

Meeting Title: Marsha Reserve Masterplan Working Group - Meeting 04
Project Title: Marsha Reserve Wastewater Pump Station
Date: 16 October 2023
Time: 4:30 – 6:30pm
Location: Marsha Reserve

Invitees:

Group member	Role	Present	Proxy
Elliot St Claire	Site neighbour	Apology	Lina Garcia attended as proxy
Joanna Henderson	Site neighbour	Yes	
Michelle Perry	Site neighbour	Yes	
Rose Morton	Tea Tree Gully CWMS Action Group and Marsha Drive resident	Yes	
Sarah Linton	Site neighbour	Yes	
Scott Brien	Site neighbour	Apology	
Trevor Camac	Site neighbour	Yes	
Cr Jessica Hawkvelt	Council elected member	Apology	
Cr Lucas Jones	Council elected member	Apology	
Greg Salmon	Manager Project Management Office, City of Tea Tree Gully	Yes	
Olivia Savvas MP	Member for Newland	Apology	
Emma Goldsworthy	Manager, Capital Delivery, SA Water	Yes	
Ellie Ridgway	Stakeholder Engagement Advisor, SA Water	Yes	

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The meeting opened with Steve Dangerfield providing an acknowledgement of country. Apologies were:

- Elliot St Claire, with Lina Garcia attending as his proxy
- Scott Brien
- Cr Jessica Hawkvelt
- Cr Lucas Jones
- Olivia Savvas MP.

2. HOUSEKEEPING

- Minutes from meeting 3 have been circulated and will be discussed at meeting 5.
- A handout was provided to the group, and it was requested that these be returned at the end of the site visit as the information was put together to guide the site visit and does not represent a particular path forward for the pump station.

3. INSPECTION OF PREFERRED PUMP STATION LOCATION AREAS

Three pegged out areas were presented to the group, noting that the measurements used were not as exact as they would be if any location was chosen as the final location for construction. The marked-out areas were indicative only to provide a conceptual understanding of how each site would interact with the park. At each of the three locations flags were used to mark out potential access points for maintenance trucks and different coloured ribbons were used to show:

- Regulated and non-regulated trees that would have to be removed.
- Regulated and non-regulated trees that would possibly be impacted by the pump station footprint but not necessarily need to be removed.

At all three sites a worst case scenario was presented, noting that whichever site(s) were selected for further exploration and development, every effort would be made to optimise the size of the overall footprint.

It was noted that:

- Landskap will work closely with an arborist to protect any tree that doesn't need to be removed but could possibly be impacted.
- SA Water is gathering information about trees that may or would be impacted through the construction stage of the pump station, and the Group was advised that this would be presented at the next meeting.
- Each location option presented adheres to the SA Water standards.

Option A – back of reserve

- At this location the entry point for maintenance trucks is likely to be Oleander Drive. There are currently two paths from Oleander Drive into Marsha Reserve, and if this location was selected the northern path would become an access road while the southern path would be enhanced as a pedestrian access point.
- We are seeking further information as to whether the overhead powerline at the end of Oleander Drive would need to be placed underground, and understand that the power line supplies adjacent houses. Any disruption to electricity supply would need to be thoroughly understood.
- One significant tree would have to be removed to accommodate the footprint and access road for the pump station. Three other significant trees would potentially be impacted, but there are methods that can be used to minimise risks to them and by working closely with an arborist we can put protective measures in place. The exact number of trees impacted will be confirmed at the next meeting.
- Geotechnical investigations need to be conducted to ensure that this option is fully viable.
- Concerns were expressed about whether maintenance access to the pump station from the end of Oleander Drive would make this pedestrian entry look like a path to a pump station rather than a park. This would have to be considered carefully through the design and the Group would be consulted with on this further.
- Access to homes at the end of Oleander Drive would have to be carefully managed and maintained during the construction process if this location was selected for the pump station, which would require further discussions with residents, SA Water and the construction company. It needed to be

noted that residents were forced to park their cars elsewhere for up to a week when the main was constructed and that this was unacceptable and could not happen a second time.

- The Group was asked whether they would continue to consider this site if further significant trees needed to be removed. The Group indicated that they would continue to consider the site but would need to be consulted in relation to this, and stated that TSA, Landskap and SA Water should continue to explore this site and scope further the possible impacts and amenity design.
- SA Water indicated that it was likely that the sewer main through the park extending from Oleander to Marsha would have to be re-laid for this site option.

Option B – east of reserve

- The layout presented at Option B has a greater impact on trees and usable space at the Reserve.
- Under this layout, at this location, seven non-regulated trees (including approximately four juvenile trees) and two regulated trees would need to be removed to accommodate the footprint of the pump station and access road. A further four regulated trees could be impacted by the footprint.
- It is adjacent to a dwelling and concerns were expressed about access to the Reserve from the east under this option.
- With the removal of nine trees concerns were expressed about the impacts on wildlife.
- Members of the Group indicated that they feel the list of negatives for this potential location is long and therefore should not be pursued.

Option C – west of reserve

- This location was the site of the original design, with the original design running horizontally across the front of the Reserve. The layout presented runs vertically to minimise visual impact from the street.
- Three non-regulated trees would need to be removed, one non-regulated tree could be impacted and three regulated trees could be impacted.
- This location runs along the entirety of the fence line of the adjacent residence and impacts views from windows and gardens and would require a large amount of screening.
- Earthworks would need to take place towards the back of the location.
- Impacts on National Broadband Fibre to Premises for the neighbourhood may need to be considered at this location given that the Group commented that an electrical box here has previously supplied Foxtel services to the area.
- While this area did not appear to be impacted to the same extent as the eastern site, it still posed problems with respect to its proximity to the neighbouring house which would only be a few metres from the WWPS fence line.

4. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

The Group was asked to provide perspectives on next steps in terms of drafting design ideas.

- The Group was asked to consider whether it would be comfortable for further draft design work to be done on Option A. This was agreed to, on the proviso that access during construction and tree removal from private properties was explored further, with hesitations particularly in this regard noted. SA Water will look into access during construction and impact on trees on private properties as soon as possible. Despite requiring this further information, the group still considered this option to be preferable and should continue to be pursued by the team.

Minutes.

- The Group was asked whether they would also like to take Option B and/or Option C to draft design level, or whether the focus should remain on Option A for now.
- The majority of the Group agreed that Option A should be the focus at this point in time, with Options B and C to be kept in reserve in case Option A proves to not be feasible. Having said this, it was noted that neither option B or C was palatable and every effort must be made to implement option A.
- The Group also noted that timely decision making was required at this point in time, with information provided as soon as possible by service providers.
- If Option A proves not to be feasible the Group would like to understand the logistics behind this.
- TSA and Landskap will move forward with draft design ideas for Option A, to be presented at the next meeting, noting that both technical and community needs must be met and that no location is ideal for everyone.
- Group members were encouraged to contact TSA with any concerns they have at any time.