promotion of parkour and movement culture in Adelaide (Travis has been nominated as a finalist for 2014 Young Australian of the Year for his efforts) 	
Nicole Moore	<p>I think that the requirement for Food Businesses to display proof of their notification is an excellent idea and may start a precedent for other councils to follow. While it is a requirement for Food business to notify their local councils, it can be difficult for Environmental Health Officers to follow-up on this and enforce this law. Having a local by-law may make this easier.</p>	Food Business Notification
Garth Hack Kevin Seeley Edgar (Gar) Gooden	<p>By-Law No. 12 – Amendment Phase 2 in Particular Subclause 2.2C “DISTRIBUTE”</p> <p>Submission on behalf of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are joint holders of Permit No. ONSTAC/11/2014///PREACH • Along with many other members of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church, we have been preaching in Victoria Square (adjacent to the Captain Charles Sturt memorial) and in North Terrace (outside the old Parliament House Building) over a period of 30 years in which time we have freely distributed Christian gospel tracts (small booklets 8 x 11 cm) to any passers-by who were interested enough to take them. To our knowledge, there have never been any complaints made about either the content or the distribution of these tracts. • On an historical note, Mr E. L. Gooden, a retired high school principal, preached from 1960-1980 at the same spot in Victoria Square and brought with him a small (500 x 500 mm) display rack containing some 12 or so tracts from which anybody interested could make a selection. • On the same note, Mr G. L. Shepherd, a solicitor whose offices were in Rechabite Chambers, preached in a similar position from 1950 – 1990 and 	<p>Distribute Literature</p> <p>The addition of Clause 2.2.C into By-Law 4 brings it in line with the same wording already in place in By-Law 3.</p> <p>It means that a permit is required to distribute literature (it has not been stopped as your submission seems to indicate) and when in place would be one of the activities requiring permission and briefly would read:-</p> <p>2. Activities requiring permission</p> <p>2.2.C Distribute give out or distribute to any bystander etc.</p> <p>In effect it has moved some of the permissions around in the existing By-law and simply reiterates that a permit is required.</p> <p>I believe that this will have no negative affect on your organisation.</p> <p>You may keep this email if you wish as confirmation of the result of that inclusion.</p> <p>If you require any further clarification, I will be only too happy to respond.</p>

	<p>freely distributed tracts to interested parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have never been in the business of haranguing or intimidating people, and we do not support the kind of activity that led to the dispute with a Council last year. We hold that the gospel is 'for he that will' (Revelation ch 22 v 17), and we totally respect other peoples' right to believe or not believe what they wish. • Our practice of open-air preaching and distributing tracts happens in a number of other locations in South Australia and Australia and indeed in hundreds of locations throughout the world. We are not aware of any other jurisdiction anywhere in which Church members reside where the giving out of tracts is forbidden. In the UK, for example, on Boxing Day last year in London, nearly 50,000 tracts were distributed in Oxford Street alone, amongst the estimated 20 million shoppers. <p>See: http://www.theplymouthbrethren.org.uk/our-life/spreading-the-gospel-message-far-and-wide/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please be free to visit the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church website where you will see that this is part of our way of life in spreading the gospel message as Christ commanded in Mark ch 16 v 15, 'Go into all the world, and preach glad tidings to all the creation.' <p>http://www.plymouthbrethrenchristianchurch.org/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the new amendment of By-Law No. 12 Clause 2.2C should succeed, we request that some mechanism be included to allow for an additional discretionary exemption from this amendment to be granted to permit holders, under certain conditions, which could include submitting samples of the literature. • We respect and pray for government at every level, but would appreciate our Christian way of life to be acknowledged and provided for, particularly in the light of long-standing practice over many years that has never bought us into any disrepute. 	
Jennie Boisvert	<p>I don't seem to be able to find the relevant section and the proposed changes that would ensure the commercial waste is collected from the site by the contractor and then the empty bin placed back on the property? Can you direct me to this please before I have my say again about the other valuable input that others have so clearly made?</p> <p>Thanks, Jennie</p>	<p>Waste Management</p> <p>Hi Jennie,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in Councils By-law consultation – phase 2. We believe we already have a clause which will enable us to deal with such issues as you have explained. I have included this section (from current by-law 5 Waste Management) for you below:</p>

Attachment C

3.7.2 An occupier of a premises must ensure that the container containing the relevant kind of material is placed out for collection:

3.7.2.1 on the footpath area in front of and on the same side as the premises, abutting the edge of (but not on) the carriageway and positioned so that the side of the container on which the hinges of the lid are situated faces the premises; or

3.7.2.2 in another position as approved or directed by Council; and

3.7.2.3 not under the overhanging branches of street trees; and not so as to impede the passage of pedestrian or other traffic.

3.7.3 an occupier of premises must remove the container from that position on the same day that the collection has taken place.

Businesses not complying with this section of the by-law will be advised that they are committing a breach and should they fail to comply with the direction of an authorised officer, legal action may commence.