

Councillor Davis - QoN - Special Council Meeting 14 April 2025

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Henry Davis

Public

Contact Officer:
Michael Sedgman, Chief Executive Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Henry Davis will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Noting the Special Meeting of Council held on 14 April 2025, could the Administration;

1. Clarify the basis on which advice was provided to Cr Martin that he could remain in the chamber after declaring a material conflict of interest, given that Section 75C(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act* states that a member must leave the room in such cases?
2. Was the Lord Mayor aware of the advice prior to attendance at the meeting?
3. Was there any written Ministerial approval under Section 75C(3) that allowed Cr Martin to stay and participate in the meeting? If not, what provision was relied on to support that advice?
4. In this instance, was any legal advice sought in advance regarding how to manage potential quorum issues when a member has a material conflict of interest?
5. Is it the Chief Executive Officer's understanding that concerns about maintaining quorum can affect the obligation to leave the meeting room under Section 75C, or is that obligation absolute unless Ministerial approval is obtained?
6. What would have been the consequences for the council had the council accepted the advice that there was an exemption which would allow Cr Martin to ignore the material conflict of interest?
7. Given that the Act appears to be quite clear on this matter, what this a misstep, and are there plans to clarify or correct the process going forward?'

REPLY

1. The Minutes of the Special Council Meeting of 14 April 2025 are provided [here](#).
2. In response to part 1 of the Question on Notice:
 - 2.1 The motion initially before the meeting, prior to variation, was that a councillor be appointed to the position of Deputy Lord Mayor. The advice initially provided to the meeting was premised on there being a general conflict of interest in the making of such an appointment. Under Section 75B(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA), a person who declares a general conflict of interest and who determines that they will leave the meeting as a result, is nevertheless permitted to remain if their leaving of the meeting would cause the meeting to be inquorate.
 - 2.2 Noting that an additional allowance is payable for the position of Deputy Lord Mayor, clarification obtained from Council Administration confirmed that a decision to appoint a particular person to the office of Deputy Lord Mayor would also give rise to a material conflict of interest. No exemption equivalent to that found in Section 75B(2) applies to material conflicts of interest.

2.3 While nominations for the position of Deputy Lord Mayor were sought during debate on the motion that a councillor be appointed, at no time was there a motion before the meeting to appoint a particular councillor to the position of Deputy Lord Mayor. The obligation to declare a material conflict of interest only arises at the point in time when a motion to appoint a particular councillor is discussed.

- 3 In response to part 2 of the Question on Notice, the Lord Mayor was not aware of the advice prior to her attendance at the meeting.
- 4 In response to part 3 of the Question on Notice, no Ministerial approval was required or sought in relation to Council Member attendance in the Chamber in regard to the item of business to appoint a Deputy Lord Mayor.
- 5 In response to part 4 of the Question on Notice, legal advice was not required or sought in regard to managing potential quorum issues when a Council Member has a material conflict of interest.
- 6 In response to part 5 of the Question on Notice, refer to parts 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 in this reply.
- 7 In response to part 6 of the Question on Notice, at no time was there a motion before the meeting to appoint a particular councillor to the position of Deputy Lord Mayor.
- 8 In response to part 7 of the Question on Notice, the method of appointment for the Deputy Lord Mayor is set out in the Council's Code of Practice for Council Meeting Procedures.

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Terms, Appointments and Remuneration of Councillors

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Can the Chief Executive Officer provide a list detailing the following information for each individual current and past Councillors from start of the current term.

1. The periods (dates) during which each Councillor has served as:
 - a. Chair of a Council Committee
 - b. Deputy Chair of a Council Committee
 - c. Detail additional remuneration, allowances, or meeting fees received as part of these roles
2. The current and past appointments of each Councillor to Council subsidiaries, including:
 - a. The name of the subsidiary
 - b. The position held (e.g. Board Member, Chair)
 - c. The dates of appointment
 - d. Any remuneration, allowances, or meeting fees received as part of these roles detailed individually
3. The remuneration, allowances, or other financial benefits received by any Councillor for serving as Deputy Lord Mayor, including the period(s) served.'

REPLY

1. In accordance with part 3 of the Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal (the Determination) ([Link 1](#)) and pursuant to both section 76 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) (the Act) and section 24 of the *City of Adelaide Act 1998*, City of Adelaide Council Members are entitled to receive an annual allowance to assist with performing the functions and duties of the role.
2. As provided in section 76(9) of the Act, and within the Council Members Allowances and Benefits Policy (the Policy) ([Link 2](#)), Council Member allowances are subject to adjustment on the first, second and third anniversaries of the relevant periodic elections to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
3. In accordance with the Determination and subsequent CPI adjustments, the base annual allowances for Council Members from the commencement of the 2022-2026 Council Term to present are detailed as follows:
 - 3.1. 17 January 2023 to 11 November 2023: \$28,692 per annum
 - 3.2. 12 November 2023 to 11 November 2024: \$30,385 per annum

3.3. 12 November 2024 to present: \$31,357 per annum

Committees

4. Council's Core Committees were established by Council, pursuant to section 41 of *the Local Government Act 1999* (SA) (the Act) at its meeting of 17 January 2023.
5. Part 5 the Determination dictates that Presiding Members of Committees established by the Council are to be remunerated at 1.25 times the annual allowance for Council Members, for the period appointed as Chair.
6. A Deputy Chair of a Committee is only entitled to receive additional remuneration should they be acting as Chair for a minimum period of one month.
7. The remuneration rate for Presiding Members of Committees and subsequent CPI adjustments, in addition to the base annual allowances from the commencement of the 2022-2026 Council Term to present are detailed as follows:
 - 7.1. 17 January 2023 to 11 November 2023: \$597.75 per month (\$35,865 per annum)
 - 7.2. 12 November 2023 to 11 November 2024: \$633.02 per month (\$37,981.25 per annum)
 - 7.3. 12 November 2024 to present: \$653.27 per month (\$39,196.25 per annum)
8. The following Councillors (current and former*) have served as either a Chair of a Council Committee or a Deputy Chair of a Council Committee:

City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee

Council Member	Position	Terms of Appointment
Councillor Noon*	Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
		1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
		1 April 2025 – 11 April 2025
Councillor Martin	Deputy Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
		1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
		1 April 2025 – end of 2022-2026 Council Term

City Community Services and Culture Committee

Council Member	Position	Terms of Appointment
Councillor Giles	Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
		1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
	Deputy Chair	1 April 2025 – end of 2022-2026 Council Term
Councillor Davis	Deputy Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
Councillor Snape	Deputy Chair	1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
	Chair	1 April 2025 – end of 2022-2026 Council Term

City Finance and Governance Committee

Council Member	Position	Terms of Appointment
Councillor Siebentritt	Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
		1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
		1 April 2025 – end of 2022-2026 Council Term
Councillor Li*	Deputy Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
Councillor Elliott*	Deputy Chair	1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
		1 April 2025 – 11 April 2025

Infrastructure and Public Works Committee

Council Member	Position	Terms of Appointment
Councillor Couros	Chair	17 January 2023 – 30 January 2024
Councillor Elliott*	Deputy Chair	17 January 2023 – 31 March 2024
	Chair	1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025

		1 April 2025 – 11 April 2025
Councillor Noon*	Deputy Chair	1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
		1 April 2025 – 11 April 2025

Subsidiaries

9. Remuneration for subsidiary boards is structured based on the respective boards' Terms of Reference, Charter or equivalent document and are provided for within their annual budgets which are adopted by Council.
10. The following Councillors (current and former*) have served as either a Chair or Board Member of a Council Subsidiary and the details of any additional remuneration allowances, or meeting fees received as part of these roles are detailed individually below:

Council Member	Subsidiary	Position	Terms of Appointment	Remuneration		
				FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25
The Lord Mayor, Dr Jane Lomax Smith	Adelaide Economic Development Agency	Board Member (<i>ex-officio</i>)	2022-2026 Council term	\$3,800.00	\$8,550.00	\$6,650.00 (YTD)*
	Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority	Chair (<i>ex-officio</i>)	2022-2026 Council term	\$993.41	\$4,548.72	\$3,283.70 (YTD)*
Councillor Snape	Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority	Board Member	2022-2026 Council term	\$993.41	\$5,616.72	\$2,338.22 (YTD)
Councillor Davis	Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority	Board Member (Proxy)	2022-2026 Council term	Nil	\$342.06	Nil
Councillor Noon*	Adelaide Central Market Authority Board	Board Member	13 December 2022 – 14 December 2024	\$7,725.00	\$15,450.00	\$6,866.64 (YTD)
Councillor Martin	Adelaide Central Market Authority Board	Board Member	14 December 2024 – end of 2022-2026 Council Term			\$5,149.98 (YTD)

**These amounts are subject to an agreement to be paid annually and have not been disbursed.*

Deputy Lord Mayor

11. The position of Deputy Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide is remunerated at 1.5 times the allowance payable to Council Members, in accordance with part 5 of the Determination.
12. The Policy provides that the Deputy Lord Mayor will receive assistance which is reasonably necessary to enable the Deputy Lord Mayor to carry out the role, in support of the Lord Mayors' duties. This primarily consists of administrative support.
13. The total annual allowances and subsequent CPI adjustments for Council Members appointed to the position of Deputy Lord Mayor from the commencement of the 2022-2026 Council Term to present are detailed as follows:
 - 13.1. 29 November 2022 to 11 November 2023: \$43,038 per annum
 - 13.2. 12 November 2023 to 11 November 2024: \$45,577.50 per annum
 - 13.3. 12 November 2024 to present: \$47,035.50 per annum
14. The following Councillors (current and former*) have served as the Deputy Lord Mayor:

Council Member	Term of Appointment
Councillor Martin	29 November 2022 – 31 December 2023
Councillor Snape	1 January 2024 - 31 December 2024
Councillor Elliott*	1 January 2025 – 11 April 2025

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Tree Martins - first identified as significant problem

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Tom McCready, Director City
Infrastructure

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Can Administration advise of:

1. Provide an approximate date where the birds were first identified as a significant issue on Leigh Street, and what actions were taken in response to them at that time?
 2. How many Motions with or without notice, if any, have Administration received in relation to the birds and trees on Leigh Street? Be it this Council or previous Council.
 3. Did former Councillor Houssam Abiad, who concluded his term in 2020, submit any Questions or Motions, with or without notice, relating to the bird issue on Leigh Street?
 4. Were current elected members advised of the decision to install nets on trees along Leigh Street? If so, when did this take place?
 5. Were any formal objections or concerns raised by elected members in relation to the installation of the nets, and if so, can Administration provide details of those objections?
-

REPLY

1. In response to question 1. the following advice is provided:
 - 1.1 The earliest documented evidence of Tree Martins in Leigh Street (reported on the Green Adelaide website [Green Adelaide tree-martins leigh-street](#)) dates back to 2015. The issue of cleanliness, smell and the impacts of Tree Martins roosting escalated in May 2020 with property owners and businesses asking for increased cleaning due to bird faeces. As a result, the Administration intensified cleaning of the street.
 - 1.2 In March 2021 a property owner (major) contacted the Administration again asking for urgent action pertaining to the roosting of the birds. The following items were considered as a potential solution, with continued dialogue with Leigh Street stakeholders, Department for Environment and Water (DEW) and Green Adelaide.
 - 1.3 Measures taken to improve outcomes:
 - 1.3.1 Consulted with Green Adelaide and the DEW (about the habits of the Tree Martins) on several occasions to inform decision making.
 - 1.3.2 Investigated bird control for commercial buildings, including sonar, ultra sonar and laser technology.

- 1.3.3 Additional tree pruning to minimise overhang above dining areas, undertaken by Councils Senior Arborist and an independent Arborist as a result of inspections of all trees on the street.
 - 1.3.4 Increased, detailed scrubbing and pressure washing of the pavement and urban elements.
 - 1.3.5 Additional cleaning during migration season from daily to three daily visits in total to remove bird droppings.
 - 1.3.6 Development Assessment approval of canopy for Shobosho bar and kitchen.
 - 1.3.7 Investigated the appropriateness of netting trees.
 - 1.3.8 Investigated alternate tree species.
 - 1.3.9 Investigated removal of the trees.
 - 1.3.10 Regular monitoring and spot cleaning in addition to the three daily visits.
 - 1.3.11 Informed Green Adelaide and the Department for Environment & Water of the proposal to install netting on the trees, noting that it was still possible that Tree Martins would migrate to another location within the city.
 - 1.3.12 Engaged a specialist contractor to install bird netting on all trees on the street which occurred in August 2024.
2. A search within Council meeting documents and decisions databases has only found two items relating to the subject birds and trees on Leigh Street.
 - 2.1. Cllr Abrahamzadeh – Question on Notice – Seasonal Bird Nesting – 26 March 2024
 - 2.2. Cllr Davis – Motion without Notice - Tree Martin Management and Support Measures – 22 April 2025.
 3. There is no record of former Councillor Abiad raising either a Question or Motion, with or without notice, relating to the bird issue on Leigh Street.
 4. Council Members were provided with updates on the migrating Tree Martins within Leigh Street
 - 4.1. [E-News- Tree-Martins in Leigh-Street February 2024](#) - general update,
 - 4.2. [E-News- Leigh-Street Update May 2024](#) - update on meeting with Property Owner - Leigh Street and next steps.
 - 4.3. [E-News - Leigh-Street Tree Netting August 2024](#)- information provided highlighted the installation of tree nets, ongoing dialogue with traders and proposed dates of installation.
 5. In response to question 5. the following advice is provided:
 - 5.1. There is no record of any objections received from Council Members relating to the installation of the nets in Leigh Street.
 - 5.2. The only contact from Council Members was in the form of email and telephone enquiries seeking to understand how the Administration would seek to resolve the issue and support Leigh Street property and business owners relating to the impacts of Tree Martin roosting within the street.

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Abrahamzadeh - QoN - City Benchmarking Study

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh

Public

Contact Officer:
Ilia Houridis, Director City Shaping

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh will ask the following Question on Notice:

Has the latest city benchmarking study commissioned by the Committee for Adelaide and conducted by urban consultancy firm, The Business of Cities, in which the City of Adelaide and the Adelaide Economic Development Agency (AEDA) are partners in commissioning, been tabled with the State Government and any of its Ministers or Committees?

REPLY

- 1. The Benchmarking Adelaide 2025 Report was published on the Committee for Adelaide website at: [2025 Benchmarking Adelaide Report - Committee For Adelaide](#) and launched at an event at Sky City on 30 April 2025.
 - 1.1. To mark the release of the report, Council CEO, Michael Sedgman, featured on a panel at the launch event, alongside representatives of other partner organisations, and Jordon Tomopoulos (Advisor, Economic Research, AEDA) will feature on a podcast series curated by the Committee for Adelaide.
 - 1.2. An opportunity to showcase the report at a future AEDA Data 4 Lunch event is also being investigated by Administration.
- 2. Administration has been advised that Sam Dighton (CEO, Committee for Adelaide) and Dr Tim Moonen (Managing Director, The Business of Cities) hosted a Parliamentary Briefing on the report on 30 April 2025.
 - 2.1. The briefing was open to all Members of Parliament (MPs) and parliamentary staff. Administration has been advised that the briefing was attended by nine MPs from across the Government and Opposition parties, The Greens SA, and an Independent MP, in addition to staff from several other MP's offices.
 - 2.2. Administration has also been advised that copies of the report have been received by both the South Australian Premier and Treasurer.

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

Councillor Martin - QoN - Revenue Percentages

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Phillip Martin

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Phillip Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Is the Administration able to provide advice on;

- 1. The percentage of revenue, including rates, spent on the maintenance of assets, facilities, services and grants, assistance programs and initiatives (such as AEDA) that support business in the City of Adelaide?
- 2. The percentage of revenue, including rates, spent on the maintenance of assets, facilities, services and grants, assistance programs and initiatives that support residents in the City of Adelaide?
- 3. The percentage of revenue, including rates, spent on the maintenance of assets, facilities, services and grants, assistance programs and initiatives (such as AEDA) that support business in North Adelaide in comparison with the broader City of Adelaide area?
- 4. The percentage of revenue, including rates, spent on the maintenance of assets, facilities, services and grants, assistance programs and initiatives that support residents in North Adelaide in comparison with the broader City of Adelaide area?'

REPLY

- 1. It is difficult to ascertain the precise amount of expenditure that specifically supports business on each of the categories requested given many of the services we provide crossover and are likely to contribute in some way to supporting businesses (e.g. providing footpaths and roads to allow residents access to businesses). However, based on incorporating a range of business specific services (and the assumptions for each of these), the percentage of revenue expended on support of businesses is approximately 69% (or 111% of rates revenue).
- 2. Assuming the same logic as above, the percentage of rates revenue expended in support of residents is approximately 39% of total revenue (or 62% of rates revenue).
- 3. Assuming the same logic as above, the percentage of rates revenue expended in support of businesses is approximately 10% of total revenue (or 16% of rates revenue) in North Adelaide.
- 4. Assuming the same logic as above, the percentage of rates revenue expended in support of residents is approximately 6% of total revenue (or 10% of rates revenue) in North Adelaide.

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

Councillor Davis - QoN - Minimum Rate

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Henry Davis

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Henry Davis will ask the following Question on Notice:

1. How many ratepayers will be directly impacted by the \$600 minimum rate, and where are they geographically concentrated within the city?
2. Has Administration provided a precise count or just an estimate?
3. Of these, how many are residents versus commercial or mixed-use properties?
4. Are there clusters of impacted properties in certain buildings or suburbs that suggest this measure will disproportionately target specific parts of the city (e.g., strata offices in the CBD, student housing, or small shopfronts)?
5. What is the breakdown by property value—i.e., how many impacted properties are currently paying less than \$200, \$300, or \$400 in general rates?
6. What is the breakdown of the property values who will be impacted?
7. What percentage of affected ratepayers are residential versus commercial, and how many are pensioners, sole traders, or low-income households?
8. How many are likely to be small business owners, sole traders, or startup tenants leasing low-value properties?
9. How many are residential investors with marginal rental yields who may pass on this increase to tenants?
10. How many are older residents or fixed-income households—such as pensioners—whose properties fall into low-value categories?
11. Has the Council conducted any equity assessment to identify whether these increases are regressive or potentially discriminatory?
12. Could this policy force the sale or abandonment of properties that are no longer financially viable under the new rate structure?
13. How many recipients of concessions or hardship relief will be impacted, and are they exempt?
14. Has any modelling been done to determine the income brackets of those most affected by this change?
15. How many ratepayers will experience rate increases of more than 100%, 200%, or even 300% as a result of this minimum rate?
16. Were any of the affected ratepayers consulted before the motion was introduced?
17. Why was this motion not included in the formal agenda or supported by a public report outlining its financial and community impact?

18. Who was informed that Cr Siebentritt was going to introduce this motion? Was Cr Snape, Cr Martin, Cr Giles and the Lord Mayor aware of the motion before it was presented to council? When were they informed?
 19. Was any legal, economic, or equity impact analysis provided to Council Members before the vote?
 20. What is the expected total revenue increase from implementing the \$600 minimum rate?
 21. Can Administration provide a breakdown showing the revenue gained by property type, including residential, commercial, and mixed-use properties?
 22. Does the Administration consider it prudent to consider reversing or suspending this policy pending proper modelling and a separate public consultation?
 23. Do councils often consult on major policy changes at the same time as the budget or is a separate process usually carried out?
 24. What was the rationale for choosing \$600 specifically—why not \$400, \$800, or a different figure?
 25. Has any consideration been given to phasing in the minimum rate or exempting certain categories of ratepayers?
 26. What policy objective is this measure meant to achieve—and is there any evidence it will succeed?
 27. Do ratepayers who would be impacted use council resources to the same extent as other ratepayers? What evidence is there for or against this proposition?
 28. Which specific councils were relied upon to justify the \$600 minimum rate, and what is the makeup of their ratepayer base?
 29. Do any of those councils have the same concentration of small commercial offices, strata-titled shops, or low-value inner-city properties as Adelaide?
 30. How many properties in those councils pay rates below \$600—and how does that compare to the City of Adelaide?
 31. What would be the lowest rate paid by the councils if not for a minimum rate?
 32. Has Administration conducted any benchmarking to confirm whether the impact in Adelaide would be more severe due to the unique makeup of our rate base?
 33. Have other councils imposed a similar minimum without consulting ratepayers—especially when small businesses or sole traders were involved?
 34. Is there evidence that minimum rates in other councils have improved revenue outcomes without causing unintended economic harm?
 35. Were the demographics, land use patterns, and average property values of those councils considered before adopting a policy that may not fit our local context?
 36. What support mechanisms or hardship policies are being proposed alongside this minimum rate, and how do they compare to those in other councils?
 37. If other councils were to raise their minimums even higher, would Adelaide follow suit without independent analysis?
 38. Is Council prepared for the political fallout of ratepayers discovering a sudden and significant rate increase without warning?
 39. How will Council communicate this change to those impacted before they receive their rates notice?
 40. Will Council acknowledge that this change could be perceived as a stealth rate rise by those affected?
-

REPLY

1. In reply to question 1, 1,101 ratepayers of which 54 are in North Adelaide and 1,047 are in Adelaide. In the time available, it is not possible to determine concentrations.
2. In reply to question 2, a precise count based on rates paid in 2024/25. Subject to valuations and rate in dollar (RID) setting for 2025/26, this number may change.
3. In response to question 3, 24 are classified “Residential” and 1,041 are “commercial”.

4. In response to question 4, in the time available, it is not possible to determine concentrations.
5. In response to question 5, the breakdown as per the tables below:

Residential valuations

\$ Valuation Range	No. of Properties	\$ Value Range Top Line	Average 24/25 General Rate
1001 - 2000	18	2000	\$223
2001 - 3000	1	3000	\$335
3001 - 4000	4	4000	\$447
4001 - 5000	1	5000	\$558

Non-Residential valuations

\$ Valuation Range	No. of Properties	\$ Value Range Top Line	Average 24/25 General Rate
1 - 1000	43	1000	\$137
1001 - 2000	437	2000	\$274
2001 - 3000	255	3000	\$410
3001 - 4000	278	4000	\$547

6. In response to question 6, this information is contained in the tables immediately above.
7. In response to question 7, we rate on assessments based on occupation. The information stored on ratepayers does not identify if they are pensioners (unless they apply for a rebate), sole traders or low-income households. Further, the administration does not have access to ratepayer income records.
8. In response to question 8, we rate on assessments based on occupation. The information stored on ratepayers does not identify if they are pensioners (unless they apply for a rebate), sole traders or low-income households. Further, the administration does not have access to ratepayer income records.
9. In response to question 9, the administration does not have access to such information on ratepayers.
10. In response to question 10, the administration does not have access to income information for ratepayers.
11. In response to question 11, the intent behind the minimum rate introduction is to provide broader equity, where every ratepayer / rateable property contributes a reasonable amount towards basic council services and the renewal and maintenance of infrastructure, as do 50% of all councils in SA. The other 50% use a fixed charge component to achieve similar outcomes. Whether the increases are regressive or discriminatory would be purely speculative.
12. In response to question 12, Council can only force the sale of a property where rates overdue payments fall 3 years in arrears.
13. In response to question 13, no rateable property is exempt unless it falls under the guidelines that determines exemptions. As with any ratepayer, hardship provisions are available to all ratepayers should they be necessary. We do not store information on ratepayers to determine if they are pensioners unless they apply for the rebate.
14. In response to question 14, the administration does not have access to income information on ratepayers.

15. In response to question 15, the breakdown is per the tables below:

Properties	% increase		Properties	\$ increase
360	0%-50%		59	\$0-\$50
229	50%-100%		71	\$50-\$100
379	100%-200%		190	\$100-\$150
89	200%-300%		39	\$150-\$200
20	300%-400%		229	\$200-\$300
5	400%-500%		379	\$300-\$400
19	500% +		114	\$400-\$500
			20	\$500 +
1,101			1,101	

16. In response to question 16, the Business Plan & Budget consultation process provides all ratepayers the opportunity to provide feedback. Rating Policy consultation will provide impacted ratepayers an opportunity to provide feedback.
17. In response to question 17, as reflected in the minutes of the Special Meeting of Council held on 29 April 2025, an alternate motion was moved.
18. In response to question 18, the administration was forewarned by Cr Siebentritt that he intended to move an alternate motion.
19. In response to question 19, legal advice was sought on the introduction of the minimum rate prior to the workshop where it was discussed, to ensure that its introduction is allowable and to inform consultation requirements under the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* (the Act). Council Members were presented with information on two options - \$300 and \$600 as part of the Special City Finance and Governance Committee Workshop on 22 April 2025.
20. In response to question 20, the introduction of a \$600 Minimum Rate will impact approximately 1,101 rateable properties and generate approximately \$0.287m additional rates revenue based on the 2024/25 General Rates.
21. In response to question 21, the below table provides a breakdown of each category of assessments against the Local Government Description (noting mixed-use is not a category) with the Total expected rates revenue:

	Current Rates		LOCAL GOVERNMENT DESCRIPTION	
			ADDITIONAL REVENUE	TOTAL (\$'000s)
	Min	Max	(NUMBER OF IMPACTED ASSESSMENTS)	
Consulting Room	\$192	\$575	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Commercial – Office: \$408 (1) 4 Commercial – Other: \$91 (2) 	\$499 (3)
House	\$536	\$536	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Residential: \$64 (1) 	\$64 (1)
Laboratory	\$561	\$561	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$39 (1) 	\$39 (1)
Land Incidental	\$179	\$469	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 Vacant: \$552 (2) 	\$552 (2)
Naming Rights	\$246	\$534	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$420 (2) 	\$420 (2)
Office	\$96	\$588	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Residential: \$351 (2) 	\$39.192 (233)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Commercial – Office: \$38,460 (230) 4 Commercial – Other: \$395 (1) 	
Parking Commercial	\$178	\$547	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$147,410 (468) 	\$147,410 (468)
Parking Lot Commercial	\$192	\$588	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$9,476 (27) 	\$9,476 (27)
Radio Station	\$137	\$137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$463 (1) 	\$463 (1)
Residential Carpark Multi Storey	\$145	\$212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Residential: \$6,606 (16) 	\$6,606 (16)
Residential Flat	\$201	\$435	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Residential: \$907 (3) 	\$907 (3)
Residential Garage	\$391	\$391	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Residential: \$209 (1) 	\$209 (1)
Road Public Declared	\$171	\$171	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 Other: \$429 (1) 	\$429 (1)
Shop	\$260	\$588	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Commercial – Shop: \$985 (7) 3 Commercial – Office: \$107 (1) 4 Commercial – Other: \$283 (2) 	\$1,375 (10)
Showcase	\$41	\$123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Commercial – Shop: \$1,554 (3) 	\$1,554 (3)
Sign	\$123	\$465	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$19,251 (135) 	\$19,251 (135)
Single Carpark Multi Storey Building	\$223	\$223	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Residential: \$377 (1) 	\$377 (1)
Staff Facilities	\$383	\$383	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 Other: \$217 (1) 	\$217 (1)
Storage Area	\$41	\$588	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Commercial – Office: \$1,427 (5) 4 Commercial – Other: \$50,266 (153) 	\$51,693 (158)
Theatre	\$322	\$322	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$278 (1) 	\$278 (1)
Training Institution	\$534	\$561	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Commercial – Office: \$39 (1) 4 Commercial – Other: \$66 (1) 	\$105 (2)
Transmission Mast	\$164	\$506	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$1,373 (5) 	\$1,373 (5)
Warehouse	\$534	\$561	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Commercial – Other: \$105 (2) 	\$105 (2)
Workshop	\$233	\$588	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Commercial – Shop: \$25 (1) 3 Commercial – Office: \$352 (2) 5 Industrial – Light: \$3,995 (21) 	\$4,372 (24)

22. In response to question 22, this is a matter for Council.
23. In response to question 23, the Act requires Council to consult but does not mandate separate processes for policy and budget consultations. Introducing a minimum rate does not alter the rating structure; it simply sets a base amount payable. Legal advice supports consulting on this change alongside the Business Plan and Budget to streamline communication and avoid consultation fatigue.
24. In response to question 24, this is a matter for Council.
25. In response to question 25, this is a matter for Council.
26. In response to question 26, the introduction of a minimum rate supports a more equitable rating system where all rateable properties contribute a base level contribution to the cost of:
 - 26.1 Creating and maintaining the physical infrastructure that supports each property
 - 26.2 Administering council functions
 - 26.3 Delivering core council services.
27. The success of the minimum rate introduction is a matter for Council when considering future changes to the Rating Policy.
28. In response to question 27, all ratepayers have equal access to all council services.
29. In response to questions 28, 29, 30 and 31, Council Members were presented with information on options, as part of the Special City Finance and Governance Committee Workshop on 22 April 2025. Examples of minimum rates applied by other councils formed part of the presentation briefing. No council was relied upon to justify the \$600 minimum rate.
30. In response to question 32, Council Members were presented with information on options, as part of the Special City Finance and Governance Committee Workshop on 22 April 2025. Benchmarking information formed part of the presentation briefing. Whether any impact is more or less severe is speculative.
31. In response to question 33, all Councils in South Australia are required to consult on changes to a Rating Policy in accordance with the Act.
32. In response to question 34, Administration is not aware of any available evidence.
33. In response to question 35, refer to the answer given for question 28.
34. In response to question 36, similar to the answer given for question 13 above, hardship provisions are available to all ratepayers should they be necessary.
35. In response to question 37, this is a matter for Council.
36. In response to question 38, this is a matter for Council.
37. In response to question 39, as part of the consultation, an email is distributed to the rate payer database to advise them that the consultation is open and invites them to review and provide feedback.
38. Other consultation activities also include:
 - 41.1 Flyer drop advertising the consultation to all properties
 - 41.2 Social media campaign
 - 41.3 In-person drop in sessions at various locations.

39. In response to question 40, this is a matter for Council.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 10 hours.
--	--

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Percentage Increase and CPI comparison

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

‘Can the administration please advise:

- 1. What has been the percentage increase in council rates each year for the past three financial years, including the current business plan and budget out for consultation?
- 2. What is the cumulative percentage increase over the three years?
- 3. How does the council’s rate increase compare to the CPI over the same period?’

REPLY

1. The percentage increase in Council rates for the past three financial yeas is shown in the table below.

Period	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Rate revenue increase (excluding growth)	1.9%	7.5%	5.9%
Growth from new properties	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%
Total	3.0%	8.5%	6.9%

1. As per the above table, 15.3% (not compounded) rate revenue increase, excluding growth.
2. The comparison in Council's rate increase compared to CPI is shown in the table below.

Period	2022-23 June 2023	2023-24 June 2024	2024-25 March 2025	TOTAL
CPI*	6.9%	4.5%	2.2%	13.6%
Council's rate	1.9%	7.5%	5.9%	15.3%

*Source: ABS

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

Councillor Couros - QoN - Key Performance Indicators Measured by Administration

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

‘Can the administration please advise:

- 1. Given the ongoing rise in rates, what KPI’s (Key Performance Indicators) does the Council use to measure financial performance and value for ratepayers?
- 2. Have any independent audits or reviews (besides ESCOSA) highlighted areas of overspending, inefficiency or financial risk that have contributed to the need for higher rates?’

REPLY

- 1. Council has endorsed a suite of 7 financial indicators (KFIs) to measure its financial performance, to guide decision making on major projects, and to secure its continued financial sustainability. These are provided in the Long-Term Financial Plan and updates are provided to Council through the quarterly budget review process.
- 1. Administration is not aware of any independent audits or reviews being undertaken.

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Revenue Generating Projects

Tuesday, 13 May 2025
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Tom McCreedy, Director City
Infrastructure

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Can the administration please advise:

What new revenue-generating projects involving Council property have been initiated or delivered in the past 3 years (including the budget that is out for consultation) that have increased the revenue for the City of Adelaide within that time? If any, can the administration detail the revenue raised by each initiative?

Has the Council set targets for increasing the proportion of its revenue from property-related or commercial activities? If so, what are these targets?

Besides increasing the car park fee for UParks, what initiatives have been undertaken to leverage increased revenue that supports the business community within the City of Adelaide?'

REPLY

1. The following initiatives and transactions continue to derive revenue both current and into the future. These are built into Council budgets and Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP).
2. Property related activities include:
 - 2.1. 211 Pirie Street land sale
 - 2.2. Eighty-Eight O'Connell land sale
 - 2.3. Whitmore Square apartment and commercial sales
 - 2.4. Former bus station land sale on Franklin Street
 - 2.5. Other ancillary transactions.
3. Non-property related activities include:
 - 3.1. Hilton Hotel ground lease extension
 - 3.2. Central Market Arcade Redevelopment forecast lease revenue
 - 3.3. Digital advertising, include more than 100 locations for digital advertising at bus shelters
 - 3.4. Periodic sale of gambling licences
 - 3.5. Two new management agreements on existing open-lot car parks, deriving an ongoing revenue stream.

4. Given the commercial nature of the agreements and contracts, Council's commercial and property transactions were considered and remain 'In Confidence'. In some cases, the commitment timing and receipt of funds spans more than three years.
5. In determining property transactions, targets and returns are set using current valuations. This is supported by the Administration undertaking a full review of each transaction, incorporating Council's desired outcomes (guiding principles), due diligence reporting and market testing supported by independent commercial advice. This information is provided to Council with the support of a Prudential Issues Report (as required) which provides details and data that assist Council in its deliberations.
6. Commercial fees and charges are presented to Council for consideration as part of its annual Business Plan and Budget process. Fees and charges are tested against current market conditions and support City visitation.
7. The initiatives listed above have resulted in the following:
 - 7.1. Over \$90m in property proceeds
 - 7.2. Redevelopment outcomes that will generate \$1.3 billion of City investment providing over 800 apartments, over 2,000 jobs and approximately \$3.9 million in additional rates revenue per annum (in perpetuity)
 - 7.3. Commercial (non-property) related activities derive \$2.2m in new annual revenue.
8. Property and non-property related activities will see significant new housing outcomes with a large uplift in residents, new retail businesses, hotels, commercial office space reflecting an increased residents and city workers, who shop, dine and utilise services within the City of Adelaide.
9. In addition, revenues generated from property and non-property related activities are invested into supporting the extensive and ongoing capital works program undertaken by Council, including revitalising main streets and precincts, and supporting services and event activation to the benefit of businesses and the residential community.

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

- END OF REPORT -