

Free Public Transport Tickets

ITEM 15.2 08/09/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Simms

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

MOTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Simms will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:

'That:

Council requests that administration prepare a report with options to offer free bus, train and tram tickets to encourage visitors to the city.'

ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. Adelaide Metro offers two ticketing types: Metrocard for regular users and short-term (paper) tickets for infrequent users.
2. The key considerations to providing a ticket for free bus, train and tram tickets to encourage visitors to the city includes:
 - 2.1. The potential for misuse by commuters who already use public transport to travel to the City (and beyond) for work.
 - 2.2. Tickets are not location based and could be used for other purposes.
 - 2.3. Recent surveys have shown a high level of concern the general public has for using public transport, with concern only exceeded by travel by aeroplane and attendance at a large event, which could impact the effectiveness of the proposal (source: <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/marketing-and-sales/our-insights/survey-australian-consumer-sentiment-during-the-coronavirus-crisis>)
 - 2.4. Due to the concerns raised regarding use of public transport in the current climate it may be more beneficial to promote visitors to the city through activations and promotions.
3. Metrocards are targeted at regular public transport users given the upfront cost of the card, hence they are less suitable for use as an incentive to visit the city by bus, train and tram. However, Metrocard users could potentially be reimbursed for public transport trips made for retail or leisure.
4. Short-term tickets are considered more suitable for a promotional offer to encourage visitors to the city. Adelaide Metro offers three short-term ticket options for regular fares (excluding concession and student tickets), including peak single trip (\$5.70), off-peak single trip (\$3.80), and daytrip (\$10.80).
5. There are benefits and drawbacks to offering each ticket type, including:

- 5.1. Peak period single trip tickets would be able to be used by commuters who would visit the city irrespective of the offer. Two tickets would have to be provided to allow for a round trip.
- 5.2. Off-peak single trip tickets would reduce utilisation by use by commuters but offer limited hours of travel and cannot be used on Saturdays. Two tickets would have to be provided to allow for a round trip.
- 5.3. Daytrip tickets would allow users to make a return trip on a single ticket and would be more cost-effective for CoA than providing two peak period single trip tickets. However, the likelihood of use by commuters also applies.
6. The number of tickets provided to visitors will be dependent on the funding allocated and the type of ticket offered. Funding will also be required to promote and administer the scheme.
 - 6.1. Current census data tells us that fifty-four thousand people commute to the city for work on public transport each day, this does not include visitors. This equates to somewhere between \$410,400 (off peak) to \$615,600 (peak) per day of public transport patronage revenue. Council may need to consider how and what type of commuter accesses free subsidised transport to the city and for what purpose.
7. If the Motion is successful, the Administration will seek to develop options to encourage use and offer public transport tickets for the use of retail and leisure visitors to the city. Consultation will be undertaken with the South Australian Public Transport Authority to assist with the development of options.

Should the motion be carried, the following implications of this motion should be considered. Note any costs provided are estimates only – no quotes or prices have been obtained:	
Public consultation	Not applicable
External consultant advice	Not applicable
Legal advice / litigation (eg contract breach)	Not applicable
Impacts on existing projects	Not applicable
Budget reallocation	Cost of CoA funding free travel to be determined
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	20 hours
Other	Not applicable
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 4.5 hours.

- END OF REPORT -

Masterplan for Hutt Street

ITEM 15.6 08/09/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Moran

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

MOTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Moran will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:

'That:

the expensive master plan for Hutt Street be abandoned given the Deputy Lord Mayor has proposed a plan and publicly announced it.'

ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. Developing Master Plans (Action Plans) for Hutt Street (as well as Melbourne and O'Connell Streets), was an approved \$370,000 project within the 2019/20 Integrated Business Plan (IBP) to coordinate the improvement and reinvigoration of the main streets over time, and identify short, medium and long term actions to guide future investment in the streets, including engagement with businesses and the local community.
2. In April 2020, due to financial impacts of Covid-19, the unspent budget of \$232,000 was re-prioritised and further approved by Council as part of the 2020/21 Business Plan.
3. The Hutt Street Action Plan is well progressed, including a draft vision and objectives developed based on detailed site investigations, data collection and analysis, including a business and retail study. The Action Plan has been built on community and stakeholder engagement that has occurred over many years. This process has informed the identification of actions to be progressively delivered.

Should the motion be carried, the following implications of this motion should be considered. Note any costs provided are estimates only – no quotes or prices have been obtained:	
Public consultation	Hutt Street stakeholders and community to be advised that the Action Plan will be abandoned.
External consultant advice	Not applicable
Legal advice / litigation (eg contract breach)	Not applicable
Impacts on existing projects	Hutt Street scheduled renewal works to be reviewed.

Budget reallocation	Reconsider/reallocate the portion of the \$232,000 2020/21 budget for developing the Hutt Street Action Plan.
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	Not applicable
Other	Not applicable
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 5.5 hours.

- END OF REPORT -

Outdoor Activation Grants

ITEM 15.7 08/09/2020
Council

Council Member
Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor
Hyde

2020/01487
Public

Contact Officer:
Ian Hill, Director Growth

MOTION ON NOTICE

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Hyde will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:

'That Council:

1. Notes the overwhelming interest in the Outdoor Activation Grants announced by the City of Adelaide in partnership with the State Government earlier in August.
2. Notes the program has been funded by the State Government.
3. Notes that as at 31 August the City stopped receiving applications for the scheme due to the high volume of applications.
4. Contributes \$300,000 further to the program and reopens applications, reflecting the significant interest and uptake from local small businesses.
5. Requests a report on the success and uptake of the program is provided to the next Capital City Committee meeting, including exemplars of what the investment is delivering.'

ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. The City of Adelaide Outdoor Activation Grant opened on Thursday 20 August and receipt of applications ceased on Monday 31 August as indications were that the amount of funding sought exceeded the budget available. Applications have been received from businesses across the city and North Adelaide.
2. A total of 48 applications had been received before the applications were closed. One applicant has been advised that their application is ineligible as the works have already been completed.
3. A condition of the grant is that 80% of the costs would be funded via the grant with the remaining 20% being covered by the business owner. A maximum of \$10,000 (GST exclusive) is available per application.
4. The popularity of this grant shows that even during the currently challenging economic conditions, business owners are willing to invest in infrastructure and works that will assist their business.
5. When the grant was closed on 31 August, there were an additional 35 applications that had been commenced on-line and we have received a further 30 direct enquiries. We have advised these applicants that the current funding has been spent. If the Motion is adopted, we will contact these applicants to advise further funding is available.
6. With regard to reporting back to the Capital City Committee, if the Motion is adopted the Lord Mayor will report back to the Capital City Committee on this program.

Should the motion be carried, the following implications of this motion should be considered. Note any costs provided are estimates only – no quotes or prices have been obtained:	
Public consultation	Not applicable
External consultant advice	Not applicable
Legal advice / litigation (eg contract breach)	Not applicable
Impacts on existing projects	Not applicable
Budget reallocation	If the Motion is supported, \$300,000 will need to be funded through savings to be identified through the Q1 budget reconsideration.
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	Preparation of the report for the Lord Mayor to provide to the Capital City Committee will take approximately 0.5 hours.
Other	Not applicable
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 4.5 hours.

- END OF REPORT -

Central Market Arcade Redevelopment

ITEM 15.8 08/09/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2015/00903
Public

Contact Officer:
Ian Hill, Director Growth

MOTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:

'That Council:

Noting the Administration advised a public Council meeting on August 11th, 2020 that;

"...the Developer has been working closely with State Commission Assessment Panel (SCAP) and Office for Design and Architecture South Australia (ODASA) through the Pre-Lodgement Phase (including ODASA design review) and has indicated that they may be in the position to submit for approval to SCAP in September 2020."

and that the key terms of this 400 million dollar Central Market Arcade Redevelopment Project Delivery Agreement provides at;

- 2.4 Council has the right to object to the application if it considers that the application is inconsistent with the Project Design or constitutes a "Material Variation", being a variation which:
- 2.4.1 in the reasonable opinion of the Council substantially and adversely alters the external appearance of the Project;
 - 2.4.2 has a material adverse effect on compliance with the Council's Design Principles forming part of the Project Design;
 - 2.4.3 results in an increase to the Lettable Area of the Air Rights Development of more than 5%;
 - 2.4.4 introduces new uses to the Air Rights Development not contemplated in the PDA, or which substantially alters the areas for uses as set out in the PDA; and
 - 2.4.5 in Council's reasonable opinion has a material adverse impact on the functioning of the Returnable Works.

Requests that the Administration provides to elected members before the submission of any plans or designs to SCAP;

1. Copies of plans for the redevelopment including, but not limited to details of the "Returnable Works" showing retail and public areas, ingress and egress, traffic management arrangements during and after the development, public access points, any proposed integration with the Central Market, service areas, the relationship between the Returnable Works and the development of the air rights including the hotel and residential apartments, floor plates for all of the air rights development including public car parking and private car parking associated with the Project, incorporating written advice of any and all variations of substance to the artist's impressions and draft plans previously presented to Council.
2. Copies of the financial agreements between the City of Adelaide and the developer, including any changes to any income to be paid to the City of Adelaide in the event that there have been changes to the Project Design and/or the Air Rights.
3. A formal vote of Council to accept, to not accept or to propose changes to any aspect of the Project Design to ensure the best outcome for all stakeholders.'

ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. On 28 November 2019 Council resolved to approve ICD Property (the Developer) as its project development partner for the Central Market Arcade Redevelopment.
2. The Developer has been working collaboratively with the Administration and the Adelaide Central Market Authority (ACMA) to progress design matters enabling lodgement of a development application with the State Commission Assessment Panel.
3. Council has been updated on the design development process and has been advised that the concept aligns with Council's Guiding Principles and meets the requirements of the Project Delivery Agreement.
4. There has been no change to the existing financial arrangements between the Developer and the City of Adelaide.
5. The net cost for Council's returnable works is \$27.74 million (plus GST) with Council's returnable works comprising 6,000m² net lettable area of retail, 260 public car parks and basement loading/ servicing.
6. The Corporation of the City of Adelaide is the relevant party to the Project Delivery Agreement with the Chief Executive Officer as the delegate to approve the concept design prior to the lodgement of the development application.

Should the motion be carried, the following implications of this motion should be considered. Note any costs provided are estimates only – no quotes or prices have been obtained:	
Public consultation	Not applicable
External consultant advice	The specific information sought may require additional consultancy input to satisfy the request.
Legal advice / litigation (eg contract breach)	The Corporation of the City of Adelaide is the relevant party to the Project Delivery Agreement with the Chief Executive Officer as the delegate.
Impacts on existing projects	Timing implication with regard to lodgement of the development application.
Budget reallocation	Not applicable
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	Not applicable
Other	Not applicable
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 5.0 hours.

- END OF REPORT -

Electronic Meetings and Standing Orders

ITEM 15.10 08/09/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2018/04066
Public

Contact Officer:
Mark Goldstone, Chief
Executive Officer

MOTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:

'That Council:

Noting that the elected body has decided to hold electronic meetings of Committees, workshops, briefings and, on occasions this year, Council, requests the Administration investigate:

1. Any amendments to Standing Orders that may be required to determine who should manage audio/vision and how, the manner in which elected members might pose procedural and other motions without the capacity to put such motions in accordance with current standing orders, protocols for locations for participating in such meetings (including security) and periodic breaks consistent with occupational safety standards. Any recommendations should be informed by standards which have been adopted by other local government areas in South Australia or other levels of government.
2. The use of hybrid technology to allow elected members willing to attend Town Hall for electronic meetings to do so in number in the Colonel Light Room.'

ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. In response to part 1 of the motion, the following information on electronic meetings is provided for context:
 - 1.1. In response to the COVID-19 public health emergency, a Ministerial Notice (the Notice) was issued on 30 March 2020 to vary and suspend certain provisions of *the Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* (the Act) to support councils to conduct remote/electronic meetings. For the City of Adelaide, meetings of both Council and The Committee were subsequently held electronically.
 - 1.2. On 7 April Council approved an addendum to the City of Adelaide Standing Orders to support the convening of, and procedure for, remote meetings of Council and committees. The updates were in accordance with the Notice provisions and Local Government Association (LGA) Guidelines.
 - 1.3. The facilitation of electronic meetings has been managed by Governance; this includes hosting and streaming the meetings to allow public viewing. The LGA Guidelines provide no specific requirements for the location of Members joining meetings electronically except to suggest that they should be in a quiet room and the need to observe confidentiality provisions.
 - 1.4. During electronic meetings the Presiding Member, with governance support, manages the audio of participants to ensure only one person is speaking at a time, in accordance with Regulation 29 of the *Local Government Association (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* (the Regulations).

- 1.5. From 1 July 2020 all meetings resumed in person in accordance with density and social distancing restrictions imposed for public attendance by the Commissioner of Police.
 - 1.6. At its meeting on 14 July, Council approved the use of Zoom (or other remote conferencing software) for meetings of The Committee unless determined otherwise at the discretion of the Chief Executive Office in consultation with the Presiding Member.
 - 1.7. A report will be presented to The Committee on 6 October 2020, followed by Council on 13 October 2020 to seek approval of the updated Terms of Reference for The Committee to cover ongoing meetings of The Committee electronically, as per the decision of Council on 14 July.
2. To assist with further context in response to part 1 of the motion the following information on the governance structure and procedures for The Committee is provided:
 - 2.1. Part 2 of the Regulations, observed at meetings of Council, do not automatically apply to The Committee. The procedures for The Committee are as prescribed by parts 1, 3 and 4 of the Regulations, relevant sections of the Standing Orders and as prescribed in The Committee Terms of Reference
 - 2.2. On 10 December 2019 Council approved the current governance structure which required all decisions to be made by Council. The Committee can therefore only make procedural decisions relating to adoption of minutes, exclusion of the public and confidentiality orders. In accordance with section 89(2) of the Act, a meeting can also adjourn.
 - 2.3. The governance procedures at The Committee have not changed when meetings are held electronically. The only implications have been the use of the electronic raise hand option to indicate the wish to speak.
 - 2.4. If Members would like to apply formal motions in The Committee, then a decision of Council to vary the current operating procedures of the governance structure would be required.
 - 2.5. The Standing Orders currently allow for the Presiding Member of The Committee to call a formal break after two hours, this has not been warranted given the duration of recent meetings. In addition, a Member may move a motion to adjourn the meeting at any time in accordance with section 89(2) of the Act.
 3. With respect to part 2 of the motion relating to hybrid technology, if Members would like to participate from Town Hall they have been and may continue to join the meeting from their offices without the need for headphones. If the preference is for more than one Member to participate from the Colonel Light Room, headphones are needed so the sound emanating from their devices does not create echoing sound.
 4. There are advanced investigations underway on using another platform to support ongoing electronic meetings which can be implemented in various hybrid forms including where meetings are convened from the Colonel Light Room and one or more Members may need to participate remotely. The implementation of this new platform is dependent on updated equipment and may need a replacement of outdated audio equipment in the Colonel Light Room. Any structural upgrades will require heritage considerations.

Should the motion be carried, the following implications of this motion should be considered. Note any costs provided are estimates only – no quotes or prices have been obtained:

Public consultation	If the motion is carried and further investigations result in updates being required to the Standing Orders relating to the use of section 90 and 91 of the Act, public consultation may be required. Previous public consultation undertaken in accordance with section 92 of the Act was at an approximate cost of \$1,500.
External consultant advice	Not applicable
Legal advice / litigation (eg contract breach)	If the motion is carried, some external legal advice may need to be sought to verify legislative compliance.
Impacts on existing projects	Not applicable but note report being prepared for Council on 13 October (via The Committee on 6 October) to consider the updated Terms of Reference which may be impacted.
Budget reallocation	Not applicable
Capital investment	Not applicable

Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	It will take several hours to review the Standing Orders, the length of time taken will depend on the level of change required. There will also be time spent to prepare a report to present back to Council.
Other	Not applicable
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 4.5 hours.

- END OF REPORT -