

BUDGET 2020/21

Community Engagement Report

August 2020



Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	6
Developing the Budget for 2020/21	6
Purpose of this report	9
Purpose of engagement	9
Communications	9
Limitations	9
Engagement approach	10
Who we engaged	10
Stage 1: Developing the draft Budget 2020/21	11
Q&A sessions	11
Online chat forums	11
Online polls	11
Stage 2: Consultation on the draft Budget 2020/21	13
Survey	13
Focus Groups	13
Submissions	14
Engagement findings	15
Stage 1: Developing the draft Budget 2020/21	15
Chat forums and online polls	15
Stage 2: Consultation on the draft Budget 2020/21	17
Principles for developing the budget	17
Economic and Social Recovery Program	18
Proposed service level changes	30
Neighbourhood investment in 2020/21	38
Next steps	39
Appendices	40
Appendix A: Survey respondent demographic data	40
Appendix B: Survey questions	43
Appendix C: Verbatim responses to open text survey question	50
Appendix D: Focus group questions	54
Appendix E: Investment for 2020/21 by neighbourhood	55

Executive summary

Our operating environment

The COVID-19 pandemic has presented us with unprecedented challenges in developing Budget 2020/21. Our priority has been keeping our community safe and well, and supporting our community through the pandemic and as we recover from its impacts, but it has come at a cost. We have had to temporarily close several community facilities and pause or rethink delivery of a range of programs and services.

We have experienced a significant reduction in our revenue streams alongside fixed operating costs such as staff salaries and other factors such as increasing waste management costs and cost shifting from other tiers of government had also contributed to an estimated \$32 million in forecast revenue reduction (now estimated to be \$31 million). For this reason, Council has reviewed and strategically reprioritised expenditure toward activities that support all our community in recovering from the impacts of COVID-19.

To achieve a balanced budget that responds to the significant financial impact and risks associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and other risks, and provides critical services and infrastructure to help our community move from response to recovery as quickly as possible, we have proposed a small number of temporary and permanent service level changes for Budget 2020/21.

Budget 2020/21 will mean change for our community, and hard decisions must be made. To achieve a balanced budget 2020/21 that responds to the significant financial impact and risks associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and other risks, and provides critical services and infrastructure, we are proposing a small number of temporary and permanent service level reductions for Budget 2020/21.

Engagement approach

In May, we shared with our community the challenges we face as a Council in developing the draft Budget 2020/21 through two online Q&A sessions. We also hosted online chat forums on an initial round of six proposed service level reductions for consideration as part of developing our draft Budget.

In early June, we asked our community to register their interest in participating in an online focus group, and on 17 June we released a draft budget for consultation. Consultation was promoted to our community via Council's website and Have Your Say, as well as through social media and various stakeholder databases and community newsletters.

Feedback on the draft Budget 2020/21 was sought through a formal submissions process. In addition to this process, we asked for community feedback on the proposed Economic and Social Recovery Program and a number of proposed service level changes through a survey and neighbourhood-based focus groups.

Engagement findings

There were several points of alignment between survey and focus group feedback. Both survey respondents and focus group participants indicated general support for the

Economic and Social Recovery Program. Strongest support was shown for the first initiative to extend hardship provisions to vulnerable resident and commercial ratepayers (82.18% support from survey respondents), with some debate across the focus groups around whether a rates waiver or cut was a better option than a deferment.

There was also strong support for the initiatives targeted at our most vulnerable community members, such as housing support for the homeless and rough sleepers in our City. Focus group discussions noted some questions around Council's ability to manage housing properties and the need for collaboration across all tiers of government.

Two initiatives received less than 50 per cent support from survey respondents (Bring forward South Melbourne and St Kilda structure plans – 43% and Funds to address emerging social impacts – 48 %). Focus group discussions around these initiatives indicate further description around these initiatives is required for our community to better understand them.

There was some debate in the focus group discussions around the value of the Corporate Volunteer Program initiative, which received 69 per cent support from survey respondents. Focus group participants supported the concept of a volunteer program, but queried the funding allocation, and there was some consensus that a volunteer program should not be at any financial cost to the organisation.

When asked what should be added to the program, survey respondents suggested a range of things, including funding for community programs and facilities that demonstrate a high level of community access, further organisational savings and a rate freeze. Several specific suggestions were also put forward by survey respondents. A list of their verbatim contributions to this question is provided as Appendix C to this report.

There was less unanimous support overall across the proposed service level reductions. Survey respondents supported a reduction in Council budget for professional services, training and conferences (60.40% strongly support, 27.72% somewhat support) and closure of the South Melbourne Night Market and NEFF Kitchen (52.48% strongly support, 26.73% somewhat support). Focus group participants also supported these reductions.

There was less than 50 per cent support from survey respondents for reducing the Customer Satisfaction Survey to minimum requirements (22.77% strongly support; 25.74% somewhat support) and ceasing afternoon litter bin service over summer (15.84% strongly support; 9.90% somewhat support). However, while there was conversely strong opposition to ceasing litter bin service (61%), respondents were more split about reducing the Customer Satisfaction Survey (29.70% strongly or somewhat oppose; 27.78% neither support nor oppose or no response). Focus group participants felt that these services were important and indicated low support for these reductions.

Participants across all focus groups indicated concerns over the proposed service level reductions to services that support children and young people. Some participants were more comfortable with these proposed reductions given they were temporary rather than permanent reductions.

Focus group participants were asked additional questions around how the budget was developed, and the level of investment planned for their neighbourhood in 2020/21. Overall, participants were satisfied with the principles and prioritisation criteria for developing Budget 2020/21. Some suggested climate change impacts and waste management challenges needed to be included in the prioritisation criteria.

Participants were generally comfortable with planned investment in their neighbourhood for 2020/21. There was some desire to understand how each neighbourhood compared against others, and for more detail around some of the investments, and some debate on the benefits around deferring capital works projects to identify further savings / reprioritise funding or bringing these projects forward to stimulate the local economy.

Introduction

Developing the Budget for 2020/21¹

The year 2020 has presented challenges unlike anything our City, state or nation has faced in generations. The COVID-19 pandemic has had significant impact on our local businesses, community organisations, ratepayers and residents. Service closures, self-isolation, restrictions on travel and gatherings, and physical distancing have had a financial impact on our community with large financial and economic losses, increases in under and unemployment, and business failures.

Several community services provided by Council have had to temporarily close such as libraries (gradual reopening from 3 June 2020), our community centres, playgroups and senior citizen services. Other services have been impacted such as food and home-based care services, maternal child & health, customer service centres, open space and recreation centres, and arts facilities.

We have also had a significant reduction in our revenue streams. Officers forecast a \$12.7 million reduction in revenue from what was budgeted in 2019/20, led by reduced parking revenue (\$7.5 million), property related income (\$2.2 million) and child care revenue (\$1.7 million). Reduced revenue streams are also expected to flow into draft Budget 2020/21 with \$20 million reduction. Combined this sees a forecast revenue reduction of over \$32 million between April 2020 and the end of June 2021.

The pace at which we can deliver projects has also been affected with some projects initially delayed while we worked out a way to engage with the community in a digital environment, there have been upstream delays with our suppliers, as well as a general loss of productivity.

While revenue and service provision has declined in certain areas, a significant proportion of our costs remain fixed, with staff salaries and contracts equating to 73% of our operating costs excluding depreciation.

This has also coincided with increasing costs, at a higher rate than CPI and rates cap, including a higher landfill levy, and cost shifting from other tiers of government, which is estimated to cost around \$4.5 million. This is common across local government as we renew and upgrade our ageing asset base and manage emerging issues. The Local Government Act 2020, which received Royal Assent came into effect on 24 March 2020, has both resourcing and financial implications on Port Phillip and the wider local government sector.

We developed a balanced draft Budget 2020/21 that addresses the rates capping challenge and responds to the significant financial impact and risks associated with COVID-19 pandemic and other risks such as the impact of the Recycling Victoria policy on waste services.

The draft Budget includes efficiency savings of \$4.9 million, including \$0.7million from the Customer Experience Program. This adds to the \$13 million of savings delivered over the previous six budgets.

¹ Please note the figures in this section are based on the draft Budget 2020/21 that was released to the community for feedback. Since then these have been updated and reflected in the Council Plan document.

The rate increase is 2 per cent, which is equivalent to the rates cap set by the Victorian Government, with the additional proceeds to be used via the \$4.2 million Economic and Social Recovery program to increase support for ratepayers, businesses and community members who need it the most.

While we have developed a balanced budget for 2020/21 and over the 10-year planning horizon, we will have to make \$147 million, of which \$75 million is expected to be addressed through ongoing efficiency savings and CX Program benefits. The residual \$72 million will need to be addressed through future service level reductions and/or a future waste charge.

Council is prioritising activities that will stimulate our economy in recovery and that will best shape our City for the future. We have taken into account factors such as community impact, legal and contractual obligations, and safety and risk issues, as well as prioritising activities that will stimulate our economy and best share our City as we recover.

To continue to provide critical services and infrastructure, in developing the draft Budget 2020/21 we undertook an extensive review of all costs and strategically reprioritised expenditure based on the following principles:

- Reprioritisation must be effective in providing the intended relief and increasing community capacity to withstand and recover from the pandemic and other future shocks.
- Reprioritisation should be targeted towards those that need it most and not duplicate support provided by others.
- Council must ensure financial sustainability.
- Reprioritisation of activities and services should be aligned to the Council Plan priorities, transparent, defensible, and distributed fairly based on the role of Council, support available from others, risk, and cost.

Based on these principles, priority has been given to activities that:

- meet legal and/or contractual requirements
- are essential to keeping our community safe, with a focus on the most vulnerable, in the response stage
- are essential to manage risk, including risk to Council's long-term financial sustainability (e.g. priority asset maintenance & renewal)
- are essential to helping our community move from response to recovery as quickly as possible
- are essential to preparing the Council administration for the recovery stage, including business continuity and retaining and building new capacity to start up again.

The draft Budget 2020/21 includes:

- a rate increase of 2 per cent, which is equivalent to the rates cap set by the Victorian Government, with the additional proceeds to be used to:
 - fund the significant above rates cap increases in waste management and recycling costs and other above CPI cost increases and;
 - increase support for ratepayers, businesses and community members who need it the most (see proposed Economic and Social Recovery program below).

- a general increase in fees and charges of 2.25 per cent, which is consistent with our financial strategy, unless it makes sense to vary, and to provide targeted support to those who need it most
- efficiency savings of \$4.9 million, including \$0.7million from the Customer Experience Program (this adds to the \$13 million of savings delivered over the previous six budgets)
- no increase in an already low debt position, with the majority of this proposed to be repaid in 2021/22
- cash reserve for operational needs including staff leave and contingency of \$23.9 million
- project investment of \$47 million to maintain, grow and improve services and assets
- continued support to pensioners with a council-funded pensioner rates rebate which will increase by 2.9 per cent to \$175 in 2020/21
- a cash surplus of \$0.983 million, which is above the financial strategy target of \$0.5 million (this provides additional contingency for enterprise financial risks including COVID-19 recovery).

To achieve a balanced budget with the above financial credentials that responds to the significant financial impact and risks associated with COVID-19 pandemic and other risks, and provides critical services and infrastructure, we proposed a small number of temporary and permanent service level reductions in the draft Budget 2020/21.

We also applied careful prioritisation of spend within capital and operating portfolio and reduced the projected spend in 2020/21 from \$61 million (excluding land purchases) as reported in last year's Council Plan to \$47 million, consisting of a mix of reduced scopes in programs and project deferrals with increased investments in the following years to ensure our asset base and responses to our strategies are maintained over the medium and long-term.

Significant investment continues to be projected over the 10-year period on important initiatives to deliver on the Council Plan outcomes and vision:

- \$76 million to implement the Integrated Transport Strategy (Move, Connect, Live). This includes \$46 million of renewals on road assets
- \$37 million to implement the Sustainable Environment Strategy (Act and Adapt). This includes \$10 million in of renewals on stormwater assets
- \$1.4 million to implement the Waste Management Strategy (Don't Waste It) to 2021/22)
- \$13 million to implement the Art and Soul Strategy to 2024/25; this includes provisional estimates for the redevelopment of the St Kilda Library
- \$12.5 million for Customer Experience Program (to provide better and more responsive customer service while delivering a more efficient enterprise). This is in addition to the \$9.8 million expended so far. We expect productivity and efficiency savings from this program equivalent to \$40 million over the 10-year period and have included \$0.7 million of efficiency savings in the draft 2020/21 budget.

The draft Budget 2020/21 was released for community consultation at the 17 June 2020 Ordinary Meeting of Council. This Budget will affect us all and we want our community to be involved at every stage to help us shape the budget as our City recovers from this crisis.

Purpose of this report

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of community engagement in the development of Budget 2020/21. It details the various engagement levels and techniques used as part of this engagement program.

Purpose of engagement

The purpose of this engagement program was to inform the community of the challenges in developing Budget 2020/21 and the hard decisions that need to be made, and to consult the community on the draft Budget 2020/21 through a formal submissions process as part of section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, and through broader community feedback via online forums, a survey and focus groups.

There were two primary phases of engagement:

- Information and consultation to inform development of the draft Budget 2020/21
- Consultation to gather feedback on the draft Budget 2020/21 prior to its adoption.

Communications

We communicated with our community about our current financial context, including the impact of COVID-19 on the draft Budget 2020/21, mainly via Council's website and the Have Your Say site.

Due to the closure of Council facilities and COVID-19 restrictions, several distribution channels were unavailable, and promotion relied predominantly on online methods. Q&A sessions, forums and other engagement activities were promoted through these websites, and a project page was established on Have Your Say. Information about the budget process and opportunities to be involved were promoted via Council's social media channels (facebook, twitter, LinkedIn), and through various Council and community e-newsletters. Flyers were also distributed where possible, at Council childcare centres and through the South Melbourne Market's 'Click and Collect' service, as well as at local cafes and other key community locations where possible.

Limitations

Limitations to the community engagement process include:


- Due to COVID-19 restrictions all engagement activities needed to be delivered online
- Channels for promoting opportunities to provide feedback were predominantly online
- Contributions to this engagement program do not constitute a representative snapshot of our community as people have self-selected to participate
- Consultative engagement provides only a high level snapshot of community sentiment and does not reflect deeper engagement on this topic.

Engagement approach

This section details the community engagement approach in developing and consulting on the draft Budget 2020/21.

It outlines the three stages, from informing the community of the challenges in developing a balanced budget and gathering feedback on initial proposed service level reductions, to consulting on the draft Budget 2020/21, to the hearing of submissions and adoption of Budget 2020/21 in August 2020.

The diagram below provides an overview of the engagement program.



Who we engaged

Demographic data wasn't collected as part of Stage 1 engagement. However, for Stage 2 engagement, demographic questions were asked as part of the survey and as part of as part of the focus group participant recruitment process.

The following provides a brief snapshot of who we engaged through the survey. Detailed demographic data is provided as Appendix A to this report.

- A little over 50 per cent of survey respondents were aged between 35 to 59 years (52; 51.49%), with the biggest single age group being 35 to 49 years (30; 29.70%).
- Just over half the survey respondents were female (52 respondents; 51.49%).
- Most respondents identified themselves as Port Phillip residents (85; 84.16%), with 33 respondents (32.67%) also identifying as ratepayers.

- Almost half the survey respondents (45 respondents; 44.55%) were couples without children.
- Over a quarter of respondents (32; 31.69%) lived in the St Kilda / St Kilda West neighbourhood, and four respondents 3.96%) lived outside the City of Port Phillip.

Stage 1: Developing the draft Budget 2020/21

Q&A sessions

We held two online budget Q&A sessions on 4 May and 18 May, to share the challenges we face and the principles that are guiding our review and development of Budget 2020/21. Over 170 people attended across the two sessions, with recordings of both sessions, as well as questions raised and their responses, uploaded to our Have Your Say website.

Online chat forums

We hosted chat forums on six initially proposed service level reductions. The purpose of these forums was to gather initial feedback on these proposed service level reductions to support Councillors' ongoing deliberations prior to finalising the draft budget.

The forums were open for two weeks from Wednesday 20 May to Tuesday 26 May, with two half-hour sessions with Council officers for each forum topic to provide opportunities for community members to engage directly with council representatives at these times.

The six forum topics were:

1. Discontinue print production of *Diversity* magazine and move to online version
2. Reduce ASSIST counter service hours at Port Melbourne and South Melbourne town halls
3. Reduce Council expenditure on maintenance of VicRoads assets
4. Discontinue pressure washing service for activity centres
5. Maintain funding level for annual Community Grants program and discontinue Neighbourhood Grants program
6. Discontinue funding for South Port Community Legal Service.

Online polls

'Quick polls' were also conducted for each forum topic:

1. Do you support making *Diversity* an online publication?
2. Do you support reduced Assist Counter Service hours at Port Melbourne and South Melbourne town halls?

3. Do you support reduced expenditure on parks maintenance of VicRoads Assets?
4. Do you think we should discontinue the pressure washing service for activity centres?
5. Do you support maintaining annual Community Grants program at \$280,000 and removing Neighbourhood Grants program?
6. Do you support Council no longer providing funding for South Port Community Legal Service?

The table below provides a summary of contributions to the forums and polls.

Forum topic	No. poll contributions	No. forum posts
Do you support making Divercity an online publication?	60	28
Do you support reduced Assist Counter Service hours at Port Melbourne and South Melbourne town halls?	44	14
Do you support reduced expenditure on parks maintenance of VicRoads Assets?	30	14
Do you support maintaining annual Community Grants program at \$280,000 and removing Neighbourhood Grants program?	42	15
Do you support maintaining annual Community Grants program at \$280,000 and removing Neighbourhood Grants program?	46	30
Do you support maintaining annual Community Grants program at \$280,000 and removing Neighbourhood Grants program?	351	147

Stage 2: Consultation on the draft Budget 2020/21

Survey

Community feedback was sought via an online survey hosted on Have Your Say.

The survey gathered community feedback on 16 initiatives in the Economic and Social Recovery Program that would require additional Council funding, as well as suggestions around what could be added to this program. It also sought feedback on the 11 proposed service level reductions and one service level increase.

One hundred and one survey responses were received. Respondents' demographic data is provided as Appendix A to this report.

A copy of the survey questions is provided as Appendix B to this report.

Focus Groups

Between 25 June and 9 July 2020, Council hosted seven neighbourhood-based focus groups. A call for expressions of interest to join the focus groups resulted in 137 people registering their interest.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Thursday 25 June | Elwood / Ripponlea neighbourhood |
| 2. Monday 29 June | Albert Park / Middle Park neighbourhood |
| 3. Tuesday 30 June | Balaclava / East St Kilda neighbourhood |
| 4. Thursday 2 July | St Kilda / St Kilda West neighbourhood #1 |
| 5. Monday 6 July | St Kilda / St Kilda West neighbourhood #2 |
| 6. Tuesday 7 July | South Melbourne / Montague neighbourhoods |
| 7. Thursday 9 July | Port Melbourne / Sandridge / Wirraway neighbourhoods |

Two sessions were held for St Kilda / St Kilda West due to high interest from residents in this neighbourhood. Conversely, there was no focus group session for the St Kilda Road neighbourhood due to lack of interest.

Potential participants were randomly chosen to obtain a balanced mix based on the following selection criteria:

- gender
- age
- connection to Port Phillip.

While each session originally had 10 to 12 participants, a drop in actual participation rates for most sessions resulted in 40 community members participating in total across all seven sessions.

Participants were provided with some pre-reading material to support their participation in focus group discussions.

Focus group participants were asked for their views on:

- Council's principles and prioritisation approach in developing the budget
- sixteen Economic and Social Recovery Program initiatives that would require additional funding
- eleven proposed service level reductions and one proposed service level increase
- neighbourhood-based investment in 2020/21.

Submissions

A formal submissions process was also conducted during the consultation period of 19 June to 17 July 2020, in line with section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989. Hearing of submissions took place at the 5 August 2020 Ordinary Council Meeting.

Engagement findings

This chapter provides a summary of the engagement findings for Stage 1 – Developing the draft Budget 2020/21 and Stage 2 – Consultation on the draft Budget 2020/21.

Stage 1: Developing the draft Budget 2020/21

Chat forums and online polls

The following provides an overview of each of the six forum discussions, including a snapshot of the online poll results. It should be noted that the number of contributions to the forums and the polls varies and is not considered to be representational of the broader community.

Discontinuing print version of Divercity and moving online

- Twenty-eight forum contributions and 60 poll votes, with 94% of poll participants supporting this proposal.
- Several forum participants criticised the current quality and relevance of the publication's content.
- Some forum comments supported a desire to ensure those without computer access would still be able to access Divercity; however, most acknowledged that this could be covered by making copies available at libraries and community centres.

Reducing ASSIST counter hours at Port Melbourne and South Melbourne town halls

- Fourteen forum contributions and 44 poll votes, with 68% of poll participants supporting this proposal.
- Forum contributions indicated general support for reduced hours, and also demonstrated appetite to consider alternative options such as merging ASSIST counter services with the library, reducing the number of consultants available or offering after hours counter service.
- Concerns from some who didn't support reduced hours, included:
 - reduced hours proposed will lead to full closure and force people to travel to St Kilda to receive face-to-face service
 - we should not force people to come to St Kilda to do business with us
 - face-to-face service at Port Melbourne and South Melbourne town halls is valued and praised as a service, and is of value for older customers or those without internet access.

Maintaining VicRoads assets

- Fourteen forum contributions and 30 poll votes, with 47% of poll participants supporting a reduction in Council's maintenance of VicRoads assets.
- Forum comments did not indicate any clear support for / opposition to the reduction. However, comments opposing this proposed service reduction generally indicated a view that these roads are significant part of our municipality and that mature trees on these VicRoads assets were valued.
- Some comments indicated concern about maintenance impacting accessibility and also raised concerns around safety if service levels were reduced.

Discontinuing pressure washing at activity centres

- Fifteen forum contributions and 42 poll votes, with 76% of poll participants supporting the proposal to discontinue the pressure washing service.
- In contrast to the poll, forum contributions indicated an overall preference for the service to continue.
- Comments in support of continuing this service cited reasons such as public health and hygiene, as well as providing support to local food and beverage businesses, particularly in the current COVID-19 climate.
- Strong concern was also voiced around the need to feel our streets are safe and clean.
- Some comments supporting discontinuation of this service stated Council should remove any service that is inefficient and does not provide cost benefits to ratepayers, as there are less people out and about because of COVID-19 restrictions and as long as the rapid response service is still available.

Maintaining Community Grants program at \$280k and discontinuing 'quick win' Neighbourhood Grants

- Thirty forum contributions and 46 poll votes, with 59% of poll participants supporting this proposal.
- The proposal incorporated two grants programs – Community Grants and Neighbourhood Grants; forum comments helped understand community sentiment around each program.
- Most of the forum comments indicated support for (at a minimum) maintenance of the annual community grants program budget at \$280k.
- Some contributions referred to the value of grants to the community in supporting a post-COVID recovery, with commentary around the need to maintain all grant budgets and possibly increasing budget allocations for grants at this time.
- A few forum contributors highlighted the importance of a quick response grant stream, to support our community sector to be agile and responsive to changing community needs.
- Numerous respondents gave examples of the positive impacts of grant-funded programs, and the ongoing benefits derived for the community and for individuals.

Discontinuing funding for South Port Community Legal Service

- One hundred and forty-seven forum contributions and 351 poll votes, with 6% of poll participants supporting discontinuing funding for the South Port Community Legal Centre (SPCLS).
- A number of forum participants indicated they had some historical / current connection to SPCLS and / or other community legal services.
- Some forum contributions supported a view that \$65K is a small portion of Council's overall budget and that now is an inappropriate time to consider ceasing funding due to the potential impacts of COVID-19 on the vulnerable members of the Port and South Melbourne communities.
- A few comments were in favour of the proposal, suggesting that a merger between SPCLS and one or more inner Melbourne community legal services may enable the services to provide coverage without a direct Council subsidy towards operation.
- Many forum participants disagreed with Council's suggestion that (SPCLS) could access services at the St Kilda Legal Service - a number of contributors actively challenged the accuracy of this suggestion and stated the Port and South Melbourne communities would be significantly disadvantaged should this proposal go ahead.
- The St Kilda Legal Service (SKLS) website states that it covers the Cities of Port Phillip, Stonnington and Bayside; however SKLS posted in the forum that it only covers the Port Phillip suburbs of St Kilda, Balaclava, Ripponlea and Elwood, and advised Council officers its position is that SKLS catchment currently excludes Port Melbourne, South Melbourne, Fishermans Bend, Middle Park and Albert Park.

Following community feedback in this initial round of engagement, Council resolved:

- not to proceed with the proposed cessation of funding for the South Port Community Legal Service
- to suspend for one year rather than discontinue the 'quick response' Neighbourhood Grants program and
- for officers to complete a review before 1 July 2021 to assess the impact of the change on community members who do not have online access to our services.

The remaining proposals were implemented from 1 July 2020 and these decisions by Council have been incorporated into the draft Budget 2020/21.

Stage 2: Consultation on the draft Budget 2020/21

This chapter provides a summary of the engagement findings from survey responses and focus group discussions on the proposed Economic and Social Recovery Program, and proposed service level changes. Additionally, this chapter includes a summary of focus group discussions around the principles for developing Budget 2020/21 and neighbourhood-based investment for 2020/21.

Principles for developing the budget

Focus group participants were asked what they thought of the following principles applied in developing the draft Budget 2020/21:

1. Reprioritisation must be effective in providing the intended relief and increasing community capacity to withstand and recover from the pandemic and other future shocks.
2. Reprioritisation should be targeted towards those that need it most and not duplicate support provided by others.
3. Council must ensure financial sustainability.
4. Reprioritisation of activities and services should be aligned to the Council Plan priorities, transparent, defensible, and distributed fairly based on the role of Council, support available from others, risk, and cost.

There was an overall level of support across all focus groups for these principles. Several participants across the groups indicated that while the principles were sound, how they were specifically applied was of greater interest or concern. There was strong support for principles 1 and 2 as participants acknowledged the need to focus on support vulnerable members in our community.

There was some discussion around Council's financial position and ongoing financial sustainability (Principle 3), with some participants suggesting they would be comfortable with Council borrowing or doing into debt, rather than making cuts, and one participant suggesting some mechanism for scalability of reductions (including organisational costs and staffing).

Some participants indicated a desire for a stronger commitment to climate change and waste management in developing Budget 2020/21. There was some commentary around the draft Budget 2020/21 not being aligned to strategic goals (Principle 4), as well as some commentary around the need for the organisation to streamline organisational processes, spending and structure before looking at savings through service reductions.

Economic and Social Recovery Program

Survey respondents and focus group participants were asked if they supported the 16 initiatives proposed in the Economic and Social Recovery Program that are currently unfunded and would require additional funding in Budget 2020/21.

Seven initiatives received greater than 70 per cent support from survey respondents:

1. Extend hardship provisions to vulnerable resident and commercial ratepayers (six-month rate deferral with 24 months to pay) – 82.18%
2. Suspend rent increases for FY21 and South Melbourne Market rent reviews. (October 2020 to June 2021) – 71.29%
3. Footpath Trading Fees, including outdoor dining, A- frames and goods displays – Waive fees until 31 December 2020 – 75.25%
4. Temporary common ground facility- lease former backpacker (Habitat HQ) accommodation in St Kilda to keep rough sleepers in supported housing – 75.25%
5. Permanent common ground facility- partner with DHHS to deliver permanent supported housing for persons from Council's By-name list / transitioning from Habitat 'pop-up' to reduce rough sleeping – 72.28%

6. Port Phillip Zero project - continue funding to achieve a coordinated service response to homelessness (collective impact approach). Includes CoPP 'By-name list' updated fortnightly – 74.26%
7. Share The Food project- Continue support for PPCG 'Food Hub' for 3 months (July – Sept) providing food staples, fresh food, and toiletries to people facing financial hardship, and to those isolating due to immunity, age or disability (interim period whilst Food Plan prepared) – 81.19%

Focus group participants generally supported initiatives that provided some sort of financial relief (rate deferrals, suspension of rent increases) or were targeted at providing support for our more vulnerable community members (supported housing, food provision). Housing related initiatives received strong support across all groups; however, there was some discussion around Council's role and capabilities in managing housing properties and the need for a cross-government approach to addressing homelessness overall. One participant who supported these initiatives queried the level of funding compared to the level of funding support proposed for the local business community.

Seven initiatives received between 50 to 70 per cent support from survey respondents:

1. Supplier Payments – Continue to ensure Council's payment cycle to our suppliers is between 7 and 14 days rather than the standard 30 days – 56.44%
2. Reactivation and use of public space in new ways to encourage social distancing and activation – Utilise and potentially create new public space on a trial basis – 63.37%
3. Mechanisms that support and promote businesses within the City of Port Phillip and encourage visitation particularly Sept- Dec 2020 – Develop and implement with businesses, a program that supports business to survive and thrive over the coming 12 months. This could include access to information, attraction activities as well as regular engagement with key stakeholders – 59.41%
4. Corporate volunteer program – allow staff to volunteer for up to 2 days per annum. Volunteering directed to local community sector organisations delivering programs to support social recovery and / or on-going relief for vulnerable communities – 68.32%
5. Targeted grants to rebuild social connections post COVID-19 – Deliver Quick Response Community Grants (available 6 months July – Dec 2020) promoting social connections and community resilience – 56.44%
6. Proceed with Community Grants – current applicants will be given an opportunity to recast applications to address key COVID impacts before assessment process continues. Funds would be distributed to successfully applicants in September – 63.37%
7. Bridging the digital divide - provide training, equipment and other support to community groups to facilitate delivery of on-line programs and access for users – 58.42%

Across all focus groups strong support was expressed for community grants and targeted grants. However, participants wanted more detail about these initiatives and the amounts allocated to them. Participants also generally supported reactivation of public space, but felt the description of this initiative was unclear, and wanted more detail that would better explain the significant level of funding allocated to this initiative.

There was some confusion across all groups around the corporate volunteer program, with some strong views expressed about the importance of volunteering, but little support for a volunteering initiative requires funding.

Two initiatives received less than 50 per cent support:

- Bring forward South Melbourne and St Kilda structure plans with a focus in year one on an economic and employment land framework and housing growth strategy – 42.57%
- Fund to address emerging social impacts – Monitor impacts and develop appropriate responses – 47.52%

Overall comments from focus group participants about these two initiatives indicated a desire for greater clarity. Some participants commented specifically that the terminology used to describe these initiatives was too broad or technical to easily understand the intent behind them.


The following section provides survey results for each of the 16 currently unfunded initiatives in the proposed Economic and Social Recovery program.

Q. Please indicate which of the 16 proposed initiatives you support / don't support.

1. Extend hardship provisions to vulnerable resident and commercial ratepayers (six-month rate deferral with 24 months to pay)

Eighty-three of the 101 respondents indicated support for this initiative. Seven respondents did not support this initiative, while 11 respondents were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
83	7	11	0



2. **Suspend rent increases for FY21 and South Melbourne Market rent reviews. (October 2020 to June 2021)**

Survey results showed strong support for this initiative, with 72 respondents indicating they supported it. Fifteen respondents didn't support this initiative, while 13 respondents were unsure / undecided. One respondent didn't answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
72	15	13	1



3. **Footpath Trading Fees, including outdoor dining, A- frames and goods displays – Waive fees until 31 December 2020**

Survey results showed strong support for this initiative, with 76 respondents indicating support for it. Eleven respondents did not support this initiative, while 13 respondents were unsure / undecided. One respondent did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
76	11	13	1



4. Supplier Payments – Continue to ensure Council's payment cycle to our suppliers is between 7 and 14 days rather than the standard 30 days

Survey results showed a little over half the respondents (57) supported this initiative, while 21 respondents did not support it and 23 respondents were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
57	21	23	0



5. Reactivation and use public space in new ways to encourage social distancing and activation – Utilise and potentially create new public space on a trial basis

Sixty-seven respondents supported this initiative, while 24 respondents didn't support it. Thirteen respondents indicated they were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
64	24	13	0



6. **Bring forward South Melbourne and St Kilda structure plans with a focus in year one on an economic and employment land framework and housing growth strategy.**

Less than half the respondents (43) supported this initiative. Around a quarter (26 respondents) did not support it and 31 were unsure / undecided. One respondent did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
43	26	31	1



7. **Mechanisms that support and promote businesses within the City of Port Phillip and encourage visitation particularly Sept- Dec 2020 – Develop and implement with businesses, a program that supports business to survive and thrive over the coming 12 months. This could include access to information, attraction activities as well as regular engagement with key stakeholders.**

Sixty respondents supported this initiative, 18 respondents did not support it and 21 respondents were unsure / undecided. Two respondents did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
60	18	21	2



8. **Corporate volunteer program – allow staff to volunteer for up to 2 days per annum. Volunteering directed to local community sector organisations delivering programs to support social recovery and / or on-going relief for vulnerable communities.**

Sixty-nine respondents supported this initiative and 18 respondents did not support it. Nineteen respondents were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
69	19	13	0



9. **Targeted grants to rebuild social connections post COVID-19 – Deliver Quick Response Community Grants (available 6 months July – Dec 2020) promoting social connections and community resilience**

Fifty-seven respondents supported this initiative. Twenty-eight respondents did not support it and 16 respondents were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
57	28	16	0



10. **Proceed with Community Grants – current applicants will be given an opportunity to recast applications to address key COVID impacts before assessment process continues. Funds would be distributed to successfully applicants in September**

Sixty-four respondents supported this initiative. Twenty-three respondents did not support it and 14 respondents were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
64	23	14	0



11. **Bridging the digital divide - provide training, equipment and other support to community groups to facilitate delivery of on-line programs and access for users**

Fifty-nine respondents supported this initiative. Twenty-four respondents did not support it and 17 respondents were unsure / undecided. One respondent did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
59	24	17	1



12. Fund to address emerging social impacts – Monitor impacts and develop appropriate responses

Forty-eight respondents supported this initiative. Thirty-two respondents did not support it and 20 respondents were unsure / undecided. One respondent did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
48	32	20	1



13. Temporary common ground facility- lease former backpacker (Habitat HQ) accommodation in St Kilda to keep rough sleepers in supported housing

There was strong support for this initiative, with 76 respondents indicating their support. Thirteen respondents did not support it and 12 respondents were unsure / undecided.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
76	13	12	0



14. Permanent common ground facility- partner with DHHS to deliver permanent supported housing for persons from Council's By-name list / transitioning from Habitat 'pop-up' to reduce rough sleeping.

This initiative received strong support, with 73 respondents indicating their support. Fifteen respondents did not support it and 12 respondents were unsure / undecided. One respondent did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
73	15	12	1



15. Port Phillip Zero project - continue funding to achieve a coordinated service response to homelessness (collective impact approach). Includes CoPP 'By-name list' updated fortnightly.

There was strong support for this initiative, with 75 respondents indicating their support. Fifteen respondents did not support it and 11 respondents were unsure / undecided. One respondent did not answer this question.


Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
75	15	11	0



16. Share The Food project- Continue support for PPCG 'Food Hub' for 3 months (July – Sept) providing food staples, fresh food, and toiletries to people facing financial hardship, and to those isolating due to immunity, age or disability (interim period whilst Food Plan prepared).

This initiative received strong support, with 82 respondents indicating their support and nine respondents indicating they did not support it. Eight respondents were unsure / undecided and two respondents did not answer this question.

Support	Don't support	Not sure / undecided	No response
82	9	8	2



Q. Is there anything you'd like to see added to the program?

Thirty-three of the 101 survey respondents contributed to this open text question. Responses have been grouped into the following themes:

- Homelessness and housing
 - Permanent rather than temporary measures
 - Advocate for more social housing
 - Transparency around Common Ground proposal expenditure
- Public space
 - Better public space event management, including notifications of events
- Transport and parking
 - More / improved bike infrastructure to support better and safer commuting
 - Reduced parking fines

- Rates
 - No rates increase for residents / pensioners
 - Rates reduction in line property value reductions due to economic downturn
- Organisational savings
 - Reduction in staffing costs
 - Absorb operational costs
- Community programs
 - Inclusive programs that support active and healthy communities
 - Programs for older people and CALD communities
- Environment
 - Support for volunteer programs / activities
- Other
 - Advocacy to State / Federal government/s for social housing
 - No duplication of state / federal funding
 - Reduction in unnecessary and inefficiently managed road works
 - Support creation of start-up businesses
 - Sell unusable assets, use reserves or take a long term low interest loan

Specific suggestions included:

- Social impact assessment on proposed HQ location
- Advocate for more social housing
- Transparency around Common Ground proposal expenditure
- Facilitate In Our Backyard policy implementation
- Continued support for Dig In Community Garden
- Support Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve
- Continued support for SouthPort Community Centre programs
- Return EcoCentre site to public open space
- Fund St Kilda Library as a priority
- No funding for Ripponlea Gardens initiative
- No change or parking removal for Palais forecourt area

Focus group discussions focused mainly on the initiatives proposed. There was general commentary around borrowing to sustain important current initiatives rather than reducing services to fund any new ones.

Suggestions for inclusion in the Economic and Social Recovery Program from participants include:

- Climate change initiatives
- Support for childcare / community-run childcare
- Support for arts sector

- Waste management initiatives
- Bike infrastructure
- Community safety initiatives
- Investment in St Kilda Library

Proposed service level changes

Survey respondents and focus group participants were asked to what extent they supported / opposed 11 proposed service level reductions and one proposed service level increase.

Service level reductions

Three proposed service level reductions received a strong indication of support from survey respondents:

1. Reduce Councillor budget for professional services, training and conferences (89% strongly support / somewhat support)
2. Close South Melbourne Night Market and NEFF Kitchen (80 % strongly support / somewhat support)
3. Change St Kilda Film Festival to be predominantly online with an opening night event (69% strongly support / somewhat support)

There was overall support for these proposed service level reductions across all focus groups. There was commentary from some focus group participants around the need to ensure reduced support does not impact Councillors' ability to deliver good governance.

Some focus group participants shared their expectation that the South Melbourne Market is self-sustaining and its operations should not be subsidised by Council.

There was also some concern around the impact to local businesses if the St Kilda Film Festival was predominantly online, with some participants querying why St Kilda Festival was not being considered in the list of proposed reductions.

Six proposed service level reductions received some support from survey respondents:

1. Suspend Youth Service Development for 1 year (68% strongly support / somewhat support)
2. Defer Youth Leadership and Engagement program for 6 months (67% strongly support / somewhat support)
3. Reduce project funding for Friends of Suai / Covalima (60% strongly support / somewhat support).
4. Reduce operational subsidy to kindergartens from \$4,000 to \$2,000 per centre (62% strongly support / somewhat support)
5. Suspend Early Education Partnership for 1 year (60% strongly support / somewhat support)
6. Cease Pre-School Dental Check Program funding agreement with Star Health (55% strongly support / somewhat support)

There was a lot of concern across all focus groups around the number of proposed service reductions for children / young people. Participants agreed it was a priority to support young people, but some participants were willing to support the proposed reduction on the condition it was only a temporary reduction.

There was also strong discussion around ceasing the pre-school dental check program funding, as this was considered an essential program, especially for vulnerable families who may not have access to other dental health programs. Most participants indicated they did not support this reduction. Some participants gave conditional support, noting the need to confirm program support was available from the Victorian Government for this program.

Two proposed service level reductions received less than 50 per cent support from survey respondents:

1. Reduce Customer Satisfaction Survey to minimum LGPRF requirements (49% strongly support / somewhat support)
2. Cease Afternoon Litter Bin over Summer service (November to March) (26% strongly support / somewhat support)

Several focus group participants expressed mixed views about reducing the Customer Satisfaction Survey to minimum requirements. A number of participants commented on the importance of checking in regularly with our residents / ratepayers. importance of checking in with ratepayers / residents.

Participant views around ceasing the afternoon litter bin service over summer were more consistent. Many felt that this would create health and amenity issues, and negatively impact on perceptions of community safety. Some participants were willing to support it as a trial, and if there is an on-call service available if required.

More general comments about these proposed service level reductions included:

- need to streamline / restructure organisation to identify savings
- concern around funding services that are not being accessed / used by our community, or are duplicated by other levels of government
- funding services that are state responsibilities - not core council service
- level of savings from these proposed reductions is not enough – we need to look for greater savings from bigger spend items.

Service level increase


There was some support from survey respondents for this proposed service level increase (60 respondents in support). Support for this proposed increase was consistent across all seven focus groups. However, there was some question around whether the level of funding allocated to this was appropriate.

Q. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

1. Reduce Councillor budget for professional services, training and conferences

This proposed service level reduction received strong support, with 89 of the 101 respondents indicating they strongly support or somewhat support it. Only two respondents strongly opposed this reduction. Two respondents did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
61	28	6	2	2



2. Close South Melbourne Night Market and NEFF Kitchen

This proposed service level reduction received strong support, with 80 respondents indicating they strongly support or somewhat support it. Seven respondents strongly opposed this reduction. Four respondents did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
53	27	8	2	7



3. Reduce Customer Satisfaction Survey to minimum LGPRF requirements

Less than half the survey respondents (49 respondents) indicated support for this proposed service level reduction, with over a quarter of respondents (30 respondents) strongly opposing or somewhat opposing it. Three respondents did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
23	26	19	21	9



4. Defer Youth Leadership and Engagement program for 6 months

Sixty-seven survey respondents supported this proposed service level reduction, while 22 respondents opposed it. Three respondents didn't answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
38	29	9	15	7



5. Suspend Early Education Partnership for 1 year

Sixty survey respondents supported this proposed service level reduction. Twenty respondents opposed it and four respondents didn't answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
32	28	17	10	10



6. Suspend Youth Service Development for 1 year

This proposed service level reduction received support from 68 respondents, while 14 respondents opposed it. Three respondents didn't answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
30	38	16	8	6



7. Reduce operational subsidy to kindergartens from \$4,000 to \$2,000 per centre

This proposed service level reduction received 62 responses in support, with 27 responses opposing it. Three respondents did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
37	25	9	12	15



8. Reduce project funding for Friends of Suai / Covalima

Sixty respondents supported this proposed service level reduction and 25 respondents opposed it. Three respondents did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
42	18	13	17	8



9. Cease Pre-School Dental Check Program funding agreement with Star Health

Fifty-five respondents supported this proposed service level reduction. Twenty-nine respondents opposed it and 2 respondents did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
32	23	15	14	15



10. Change St Kilda Film Festival to be predominantly online with an opening night event

This proposed service level reduction was supported by 69 respondents and opposed by 18 respondents. One respondent did not answer this question.


Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
46	23	13	10	8



11. Cease Afternoon Litter Bin over Summer service (November to March)

Only 26 respondents supported this proposed service level reduction, while 61 respondents opposed it.

Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
16	10	14	22	39




Q. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service increase?

1. Provide additional Lead Family/Assertive Outreach resource to meet Council-endorsed Children's Services Policy commitments supporting families experiencing vulnerability to access early years education services (cost of \$100,000)

Sixty respondents supported this proposed service level increase, while 23 respondents opposed it. One respondent did not answer this question.

Strongly support	Somewhat support	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
36	24	17	7	16



Neighbourhood investment in 2020/21

Focus group participants were asked what they thought about the investment in their neighbourhood for 2020/21. Investment for 2020/21 by neighbourhood is provided as Appendix E to this report.

Participant comments are summarised by focus group session below:

Elwood / Ripponlea

- Lack of clarity on what advocacy for Elster Creek catchment partnership involves or how much it costs, but support the conversion of the golf course into public park land
- Suggest investment to address traffic congestion such as bike infrastructure, but also need to be mindful of alternatives for people who would not take up bike riding
- Support investment toward flood mitigation
- No apparent investment in Ripponlea

Albert Park / Middle Park

- General support for planned investment
- Support investment in road / pedestrian safety initiatives, particularly along Kerferd Road
- Missing opportunities for greening opportunities given width of roads and urban heat effect in summer
- Some surprise at seemingly low level on investment in neighbourhood – unsure how this compares against other neighbourhoods
- Support for Gasworks Arts Park project
- Some of the investment appears to be around basic maintenance – would like to see investments that will make long term contributions to the area
- Greater action and investment in waste / recycling initiatives and education / information
- Want better understanding about what is not included / has been reduced

Balaclava / East St Kilda

- Broad criticism of traffic management infrastructure at Alma Road / Alexandra Street
- Query the renewal of assets such as roads and reserves that don't appear to need it
- Unable to make comparison against other neighbourhoods, so difficult to comment about level of investment in this neighbourhood
- Explore opportunities for community involvement through some of these initiatives, such as a community garden as part of the Alma Park East renewal

St Kilda / West St Kilda #1

- Maintaining assets is important, but perhaps asset improvement works can be deferred
- Query whether Astor Theatre garden beautification works can be deferred in favour of higher priority investment
- Mixed views for and against investment into EcoCentre redevelopment and other assets
- Public toilets are a priority
- Capital works should be brought forward to stimulate the local economy
- Investment in stormwater management will help meet Council targets

St Kilda / West St Kilda #2

- Astor Theatre beautification works will address issues around amenity and anti-social behaviour
- Query need to invest funding in Palais Theatre and Elwood Foreshore at this time
- Needs to be better balance of investment for business and community to keep businesses from closing down / moving away
- Housing and homeless initiatives seem to be too concentrated in St Kilda
- Upgrade needed for St Kilda Library as a well-used community asset
- More protection for local penguins

South Melbourne / Montague

- Broad support for the level of investment overall and general acceptance that investment in these initiatives is based on sound rationale
- Lack of support for road renewals along Dorcas Street
- Investment in South Melbourne Market is necessary
- Broad understanding of the need for investment in upgrades and renewals to meet OHS and compliance requirements
- Broad lack of support for any investment in the South Melbourne Town Hall that appears to be for the benefit of another party over the local community – town hall should be used for community purposes
- Support for more and better-connected bike lanes
- More support for businesses to reduce use of plastics
- St Kilda Junction and St Kilda Road safety concerns need to be addressed

Port Melbourne / Sandridge / Wirraway

- More investment in bike infrastructure to create safer riding conditions
- Support for investment to improve open spaces that are well used by the local community
- Traffic calming measures for Bay Street
- Some support for the Graham Street Skate Park upgrade
- Create open space by transforming streets into small parks for use by locals

Next steps

Consultation on the draft Budget 2020/21 concluded on Friday 17 July 2020. Hearing of formal submissions received in accordance with section 223 of the *Local Government Act 1989* took place at the 5 August 2020 Ordinary Meeting of Council.


Council will be considering all community feedback to inform any changes to the draft Budget 2020/21 prior to considering adoption of Budget 2020/21 at its 19 August 2020 Ordinary Council Meeting.

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey respondent demographic data


Which age group do you belong to?

Under 18 years	18 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 to 84	85 and over	Prefer not to say
0	2	12	30	22	22	9	1	1




Which gender do you identify with?

Under 18 years	18 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 49
41	52	2	2




Which of the following describes your connection to the City of Port Phillip? Select all that apply

Resident	Business owner	Ratepayer	Worker	Student	Visitor
85	12	43	15	2	3




Which of the following best describes your current household?

Couple with children	Couple without children	One parent family	Group household	Single person household	Visitor only household
22	45	4	4	21	0



What is your residential suburb?

Albert Park	9
Balaclava	6
Elwood	10
Melbourne	2
Middle Park	5
Port Melbourne	19
Ripponlea	0
South Melbourne	5
Southbank	0
St Kilda	26
St Kilda East	8
St Kilda West	6
Windsor	1
Other	4
Prefer not to say	5



Appendix B: Survey questions

Economic and Social Recovery Program

Please indicate which of the 16 proposed initiatives you support / don't support.

1. **Extend hardship provisions to vulnerable resident and commercial ratepayers (six-month rate deferral with 24 months to pay)**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
2. **Suspend rent increases for FY21 and South Melbourne Market rent reviews (October 2020 to June 2021)**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
3. **Footpath Trading Fees, including outdoor dining, A-frames and goods displays – Waive fees until 31 December 2020**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
4. **Supplier Payments – Continue to ensure Council's payment cycle to our suppliers is between 7 and 14 days rather than the standard 30 days**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
5. **Reactivation and use public space in new ways to encourage social distancing and activation – Utilise and potentially create new public space on a trial basis**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
6. **Bring forward South Melbourne and St Kilda structure plans with a focus in year one on an economic and employment land framework and housing growth strategy**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
7. **Mechanisms that support and promote businesses within the City of Port Phillip and encourage visitation particularly Sept-Dec 2020 – Develop and implement with businesses, a program that supports business to survive and thrive over the coming 12 months. This could include access to information, attraction activities as well as regular engagement with key stakeholders**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided
8. **Corporate volunteer program – allow staff to volunteer for up to 2 days per annum. Volunteering directed to local community sector organisations delivering programs to support social recovery and / or on-going relief for vulnerable communities**
☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

9. Targeted grants to rebuild social connections post COVID-19 – Deliver Quick Response Community Grants (available 6 months July – Dec 2020) promoting social connections and community resilience

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

10. Proceed with Community Grants – current applicants will be given an opportunity to recast applications to address key COVID impacts before assessment process continues. Funds would be distributed to successfully applicants in September

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

11. Bridging the digital divide – provide training, equipment and other support to community groups to facilitate delivery of on-line programs and access for users

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

12. Fund to address emerging social impacts – Monitor impacts and develop appropriate responses

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

13. Temporary common ground facility – lease former backpacker (Habitat HQ) accommodation in St Kilda to keep rough sleepers in supported housing

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

14. Permanent common ground facility – partner with DHHS to deliver permanent supported housing for persons from Council's By-name list / transitioning from Habitat 'pop-up' to reduce rough sleeping

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

15. Port Phillip Zero project – continue funding to achieve a coordinated service response to homelessness (collective impact approach). Includes CoPP 'By-name list' updated fortnightly

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

16. Share The Food project – Continue support for PPCG 'Food Hub' for 3 months (July – Sept) providing food staples, fresh food, and toiletries to people facing financial hardship, and to those isolating due to immunity, age or disability (interim period whilst Food Plan prepared)

☐ Support ☐ Don't support ☐ Not sure / undecided

Is there anything you'd like to see added to the program?

Proposed service level changes

1. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Reduce Councillor budget for professional services, training and conferences – A review of 2019/20 expenditure indicates last year's budget was under-spent. Reduced budget for Councillors to attend conferences and courses, additional media and coaching training, and general training is proposed to have little impact on Councillors' ability to perform their role and no tangible impact on our community. Budget to be reinstated in 2021/22.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

2. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Close South Melbourne Night Market and NEFF Kitchen – The NEFF Kitchen Cooking School is currently closed and physical restrictions of four square metres means only three students per class making it impossible to return a profit. The school was scheduled to close permanently in October 2020; bringing this date forward saves Council \$35,000. The South Melbourne Market Night Market in January and February each year aims to attract new customers and provide a community event, but isn't overwhelmingly supported by Market traders. We feel we can still look at ways to introduce new customers to the market without having to run the night market, which required significant funding and wasn't profitable. Saving is \$52,000.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

3. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Reduce Customer Satisfaction Survey to minimum LGPRF requirements – The budget for the annual Customer Satisfaction Survey can be reduced by keeping the number of survey questions to the legislative minimum, reducing the number of survey responses from 900 to 400, and not requesting a neighbourhood report. The impact of this is that we would not be able to report on 19 of the Council Plan measures, including seven outcome indicators.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

4. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Defer Youth Leadership and Engagement program for 6 months – This year-long program supports young people who go to school in the City of Port Phillip to gain leadership skills and opportunities. It provides students with a meaningful voice and empowers them in program planning, decision making and delivery. The six-month deferral is in response to physical distancing guidelines and delivers a temporary saving made up of facilitation costs, catering and hall hire.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

5. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Suspend Early Education Partnership for 1 year – Although the Early Education Partnership is not a direct service provided by Council, we contribute \$40,000 towards the network coordination role. This role has an education disengagement focus and young people are referred into the action team. As this service is a state government responsibility and in response to Council's financial situation, this is a lower funding priority for Council.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

6. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Suspend Youth Service Development for 1 year – The funds were allocated to delivery of the leadership program and a range of consultancy costs that have been temporarily placed on hold while the COVID restrictions are in place. A review of the program is expected to build in efficiencies that will incorporate online resources along with face-to-face interactions utilising modest facilities to significantly reduce operating costs.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

7. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Reduce operational subsidy to kindergartens from \$4,000 to \$2,000 per centre – Council's contribution towards the funding of the operations for the nine kindergartens located in our municipality operations is not significant enough to be impactful and duplicates Victorian Government funding to the centres. Council will continue to fund the proportion that supports the low-income subsidy.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

8. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Reduce project funding for Friends of Suai / Covalima – Retaining \$10,000 of project funding for Friends of Suai / Covalima is proposed to enable them to conduct an annual audit of the Covalima Community Centre accounts; ship Council computer and technology equipment surplus to requirements and deliver soap and sanitiser to Suai; expand the solar lighting scheme; and conduct hygiene, maths and science training. The \$50,000 grant to Suai / Covalima Community Centre for Friendship plus the Council's coordinator position would remain.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

9. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Cease Pre-School Dental Check Program funding agreement with Star Health – The current funding agreement expires on 30 June 2020, and Star Health has been unable to undertake preschool dental checks during the State of Emergency. It is unclear how many children in our municipality are accessing the service, as the program is co-funded by other agencies. Some children, particularly those experiencing financial disadvantage, would be unable to access pre-school dental checks. As dental health is a state government responsibility and in response to Council's financial situation, this is a lower funding priority for Council.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

10. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Change St Kilda Film Festival to be predominantly online with an opening night event – The 2020 St Kilda Film Festival took place virtually, in response to physical distancing restrictions. This approach to running the Festival has been so successful that we plan to build on the success of this year's Festival by continuing with a predominantly online festival that is likely to reach out to a wider audience.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

11. To what extent do you support / oppose this proposed service reduction?

Cease Afternoon Litter Bin over Summer service (November to March) – The proposal to reduce the Summer Afternoon Litter Bin Collection only applies to collection of bins in our parks. Afternoon bin collection in the St Kilda precinct, and all other activity centres that are part of the current summer service will continue. Bins in parks may potentially fill or overflow on heavy visitation days, in which case they would be emptied the following morning.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

To what extent do you support / oppose the following service increase proposed in the draft Budget?

Provide additional Lead Family/Assertive Outreach resource to meet Council-endorsed Children's Services Policy commitments supporting families experiencing vulnerability to access early years education services (cost of \$100,000). The creation of the proposed Lead Family/Assertive Outreach role is intended to meet Council's endorsed Children's Services Policy commitment 1: "Ensure assertive outreach services to support children experiencing vulnerability to access childcare, kindergarten, toy libraries and playgroups. This includes identifying and reducing barriers such as navigating the system and accessing available subsidies." The Policy seeks to ensure that "the effects of disadvantage on children's development are minimised." The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are exacerbating existing disadvantage, impacting on children's learning outcomes and creating new vulnerabilities across the municipality. The proposed new role would seek to minimise these impacts and maximise opportunities for children to engage in high quality early years services.

- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Somewhat support
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Somewhat oppose
- ☐ Strongly oppose

A bit about you

Which age group do you belong to?

- ☐ Under 18 years ☐ 18 to 24 ☐ 35 – 49 ☐ 50 – 59 ☐ 60 – 69
☐ 70 – 84 ☐ 85 and over ☐ Prefer not to say

Which gender do you identify with?

- ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Other ☐ Prefer not to say

Which of the following describes your connection to the City of Port Phillip? Select all that apply

- ☐ Resident ☐ Business owner ☐ Ratepayer ☐ Worker ☐ Student ☐ Visitor

Which of the following best describes your current household?

- ☐ Couple with children ☐ Couple without children ☐ One parent family
☐ Group household ☐ Single person household ☐ Visitor only household
☐ Prefer not to say

What is your residential suburb?

- ☐ Albert Park ☐ Balaclava ☐ Elwood ☐ Melbourne
☐ Middle Park ☐ Port Melbourne ☐ Ripponlea ☐ South Melbourne
☐ Southbank ☐ St Kilda ☐ St Kilda East ☐ St Kilda West
☐ Windsor ☐ Other (please specify)

Appendix C: Verbatim responses to open text survey question

Is there anything you'd like to see added to the program? (33 responses)

programmes maintained that cater for older persons, particularly those from ethnic minorities. Will the IT programmes for example, have a multilingual focus?
Inclusive programs that support active and healthy communities, such as improves sports club facilities, parks and recreational spaces
Focus on creating start-up businesses encourage small tenancies so those thinking of launching a new enterprise can do so in a modest and flexible tenancy
Cease funding the eco centre. It's a waste of funds, unnecessarily uses up much public garden space and is supported by a very small group of people. It adds NO value to the community. In fact it should be cleared away and space returned back as public parkland for the community. Also, Council should draw more on existing community based services rather than duplicating them eg Star Health.
I'd like to see the above initiatives immediately implemented. One of the things that should come out of the prevailing Covid-19, is immediate actions rather than words.
Thank you for your continued support of our Accessible Yoga program and SPCC. It has made a hugely positive impact on our lives. Ours is one of 12 SPCC council funded programs that serve more than 300 participants each week. Research indicates an active, healthy, resilient, well-informed, connected community will recover more quickly from disruptions like COVID-19 and your support makes that possible. Thank you,
Firstly I wish to thank the Council for supporting many Voluntary programs in the City of Port Phillip and great care needs to be taken when cutting any funding to small programs. I think it is very important to maintain and continue to support and subsidise local programs used by many in the community if required, some things may have to run at a loss. As a member of DigIn Community Garden I have found this a very useful source of food and a place that has contributed to my families wellbeing, offering a safe place to escape to especially during this difficult time of Corona Virus lockdowns, social distancing, wearing of gloves at all times, sanitiser being offered has certainly given a sense of security and awareness of necessary issues regarding safety. This place offers the opportunity to exercise, helping improve ones mental health and wellbeing and when not going through the current lockdown requirements also offers a source of social and community support and interaction which is important for everyone. I want the council to continue to support programs like this as I believe they has much to offer.
Thank you for your continued support of the Dig In program and SPCC. It has been had a hugely positive impact on my life during the COVID-19 lockdowns and on going time. Being able to plant vegetables, walk to the garden, gardening and composting waste during this lockdown period is immensely important to my well being and mental health as I live in an apartment Dig In is one of 12 SPCC council funded programs that serve more than 300 participants each week.

Continued support of our Dig In program and SPCC. It has made a hugely positive impact on our lives. Ours is one of 12 SPCC council funded programs that serve more than 300 participants each week. Research indicates an active healthy, resilient, well-informed, connected community will recover more quickly from disruptions like COVID-19 and your support makes that possible.
No duplication of funding that state and commonwealth governments already provide or should provide.
cut all spending on memberships, grants, money given to foreign villages, Rippon Lea, the eco centre, privatise child care. renegotiate the WPA so staff do not get wage increases this year. Freeze rates.
More education and practices to support social distancing and safe covid measures. Ormond road is not obliging
I support 13, 14 & 16, but have marked 13 & 15 as unsure as I would prefer a permanent solution rather than a temporary one for homelessness. I would like to see an emphasis on arts and sustainability — we are all craving creativity and beauty at this time. It's role is essential.
Social impact assessment for the proposed Habitat HQ rough sleepers location, including nearby school catchment participants
Continue doing everything you can to support rough-sleepers and help them find safe accommodation, and access to food and medical services. Shift away from publicly and environmentally damaging activities, such as hosting Grand Prix. Be sure to update residents about closures of public spaces due to events, and ensure they are packed away ASAP so the effects on residents are minimal. Continue your support for the EcoCentre which helps connect residents with the environment, engages them so that we all care about our surroundings, and carries helpful initiatives that lead to reduction in waste.
Compared to Bayside, Stonnington, and Hobson's Bay your spending is extravagant, your staffing levels indicate gross inefficiency, and spending 33% of income on mgt is further indication of a council out of control. Further, you clearly treating single residences as cash cows, for they are being the brunt of the increases each year. What needs to happen: 1. Cut staffing by 20% to bring PP in line with the councils listed above. Mgt & admin to take the highest hit. 2. Cut spending by 30%, to progressively bring PP in line with those council. 3. Collect market-rated rental from council-owned businesses and properties. 4. Cut this year's rates by 5%, compared to last year. 5. Introduce term limits in councillors, ie bring in fresh thinking, which is focussed on the needs of ratepayers, not the councillors.
Yes - follow the lead of the state government and reduce senior staff salaries by say 20% for the next 12 months
Reduce parking fine minimums from \$83. It's too easy to get caught out after business hours, where metering is doing nothing to enhance safety (dedicated marked parking spaces) or customer access (empty spots everywhere). \$30 is a strong reminder to everyone rather than a punitive \$83. As difficult as it may be for Council to accept this, current practice highlights increasingly an unjustifiable cruel behaviour.

Now more than ever we need quality outdoor space and so support the development of Elsternwick park nature reserve. Encourage and support volunteering for plantings, birdwatching etc with local Elwood, balaclava and st Kilda community groups, schools and individuals.
Public transport?
Manage the budget so there is no rate increase for residents at this time of crisis.
Freeze rate increases
<p>Yes, an immediate rate waiver for 6 months rates and a deferral for a further 6 months for a business where the revenue has reduced and staff on job keeper and non commercial ratepayers as per the guidelines as provided by the Federal Government.</p> <p>Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial ratepayers who have been required to close due to COVID-19 • Commercial ratepayers eligible for the 'JobKeeper' payment • Non-commercial ratepayers eligible for the 'JobSeeker' or 'JobKeeper' payment • Any other ratepayer experiencing financial hardship due to income dropping by 15 per cent or more. <p>Council needs to accept the reality that many businesses have closed, owners lost heaps of money or will close and many workers have lost their job or have had income reduced.</p> <p>Council has the financial capacity to assist ratepayers by absorbing costs in the operations, deferring costs, trimming expenditures across the Council, selling unusable assets, using reserves or taking a long term low interest loan.</p> <p>Councillors need to talk with ratepayers.</p>
No rate increases for pensioners.
<p>1. I would like to see realistic home valuations.</p> <p>2. Taking into account home price reductions as a result of the economic downturn I would like to see home valuations and then rates reduce in line with this.</p> <p>3. There has been significant unnecessary and inefficiently managed road works around our area. Reducing some of these may help balance the budget</p>
<p>No rate rises for residences</p> <p>Don't waste the money on 50k for the ripponlea gardens it's glen eira councils issue not ours</p> <p>No removal of parking and changes to the area near the palais. The council have already destroyed Acland and Fitzroy streets</p>
Spend on security to deliver business back to Fitzroy and Acland St! we need traders to help with returning the people back only if it is safe! more safety for our people, residents and traders!
I strongly support Council advocating for and funding social housing however there is limited detail in the Council's Plan and Budget about the Common Ground proposals. Council has previously committed to working with local housing organisations - why aren't they involved in these proposals? Council committed to the In Our Backyard policy in 2015 and should facilitate that policy. Any shift in Council's focus must result from real consultation with local housing providers and services. It is not apparent from the Budget documentation that this has occurred. Before committing funds to a Common Ground proposal Council must make transparent it's justification for this expenditure.

<p>I am extremely disappointed to learn that the City of Port Philip has not put the re-generation of the St Kilda library as a high priority in terms of community use/ helpfulness to all vulnerable groups and to the wider community the St Kilda library needs urgent updating - it is literally falling down! I do not support any further funding of Linden Art Gallery- this is run as an exclusive art space, it has very low local patronage, it doesn't connect with the community and all financial support urgently should shift to the St Kilda library. The library is in a unique position to support, educate, raise awareness and provide a safe and inclusive space. Why doesn't the Council believe and immediate get joint State Govt funding to restore and re-generate this wonderful, historic and connected resource! please wake up Council</p>
<p>Measures to address cycle safety within the municipality. With the increase of exercise as a result of lockdowns, it is imperative that council respond by making existing paths safer and linking new paths to facilitate commuting in a Covid-Safe world.</p>
<p>Where is the funding for improved bicycle infrastructure? COVID has shown the massive demand for safe cycling infrastructure and you have done nothing to facilitate uptake of cycling. You are falling well behind your peers in City of Melbourne and City of Yarra on this front</p>
<p>A steep increase in the maintenance, safety and beauty of parkland from St Kilda Junction to Albert Park Lake and surrounds has been supported by the Council over the last 10 years. More people now use the areas of open parkland that links Fitzroy Street St Kilda to the Lake area. This important link was nearly broken a few years ago by proposals that prioritised commercial enterprises over open spaces. The Council listened to the developers and the people who used the parkland. The open sky remains and now 1000's of people are using these spaces, more so now during the Coronavirus Pandemic.</p>
<p>If we go into lockdown I would like to see support provided for people who don't want to take a Covid test because it will impact on their earnings for a day or two. We have to recognise that many families live day to day. The more we can do to support our most vulnerable the better.</p>

Appendix D: Focus group questions

Principles and prioritisation

Questions for focus group participants:

- What are your thoughts on how we prioritised / developed the draft budget?
- Do you support this approach? Why/Why not?
- In considering the principles, is there anything you think we've missed?

Views on the Economic and Social Recovery Program

Questions for focus group participants:

- What are your initial thoughts on the Economic and Social Recovery Program?
- Are there any that you would particularly support / not support?
- Is there anything that we've missed and should be included as part of this program?

Views on the proposed service level reductions

Questions for focus group participants:

- Are there any proposed service level reductions you support? Why?
- Are there any proposed service level reductions you don't support? Why?

Views on the proposed service level increase

Questions for focus group participants:

- What are your thoughts on this proposed service level increase?

Views on the proposed service level increase

Questions for focus group participants:

- What are your thoughts on proposed investment for 2020/21 in your neighbourhood?
- What do you support / not support? Why?
- Is there anything you think is missing / should be added?

Appendix E: Investment for 2020/21 by neighbourhood

Elwood / Ripponlea

- Bridge renewals
 - Pedestrian bridge at MO Moran Reserve over Elwood Canal
- Building renewals
 - Poets Grove Childcare Centre (fence upgrade)
 - Lady Forster Kindergarten (fence upgrade)
- Elster Creek catchment partnership advocacy
- Elwood Foreshore facilities strategy
- Footpath renewals
 - Lyndon Street
- Kerb and channel renewals
 - Mitford Street
- Laneway renewals and upgrades
 - R1687 (Meredith Street)
- Litter Bin Renewals
 - Elwood Foreshore
- Parks and playgrounds renewals and upgrades
 - Elwood Neighbourhood Community Centre Reserve - design
- Public space lighting renewal and upgrade
 - Elwood Foreshore
- Sports field lighting expansion
 - Elwood Park – improvement to lighting at Esplanade and Head Street ovals
- Sports playing field renewal
 - Wattie Watson Oval at Elwood Park
- Stormwater management
 - Elm Grove Laneway (stage 2 works)
 - Goldsmith Street (pipe replacement)

Albert Park / Middle Park

- Blackspot safety improvements
 - Montague Street / Bridport Street
- Building renewals
 - Carter Street Childcare Centre (fence upgrade)
 - Albert Park Preschool / Maternal Child Health Centre (fence upgrade)
- Footpath renewals
 - Danks Street
- Road renewals
 - Kerferd Road (road resurfacing)
- Gasworks Arts Park reinstatement - design
- Kerb and channel renewals
 - McGregor Street
- Public space lighting renewal and upgrade
 - Beaconsfield Parade between Port Melbourne Life Saving Club and South Melbourne Life Saving Club
- Public toilet implementation plan
 - Sandbar
- Stormwater management
 - Beaconsfield Parade (drainage upgrade)
 - Kerferd Road (access pit construction)

Balaclava / St Kilda East

- Bubup Nairn Child Care Centre cladding rectification works – complete construction
- Laneway renewals and upgrades
 - R1475 and R1481 (Gourlay Street)
- Local area traffic management infrastructure
 - Alma Road / Alexandra Street – design
- Parks and playgrounds renewals and upgrades
 - Alma Park East renewal
 - Te Arai Reserve renewal
- Road renewals
 - Albion Street

St Kilda / St Kilda West

- Astor Theatre garden – beautification works
- Bike network delivery
 - Inkerman Street – concept design and consultation
- Blackspot safety improvements
 - Fitzroy Street / Loch Street safety treatments
 - Fitzroy Street / Park Street traffic signalisation design

South Melbourne / Montague

- Building renewals and upgrades
 - Coventry Street Children's Centre (fence upgrade)
- Footpath renewals
 - City Road
- Kerb and channel renewals
 - Tribe Street
- Lillian Cannam Kindergarten (fence upgrade)
- Park and playground renewal and upgrades:
 - Sol Green Reserve – design
- South Melbourne Market building compliance works
- Road renewals
 - Dorcas Street (heavy patching)
- South Melbourne Market building compliance works
- South Melbourne Market building renewals
 - Renewal of stall shells
 - Reconfiguration of fire sprinklers
 - Lighting enhancements
- South Melbourne Market stall changeover refit works
- South Melbourne Market public safety improvements - commence construction
- South Melbourne Town Hall renewal and upgrade

Port Melbourne / Sandridge / Wirraway

- Bike network delivery:
 - Garden City bike path, from Swallow Street to The Boulevard, – complete construction
- Litter bin renewals
 - Bay Street
- Local area traffic management infrastructure:
 - Rouse Street / Esplanade East – design
- Parks and playground renewals and upgrade
 - TT Buckingham Reserve – construction
- Public Toilet Plan implementation:
 - Waterfront Place
- RF Julier Reserve pavilion replacement - design
- Road renewals:
 - Centre Avenue (road resurfacing)
 - Pickles Street (heavy patching)
- JL Murphy Reserve synthetic field – design
- JL Murphy Reserve play space upgrade – complete construction
- Sports playing field renewal
- Building renewal and upgrades
 - Bubup Womindjeka Family Centre (fence upgrade)
 - Clark Street Childcare Centre (fence upgrade)
 - Ada Mary A'Beckett Childcare Centre (fence upgrade)
- Footpath renewals
 - Rouse Street
 - Graham Street
- Graham Street skate park upgrade – complete construction
- Sport and recreation infrastructure
 - TT Buckingham Reserve – install a new small basketball court
- Kerb and channel renewals
 - Beach Street
 - Griffin Crescent
- Lagoon Reserve Sports Field Upgrade and Pavilion Replacement – designs
- North Port Oval upgrade - design for fencing, lighting and public access
- JL Murphy Reserve Soccer Pitch 2 – design