

Councillor Abrahamzadeh - QoN - Tower Crane Air Rights

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Is there a regulatory or policy framework that governs air rights for installing and operating a tower crane on a construction site, taking into consideration the neighbouring property owners' rights, and if so, what (if any) is the role of councils?'

REPLY

1. The following information is general advice relating to the operation of cranes for construction purposes, focusing on Council's role. Administration advises anyone involved with, or concerned about, a specific use of cranes in the private realm to seek independent advice.
2. Installing, operating or dismantling a tower crane that impacts public land is regulated under the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) and the *Road Traffic Act 1961* (SA). In these circumstances, Council may issue permits and impose conditions relating to public safety, traffic management, site access, insurance, and indemnities. Council's regulatory authority in this context is confined to public land and the protection of the public realm.
3. Further information is available on Council's website via the 'City Works Guide #5: Cranes and Elevated Work Platforms' ([guidelines-city-works-cranes-elevated-work-platforms.pdf](#))
4. Council does not approve or regulate private 'air rights' over neighbouring land. The use of neighbouring private airspace is typically addressed through private agreements between a developer and affected landowner(s).
5. If a construction site seeks to operate a crane over privately owned land, it is their responsibility to ensure appropriate approvals and mechanisms are in place to conduct this safely. Any disputes between private parties about the operation of a crane on private land is a civil matter, typically governed by established common law property principles, which Council would not be involved in.

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 Martin - QoN - Aquatic Centre Car Park Size

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Phillip Martin

Public

Contact Officer:
Ilia Houridis, Director City Shaping

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Phillip Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Could the Administration advise;

1. What is, in square metres, the area of Park 2 occupied by the newly opened formal Aquatic Centre Car Park, including car park entries and exits
2. What was, in square metres, the area of Park 2 formerly occupied by the old formal Aquatic Centre Car Park, including car park entries and exits
3. What is, in square metres, the area of Park 2 occupied by the newly opened Aquatic Centre, including internal and external infrastructure such as grassed areas and access roads
4. What was, in square metres, the area of Park 2 occupied by the former Aquatic Centre, including internal and external infrastructure such as grassed areas and access roads
5. What is the total difference, in square metres, between the areas described in 1 and 3 and 2 and 4 above?'

REPLY

1. In response to questions 1 and 2:
 - 1.1. At the City Finance and Governance Committee meeting held on 20 June 2023, Council was advised by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) that the car park for the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre would be 12,500sqm in area, incorporating 375 car parks.
 - 1.2. At the same City Finance and Governance Committee meeting, Council was also advised by DIT that the old Adelaide Aquatic Centre car park was 8,600sqm, incorporating 266 car parks.
2. In response to questions 3 and 4:
 - 2.1. Council was also advised by DIT at the aforementioned City Finance and Governance Committee meeting that the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre would include 9,500sqm of building footprint and 7,305sqm of external areas (including forecourt, public realm etc.), equalling 16,805sqm of internal and external infrastructure.
 - 2.2. At the same City Finance and Governance Committee meeting, Council was advised by DIT that the former Adelaide Aquatic Centre included 11,360sqm of building footprint and 10,345sqm of external areas (including forecourt, public realm etc.), equalling 21,705sqm of internal and external infrastructure.
3. DIT has advised that since that information was provided to CoA in mid 2023, the design progressed and minor refinements were made to the new centre design prior to the State Commission Assessment Panel

submission, with the revised area calculations, as submitted to SCAP being Building area of 7,893 sqm, Car park area of 12,331sqm and external areas of 9,068sqm; total 29,292sqm.

- 4. Therefore in response to question 5, the total area taken up by the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre and car park was designed to be 29,305sqm, and the total area taken up by the former Adelaide Aquatic Centre and car park was 30,305sqm, which equated to a reduction of 1,000sqm in total site footprint.
- 5. Based on the revisions in the final design and delivery, the overall area of built form and car park was reduced slightly to 29,292sqm.
- 6. The final total difference, in square metres between the areas described in questions 1 and 3 and 2 and 4 above is 1,013sqm to be returned as Adelaide Park Lands.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 6.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Martin - QoN - Mainstreet/Precinct Strategic Plans

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
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:

'Could the Administration advise if it has provided financial assistance to any Mainstreet/Precinct Group to prepare or complete a Strategic Plan and, if so, what was the total of the funding?'

REPLY

1. The City of Adelaide's financial assistance since 2021/22 for Precinct Groups has been through the Mainstreets Development Program (MDP) currently administered by the Adelaide Economic Development Agency (AEDA). Seven precinct groups have each been funded \$25,000 annually, and their funding acquitted against precinct activities agreed in each precinct's annual funding agreement.
2. MDP funding is not specifically directed to the purpose of strategic planning, and there is no requirement for Precinct Groups to demonstrate strategic planning activity in their current funding application or acquittal. Apart from overarching guidelines, and agreed activities, AEDA does not dictate where recipient groups expend their grant funds.
3. Analysis of acquittals for all seven Precinct Groups for the years 2022/23 – 2024/25 indicate that two groups did undertake some strategic planning in at least one of those years, and one did some vision development (in 2022/23).
4. One further group budgeted \$500 in one year to undertake strategic planning (which was not expended).

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 Martin - QoN - AEDA Strategic Plan

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
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:

'Noting that the Adelaide Economic Development Authority has repeatedly requested an additional two million dollars a year to fund initiatives stemming originating from its Strategic Plan, could the Administration advise if these initiatives have been determined, what the individual amounts are, to whom they would be allocated and how would they be allocated and if criteria and a process has been determined for each allocation to measure their effectiveness?'

REPLY

1. As part of Council Member engagement regarding Adelaide Economic Development Agency (AEDA) funding, Administration developed four funding scenarios for the 2026/27 budget based on priorities identified by AEDA. These address targets of the Economic Development Strategy (EDS) and AEDA Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan) to varying degrees defined by funding envelope options.
2. Scenarios have been shared with Council Members and the Audit and Risk Committee in several workshops:
 - 2.1. City Finance and Governance Committee meeting [26 August 2025 – Item 5.1](#)
 - 2.2. City Finance and Governance Committee meeting [9 December 2025 – Item 5.1](#)
 - 2.3. Audit and Risk Committee meeting 6 February 2026 [[Item 6.4 – Attachment A](#)]
3. In each scenario initiatives to meet the objectives of the relevant EDS or Strategic Plan outcomes were identified and prioritised assuming a different base-funding envelope in each scenario.
4. High-level costs were estimated for the initiatives to inform the discussion and indicate and clarify AEDA priorities against relevant strategic objectives.
5. Once the 2026/27 base-level AEDA funding envelope has been confirmed, the estimates will be developed in more detail, and specific delivery outcomes established.
6. With the proposed AEDA funding model (whereby identified priorities are managed within a fixed base allocation), the AEDA Board would be tasked with prioritising any such initiatives or activities, ensuring alignment with the AEDA Strategic Plan, the EDS and the City of Adelaide (CoA) Strategic Plan 2024-2028.
7. Where funding through AEDA underpins any contestable process, appropriate evaluation criteria will be applied (not dissimilar to processes already in place for events and festivals funding, and CoA's events funding). Any new contestable processes which might be introduced by AEDA to deliver on strategic

Council – Agenda – Tuesday, 24 February 2026

priorities would necessarily be presented to Council who ultimately approve the subsidiary budget as part of the overall CoA Budget.

- 8. The AEDA Board has begun deliberation around development of the 2026/27 AEDA budget through feedback to Administration from its 11 February 2026 meeting. The continuing 2026/27 budget development process will be considered again at its 11 March 2026 meeting and further feedback provided as necessary.

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 Maher - QoN - Residential Parking Permit Zones adjacent developments

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Patrick Maher

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Patrick Maher will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Noting:

- the Question without Notice and Undertaking at Council on 14 October 2025 regarding residential parking permits,
- the E-News response on 20 October 2025 regarding residential parking permits, particularly the deficit ratio of residential parking spaces to residential permits issued in zones 14, 15, 18, and 23, and,
- the Central Market/Gouger Street and Hutt Street developments,

can Administration please advise:

1. What consideration has been given to the allocation and timing of residential parking permit spaces in the zones adjacent to these developments, and within the development projects?
2. Whether any changes are proposed to the residential parking spaces in these zones as a result of the developments?'

REPLY

1. The number of Residential Parking Permits and parking bays was shared with Members via ENews on 20 October 2025. ([E-News: CEO Undertaking – Residential Parking Permits](#))
2. There are no plans to alter the number or timing of Residential Permit bays (Central Market/Gouger Street and Hutt Street) as part of the Mainstreet upgrades or in response to known upcoming developments within the areas listed.
3. The Residential & Visitor Parking Permit Operating Guidelines do not seek to match every permit issued with a designated permit parking space.
4. In addition to enabling permit holders to park in designated Residential Permit Zones, permit holders can also overstay in timed parking spaces, subject to conditions.
5. It is anticipated that the Draft Kerbside and Parking Management Policy project (subject to Council consideration and approval through the 2026/27 Business Plan and Budget process) may provide direction on future Residential Parking Permit Zones and spaces.

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 Cabada - QoN - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Michael Sedgman, Chief Executive Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

1. Provide a list of all parklets in 2023/24 and 2024/25 where the parklet fee included any component described as “loss of carparking revenue” or otherwise calculated by reference to lost parking revenue.
2. For each parklet identified in Question 1, provide the inputs used to calculate the lost parking revenue component:
 - a. number of parking bays displaced
 - b. whether each displaced bay was paid metered or time-limited/free (e.g., 2P)
 - c. the paid operating hours assumed (if any)
 - d. the hourly rate assumed (if any)
 - e. the utilisation/occupancy rate assumed (if any)
 - f. the days per year assumed (if any)
3. Provide the formula/method used to calculate the lost parking revenue component.
4. Confirm whether a lost parking revenue component was ever applied to a parklet where the displaced bay(s) were not paid metered bays during paid operating hours (e.g., 2P time-limited/free, loading zone, permit zone).
5. If yes to Question 4, identify each such parklet and state the basis for applying a revenue loss component.
6. For the parklets in Question 1, detail Every invoice sent to the parklet owner and include the date and amount of the invoice.
 - a. Was any invoice ever amended, corrected or withdrawn in relation to the parklets in Question 1?
 - b. If yes to question 6a, what were those amendments and why were they amended.
7. Confirm whether the same lost-revenue assumptions (rate, utilisation, paid hours, days) were applied consistently across all parklets in Question 1.
8. If no to Question 7, specify what differed and why (by parklet).
9. Confirm whether actual parking revenue/occupancy data was used to set the utilisation rate or revenue assumptions for any parklet in Question 1.
10. If yes to Question 9, identify the data source and period relied upon.

11. Identify the position title(s) authorised to approve any amendment, waiver, or recalculation of the lost parking revenue component.

REPLY

1. Administration provides the following context:
 - 1.1 The previously endorsed parklet fee model which included a 'loss of paid parking revenue' component has been the subject of numerous Motions on Notice, including:
 - 1.1.1 28 May 2024 – That Council: Resolves the additional fee charged to parklet operators be discontinued commencing the next fiscal year, and this charge is reflected in the Fees & Charges section of the Budget for 2024/25 which will be a reduction to this line item of \$20k. – Motion Lost.
 - 1.1.2 10 December 2024 – That Council: Resolves to immediately remove the component of the Parklet fee structure that charges restaurants for the loss of car parking revenue, acknowledging the financial burden it places on businesses investing in the vibrancy of the city. – Motion Lost.
 - 1.1.3 24 June 2025 – That Council requests the Chief Executive Officer: To waive the liability for the Outdoor Dining & Loss of Carparking Revenue Fees applied to all Parklet holders for the 2023/24 due to inconsistent charges applied. – Motion Lost.
 - 1.2 Noting feedback on the complexity of previously endorsed fee models, parklet fees were reviewed as part of the draft 2025/26 Annual Business Plan & Budget.
 - 1.3 A City Finance and Governance Committee workshop on 15 April 2025 demonstrated the impact of a newly proposed parklet fee model on each individual parklet operator. [\(Public Pack\)Agenda Document for City Finance and Governance Committee, 15/04/2025 19:00.](#)
 - 1.4 The 2025/26 adopted parklet fee simplifies the approach to a single rate of \$165 per square metre per annum and no longer considers the loss of paid parking revenue. The April 2025 Council Report noted the revised parklet fee was not intended to be applied retrospectively.

2 In response to Question 1:

- 2.1 Council's endorsed parklet fee model in 2023/24 and 2024/25 included a component that all parklets impacting paid parking bays were charged 50% of the loss of paid parking revenue for the bays impacted.
- 2.2 Those Parklets located in paid parking bays are listed below.

Parklet in Paid Parking Bays	Parklet Size (m ²)	Number of Parking Bays Impacted
1	26	2
2	25	1
3	24	3
4	12	1
5	6.7	1
6	30	3

3 In response to Questions 2 & 3:

- 3.1 Paid parking bays are located in the highest demand areas of the city. Parklets located in these bays reduce the availability of convenient on-street parking which impacts visitor and community use of this space. Reductions to paid parking bays also directly decrease revenue for Council, for a single operator's commercial gain.
- 3.2 Lost parking revenue in 2023/24 was calculated based on the number of bays impacted and the historical payment transaction data for the specific street/location. The 2024/25 fee component was

calculated on 2023/24 figures and indexed by 4.3% which was equivalent to the on-street parking fee increase applied from 1 July 2024.

4 In response to Question 4:

4.1 A 'loss of paid parking revenue' component of the endorsed fee model was not charged to parklets operating in unpaid bays.

5 In response to Question 6:

5.1 Invoicing is an operational function conducted by Administration.

5.2 Fees are charged in line with Council's endorsed fee structure. Authorised roles within Administration have delegated authority to vary, reduce, waive or refund whole or part fees for specific operational factors.

6 Responses to Questions 7-10 are provided in Points 3 and 4.

7 In response to Question 11:

7.1 Section 188 (3) (e) & (f) of *the Local Government Act 1999* (SA) provides for:

7.1.1 (e) – the variation of fees or charges according to specific factors

7.1.2 (f) – the reduction, waiver or refund, in whole or in part of fees or charges

7.2 Authorised roles within Administration delegated with these powers is publicly available on the Delegations Register of Council's website: [Delegations](#).

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 7.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Davis - QoN - Investigator recommendation and development of sanction and Development of apology and additional requirements

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
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: Investigator recommendation and development of sanction

1. Please identify, by reference to the investigator's final report, what recommendations (if any) were made in relation to sanction.
2. Please identify whether the investigator's report contained:
 - a. a recommendation that a public apology be required
 - b. any recommendation as to the content of an apology
 - c. any recommendation requiring a retraction of statements
 - d. any recommendation requiring removal of social media content
 - e. any recommendation requiring undertakings as to future conduct
3. Please provide the exact wording of any recommendation made by the investigator in relation to sanction.

Development of apology and additional requirements

4. Please identify who determined that the apology must include the following elements:
 - a. full acceptance that provisions were breached
 - b. acknowledgement of inappropriate use of Council resources
 - c. an undertaking to use best endeavours not to engage in similar conduct again
 - d. an undertaking to remove the video and publish a retraction online with a link to the apology
 - e. reaffirmation of commitment to the Behavioural Standards and Behavioural Support Policy
5. For each element in Question 4, please provide:
 - a. the author of the wording
 - b. the date the wording was first drafted
 - c. whether it was drafted by Council administration, external legal advisers, the investigator, the Lord Mayor, or any Council Member
 - d. whether any edits were made, and by whom
 - e. the final person who approved the wording
6. Please provide copies of all documents evidencing the development of the apology wording, including drafts, tracked changes, email correspondence, briefing notes, and instructions, excluding any material subject to legal professional privilege.

7. Please confirm whether any Council Members (including the Lord Mayor) who participated in the decision, participated in drafting, proposing, or amending the apology wording, and if so, identify those Council Members.
 8. Please confirm whether Council sought legal advice about its power to require:
 - a. a retraction
 - b. removal of published content and publication of an apology on a councillor's private account
 - c. undertakings as to future speech
 - d. admissions of wrongdoing
 9. If legal advice was obtained please provide that advice to council and disclose who gave that advice and when.
 10. Please set out verbatim section 74 of the local government act.
-

REPLY

The Lord Mayor, as presiding member, has determined that the questions are, in their totality, improper and they are not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*.

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Davis - QoN - Questions on Notice in relation to agenda Item 20.1 of the 27th January 2026

Tuesday, 24 February 2026
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:

Lord Mayor social media output and use of Council resources

1. Since commencement of the current Council term, how many posts (including reels, videos and stories) have been published on the Lord Mayor's official Instagram account and on any other official social media accounts operated in her capacity as Lord Mayor.
2. For the posts identified in Question 1, please advise:
 - a. how many posts were video
 - b. how many videos were filmed within Adelaide Town Hall, including the Council Chamber, Colonel Light Room, Members' Room, offices, corridors, foyers, or other Council controlled areas
 - c. how many videos were filmed specifically in the Council Chamber
3. For the videos identified in Question 2, please advise for each category of location:
 - a. whether any Council employee assisted in filming, editing, captioning, uploading, or promoting the content
 - b. which positions or teams provided that assistance
 - c. the estimated total staff hours expended on those activities
 - d. whether any Council equipment was used, including phones, cameras, microphones, lighting, tripods, editing software, or Council IT systems
4. Please provide the total expenditure incurred by Council since commencement of the current term in relation to the Lord Mayor's social media content, including:
 - a. external contractors or consultants
 - b. subscriptions or software
 - c. advertising or boosted posts

Statements of "personal view" versus Council position

5. Since commencement of the current Council term, how many times has the Lord Mayor published content on social media expressing an opinion on a matter that was not, at the time of publication, the subject of a Council resolution.
6. For the instances identified in Question 5, how many times did the Lord Mayor expressly state words to the effect of:
"this is my personal view" or "this is not the view of Council" and on which occasions has she said that in her instagram videos?

Council – Agenda – Tuesday, 24 February 2026

7. Since commencement of the current Council term, how many media appearances has the Lord Mayor made in her capacity as Lord Mayor, including radio, television, podcasts, print interviews, and online news interviews.
8. For the media appearances identified in Question 7, please advise:
 - a. how many involved the Lord Mayor expressing an opinion on a matter that was not, at the time of the appearance, the subject of a Council resolution
 - b. in how many of those instances did she expressly state words to the effect of “this is my personal view” or “this is not the view of Council”

Committee chair allowances and Deputy Lord Mayor allowance

9. Please provide a list of all Council Member committee chair positions established under the current committee structure and the annual allowance payable for each chair position.
10. For each Councillor who has held a committee chair position during the current Council term, please advise:
 - a. the committee chaired
 - b. the dates they held the chair position
 - c. the total allowance paid to date for that chair position
 - d. the projected total allowance payable to the end of the current term, assuming the Councillor remains in that chair position until the end of the term
11. For the Deputy Lord Mayor position during the current Council term, please advise:
 - a. the name of each Councillor who has held the position and the dates held
 - b. the additional allowance payable for the Deputy Lord Mayor role
 - c. the total additional allowance paid to date
 - d. the projected total additional allowance payable to the end of the term, assuming the Deputy Lord Mayor remains in the role until the end of the term

Interests, allowances, and participation in Item 20.1

12. For Agenda Item 20.1, please provide the names of Council Members who:
 - a. voted in favour
 - b. voted against
 - c. were absent
 - d. did not vote.
13. For each Council Member who voted in favour of Agenda Item 20.1, please state whether, as at the date of the vote, they held any of the following paid roles:
 - a. committee chair
 - b. Deputy Lord Mayor
 - c. any other position carrying an additional allowance.
14. For each Council Member identified in Question 13, please provide:
 - a. the role title
 - b. the committee or position
 - c. the annual allowance payable for that role
 - d. the total amount paid to that Council Member to date during the current term for that role
 - e. the projected total payable to the end of the term, assuming they remain in the role.
15. Please confirm whether any Council Member who voted on Agenda Item 20.1 declared:
 - a. a material conflict of interest
 - b. a perceived conflict of interest
 in relation to the decision.

16. Would it be true to characterise the video produced as being critical of payments made to the Chair or Chairs of the Council's Committees?
17. Please set out verbatim, without commentary, section 75 of the Local Government Act.
18. Please set out, without commentary, pursuant to section 74 when a perceived conflict of interest may arise in relation to a matter to be discussed at a meeting of council.

Timeframes

19. Was a report sent to Cr Davis on 26th September 2025 by the Lord Mayor's barrister?
20. What date is 7 business days from the 26th of September 2025?
21. When did Cr Davis submit a response to the email from the Lord Mayor's barrister?
22. When did the Lord Mayor become aware of Cr Davis's intention to run for the upper house of the state election?
23. Did the Lord Mayor receive the final report on or before 8th October 2025?
24. How many days are there between 8th October 2025 and the 27th of January 2026?
25. How much as this matter cost ratepayers to date?

REPLY

The Lord Mayor, as presiding member, has determined that the questions are, in their totality, improper and they are not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*.

- END OF REPORT -