



AGENDA

Unley Business and Economic Development Committee Agenda

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1999, that a meeting of the Unley Business and Economic Development Committee will be held in the Council Chambers, 181 Unley Road Unley on

***Wednesday, 2 December 2015
at 6.30pm***

for the purpose of considering the items included on the Agenda.

**Peter Tsokas
Chief Executive Officer**

UNLEY BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

PRESENT:

Councillor John Koumi – Presiding Member
Mayor Lachlan Clyne – ex Officio
Councillor Anthony Lapidge
Councillor Don Palmer
Councillor Luke Smolucha
Doug Strain
Orren Pruncken
Alison Snel
Jodie Gaffney
Craig Phillips
James Morris
Susan Straschko
Leonie Clyne

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

We acknowledge that the land we meet on today is the traditional land of the Aboriginal people and that we respect their spiritual relationship with their country.

We also acknowledge that the Aboriginal people are the custodians of the Adelaide region and that their cultural and heritage beliefs are still important to the living Aboriginal people today.

APOLOGIES:

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

MOVED:

SECONDED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Unley Business and Economic Development Committee held on Wednesday, 7 October 2015 as printed and circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

DEPUTATIONS

PRESENTATION:

NBN Presentation by Chris Gregory

Goodwood PLEC Project Overview

WRITTEN REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES

Nil.

OFFICER'S REPORTS

19	Differential Separate Rate Capping	1-6
20	Unley Business and Economic Development Committee Meeting Dates 2016	7-9

NEXT MEETING

To be advised

DECISION REPORT

REPORT TITLE: REVIEW OF SEPARATE RATES
ITEM NUMBER: 19
DATE OF MEETING: 2 DECEMBER 2015
AUTHOR: PETER KENNEDY
JOB TITLE: BUSINESS & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
MANAGER

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following a recommendation from the October Unley Business & Economic Development Committee (UBED) meeting to Council it was resolved to seek a further report on the feasibility of introducing a cap to the separate rate, and the proposed methodology to be undertaken for reviewing the Trader Association model.

This report outlines the detail regarding the issues raised in the motion and includes modelling of the effects of rate capping at different levels.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Unley Business & Economic Development Committee engage and consult with Main Street Trader Associations to discuss and investigate the possible capping for the application of separate rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.
 2. An independent consultant be engaged to undertake a review of the role and operation of the Trader Associations, in conjunction with the Associations, to ensure they are still the most appropriate method for promotion of the precincts, and are supported by the businesses of those precincts. The review to include face to face interviews with a broad cross section of those who pay the separate rate.
-

3. **RELEVANT CORE STRATEGIES/POLICIES**

3.1 Community Goal 1.1 A thriving and prosperous business community.

4. **DISCUSSION**

Revenue raised from the separate rate in each Precinct is provided by Council to the Trader Associations in those Precincts for them to implement their marketing program for the year. The annual program is submitted to UBED for recommendation to Council prior to the separate rate being applied.

As the rating process has evolved over the years, this has led to some inconsistencies across the Council area, as was demonstrated in the report to the October UBED meeting (Attachment 1 to Item 19/15).

Attachment 1

Category 2 – Commercial Shop, Category 3 – Commercial Office and
Category 4 – Commercial other,

- **Fullarton Road** in the area between Cross Road and Fisher Street.
- **Goodwood Road** in the area between Leader/Parsons Street and Mitchell Street/Arundel Avenue.
- **Unley Road** for the entire length of Unley Road.

Category 2 – Commercial Shop

- **King William Road** between Greenhill Road and Commercial Road.
- **Glen Osmond Road** in the area between Greenhill Road and Katherine Street.

The rates applied are as follows for the 2015-2016 financial year:

- Fullarton Road - \$250 per site
- Goodwood Road – 0.00143780 rate in the dollar
- Unley Road – 0.00036390 rate in the dollar
- King William Road – 0.00193200 rate in the dollar
- Glen Osmond Road – 0.0008270 rate in the dollar

CAPPING

If the separate rate was capped at \$1,500, \$1,750 or \$2,000 the effect would be as follows:

	2014/15			
	Total Raised	\$1,500 Cap	\$1,750 Cap	\$2,000 Cap
Glen Osmond Road	\$ 18,356.65	\$ 13,652.10	\$ 14,059.50	\$ 14,309.50
Percentage Decrease		25%	23%	22%
Dollar Decrease		\$ 4,704.55	\$ 4,297.15	\$ 4,047.15
Traders Affected		2	1	1
Goodwood Road	\$ 55,002.65	\$ 50,562.10	\$ 51,062.10	\$ 51,395.25
Percentage Decrease		8%	7%	6%
Dollar Decrease		\$ 4,440.55	\$ 3,940.55	\$ 3,607.40
Traders Affected		2	2	1
King William Road	\$ 144,100.50	\$ 129,964.10	\$ 135,972.40	\$ 139,823.50
Percentage Decrease		10%	5%	3%
Dollar Decrease		\$ 14,136.40	\$ 8,128.10	\$ 4,277.00
Traders Affected		31	17	12
Unley Road	\$ 105,639.70	\$101,874.55	\$102,710.15	\$103,279.15
Percentage Decrease		4%	3%	2%
Dollar Decrease		\$3,765.15	\$2,929.55	\$2,360.55
Traders Affected		4	3	2

The modelling shows the anticipated decreases in dollar and percentage forms, as well as the number of traders whose separate rate would be reduced.

Any reduction would impact the marketing budget of the Trader Association.

As a consequence, consultation with each Association, showing the modelled figures is recommended before any decision is made.

REVIEWING METHODOLOGY

The methodology recommended for the review of the operation of the Trader Associations, in conjunction with the associations, regarding the most appropriate method for promoting the precincts is as follows.

An independent consultant, with a proven history in dealing with the business community be sourced and engaged to undertake the review as outlined in the Council resolution of October 26 being:

“A review be undertaken of the role and operation of the Trader Associations, in conjunction with the associations, to ensure they are still the most appropriate method for promotion of the precincts and are supported by the businesses in those precincts.

The Unley Business & Economic Development Committee engage and consult with main street traders and businesses to discuss and investigate the existing arrangements for the application of Differential Separate Rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.”

There have been previous reviews undertaken which should all be made available to ensure the best and most balanced outcome is achieved.

It is therefore recommended that UBED engage and consult with Main Street Trader Associations to discuss and investigate the possible capping for the application of separate rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.

It is also recommended that an independent consultant be engaged to undertake a review of the role and operation of the Trader Associations, in conjunction with the Associations, to ensure they are still the most appropriate method for promotion of the precincts, and are supported by the businesses of those precincts.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The report is proposing engagement and consultation so Policy implications will not be formally addressed until the process has been completed and the results are reported with recommendations for action to UBED and Council.

5.1 *Financial/budget*

Cost of consultant to be obtained and met within existing budget allocations.

5.2 *Legislative/Risk Management*

Prior to implementing any changes to a separate rate, Council must ensure compliance with the provisions of the Local Government Act, however this will be a consideration following the consultation process recommended in this report.

5.3 *Staffing/Work Plans*

- *There will be no additional staff required to carry out the consultation process as it will be managed with existing staff.*

5.4 *Environmental/Social/Economic – N/A*

5.5 Stakeholder Engagement – Purpose of report

*Using the City of Unley “Community Engagement Toolkit” the following project scored a 4 – 5 High to Very High – At a minimum you should **involve** the community but consider opportunities to **collaborate** and/or **empower**.*

The consultation process, as directed by the resolution, “to engage and consult with main street traders and businesses” will involve traders, businesses and owners of business premises in Unley.

6. REPORT CONSULTATION

This report recommends a consultation process so accordingly no consultation has occurred.

7. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

Option 1

- The Unley Business & Economic Development Committee engage and consult with Main Street Trader Associations to discuss and investigate the possible capping for the application of separate rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.

And

- An independent consultant be engaged to undertake a review of the role and operation of the Trader Associations, in conjunction with the Associations, to ensure they are still the most appropriate method for promotion of the precincts, and are supported by the businesses of those precincts. The review to include face to face interviews with a broad cross section of those who pay the separate rate.

Due to the rapidly changing nature of business operations a regular review of the operations of the separate rate and the Trader Associations is considered prudent practice.

Council will then have the opportunity to enact any changes which are considered for the betterment of the City of Unley Trader Association model, and therefore perform better marketing of the businesses.

The independence of the consultant is considered important to enable those separate ratepayers of the precincts to be satisfied that transparency in dealings has been maintained.

Option 2

- The Unley Business & Economic Development Committee not engage and consult with Main Street Trader Associations to discuss and investigate the possible capping for the application of separate rate.

And

- An independent consultant not be engaged to undertake a review of the role and operation of the Trader Associations.

This would result in not complying with Council's resolution and the Trader Associations continue to operate in their current form losing the opportunity to make improvements to better serve the businesses of the precincts of Unley.

8. RECOMMENDED OPTION

Option 1 is the recommended option.

9. ATTACHMENTS

- UBED Report with attachment 2 October 2015

8. REPORT AUTHORISERS

Name	Title
David Litchfield	General Manager Economic Development and Planning

DECISION REPORT

REPORT TITLE: REVIEW OF DIFFERENTIAL SEPARATE RATES
ITEM NUMBER: 14
DATE OF MEETING: 7 OCTOBER 2015
AUTHOR: PETER KENNEDY
JOB TITLE: BUSINESS & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
MANAGER
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER: DAVID LITCHFIELD
JOB TITLE: GENERAL MANAGER ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 2015, Council adopted a motion requiring UBED to investigate aspects of the Special Rate process applied to businesses in the main trading precincts. In July 2015, Council received correspondence from one of those businesses that pays the Special rate, querying both the quantum and benefits that apply to their business.

This report outlines the issues raised in the motion and correspondence, and considers options available for Council.

2. RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends to Council that:

1. The report be received.
 2. A review be undertaken of the role and operation of the Trader Associations, in conjunction with the associations, to ensure they are still the most appropriate method for promotion of the precincts and are supported by the businesses in those precincts.
 3. The Unley Business & Economic Development Committee engage and consult with main street traders and businesses to discuss and investigate the existing arrangements for the application of Differential Separate Rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.
-

3. RELEVANT CORE STRATEGIES/POLICIES

3.1 Community Goal 1.1 A thriving and prosperous business community.

4. DISCUSSION

Council currently funds the work of the five Trader Associations by the imposition of a separate rate. The rate is levied as indicated across the five mixed business precincts:

Category 2 – Commercial Shop, Category 3 – Commercial Office and Category 4 – Commercial other,

- **Fullarton Road** in the area between Cross Road and Fisher Street.
- **Goodwood Road** in the area between Leader/Parsons Street and Mitchell Street/Arundel Avenue.
- **Unley Road** for the entire length of Unley Road.

Category 2 – Commercial Shop

- **King William Road** between Greenhill Road and Commercial Road.
- **Glen Osmond Road** in the area between Greenhill Road and Katherine Street.

The rates applied are as follows for the 2015-2016 financial year:

- Fullarton Road - \$250 per site
- Goodwood Road – 0.00143780 rate in the dollar
- Unley Road – 0.00036390 rate in the dollar
- King William Road – 0.00193200 rate in the dollar
- Glen Osmond Road – 0.0008270 rate in the dollar

Revenue raised from the Separate Rate in each Precinct is provided by Council to the Trader Associations in those Precincts for them to implement their marketing program for the year. The Program is submitted to UBED for recommendation to Council prior to the Separate Rate being levied.

As the rating process has evolved over the years, this has led to some inconsistencies across the Council area.

Examples of these are:

1. Office with a Capital Value of \$820 000

- Separate Rate if located on Unley Road - \$298.40
- Separate Rate if located on Goodwood Road - \$1179.00
- Separate Rate if located on Fullarton Road - \$250
- Separate Rate if located on King William Road - \$nil
- Separate Rate if located on Glen Osmond Road - \$nil

2. Shop with a Capital value of \$660 000
 - Separate Rate if located on Unley Road - \$240.10
 - Separate Rate if located on Fullarton Road - \$250
 - Separate Rate if located on King William Road - \$1275.12
 - Separate Rate if located on Glen Osmond Road - \$545.80
 - Separate Rate if located on Goodwood Road - \$948.95
3. One of the major supermarket chains has two similar stores in the Council area. At one of their stores, the (Separate Rate) marketing levy is \$6407 per annum, at the other it is \$3814.
4. Hotels located in the relevant strip on Glen Osmond Road and King William Road pay nothing, hotels located on Unley Road and Goodwood Road pay the levy.

What are the reasons for these inconsistencies?

There are significant differences in the number of businesses in each of the Precincts. More Unley Road businesses pay the levy than in other Precincts.

The aspirations of the relevant associations are different. For example, KWR Traders hold a major event each year, Variety on King William, which is an expensive event to run but is considered to be a good promotional event.

The largest expense for most of the associations is their Marketing Officer. The amount of hours worked by these officers and their hourly remuneration varies between associations.

Correspondence (Attached) has been received from the Goodwood Hotel, which highlights how particular businesses can be asked to pay what could be argued to be excessive contributions towards the activities of their respective Association.

Some of the questions that perhaps need to be asked in light of the information presented here might include:

Is the Precinct Association model still the best way of promoting the major shopping precincts in the City?

If not, what are the alternative options?

Should promotion be left to individual businesses rather than trying to promote Precincts?

Is the Separate Rate the appropriate way to fund these Associations?

Is it time to ask those businesses that pay the Separate Rate for their views?

Should the inconsistencies in type of businesses that pay the Separate Rate and the quantum of the Separate Rate be addressed?

Should there be a cap on the Separate Rate payable by any business?

Should the calculation at which the rate is collected be kept identical across each Association?

Is the flat rate fairer than the rate in the dollar?

Council raises around \$336,000 in Separate Rate annually from businesses in the Precincts. Should the promotion activities of the Associations be funded from general rate revenue?

Could the promotion of the Precincts be better served by one overarching committee rather than five, with five marketing coordinators?

The purpose of this report was principally to address the motion on notice but as the letter from the Goodwood Hotel had been subsequently received, it was considered prudent to include it in the discussion to give another perspective.

The Motion on Notice and a summary of the letter from the Goodwood Hotel are reproduced here:

ITEM 91 – 23 March 2015

MOTION ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR SCHNELL RE RATES

*MOVED Councillor Schnell
SECONDED Councillor Boisvert*

*That Council direct the Unley Business Economic & Development Committee to engage and consult with main street traders and businesses to discuss and investigate the existing arrangements for the application of Differential Separate Rates and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent. It is envisaged that any proposed broadening of application of the Differential Separate Rate beyond current arrangements would be implemented in the 2016-17 financial year to enable appropriate consultation and transparency. **CARRIED***

Letter from the Goodwood Hotel (attached)

In summary, the Hotel is objecting to paying a Differential Separate rate in the vicinity of "\$5,800" due to a recent increase.

The letter goes on to make three suggestions to adjust the rating system to one which they would consider fairer to themselves and other business similarly charged. The suggestions are for a fixed upper limit of \$1,500, a special rate reflecting a discount percentage based on the value of the capital value, and to change the boundary to exclude the Hotel from the rated area.

The letter then goes on to make some general observations regarding precinct issues such as dominance of small traders and lack of events, and the Trader Association structure, noting the lack of "clout" and financial resources, advocating that the Association needed considerably more funds to be effective.

There some suggestions for the future, which included increasing the boundary area to the North and South, and to conduct some major events to benefit the enlarged area, noting that a specialist committee would be needed.

It is therefore recommended that The Unley Business Economic & Development Committee engage and consult with main street traders and businesses to discuss and investigate the existing arrangements for the application of Differential Separate Rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.

It is logical however to revisit the issue of whether the Trader Associations remain the best method of promoting the Precincts. It is important to understand whether the businesses in the precincts support the existing model or what changes they would like to see.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The report is proposing engagement and consultation so Policy implications will not be formally addressed until the process has been completed and the results are reported with recommendations for action to UBED and Council.

5.1 Financial/budget

As per staffing/work plans which follows. There may be external assistance sought as part of the review, but this will be funded from existing budgets.

5.2 Legislative/Risk Management

Prior to implementing any changes to a Separate Rate, Council must ensure compliance with the provisions of the Local Government Act however this will be a consideration following the consultation process recommended in this report.

5.3 Staffing/Work Plans

There will be no additional staff required to carry out the consultation process as it will be managed with existing staff.

5.4 Environmental/Social/Economic – N/A

5.5 Stakeholder Engagement – Purpose of report

*Using the City of Unley “Community Engagement Toolkit” the following project scored a (4 – 5 High to Very High – At a minimum you should **involve** the community but consider opportunities to **collaborate** and/or **empower**).*

The consultation process, as directed by the resolution, “to engage and consult with main street traders and businesses” will involve traders, businesses and owners of business premises in Unley.

6. REPORT CONSULTATION

This report recommends a consultation process, so accordingly no consultation has occurred at this time.

7. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

Option 1 – Review the existing Trader Association structure and the Separate Rate arrangements

The Unley Business Economic & Development Committee engage and consult with main street traders and businesses to discuss and investigate the existing Trader Association arrangements, and arrangements for the application of Differential Separate Rates, and provide recommendations to Council as to any changes that may be prudent.

Option 2 – Advise Council it does not wish to undertake this task

The Unley Business Economic & Development Committee not undertake the reviews, and advise Council their reasons.

UBED is a Section 41 Committee of Council and Council can provide direction to such committees. Council’s response may be to wind up the Committee.

8. RECOMMENDED OPTION

Option 1 is the recommended option.

9. ATTACHMENTS

- Goodwood Hotel Letter

taplin.consultancy.

valuations, feasibility studies and property advice

e gtaplin1@hotmail.com

p 0412 824 575

a 6A Wanbrow Avenue WATTLE PARK SA 5066

ABN 82 772 724 361

30/06/2015

Mrs Leonie Clyne

Chairman

Goodwood Central Traders and Services Association

c/- 125 Goodwood Road

GOODWOOD SA 5034

leonie@angusclyne.com.au

Re: Goodwood Hotel and the Association

I have been requested to submit the following correspondence on behalf of the lessees of the Goodwood Hotel, who are responsible for the levy payments to the Association and the recipient (partly) to the benefits of its membership thereto.

We wish to thank you for the meeting last Monday, and for the frank and cordial manner in which you listened to our concerns, and offered advice.

BACKGROUND

The Goodwood Park Hotel has been a member of the Association for many years, but it was the recent massive increase in the levy last year, of some 22.5%, that has prompted management to review the value of the Association to them compared to the expense – some \$5,800.

A letter of protest to the Council has not elicited an appropriate response, and hence the meeting with you to voice the major concerns and to offer some alternatives, even some suggestions for the future of the Association moving forward.

We are aware that the levy is based to the Capital Values, but the levy went up by 20% despite any increase in the CV. Further, there has been no concrete action that the Hotel can cite that gives it a benefit of anywhere near that amount, let alone a three or four times multiple, which is the yardstick for members of such organisations.

Indeed the inclusion of the Hotel in the jurisdiction is dubious, as all previous surveys and action plans have been almost solely for the benefit of the traders to the south of the tramline, and this physical barrier also sees the curtailment of recognisable activities for the Association. I refer particularly to the Strategic Plans from year to year, and Reports by Jenson and Lucid, where the hotel is not even on the map.

Hence, whilst the hotel wishes to have an ongoing involvement with the traders in the near vicinity, it firmly believes it is paying out of proportion for the benefit it is getting from its forced involvement with the Association. It is almost certainly the largest Levy payer in the precinct, and employs its own publicity consultants, who specialise in hospitality, to do much of what appears to be the only benefit it receives – some internet promotional linkage - yet its benefit is negligible and the expense therefore unsustainable.

LEVY RATE RECCOMENDATIONS

The raising of the Levy or Special Rate based to the Capital Value by the Council is fair in most circumstances, as it is difficult to raise these funds by other methods, mainly because some traders will always benefit more than others compared to their contribution.

However the process can lead to obvious distortions, one of which is the Goodwood Park Hotel, simply because it's Capital Value at \$4.1m is substantially higher than all the other traders in the Association.

As a result of this review, we would like to recommend an alteration to the Levy Rate to more fairly recognise the contribution the Association gives to it compared to other members.

There are 3 suggestions:-

- 1. Fixed Upper Limit** – The Hotel wishes to remain as a member in the future, and to contribute a fair amount, which it considers in the current circumstances to be \$1,500. Based to the current levy rate of .00143, this would mean effectively all properties over \$1m would pay the maximum of \$1,500, which is more in line with the benefit they are currently receiving.
- 2. Special Rate** – Similar to above, whereby all properties having a CV of more than say, \$1m are charged at rate that reflects a discount of 50% of the prime rate, and those over say, \$3m are charged at rate that reflects a discount of 75% of the prime rate.

3. **Change the Boundaries** – As the Hotel is receiving so little benefit - which seems solely for the smaller traders south of the tramline - and seeing that the future benefit to all the traders of membership with the Association currently shows no signs of improvement, given the difficulty of the physical shape and size of the precinct and the effect of Goodwood Road as an arterial highway, the Hotel requests you change the boundary of the Association to the tramline, resulting in the termination of the Hotel as a member.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. **Precinct Issues** – Unlike many other trades Associations, this one has considerable physical and structural difficulties, and, in our opinion, will never be successful unless some major structural changes are adopted. Apart from the Hotel and the Capri, there are no major stakeholders, and neither of them needs the Association in practical terms to improve their businesses.

The overpowering influence of Goodwood Road, the small size of the real estate holdings, the diverse yet limited number and type of traders, and the poor carparking, and the power of the resident's action groups all limit the potential of the Association to conduct a meaningful and worthwhile operation to the benefit of its members.

The total value of the operations conducted therein is small in Capital Value terms, and are principally owned by small investors, many of whom have no wish or expertise to promote their real estate holding or their tenants via the Association.

The total lack of a meaningful series of events and festivals probably means there is little real support from either the Council or the State government.

2. **Association Structure** – It is observed that there is little real impetus from the stakeholders in improving the operations of the Association. If it is to survive and become viable and worthwhile to the community, council, and broader Adelaide, it needs to have a committee of strength, clout and commitment. Other similar bodies have the Mayor as a member or chair, a permanent assistant from council, a councillor, and at least two representatives of traders and owners on the committee.

Further, many allow a professional representative/advocate with special skills to represent them on the committee in

order to get the strategic plan both relevant and fully operational, and not just an annual set of words to justify that year's budget.

It is vital that some of the representatives have an open and permanent dialogue chain set up with the relevant Minister of the State Government, and even the Federal Government if a local member is represented in the precinct.

- 3. Financial** – To be really effective and relevant in these difficult times, and with so much competition for the population's dollars and time, considerable sums are needed to prevent leakages to other competing interests – in this case to other shopping centres and precincts.

Therefore not only a substantial annual budget is needed for on-going programs, but a 'war-chest' is required for a major project which will elevate the precinct into a viable destination for consumers, and to give substance to its existence.

Goodwood Road probably has too many hurdles in this regard to overcome, but the prime concern for the future is the lack of offstreet carparking. If council adopted a progressive view and concentrated on consolidating a site for a multi-storey carpark, and made access from one side of the road to the other easier and less dangerous, all of a sudden the precinct has value and is able to attract far more attention than it is currently been getting.

Budgets can then be justified to be increased as there is a much wider audience, and more events and festivals will be viable.

SOME IDEAS FOR THE FUTURE

- 1. Boundaries** – The current configuration has no future, not only because it is small geographically, but also in terms of the strength of the owners/traders – there is no 'grunt'.

It is therefore suggested that the area of influence be increased to Greenhill Road to the north and the rail bridge to the south.

To the north will bring in a large number of smaller traders needing support, but also some much larger owners with 'grunt' and experience. A special presentation should be commissioned to bring the Showgrounds into the action, and to have a representative from there on the Committee.

To the south, perhaps the College needs to be brought into the equation, to encourage the knowledge of the precinct to its potential student/clients.

Alternatively, contract right back to the tramline, and concentrate on those small traders in that narrow strip, recognising the shortcomings, but still providing a range of services that may be relevant to them.

- 2. Events/Festivals** – The current payment by the Goodwood Park Hotel could possibly be justified if there were several major events occurring in the street each year such that the expense of membership could be recouped by incomes generated by the customer traffic to these events.

Most other Traders Associations have them – notable being Jetty Road, Rundle Mall and Rundle Street, and Norwood Parade, but most of the others as well.

To do this, the precinct has to be much larger, the cooperation of the Council, Showgrounds authority and the state government needs to be obtained, and the Road needs to be closed for at least half a day at least twice a year, from potentially Leader Street through to Mitchell Street. Only when such an impact is created will the current levy levels be justified for the Hotel.

This enlarged concept will need a specialist Committee, tasked at looking at much larger projects than currently in the Strategic Plan, and probably needing the cooperation of the other Traders Associations under the Unley Council's influence.

SUMMARY

The Goodwood Park Hotel has no need for the Traders Association, but sees some potential for an ongoing commitment.

It request an immediate reduction of its levy for 2015-16 to \$1,500, or a change in the boundary of influence to the tramline, unless before the rate is struck it can be proved there is greater than \$6,000 benefit to it by remaining involved.

On the other hand, it sees great benefit in having the size of the precinct expanded, giving the Association many more opportunities, a much bigger budget, access to some skilled owner/operators, and a program/strategic plan that will deliver real and tangible results to the paying participants.

We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss the detail contained in this correspondence and await the favour of your response.

Yours sincerely,
TAPLIN CONSULTANCY



GARY E TAPLIN FAPI FREI
B Ec, B App Sc (Val)
Certified Practising Valuer
Life Member of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia

CC Mr Lachlan Clyne
Mr John Koumi
Mr Peter Tsokis
Mr Bob Schnell
Mr Luke Smolucha

DECISION REPORT

REPORT TITLE: UNLEY BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
DATES 2016

ITEM NUMBER: 20

DATE OF MEETING: 2 DECEMBER 2015

AUTHOR: KELLEY JAENSCH

JOB TITLE: EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

To determine the meeting dates for the Unley Business and Economic Development Committee meeting for 2016.

Under the Terms of Reference the committee is required to meet on a quarterly basis.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The Unley Business Economic Development Committee meet quarterly on the first Wednesday of the month at 6.30pm at the Council Chambers, 181 Unley Road Unley, with appropriate adjustments to accommodate other meetings, in accordance with the meeting schedule outlined below:

Wednesday,	2 March 2016
Wednesday,	1 June 2016
Wednesday,	7 September 2016
Wednesday,	7 December 2016

3. RELEVANT CORE STRATEGIES/POLICIES

Section 41 committees of the Council are authorised in their Terms of Reference to determine the time and place of their meetings. A schedule of meeting dates for 2016 is required and the Committee will meet quarterly on the first Wednesday of the month.

4. DISCUSSION

The Unley Business and Economic Development Committee will be required to meet in February. Under the Committee's Terms of Reference the committee is able to change the meeting dates.

5. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

Option 1 – The Unley Business and Economic Development Committee meet quarterly on the first Wednesday of the month at 6.30pm at the Council Chambers, 181 Unley Road Unley, with appropriate adjustments to accommodate other meetings, in accordance with the meeting schedule outlined below:

Wednesday,	2 March 2016
Wednesday,	1 June 2016
Wednesday,	7 September 2016
Wednesday,	7 December 2016

Option 2 – Not adopt the schedule as proposed.

The Committee can make changes to the meeting dates proposed above.

6. RECOMMENDED OPTION

Option 1 is the recommended option.

7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 *Financial/budget*

- Payment of allowances for independent members has been budgeted for.

7.2 Legislative/Risk Management

N/A

7.3 Staffing/Work Plans

N/A

7.4 Environmental/Social/Economic

N/A

7.5 Stakeholder Engagement

Community consultation not required.

8. REPORT CONSULTATION

Manager Business and Economic Development re meeting dates.

9. ATTACHMENTS

Nil

10. REPORT AUTHORISERS

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
David Litchfield	General Manager Economic Development & Planning