

# Outdoor Activation Grant

**ITEM 17.4** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Councillor Abrahamzadeh

2020/01700  
Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Ian Hill, Director Growth

## MOTION ON NOTICE

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

'That Council:

1. Notes the success and demand for the outdoor activation grant which has provided funds to businesses across the City and North Adelaide and has provided much needed assistance to small businesses impacted by COVID-19;
2. Notes that the second grant was increased after the first grant was over-subscribed where council agreed to additional funding of \$375,000;
3. Requests the CEO provide a monetary estimate of the required amount needed to cover any submissions that were not granted due to being over-subscribed in second round; and
4. Increases the outdoor activation grant by an additional \$400,000 to allow for further applications and to give all businesses the opportunity to submit if they have not done so.'

---

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. Council at its meeting on 8 September approved funding of \$375,000 to support the City of Adelaide Outdoor Activation Grant. Applications for Round 2 of the Grant opened on Thursday 24 September 2020 and closed on Thursday 1 October with applications received from 123 businesses.
2. Since Round 2 of the Grant closed a further 2 applications as at 8 October 2020 have been received directly from city businesses.
3. All 125 applications meet the grant criteria.
4. The total value of Council's contribution if all 125 applications are funded is approximately \$849,200. A further \$474,200 budget allocation from Council would be required to fund applications received as at 8 October 2020. This represents a total spend of approximately \$1,325,000, with city businesses contributing approximately \$475,800.

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	Any further funding for the Outdoor Activation Grant is not included in the current 2020-21 Business Plan and Budget and will need to be paid from borrowings or savings from activities that Council agrees will not proceed.
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	Not applicable
Other	When Council approved the funding of \$375,000 a request was made to the State Government seeking further matching funding of \$375,000. To date no response has been received to this request.
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 5 hours.

---

- END OF REPORT -

# Adelaide Review

**ITEM 17.5** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Councillor Martin

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:

Regrets the closure of the Adelaide Review and formally records its appreciation of the work of its owners, staff and contributors who, over the past 36 years, have helped to enrich the political and cultural discourse of the City.'

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

- Should this Motion be endorsed, the Lord Mayor will send a letter on behalf of Council to express regret and appreciation.

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	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 4 hours.

---

- END OF REPORT -

# Councillor Participation at Roundtables

**ITEM 17.6** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Councillor Martin

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 on Tuesday September 29th in the Queen Adelaide Room at Town Hall the Lord Mayor conducted a Melbourne Street Roundtable attended by representatives of one communication organisation, one business organisation and five individuals to:

1. Encourage greater communication and collaboration between stakeholders
2. Discuss opportunities and explore new ideas to improve the amenity of Melbourne Street for local businesses, residents and City users
3. Provide advice on emerging issues, asking recommendations on effective solutions
4. Brainstorming ideas on future development, vision and plans to create new and exciting experiences and opportunities for businesses, residents and City users
5. Update members on Council initiatives, including Mainstreet Action Plan, Community Activations and Events, and Quick Wins

And further noting the Lord Mayor decided to exclude elected members from participation in this event, requests the Lord Mayor now include Councillors for such discussions as stakeholders as the elected representatives of all businesses and residents and to aid effective communication and collaboration in the City of Adelaide.'

---

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. The Lord Mayor regularly undertakes stakeholder engagement activities as part of her civic leadership responsibilities.
2. This includes regular 'Open Door' sessions and forums such as the '40 Under 40 (Millennial) Forum' held in partnership with Solstice Media in June 2020.
3. This has also included roundtable meetings with key stakeholders associated with Hindley Street and Hutt Street, and more recently Melbourne Street, such as resident/precinct groups and business owners.
4. Outcomes of the recent Melbourne Street Roundtable meeting will be shared with Council Members in the coming days.

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	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 4 hours.

---

- END OF REPORT -

# Independent Review of Yoursay

ITEM 17.7 13/10/2020  
Council

Council Member  
Councillor Martin

2018/00448  
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:

Acknowledges that despite a 2018 review there have been continuing and various complaints about the US licensed Yoursay online consultation process and asks the Administration to initiate an external and independent investigation into the efficiency of the manner in which the City of Adelaide conducts its consultation processes, including but not limited to;

1. Whether the Yoursay registration process is too onerous.
2. Any perceptions that lengthy and complex surveys deter participation.
3. Possible impacts associated with the common Yoursay practice of posing binary questions.
4. The role and relative value placed on general commentary provided by participants.
5. Ways in which ratepayers preferring to respond to consultations on paper can be better accommodated.
6. Options for alternative consultation processes available in the marketplace.'

---

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. Your Say Adelaide (the Engagement HQ platform developed by Bang the Table) has been used by the City of Adelaide as its online engagement platform since 2011. Bang the Table is an Australian owned, Melbourne based company with an international footprint in the UK, USA and Canada.
2. The Engagement HQ platform is used by 14 metropolitan councils in Adelaide and several capital city councils including Brisbane, Perth, Darwin, Hobart, Canberra and Auckland. It is widely used by all tiers of Government and the not-for profit sector.
3. A review was undertaken in 2019 of the City of Adelaide's current community engagement service delivery. The review included interviews with staff, Council Members and external stakeholder organisations and a community survey as well as online research. An outcome of the review was that city residents were concerned about how engagement activities were promoted rather than the use of tools used to assist with the engagements.

4. Your Say Adelaide is one of many tools used for public engagement for each project. Depending on the target audience sought to be reached, other public engagement tools include door to door visits, Park Lands activities, intercept surveys, community workshops, public meetings (currently online), and bespoke forums.
5. During the 19/20 financial year, 77 engagement projects were facilitated through Your Say Adelaide and the participant database increased by 58% to 11,247. Participants are only required to register once and then have ongoing access to respond to engagements as they wish. Registration provides demographic data about who is engaging and who is not, to ensure impacted stakeholders are having a say.
6. In addition to the online Your Say Adelaide platform, members of the public are also able to provide feedback via email, phone call, letter or hard copy surveys that are accessible in community centres, libraries and the Customer Centre.
7. To conduct an investigation as proposed, Council will need to engage an external consultant. The anticipated cost for this is approximately \$40,000. Funding for this engagement is not included in the current business plan and budget.

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	Engagement of an external consultant would be required to undertake a review. It is anticipated the cost of this would be approximately \$40,000.
Legal advice / litigation (eg contract breach)	Not applicable
Impacts on existing projects	Not applicable
Budget reallocation	If the Motion is adopted, funding to undertake the review is not included in the 2020-21 Business Plan and Budget. A decision will need to be made on what other activity is foregone to fund this consultancy.
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 -



# Use of Personal E-Scooters

**ITEM 17.8** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Councillor Hou

2018/04053  
Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Kliinton Devenish, Director  
Place

## MOTION ON NOTICE

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

'That Council:

1. Notes the success and demand for the use of E-Scooters which has become popular within the City;
2. Notes that the use of personal e-scooters within the City of Adelaide is not allowed under the current legislation;
3. Asks the Lord Mayor to write to the State Government requesting a change to this legislation to allow the use of personal e-scooters.'

---

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. Two e-scooter companies are currently permitted to operate within the City of Adelaide, being Neuron and Beam, with both companies recording increasing numbers of trips.
2. There are a number of barriers that currently prevent the State Government from allowing private e-scooter usage on public land. These barriers include, but are not limited to:
  - 2.1. The ability to limit e-scooter vehicle speeds. Private e-scooters with top speeds of over 100 km/h are currently available for purchase to the general public in Australia and would require resourcing and enforcement by SAPOL to manage. Neuron and Beam e-scooters have speed limits programmed in.
  - 2.2. No insurer in Australia currently offers personal or property insurance for private e-scooters.
  - 2.3. Being able to control the area of travel for e-scooters to ensure they do not operate in environments that pose significant safety risks to road users, such as freight routes. Neuron and Beam are geo-locked to our Council boundary and are not permitted to travel outside of this boundary.
3. In late 2019 the National Transport Commission (NTC) consulted on Motorised Mobility Devices, which includes e-scooters, with a vision to developing a set of design standards for these vehicles in Australia. Recommendations from this engagement is anticipated to shortly be presented to Federal Ministers with the expectation that this will inform the future of e-scooter devices and similar, in Australia.
4. Previous discussions with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) identified that the State Governments position is to wait for the outcomes of the NTC's Motorised Mobility Devices project before reviewing private e-scooter use in South Australia.

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	If private e-scooters are allowed in South Australia, this may impact on the viability of shared e-scooter operations in Adelaide and may result in a reduction in operation and subsequently income to the City resulting from the e-scooter permits.
Budget reallocation	Not applicable.
Capital investment	Not applicable.
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	If Administration are required to prepare a letter to the State Government regarding allowing private e-scooter devices, this is anticipated to take approximately 2 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 -

# Bikes and E-Scooters on Public Transport

**ITEM 17.9** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Councillor Hou

2018/04053  
Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Klinton Devenish, Director  
Place

## MOTION ON NOTICE

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

'That Council:

1. Notes that E-Scooters are currently banned from public trams, trains and buses whilst bikes are allowed only on trains;
2. Asks the Lord Mayor to write to the Minister seeking consideration to allow both bikes and e-scooters on public transport.'

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. Adelaide Metro currently allows bicycles on trains without charge outside of peak travel hours, however during peak travel hours the user must hold a valid concession ticket for the bike. The Administration understands that this position is due to demand for limited space by users during the peak periods.
2. It is understood by the Administration that bicycles are currently not allowed on other services, including buses and trams, due to limited internal space within the vehicles and potential risk to other users of unrestrained bicycles.
3. Private e-scooters are not allowed on public land in South Australia. Shared e-scooter devices in the City of Adelaide are geo-locked to our Council boundary and are not permitted to travel outside of this boundary.
4. In lieu of allowing bicycles and similar on public transport services, the Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) have focused on providing suitable bicycle storage and end of trip facilities at public transport hubs.
5. The Administration understands that the DIT has previously investigated various options for transporting bikes on public transport, including external storage racks on buses to allow buses to transport bicycles, however no viable options were identified as part of that review.

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	Not applicable.
Capital investment	Not applicable.
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	To prepare a letter to the DIT in response to the motion on notice, it is estimated this will take the Administration 4 hour.
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 -

# Sands & McDougall State Heritage Listing Advocacy

**ITEM 17.10** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
The Lord Mayor (Sandy Verschoor)

2018/04053  
Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Klinton Devenish, Director  
Place

## MOTION ON NOTICE

**The Lord Mayor (Sandy Verschoor) will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:**

That Council:

1. Notes the unique heritage value of the Art Deco facade on 64 King William Street, Adelaide (former Sands & McDougall Pty Ltd building).
2. Notes that the building façade (Frontage of Shop) is currently provisionally entered as a State Heritage Place, as per the *Heritage Places Act 1993*.
3. Notes that The South Australian Heritage Council is currently receiving submissions in support of the Frontage of Shop (former Sands & McDougall Pty Ltd building) being entered on the SA Heritage Register.
4. Requests that the Administration provide a submission to The South Australian Heritage Council that speaks in support of the Frontage of Shop (former Sands & McDougall Pty Ltd building) being of State Heritage significance prior to the 24 November 2020.

---

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. The former Sands & McDougall building is already included as a Local Heritage Place within the Adelaide (City) Development Plan.
  - 1.1. The description of the Local Heritage Place listing is “Shop (Sands & McDougall); External form, in particular the art deco detailing of King William Street façade. Excludes incongruous later shopfront”.
2. The Minister for Environment and Water has written to the Lord Mayor advising of his intention to consult with relevant stakeholders, including the City of Adelaide, regarding whether the decision to enter the Former Sands & McDougall Building into the Register is in the public interest.
3. Administration will be providing a submission as part of this consultation in support of the listing.
4. If this Motion is successful, administration will also prepare a letter to the South Australian Heritage Council advising of support of the listing and the associated submission to the Minister.

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	Not applicable
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	Not applicable
Other	4 – 5 hours to prepare submission and related correspondence
Staff time in receiving and preparing this administration comment	To prepare this administration comment in response to the motion on notice took approximately 4 hours.

---

- END OF REPORT -

# Adelaide Park Lands Foundation

**ITEM 17.11** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
The Lord Mayor (Sandy  
Verschoor)

2012/01346  
Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Mark Goldstone, Chief  
Executive Officer

## MOTION ON NOTICE

**The Lord Mayor (Sandy Verschoor) will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:**

'That Council:

1. Notes community interest in philanthropic fundraising for Park Lands enhancement and conservation;
2. Notes that the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005* and its associated Adelaide Park Lands Fund, does not hold the required independence nor legal autonomy to be able to attain and maintain deductible gift recipient (DGR) endorsement;
3. Request administration provide Council with an options framework to establish a legally independent Adelaide Park Lands Foundation by the City of Adelaide in consultation with Adelaide Park Lands Authority, ensuring that such an entity would be a public fund and have (DGR) status.
4. Requests that the proposed expenditure of the fundraised money would be allocated only to Council endorsed projects, which are in keeping with the Adelaide Park Lands Management Strategy and have been recommended by APLA.
5. Requests that efforts into operational options should consider the Foundation supporting the unique relationship and knowledge base that exists between the Kaurna People and the Park Lands.
6. Notes the stringent rules surrounding DGR status;
7. Requested that the administration investigate what type of governance model would be appropriate to meet the objectives outlined above, including but not limited to a prudential analysis of the Foundations operation and maintenance.'

---

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. If the Motion is successful, Administration will develop an options framework that addresses possible legal structures to achieve DGR status, governance models and resource analysis.

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)	\$1,000 - \$2,000
Impacts on existing projects	Not applicable
Budget reallocation	Not applicable
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	10-15 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 hours.

---

- END OF REPORT -



# Lord Mayor's Home Buyer Remission Scheme

**ITEM 17.12** 13/10/2020  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
The Lord Mayor (Sandy Verschoor)

2007/02537  
Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Ian Hill, Director Growth

## MOTION ON NOTICE

**The Lord Mayor (Sandy Verschoor) will move a motion and seek a seconder for the matter shown below to facilitate consideration by the Council:**

'That Council:

1. Notes the need for more affordable housing in the city;
2. Notes the contribution made by key workers to the city;
3. Notes that Council holds a strategic priority to increase residential growth in the city;
4. Requests that the Administration develop a framework aimed at achieving a 5-year rate free period for owner-occupiers who purchase new and off the plan dwellings;
5. Requests that the Administration develop an eligibility mechanism for admissibility into the remission scheme with an aim at attracting key workers;
6. Implements the scheme subject to complimentary measures funded by the State Government;
7. Requests that the State Government waive the 7% foreign acquirer duty (stamp duty surcharge) for all eligible key workers for the duration of the scheme;
8. Requests that the Lord Mayor write to State Government to seek support for the scheme (and waiver) to increase residential growth and encourage further owner-occupiers to the city.'

## ADMINISTRATION COMMENT

1. If the Motion is adopted, a framework and eligibility criteria for a 5-year rate free period for owner-occupiers who purchase new or off the plan dwellings will be prepared. The framework will take into account income levels for the various key worker occupations and other relevant considerations including low to moderate household income ranges and affordable dwelling prices will be prepared for consideration by Council.
2. A letter will also be prepared for the Lord Mayor to send to the State Government seeking support for the remission scheme and introduce complementary measures including:
  - 2.1. Waiving the 7% foreign acquirer duty (stamp duty surcharge) for all eligible key workers for the duration of the scheme;
  - 2.2. Any other financial measures that would assist in attracting key workers to live and work in the city.

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	Relates to the Social and Affordable Housing Policy and considerations regarding attracting millennials to live and work in the city
Budget reallocation	If a rent free period is endorsed by Council there will a future loss of rate revenue for the eligible dwellings.
Capital investment	Not applicable
Staff time in preparing the workshop / report requested in the motion	The research and investigations will involve input from staff from City Growth, Rates and City Insights teams. It is estimated that it will take approximately 1-2 weeks.
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 -