South Road Upgrade – Torrens Road to River Torrens Community Liaison Groups (CLGs) Evaluation Form



Twelve evaluation forms were completed and returned as of 16 May 2014. Not all boxes were 'ticked' for every question, accounting for numbers where less than twelve (12) were recorded.

1. Do you believe the CLG served its purpose of: (please tick which the box which best applies)

a.	Creating a forum for discussion about information exchange?	10 - Yes	0 - No
b.	Identifying community issues and possible solutions to these issues?	11 - Yes	1 - No
C.	Representing a range of community and stakeholder interests?	9 - Yes	1 - No
d.	Disseminating information to the residents/ businesses /groups you represent?	5 - Yes	4 - No

- The last point was harder but managed.
- More resources to disseminate the activities and recommendations of the CLG's in a user friendly manner. Examples include a blog, Facebook page, newsletter, etc.
- The group was very engaged and staff facilitator excellent.
- I don't think the interest level from residents was high they still don't believe the project will go ahead maybe something in the messenger would have been helpful to direct people to the website or to on CLG member.
- The CLG was only partially successful in its purpose. It offered a forum and a representation of
 different stakeholders, but the solutions on offer and alternatives did not address the needs of
 the community. I felt a sense of powerlessness as I believe the agenda is set already as are
 the solutions and the CLG felt like amerce token gesture.
- A best practice idea. Actually listening and implementing solutions from the most affected stakeholders before construction starts.
- I am not sure that the group was 'representative' of the community or had more of a personal interest. This is evidenced by anecdotal feedback from community members of concerns about the project (particularly the option of an elevated Croydon Station).
- The three options for the railway overpass were only presented at the last meeting.
- 2. How well do you think the Community Liaison Group meetings were organised and run? (on a scale of 1 to 5, with '1' being 'not at all' and '5' being 'very', please circle the number which best applies)

1 - 0 2 - 1 3 - 1 4 - 3 5 - 7
Not at all Very

South Road Upgrade – Torrens Road to River Torrens Community Liaison Groups (CLGs) Evaluation Form



3.	In your opinion, were the interests of local residents, businesses and community group adequately represented on the Community Liaison Group?				
	Yes - 7	□ No - 1	☐ Somewhat - 4		
	see if truly representative.		erest the list of issues and priority to		
	 Members consulted their community members. 	community well and were ab	le to disseminate their opinions of		
	 Business didn't really get re choice, but still a shame. 	epresented it was a shame the	ey didn't want to get involved. Their		
	 I lacked a sense of honesty and flexibility in the propos 	ed solutions and our discussi- the table for discussion and w	nere was lack of clarity and direction ions. I wanted to be given clear cut what was not. This would have given		
	pro-active or have language	problems.	onsulted, however some are not very		
	 It would have been useful confusion with dates; postin 	g agendas and minutes on the	ons were sent as there was some website was useful and transparent. but acknowledge, this is difficult to		
		tions and democracy comes co	ompromise!		
4.	Overall, do you think you were well informed about the different elements of the Sout Road Upgrade plans between Torrens Road and the River Torrens?				
	Yes - 9	□ No - 1	☐ Somewhat – 2		
	 Staff were excellent at making project. Sadly a lot of reference was (i.e. CLG) a lot more efforts 	s made to the website, but in	the community consultation process gage with the community. One "open		

South Road Upgrade – Torrens Road to River Torrens Community Liaison Groups (CLGs) Evaluation Form



- I think a genuine effort was made to have as much info shared in both directions. Well done
 and congratulations.
- The project team is very familiar with all aspects of the project and seemed receptive to suggestions.
- And I tried to impart this community who asked, but that was tough.

5. What did you most like about the Community Liaison Group?

- The openness and willingness to share information from all participants.
- The way issues were discussed and partially resolved.
- The belief that our input was valued and could improve the outcomes for the project.
- Meeting people in my community and staff who were passionate about the project.
- Meeting other residents in the area. Being able to have a say about likes, dislikes and make suggestions.
- The engagement with the architect, their interpretations of our issues, their summary, their documentations and visual concepts. That was the only glimmer of light, but sadly the choice of building materials was not flexible and one again aimed at for the quickest and cheapest option concrete!
- The ability to present views or solutions to community concerns in a forum where we can have some impact on the final plan.
- I thought it ran well, good having the meetings run by an independent facilitator.
- Group members respected each other's views; an opportunity to gain first-hand knowledge of the project, its impacts and to share community concerns which influenced design outcomes.
- The openness of the DPTI team to discussing all of the issues surrounding the elevation and their willingness to consider alternate proposals. There was also a good sense that we were getting the big picture and were being kept up to date as changes occurred.
- To be able to have some input to the project.
- Liaison
- That those in charge actually listened. Hopefully that wasn't lip service.

South Road Upgrade – Torrens Road to River Torrens Community Liaison Groups (CLGs) Evaluation Form



6. What did you least like about the Community Liaison Group?

- I was extremely disappointed on the minimal, it at all, attendance rate of the Charles Sturt councilors. They should be present at ongoing discussions that involve their ward.
- The local traffic workshops. Without a facilitator and professional traffic consultants these events became very emotive and difficult to participate in.
- Issues which were very parochial and somewhat ill-informed due to lack of attendance at meetings.
- Mainly that not directly changing plan in PAR prior to public release.
- Sometimes there was a delay in receiving info between meetings, but nothing major.
- There was no empowerment given to the members, I felt I was not being taken seriously and that the agenda was already set with very little or no choice of being creative, innovative. I felt we were not really listened to.
- Earlier resistance to some suggestions that were not on the original plan or differed radically to the existing one.
- I felt that times the discussions was allowed to wander a little too far leading to meetings running overtime. A lack of commitment from some members was also somewhat disappointing.
- As above, not sure if it was truly representative; no representations from east of South Road from Port to Torrens; very high input / interest from local business.
- The majority of the project was already set in concrete. We got to tinker around the edges.
- The vacuum of 'on again' 'off again' Torrens to Torrens.

7. What recommendations would you make regarding a future Community Liaison Group for the detailed design and construction phase of the project?

- I think present model worked well. Particularly the community day it is vital to be open to all opinions in these and the open day enhanced that possibility. This is a small thing and almost impossible to manage, but occasionally people did monopolize the meeting with their particular focus or agenda. That is rather frustrating.
- Make sure a CLG sees the reasoning behind decisions. This should be before meeting with design team.

South Road Upgrade – Torrens Road to River Torrens Community Liaison Groups (CLGs) Evaluation Form



- The project clearly articulates what the limits are for influencing and changing the design or construction process. That the end state be clearly articulated at the start. If smaller working groups are to be established, provide them with hands on support and an independent facilitator. Embrace social media to help communicate the activities of the CLG.
- Ensure all information is disseminated in a timely manner and these members are the ones who attended this group regularly. When it happens a letterbox drop in the affected areas would help spark interest in the project again. Something to direct them to the appropriate website or CLG member.
- Be very honest with the people you engage with who are there because they live and breathe in the neighborhood, they are the community, they have valuable input. Be challenged by the community. Give us clear boundaries of what has to happen and what is up for negotiation and give us a sense of empowerment. Don't make it a token gesture. We can come up with compromise if we are treated fairly. Be proactive and offer alternatives remediate the vacant sites, plant trees, engage us. We core!
- I feel that the same amount of consultation and respect for all sides of the argument should continue.
- Maintain a core group of the existing members and endeavor to draw in some new members
 who are both heavily affected by the works and have some strong value to add to any
 discussions.
- There would value in continuing the CLG, so they can convey issues / opportunities through the construction phase which can be quite disruptive.
- Have the process from the beginning of the project.
- Have some way that the info can be relayed back to the community.
- A signed, sealed and delivered project. START.
- 8. Overall, how would you rate your experience of being a Community Liaison Group member on the Torrens Road to River Torrens project? (please tick the box which best applies)

Very positive - 8 Somewhat positive - 3 Not overly positive - 1 Not positive at all - 0