



# Workshop Program

**Tuesday 10 January 2017 commencing at 6.15pm**

Reception Room, Civic Centre, 128 Prospect Road, Prospect

**Workshop Chair: Cate Hart, Chief Executive Officer**

## Workshop Opening

- Apologies
- On Leave

Page

Notes from previous workshop .....3

Workshop Items .....7

1 CLIC Project - Funding Options .....7

Future Workshop and Council Agenda Items .....8

Meeting Close



## Workshop Guidelines

The following details provide an overview of the procedures to be observed:

1. The Workshop will be held on the first and second Tuesday of each month, other than January of each year, between the hours of 6.15pm and 9.30pm (commencing with a light meal for elected members and staff), for the term of the Council or until the Council determines to discontinue the Workshop structure.
2. The need for extraordinary Workshops will be assessed and determined by the CEO.
3. The Workshops will be held in the Reception Room, Civic Centre, 128 Prospect Road, Prospect SA 5082.
4. The time, date and location may be subject to change by the CEO where necessary.
5. The Workshops will be open to the public and media. Notice of a Workshop and the program for a Workshop is to be placed on the Council's website.
6. A confidentiality declaration may be determined by either the Council or CEO in accordance with Council's Informal Gatherings Policy.
7. No decisions will be made at the Workshops. There will be the opportunity for discussion and questions and answers only, and the provision of guidance to the Administration.
8. The CEO or proxy will convene and chair the Workshop to ensure the smooth running of the meeting. The proxy will be determined by the CEO on a needs basis.
9. All Elected Members will be encouraged to attend.
10. The CEO will ensure the Program and papers for the Workshop, which will include Agenda items for the following Council Meeting, will be provided to members by the Friday preceding the Workshop to allow time for members to read the reports and prepare their questions prior to the Workshop.
11. Notes will be made of the general issues and items covered by the Workshop, given that no decisions can be made, and distributed to Elected Members for information.
12. The format for the Workshop may vary on a meeting by meeting basis and could include training, planning, presentations, and discussions.
13. The format for the Workshop will be determined by the CEO.
14. External parties may make Presentations/deputations to the Workshop, subject to prior agreement by the CEO.
15. Elected Members, employees and consultants will be required to disclose any financial and/or conflicts of interest in matters to be discussed. The disclosure of such interest and participation in the Workshop will need to be made as if the matter was considered in accordance with the Local Government Act 1999. A record of the disclosures of interest will be made and maintained by the CEO.

## Workshop Protocol

The protocols are a set of guiding principles that aim to achieving enhanced, meaningful engagement of members and to facilitate an equal and equitable participation of all members.

The individual members commitment to active listening and disciplined talking, displaying both courtesy and respect to other members is paramount.

1. The Chair ensures that every members' input is heard and not overlooked or lost, and will enforce a limit on speakers' time when it is best required.
2. No rank and/or officer position of administrative or governance authority recognised within the workshop (except for the Chair), and protocols are enforced when deemed necessary.
3. Members and staff are to be addressed by their first name and not by their title of office they hold.
4. Discussion must be focussed on the issues and matters being the subject of discussion.
5. One member speaking at a time is a right, and must be enjoyed by all members.
6. Interrupting another member speaking is not desired and members are encouraged to exercise restraint for the benefit of all concerned. Equally, there should be no dialogue between members and person(s) in the gallery that interrupts the workshop discussion.
7. No ridicule, blame or shame to be expressed and/or exchanged during the workshop and care should always be taken with the words used in debate.
8. Problems and solution expressed by members are a healthy part of the discussion and may lead to positive outcomes, and should not be frowned upon but rather encouraged.
9. Although it is not a decision-making forum, it is an important part of ensuring a well-informed and enhanced decision-making process for Council.
10. The imperatives for a successful conduct of these workshops are that all members need to work together, displaying courtesy and respect to each other.

It is important that all members recognise the above list of protocols is not about rules; protocols are a set of guiding principles that are agreed on and committed to by all participating members.

# Notes from previous workshop

---

## Notes from Workshop 13/12/2016

**Chair:** Cate Hart, Chief Executive Officer

**Present:** D O'Loughlin, K Barnett, T Evans, A De Backer, A Harris, M Standen, M Larwood, M Lee, M Groot

Notes from previous workshop held on 06/12/2016

- Taken as read.

## 1. Update on Information Management and Information Technology Services

George Pajak presented a briefing on the alignment of Council's information services with Council's Strategic Plan 2020 and the responsibilities associated with both teams:

- The Information Management team is responsible for the governance of council information resources including the Electronic Document Records Management System (EDRMS) and training of staff in information management.
- Information Technology manages and administrates contracts and agreements with external vendors for services such as the IT Service Desk, telecommunications and software licensing, and also maintain assets and infrastructure and provide support for key enterprise information systems.

Projects and activities completed or in progress:

- Remediation Work – upgrading back office environment, including servers and true up of all software licences;
- Authority Upgrade; EDRMS Upgrade; development of IT Disaster Recovery Plan
- Development of an IT Strategy Plan;
- Introduced Customer Services initiatives: A-Z Knowledge Database; Electronic Visitor Registration System;
- Presentation and Elected Member training on the Customer Request Management (CRM) facilities will be held during a February 2017 workshop;
- In-house improvements include – enhanced internet service; integration of key systems; replacement of video-conferencing facilities; enhanced CRM workflows; digital transformation (grant funding for cross-council Facilities Booking System);
- Enhanced Wi-Fi coverage in Civic Centre for staff, including limited access for the public;
- Large document sharing; enhance network scalability; computer replacement; applications roadmap; review of internal governance processes; delivery of an extranet and progressing the digital transformation project continues.

Elected Member comments and questions included:

- Why do we have so many vendors, is this a Local Government thing, should it be a goal to rationalise the amount of vendors we do business with? – There are a range of vendors which are accessible from the LGAP vendor panel;
- Is there any timeframe to have the facilities booking system operational? – We are working with City of Charles Sturt to develop a project brief to complete a formal requirements analysis briefing document on the project with the aim of having the system completed this financial year;
- Concerns that we may be developing a bespoke service when there is something already being used, does it require a commitment from other councils? – yes there is interest within the sector and it will allow searching for facilities without boundaries;
- Noted that LGIT & LGAP were not listed as a vendor – staff advised that council currently use LG panels.

## 2. Main North Road Master Plan

Gene Fong; Anders Bogdanowicz & Rick Chenoweth presented the guiding principles to provide connection and revitalisation of Main North Road (MNR) as a 'Green Corporate Boulevard'. Further information was provided on the proposed design precincts with two of the three precincts being considered by neighbouring Councils, and the central precinct to be a key area for the City of Prospect. The Southern area will require collaboration and a further look at providing connectivity.

Design approach: greenery; urban design and built form; economics & business; movement & connection; art & design. Council staff has liaised with DPTI who have indicated that MNR must remain a high traffic movement area, whilst catering for East/West connections and bicycle routes with neighbouring councils.

### Elected Member comments and questions included:

- Do the zone boundaries make a difference? If it matters, is this worth considering relative to the neighbouring Councils?
- Are DPTI still considering a bus terminus at Northpark shopping centre?
- Firstly we should understand what is wanted at Scotty's corner? Have we heard if anything is going to happen at the hospital site? – Council's planning team have received no enquiries about the site; next door is under separate ownership and proposed for a multi-story development.
- Can we find out what is happening at the Rapid Surf & Ski Site? - We are working with DPTI.
- How do you source statistics of the area if it is not being used like the proposed changes now?
- Considering the night time economy, can any of the benefits of right hand turns be determined now?
- Will any detail be provided in next week's Council report? – Only the guiding principles;
- Good work so far but only limited detail at this time, where does the staff recommend we should start? – breakdown the vision into 3 areas including the southern, northern and central precinct, Council will look at 'greening' first e.g. side street green refuges;
- It would be ideal for the next steps to be included in the next Council report, including timelines, order of priority, how much of the \$200k budget will be spent this financial year;
- Would you do the whole 3 areas equally or start with one? Council seem to do things in an order where at some point in the future we have to undo what we have done, wasting money, can we reverse engineer the strategy? – Start of the initial assessment was to analyse the future directions. The first area for works will be the central precinct, with this being the main focus for 2017.
- Is there a public art programme we will be applying funding for? – Some of the \$200k may be used for developing public art for these areas.

### Next steps and key dates:

- Breakdown the plan into the 3 areas.
- Timelines – waiting for Council endorsement to commence.

## 3. Council Depot Options/CLIC Site Considerations

### **CLIC Site Considerations**

Nathan Cunningham & Michael Richardson (BRM Holdich) presented on the nine (9) scenarios delivered at an earlier workshop by Marcus Spiller (SGS). An Economic & Social Analysis Report identified the options and appraised them to provide Council with further information relating to a range of relevant factors including: policy alignment; cost benefit analysis (community/non-financial); financial analysis; and delivery risk assessment.

One of the more significant issues is to determine a preferred weighting for these factors. Council staff determined a weighting which was:

- Policy alignment of 5% on the basis both sites generally meet policies established within the Strategic Plan and Development Plan;
- Cost benefit analysis of 40% as this was considered the most important element to the community given the development is an intergenerational decision and will have a significant benefit to the community;

- Financial analysis of 35% given the impact on Councils financial ratios and long term financial plan. However this was given a lower rating to the cost benefit analysis (community/non-financial) as Council has guaranteed income, but it is the manner in which funding is raised;
- Delivery risk assessment of 20% as Council has not delivered a project of this undertaking previously. Also, there will be varied support for the sale of the alternate site to assist in delivering the project.

Elected Member comments and questions included:

- The lack of detail in respect to Option 2a – This mirrors Option 2 with the loss of the depot services from the site. The consultant considered this did not significantly change the makeup of the financial analysis given the staff numbers at the depot operations were not significant and Option 2 already had the materials storage, fuel and wash down area relocated to another site.
- There was no value attributed to Main North Road in respect to Precinct Vibrancy – The analysis is based on the consultant’s assessment of the current vibrancy (not the anticipated vibrancy) and the Main North Road site has little activity around it to encourage visitation, pedestrians and activity.
- Please define what we mean by the Civic Centre site, does it include the Town Hall? - Activities can be undertaken over and behind the town hall; the options are not costed to sell the Town Hall;
- In regards to weightings was there any consideration to weight the unknown? – Advised that the unknown is included in the risk assessment;
- Would be sensible to break risk into 4 elements – political; partnerships; ability to manage partnership; time & budget? - There are 3 criteria, commercial development mixed use (finding the right partner); financial risk of selling the other site and moving operations while site is developed. Neither of the sites have community land status.
- Is the intent that we use the weighting assumptions as provided from here or do we have the opportunity to consider changing them? - Whilst each member will have a different perspective it was considered the weightings provided a balanced view.
- SGS provided weightings in their report so what is the difference with the BRM Holdich approach? - SGS did not include an assessment of risk, that was left to Council;
- When we had the SGS presentation, option 2a & 6a were the lead inquiries, so this is not comparable. – SGS include both financial and non-financial benefit as one element, we stripped out financial benefit to give non-financial (cost/benefit analysis) its own weighting;
- SGS removed the transfer effect but I would rather not lose any individual benefit and pick up new ones;
- Will the workshop in January also consider resourcing components for the CLIC (service level ongoing costs)? Did SGS consider the Net Present Value (NPV) as a basis for the construction costs as part of the financial analysis? - The financial models use NPV over 20 years;
- Have we had discussions with the Council workers involved in the move? - We are not removing the need to have a depot, it is about where the facility will be housed;
- There is some concern that we are not catering for the gallery in the new development, can you provide what we currently have and what we are including or removing? – This will be discussed as we move forward but we are assuring the community that what we have in the current facility will be included but at a larger scale. The question will be what will the scale be?
- Is this our last chance tonight to discuss this as a group, we have been given a great deal of information, qualitative & quantitative, will we be able to look at a broader input opportunity before considering at January Council? – The workshop on 10<sup>th</sup> January will be dedicated to the project and will be the opportunity to further discuss the project prior to a decision report at the January Council meeting;
- Libraries Alive what are they saying? - Do what you currently do and do that in a bigger space;
- We need to think about the funding model including selling land or not; raising rates; opportunity for joint ventures; development partnership or do less. Are we happy to consider selling to keep interest costs down or do less to keep rate rise down?
- The SGS report and this analysis (BRM Holdich), along with the previous reports and information appear to be indicating Prospect Road site is a better site than Main North Road site;
- The response to the community should include information that identifies the decision to undertake the project is directly linked to the need to provide a community based facility given DECD’s decision to cease the lease of the existing facility;
- We do not have to provide this service but it is a choice that I am proud to make.

Next steps and key dates:

- A report will be provided to December Council;

- January workshop programmed to discuss project funding options;
- A report to January Council to identify the preferred site.

### Council Depot Options

Greg Georgopoulos provided an update on the progression of the Council Depot site relocation proposal. The Depot site is currently located at the Tram Barn on Main North Road (MNR), with a footprint of an estimated 800m<sup>2</sup>, within an area that is underutilised, offering potential for future development.

Service delivery and location are lead priorities, realising that this could not be considered in isolation with the imminent CLIC project. Work commenced in 2013 with the proposal of a number of options:

- Retain and rationalize current MNR site;
- Build new and sell existing;
- Propose Depot co-share with Port Adelaide Enfield Council;
- Disaggregated depot;
- Leasing a private site;
- Incorporating with CLIC.

A brief outline of factors affecting proposed options:

- High opportunity cost of staying at MNR site due to size;
- closed gate policy provides flexibility to consider alternative options;
- cohabitation provides opportunity for synergies

#### Elected Member comments and questions included:

- What did the private lease option analysis look like? – Estimates of \$40-\$45Kp.a. for a 5 year term.
- Regarding the co-sharing of a site, what are the thoughts of our current staff? Could we pick up work from other Councils because how more efficient we are? – At this time we are looking to simply share a site but over time we could look at developing other opportunities.
- What are the financial & environmental impacts of moving from where we are now? – Depot co-share with Adelaide City estimated at \$40kp.a., provision in design of new CLIC \$800k per SGS report, there may be a carbon footprint increase that could be reduced with green vehicles.
- Cultural issues could be a challenge; ACC could provide intel on things to avoid or do better.

Workshop closed at 9.30pm



# Workshop Items

## 1 CLIC Project - Funding Options

---

**Responsible Director: Ginny Moon – Director Corporate Services**

**Expected Duration: 180 minutes**

**Presented by: Chris Birch – Manager Financial Services**

Staff will be presenting various models of the revised Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) for discussion at this Workshop.

The financial information regarding the Community Hub Library Innovation Centre CLIC Project was extracted from the SGS report that was tabled in the December 2016 Council Meeting and the SGS Financial Assessment and Cost-Benefit Analysis spreadsheets that was emailed to all Elected Members on 20 December 2016.

Three LTFP models will be presented on the following options to demonstrate an indicative range of financial impact to Council's LTFP:-

- **Option 2a**  
*CLIC at MNR / high mixed use development/ no integration of CLIC & Civic Centre / Depot located elsewhere*
- **Option 4a**  
*CLIC at MNR / low mixed use development/ integration of CLIC & Civic Centre / Depot located elsewhere / expanded community services / sell Prospect Road*
- **Option 6a**  
*CLIC at Prospect Road / moderate use development/ integration of CLIC & Civic Centre / Depot located elsewhere / expanded community services / sell MNR*

Council's Internal Auditors has also been engaged to review the LTFP models prior to the WS and staff will provide an update on their feedback at the Meeting.

Council's Audit Committee Members have been invited to the Workshop as observers, in preparation for a Special AC Meeting on 12/1/2017, to consider:-

- *a review of Key Financial Indicator's across the Local Government sector and how that may impact on City of Prospect Key Financial Indicator's;*
- *the process leading to the decision making regarding location and delivery of the Community Hub, Library and Innovation Centre; and*
- *review the current Key Financial Indicator's and consider appropriate target ranges.*

### **Attachments:**

Nil

## **Future Workshop and Council Agenda Items**

---

**Members may seek advice as to the purpose, or intended resolutions planned for the next Council meeting. These items are subject to change.**

### **Council Meeting 24/01/2017**

- Mayoral Monthly Report
- Discretionary And Mandatory Rates Rebate Report
- Annual Report of Council Resolutions
- CLIC Update
- Code of Practice - Meeting Procedures Review
- Information Report
- Annual Business Plan - Capital and Operation Projects Progress Report