

Speed Limit around the Park Lands

ITEM 15.1 10/11/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Simms

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Simms will ask the following Question on Notice:

'What is the status of the request made by a majority of Council of the State Government to implement a speed limit of 60 km/hr around the Park Lands?'

REPLY

1. On 11 August 2020, Council carried the following Motion on Notice regarding the consistency of speed limits on Park Land Roads:
'That Council request the administration deliver by November 2020 a suite of initiatives under the title 'Driver's Month', including but not limited to:
 4. *Requesting the State Government implement a uniform 60kmp/h speed limit on all Park Lands roads entering the city.'*
2. In response to this Motion on Notice, the Administration wrote to the Department of Infrastructure and Transport (DIT). On 2 October 2020, DIT provided a response advising that they do not support an increase to speed limits on roads through the Park Lands. The main reasons for this position are:
 - 2.1. The posted speed limits on roads through the Park Lands form a continuation of the speed limits on roads outside the Park Lands fringe;
 - 2.2. The length of the roads through the Adelaide Park Lands do not generally meet the minimum length of road required for a change of speed limit as per the DIT's speed limit guidelines;
 - 2.3. Congestion is the main factor for delays on roads through the Park Lands, not vehicles speeds. Changes to speed limit would be unlikely to change driver behaviour or result in reduced travel times.
3. A summary of the above information was provided to Councillors via an e-news dated 20 October 2020.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Driver's Month

ITEM 15.2 10/11/2020

Council

Council Member
Councillor Simms

2019/00551
Public

Contact Officer:
Clare Mockler, Deputy CEO &
Director Culture

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Simms will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Can administration please advise what actions will be taken during November to promote the Driver's Month initiative and the costs and staff resources associated with each of these?'

REPLY

1. The Park & Play campaign being delivered throughout Driver's Month focuses on showcasing how easy is to park in the City, enjoying what's on offer in the City of Adelaide during November, and making it even easier and cheaper to park during the month.
2. The majority of actions are promotional, predominately using digital channels.
3. Promotion is occurring through a dedicated website (<https://explore.cityofadelaide.com.au/park-n-play/>), social media posts, radio and digital advertising, and enhanced information online regarding existing parking controls and Council's Park Adelaide app. Non-digital channels include stickers on parking ticket machines and promotional flyers.
4. As part of Park and Play, during November we will be:
 - 4.1. Discounting on-street parking fees by 25% when paid via the Park Adelaide app
 - 4.2. Conducting lotteries throughout November giving anyone that pays for on-street parking the chance to win \$100 to spend in City businesses
 - 4.3. Offering \$2 parking in certain UParks on nights and weekends when booking online
5. Park & Play promotion will link to other events occurring during November to help entice people to the City
6. Approximately \$30k has been allocated for the campaign.
7. An estimated 90 hours of staff time has been required to deliver this Council decision.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Hutt Street Centre Review

ITEM 15.3 10/11/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Simms

2019/01138
Public

Contact Officer:
Mark Goldstone, Chief
Executive Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Simms will ask the following Question on Notice:

'In addition to the \$41,086.00 legal costs associated with the Hutt Street Centre Review, can administration please advise of other costs incurred by the City of Adelaide in administering this review (including but not limited to staff time, use of Town Hall facilities and any other resources)?'

REPLY

1. The total estimated allocation of staff time to the Hutt Street Centre legal review is approximately 23.5 hours as set out below:
 - 1.1. Manager Governance - 5.5 hours. (coordinating hearing with Hutt Street Centre and objectors/representors, conferring with Norman Waterhouse Lawyers by phone and email, reviewing the findings of Dr Manetta, attending meetings).
 - 1.2. Consultant, Legal Governance - 15 hours (coordinating files, liaising, conferring with Norman Waterhouse Lawyers by phone, email and in meetings, reviewing the findings of Dr Manetta, Council Report writing, validating and processing legal invoices, attending meetings).
 - 1.3. Digitisation Officer - 3 hours (searching and retrieving historical planning, property and building files).
2. No cost has been allocated to the use of the Town Hall meeting room as no hire charge is applicable for the use of this particular space.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	4.5hrs
--	--------

- END OF REPORT -

LeFevre Terrace Trucks

ITEM 15.4 10/11/2020

Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Could the Administration advise:

1. why the transit of trucks from the North to the South of LeFevre Terrace and from the South to the North of LeFevre Terrace has been permitted, according to residents, when a sign on the northern side of the intersection of Melbourne and Brougham Streets prohibits trucks, but there is no similar sign at the Northern entrance, and
2. the advice of SAPOL on whether infringement notices have been issued in the area in the past year (and, if not, why) and the steps the City of Adelaide can take to assist truck drivers to comply?'

REPLY

1. The City of Adelaide internal records do not provide reasoning as to why the no-trucks sign was installed on Brougham Place immediately north of Sir Edwin Smith Avenue / Melbourne Street, for northbound trucks, and no sign for the southbound direction has been installed. It is likely as a result of a customer enquiry.
2. The Australian Road Rules (Road rule 104) specify that the no-trucks rule does not apply to a driver if the destination of the driver lies beyond a no trucks sign and:
 - (a) there is no other route by which the driver's vehicle could reach that destination; or
 - (b) any other route by which the driver's vehicle could reach that destination would require the vehicle to pass another no trucks sign.
3. The Administration has requested information from SAPOL, and when received this will be distributed by e-news. We will also investigate and provide commercial vehicle volumes for Lefevre Terrace as part of this e-news.
4. General access vehicles, which are up to 19m long and weigh up to 42.5 tonnes are legally allowed to travel along all roads in the City.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Parking Inspectors

ITEM 15.5 10/11/2020

Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2019/00551
Public

Contact Officer:
Clare Mockler, Deputy CEO &
Director Culture

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Could the Administration advise:

1. The number of parking inspectors, or Parking Information Officers, directly employed by the City of Adelaide as at July 1st, 2020 and the number directly employed at November 1st, 2020;
2. Whether, and at which times of the day and week, private contractors have been engaged this year to expiate the owners of vehicles for parking infringements on street in the City;
3. If private contractors have been engaged, have they or their agents been paid a commission on each infringement or any fee other than an hourly rate; and
4. If private contractors have been engaged, what training has been directly provided by the City of Adelaide in respect to the elected body's previously stated desire to educate rather than to expiate and to exercise leniency wherever possible?'

REPLY

1. On 1 July 2020 there were 32 Parking & Information Officers (headcount) employed by the City of Adelaide.
2. On 1 November 2020, there were 28 Parking & Information Officers (headcount) employed by the City of Adelaide.
3. Since 2008, Council has engaged an external contractor to undertake two after-hours shifts, monitoring city safety and on-street parking compliance. These shift times were between 12am-5am on Saturday and Sunday mornings.
4. The use of an external contractor ceased in March 2020. They have not been used since, and there is no current plan to engage them again.
5. When previously engaged, the contractor was paid a set hourly rate that was in no way connected to volume of expiations.
6. All officers engaged by the contractor were Authorised Officers and received training from Council's Parking & Information Officers about the approach to enforcement upon commencement.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Masterplan Budget

ITEM 15.6 10/11/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Council approved in 2019, shortly after the beginning of their term of Council, a budget for Masterplans to be developed for the O'Connell, Melbourne Street and Hutt Street Precincts. Could the Administration advise;

1. The 2019/20 approved budget allocation for the Masterplans;
2. Any funds allocated from the Masterplans budget to other initiatives, the nature, location and quantum of any such expenditure;
3. The balance available to complete each Masterplan;
4. The date or dates on which the Administration expects to deliver the three Masterplans?'

REPLY

1. As part of the 2019/20 Integrated Business Plan \$370,000 was allocated to master plan the Main Streets – Hutt Street, O'Connell Street and Melbourne Street, as an operating project. As at April 2020, \$232,000 was unspent and re-prioritised due to impacts of COVID-19.
2. This information was provided on 4 May 2020 via E-News as a response to an undertaking from the Committee Meeting of 21 April 2020.
3. As a result, draft Action Plans were developed to prioritise and coordinate the improvement and reinvigoration of these Main Streets and work towards the longer term thinking of a full Master Plan. The Draft Action Plans have been categorised as follows:
 - 3.1. 'Quick wins' delivered this financial year, to activate and engage with the streets, and testing initial ideas.
 - 3.2. Short term actions, to address current needs, to trial, evaluate and plan for longer term approaches to the street. These have been developed through engagement with key stakeholders (including precinct and resident groups and the Lord Mayor Round Tables).
 - 3.3. 'Medium term' (1-3 years), including the development of a detailed Master Plan for each street.
 - 3.4. Long term actions (3+ years).
4. Due to the impacts of COVID-19, the 'Quick Wins' were fast tracked to support the Main Streets as part of CoA's Recover + Reimagine (R+R) project.

'Quick wins' include temporary lighting, events and activations, and a range of business support services. The 'Quick Wins' have been delivered across each street, between May and September 2020. These have been funded from the R+R budget.

5. The \$232,000 remaining budget allocation has not yet been apportioned across the streets, however, will be used to implement the Short Term Actions and support the longer term vision for each street
6. An update will be provided to Council outlining proposed medium- and long-term actions, staging and high-level costings for future consideration.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

88 O'Connell Street Development

ITEM 15.7 10/11/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2018/02324
Public

Contact Officer:
Ian Hill, Director Growth

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'On 18 December 2019 the Lord Mayor letterboxed ratepayers in North Adelaide, pledging that Council was "working hard to finalise negotiations so that we [Council] can share the concepts with the community early in the [2020] new year. Details did not follow. On 1 July 2020 the Lord Mayor again letterboxed ratepayers, this time pledging to "finalise the terms and conditions of the agreement [with a developer] including the final design outcome with the selected developer in the coming months". Details did not follow. However, a 16 October *Indaily* report stated that ratepayers cannot now be briefed until early 2021.

Advisory documents given to elected members in late 2017 (before the land sale) and publicly released in April 2018 (months after the sale) noted if development certainty could not be established within two years of the \$24m purchase, that is, by January 2020, then an 'exit strategy' would need to be triggered.

Could the Administration provide answers to the following questions that arise.

1. What is that "exit strategy" which should have been triggered at the beginning of this year and when will it be implemented?
2. What have been the total payments for the site to end October 2020 (interest and principal) on the land purchase, pre and post State Government contributions?
3. The *InDaily* article of 16 October 2020 noted that "the council has so far spent \$728,0000 on progressing the development of the site". What is the nature and detail of this spending?
4. When were elected members informed of these payments or were, they delegated to the CEO?
5. The *InDaily* article claimed that "a further \$396,000 [has been spent] on temporary activations, including car parking, public art installations and events, while the plot has remained vacant". What are the amounts that constitute the total, the dates of expenditure and the items on which this money was spent?
6. What has council budgeted for the remainder of 2020-21 to be spent on "progressing the development of the site" or on "activation" of the site?

REPLY

1. In November 2019, Council selected a preferred proponent and commenced the Stage 3 negotiation process. On that basis it was not considered appropriate to apply an exit strategy. The primary objective is to continue negotiations with the Council's preferred proponent, noting the commitment from the preferred proponent and the many presentations to Council post November 2019.
2. The total payments for the site to the end of October 2020 are \$2.1M (with the current monthly re-payments at approximately \$35K). The total payment considers timing of the State Government funding which reduced the debt by \$10.0M during FY 19/20.
3. During FY's 18/19, 19/20 and 20/21 approximately \$790K has been expended on progressing the development of the site which has included a range of consultant fees, legal advice, appointment of the Real Estate Agent (global EOI process), project reference, evaluation panel and probity and commercial services.
4. The payments (in relation to the payment of the debt) are in line with the project budget allocated by Council through the Business Plan and Budget Process
5. During FY's 18/19, 19/20, and 20/21 approximately \$500K (Council endorsed budget) has been expended on activation of the site. Council's objective was to ensure that the site accommodated a range of free community events that complemented, rather than competed, with the O'Connell Street precinct. Expenditure included a resource allocation, a range of external contractors, hire of plant and equipment, and an upgrade of the temporary car park and bollards to minimise impacts to adjoining property owners.
6. Council has approved a budget of \$290K for the current financial year which includes a carry forward of the remaining budget from the previous financial year. This budget will support a Legal Advisor, Commercial Advisor, Prudential reporting and flexibility to contribute to activation on the site in a way which will support the precinct.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 5.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Park Lands Foundation

ITEM 15.8 10/11/2020

Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'In light of the Lord Mayor's request to the Administration and Council's agreement to establish a Park Lands "foundation" for philanthropic donations, it has come to light that on State Parliament passing the Park Lands Act around 2007, the organisation that came to be known as the Adelaide Park Lands Preservation Association donated to the Adelaide City Council ... in good faith ... the sum of \$1,000 "specifically for the establishment of a Park Lands fund for projects within the Park Lands". Were these funds expended or have they been retained and, if so, where are they and what will happen to them?'

REPLY

1. When the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005* came into effect in 2006, Part 5 of that Act required the Adelaide Park Lands Authority (APLA) to establish and maintain the Adelaide Park Lands Fund.
2. APLA duly established the Fund and continues to maintain it.
3. The only contributor to date has been the Adelaide Park Lands Preservation Association, which provided \$1000.00 in 2007. With interest, that amount now sits at \$1393.01 and is identified each year in APLA's Annual Report.
4. APLA has not made a decision about the use of the money.
5. The relevant provision in the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005* (The Act) for the Fund, which cannot be granted tax deductibility status (because it is operated by APLA, which is a Government entity by virtue of being a subsidiary of the City of Adelaide) is outlined in *Part 5 – Section 22* of the Act.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Jerningham and Kingston Terrace Intersection

ITEM 15.9 10/11/2020
Council

Council Member
Councillor Martin

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'On September 15th, the Administration reported to elected members via the internal E-News system that ...

"At the meeting of Council on 10 March 2020 a decision was made to undertake a review of the traffic management arrangements at the junction of Jerningham Street and Kingston Terrace, North Adelaide.

The Administration's Traffic & Transport Department has completed a review, which included an assessment of current traffic arrangements, traffic volumes and crash history at the junction. The review concluded that no significant traffic or safety issues are considered to exist at the junction. There has been one recorded crash at the junction in the five-year period from 2015-2019. The crash was a single vehicle collision in 2019 caused by driver inattention. There were no casualties recorded. The crash rate is therefore deemed low compared to junctions with similar traffic volumes. Given the nature of the crash, it is unlikely that additional physical control measures would have prevented that incident."

Putting to one side that the report did not mention a car mounted the kerb and destroyed a traffic warning sign the night before the report was issued, the Administration response did not specifically address the second part of the March decision of Council which asked also for an assessment of the safety of pedestrians.

Could the Administration advise if, in its opinion, there is any risk posed to pedestrians by the current configuration of the crossings and, if so, how it proposes to deal with such risks?'

REPLY

1. Pedestrian safety was assessed as part of the investigation undertaken by the Administration.
 - 1.1. Crash statistics were obtained from the official Centre for Automotive Safety and Research (CASR) database, which is compiled of all crashes recorded by SA Police. The most recent period of officially recorded crashes is to the end of 2019.
 - 1.2. In the standard five-year assessment period, as used in Black Spot crash analysis, there was only one crash recorded at the junction. No crashes involving pedestrians were recorded.
 - 1.3. A review was undertaken of all recorded crashes at the junction from 1990 (the first year of available data), up to and including 2019. Over this period, there were no crashes involving pedestrians.
 - 1.4. Based on the recorded crash rates, the junction is not considered to pose an unacceptable safety risk or warrant substantial upgrades.

2. The investigation report provided a number of possible upgrade options to improve safety for both motorists and pedestrians. Vehicle swept path requirements and impact to Park Lands and on-street parking provision limited the feasible options.
3. The investigation concluded that upgrades to lighting and kerb ramps with a small median refuge would be the most suitable upgrades for pedestrian safety and that these upgrades be undertaken as part of future asset renewal works.
4. The cause of the crash on the night of 14 September 2020 which involved a traffic sign is not known, and it is unknown if additional physical control measures would have prevented this crash. We expect this crash to be included in 2020 crash data if it was reported to SA Police, and if there was a key safety issue arising, it is expected that CoA would have been contacted by SA Police.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Matched Grant Funding

ITEM 15.10 10/11/2020
Council

Council Member
Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor
Hyde

2018/04053
Public

Contact Officer:
Klinton Devenish, Director
Place

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Hyde will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Given the recent budget announcement that the South Australian Government will be offering to South Australian Councils, allocated matched grant funding of \$100 million for 'shovel ready' projects, could Administration please provide Members a list of all projects that we would be able to deliver in the following time frames:

- Up to six months (ready to go)
- Six to 12 months (design done, detailed design and able to deliver within a 12 months time frame)
- Larger projects that could be staged over one or more financial years?

Could the Administration also specifically highlight those shovel ready projects that are on Hindley Street, Hutt Street, O'Connell Street and Melbourne Street?'

REPLY

1. Administration keep a register of infrastructure projects that have already been submitted or have potential for external funding.
2. To enable us to provide Elected Members with adequate detail of the projects, including scope and availability of matched funding we will circulate information by E-News.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -