

Councillor Cabada - QoN - Correspondence with the Premier and State Ministers

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

- '1. Since 22 November 2022, how many formal letters have been sent by the Lord Mayor or the Chief Executive Officer to:
 - a) The Premier; and
 - b) State Government Ministers?
2. Of those letters:
 - a) How many have received a formal written response?
 - b) How many remain without a response?
3. For correspondence that has not received a response:
 - a) What is the date each letter was sent?
 - b) How many days have elapsed since each letter was issued?
 - c) Has any follow-up correspondence or contact been made, and if so, on what date?
 - d) What are the subject matters of the outstanding letters that have not yet received a response?
4. Does the City of Adelaide maintain a formal register or tracking mechanism for correspondence sent to the Premier and Ministers, including response timeframes?
5. Is there an established protocol for follow-up where correspondence has not been acknowledged or responded to within a reasonable timeframe?
6. In the past 12 months, what has been the average response time for ministerial correspondence?'

REPLY

As Presiding Member, I have determined that, taken in totality with the other questions asked, the question is improper due to the unreasonable length and number of questions asked by the Councillor and the principle that questions must not impede the meeting or unreasonably divert Council resources.

Notwithstanding, I have decided that on this occasion the questions will be answered; however, should this pattern continue, I will be likely to determine such questions to be improper, and they will not be answered.

The following response maintains the original numbering for clarity.

1. The Lord Mayor, as Presiding Member, has determined that this question is vague and improper and is not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*.

It is not clear what is meant by the term 'formal letter' and the scope of the request is so broad such that we expect the degree of work required to answer the question would more appropriately be dealt with by way of a motion with or without notice.

2. The Lord Mayor, as Presiding Member, has determined that this question is vague and improper and is not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* for the reasons outlined above.
3. The Lord Mayor, as Presiding Member, has determined that this question is vague and improper and is not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* for the reasons outlined above.
4. Council maintains a formal register of all correspondence and records in accordance with the requirements of the *State Records Act 1997 (SA)* (State Records Act). Council utilises the Content Manager system to store electronic versions of all correspondence and records. Hard-copy documents are retained as required under the provisions of the State Records Act, ensuring compliance with relevant legislative and record-keeping standards.
5. Council has no additional procedures or policies beyond the correspondence requirements noted above, which encompass the receipt, registration, response, and timely management of correspondence.
6. The Lord Mayor, as Presiding Member, has determined that this question is vague and improper and is not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* for the reasons outlined above.

The question is also arguably additionally vague as it refers to the response time for all 'ministerial correspondence' not just correspondence in response to a letter from the Lord Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to the Premier and Ministers.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 3.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Cabada - QoN - Commercial Property Valuations and Rates Objection Process

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

1. What is the process for commercial ratepayers to lodge an objection to the valuation of their property where they believe the assessed value is incorrect?
 2. Who is responsible for determining property valuations used for rating purposes:
 - a) Is this undertaken by the Valuer-General, an external contractor, or another entity?
 - b) What role, if any, does the City of Adelaide have in influencing or reviewing these valuations?
 3. When a commercial ratepayer lodges an objection:
 - a) Which organisation assesses and determines the objection?
 - b) What is the average timeframe for resolution?
 - c) What rights of review or appeal are available if the ratepayer is dissatisfied with the outcome?
 4. Where is the organisation responsible for administering or determining valuation objections headquartered?
 5. How many commercial valuation objections have been lodged within the City of Adelaide in:
 - a) The 2023–24 financial year; and
 - b) The 2024–25 financial year to date?
 6. Of those objections:
 - a) How many resulted in a reduction in valuation?
 - b) What was the aggregate financial impact on rate revenue?
 7. Have any commercial valuation objections proceeded to external review, tribunal or court proceedings in the above financial years?
 - a) If so, how many?
 - b) What were the outcomes of those matters?
 - c) What legal or external costs were incurred by the City of Adelaide in relation to those proceedings?
 8. Does the City of Adelaide provide guidance or assistance to commercial ratepayers who wish to understand or challenge their valuation, and if so, what form does that assistance take?
-

REPLY

As Presiding Member, I have determined that, taken in totality with the other questions asked, the question is improper due to the unreasonable length and number of questions asked by the Councillor and the principle that questions must not impede the meeting or unreasonably divert Council resources.

Notwithstanding, I have decided that on this occasion the questions will be answered; however, should this pattern continue, I will be likely to determine such questions to be improper, and they will not be answered.

1. What is the process for commercial ratepayers to lodge an objection to the valuation of their property where they believe the assessed value is incorrect?

Information on the valuation, objection and review process is available online at:
<https://www.cityofadelaide.com.au/resident/home-management/rates/>

2. Who is responsible for determining property valuations used for rating purposes:

a) Is this undertaken by the Valuer-General, an external contractor, or another entity?

See answer to question 1, above.

b) What role, if any, does the City of Adelaide have in influencing or reviewing these valuations?

See answer to question 1, above.

Westlink are independent valuers and, as such, City of Adelaide has no role in determining, influencing or reviewing valuations

3. When a commercial ratepayer lodges an objection:

a) Which organisation assesses and determines the objection?

See answer to question 1, above.

b) What is the average timeframe for resolution?

See answer to question 1, above.

The timeframe to assess and determine an objection can vary depending on the circumstances, including complexity and availability of information (including that provided by objector).

c) What rights of review or appeal are available if the ratepayer is dissatisfied with the outcome?

See answer to question 1, above.

4. Where is the organisation responsible for administering or determining valuation objections headquartered?

The City of Adelaide Rates and Receivables team receives the objections and liaises with the property valuation company Westlink Consulting to manage and process the objection directly with objectors. Westlink Consulting are head quartered in Melbourne but have a presence in Adelaide.

There were no organisations in Adelaide which undertake Annual Assessed Value valuations at the time the City of Adelaide engaged Westlink.

5. How many commercial valuation objections have been lodged within the City of Adelaide in:

a) The 2023–24 financial year

61 objections to individual valuation assessments were lodged (an objection may include multiple valuation assessments).

b) The 2024–25 financial year to date?

89 objections to individual valuation assessments were lodged (an objection may include multiple valuation assessments).

6. Of those objections:

a) How many resulted in a reduction in valuation?

1. 2023-24 objections resulted in sixteen (16) reductions in valuation.

2. 2024-25 objections resulted in fourteen (14) reductions in valuation.

b) What was the aggregate financial impact on rate revenue?

The objections to valuation resulted in a reduction to rate revenue of \$246k.

7. Have any commercial valuation objections proceeded to external review, tribunal or court proceedings in the above financial years?

a) If so, how many?

Two property assessments relating to the same property were referred to the Office of the Valuer-General for independent review in 2024/25.

b) What were the outcomes of those matters?

A reduction in valuation in both related matters.

c) What legal or external costs were incurred by the City of Adelaide in relation to those proceedings?

The cost of the independent review valuer engaged by the Office of the Valuer-General was \$1,381 (Ex GST) per valuation.

8. Does the City of Adelaide provide guidance or assistance to commercial ratepayers who wish to understand or challenge their valuation, and if so, what form does that assistance take?

See answer to question 1, above.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 9.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

In relation to the response to the Question on Notice - Councillor Cabada - QoN - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders, provided at the meeting of Council held on 24 February 2026, further information is provided in response to question 6:

- ‘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.’*
-

REPLY

The Question on Notice has been responded to as part of Item 20 - Confidential Question on Notice Reply, as listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 2026 and will be distributed separately to Council Members.

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Cabada - QoN - Vehicle Theft in the Adelaide CBD

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Iliia Houridis, Director City Shaping

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

'In light of recent media reporting citing SA Police data that Adelaide recorded the highest number of vehicle theft offences in the State during the 2024–25 financial year, I seek clarification from the CEO on the following matters:

1. Is the City of Adelaide aware of the SAPOL data referenced in recent media reporting indicating that 184 vehicle theft offences occurred within the 5000 postcode during the 2024–25 financial year?
2. Has Council received any recent briefings from SAPOL regarding trends in vehicle theft within the CBD and North Adelaide?
3. Are there specific locations, precincts or public car parks within the City where vehicle theft or attempted theft incidents are more frequently occurring?
4. What preventative measures are currently in place within Council-managed car parks and public spaces to deter vehicle theft, including:
 - a) CCTV coverage
 - b) Lighting improvements
 - c) Security patrols
 - d) Crime prevention through environmental design measures
5. Has Council undertaken any recent assessments of lighting, surveillance or security infrastructure in areas where vehicle theft incidents are occurring?
6. Does Council have any current or planned initiatives, in collaboration with SAPOL, aimed at reducing vehicle theft or improving public safety in the CBD?
7. Has Council considered whether additional lighting, surveillance, security presence or design changes may be required in Council-managed parking areas or public spaces to help deter vehicle theft?'

The Lord Mayor will provide a reply at the meeting, the reply and question will be included in the Minutes of the meeting.

REPLY

1. As Presiding Member, I have determined that, taken in totality with the other questions asked, the question is improper due to the unreasonable length and number of questions asked by the Councillor and the principle that questions must not impede the meeting or unreasonably divert Council resources.
2. The question has been referred to SAPOL and will be responded to as part of their briefing to Council on 9 June 2026.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 1.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Abrahamzadeh - QoN - Motions and Questions

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh will ask the following Question on Notice:

'In relation to Motions and Questions submitted by Elected Members, what policy framework constitutes:

- the maximum number of Motions and Questions on Notice; and
- the relevant authority, including relevant provisions, that can impose such a limit?'

REPLY

1. The policy framework relating to motions and questions on notice is established through the following instruments:
 - 1.1. *Local Government Act 1999* (SA)
 - 1.2. *City of Adelaide Act 1998* (SA)
 - 1.3. *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* (SA)
 - 1.4. City of Adelaide Code of Practice for Meeting Procedures
2. These documents collectively set the rules under which Council meetings are conducted. Importantly, there is no provision within this framework that places a limit on the number of motions or questions on notice that may be submitted by Council Members.
3. However, as Presiding Member, I provide the following advice to support the effective functioning of Council meetings.
4. As Presiding Member, I have a responsibility to provide leadership and guidance to ensure Council meetings operate efficiently and in accordance with their intended purpose. This includes mitigating the impact of numerous or unnecessary questions and motions on the organisation's capacity and resources. Our collective focus must remain on matters properly before the Council.
5. I take this opportunity to remind Councillors of the provisions of Regulation 9 of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*. Regulation 9(6) provides that the Presiding Member may rule that a question, with or without notice, not be answered if it is "vague, irrelevant, insulting or improper." These terms

operate as a composite test; a single question may fall within one or more of these categories or be improper in its own right.

6. The purpose of Regulation 9 is to ensure that questions asked by Council Members seek information relevant to the functions of the Council or its committees. It is not intended to facilitate questions of a personal nature or those that fall outside the powers, functions, or responsibilities of Council.
7. Examples of questions that may be considered improper under Regulation 9 include those that:
 - 7.1. are unreasonably lengthy in number or scale, such that they impede the meeting’s proceedings or demand disproportionate administrative resources;
 - 7.2. repeat content already asked or answered, or which is otherwise publicly available;
 - 7.3. are structured in a way that does not make sense within the roles and functions of Council or Council Members;
 - 7.4. contain statements, assertions, or implications that may be untruthful;
 - 7.5. involve personal matters or rely on personal knowledge of individual members;
 - 7.6. request speculative or hypothetical information or answers; or
 - 7.7. fall outside matters properly before Council or outside Council’s lawful responsibilities.
8. I trust this clarifies the regulatory framework and the principles I apply in managing questions and motions on notice.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 3.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Freedom of Information - SAPOL Communications

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
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:

In light of recent media reporting and public comments made by an elected member regarding communications between SA Police and City of Adelaide, several community members and ratepayers have expressed concern about the council not being transparent regarding the FOI request.

Given the elected member concerned has now publicly discussed aspects of the matter and was clear that transparency is important, I ask the Administration to advise:

1. Whether the public statements made by the councillor regarding the incident and existence of communications with SA Police alter the basis on which the documents were withheld under the Freedom of Information Act 1991 (SA)
2. Whether, in light of the matter now being publicly discussed by the councillor concerned, the Administration will reconsider the decision to refuse release of the three communications referenced in the FOI request.
3. If the decision is reconsidered, can the Administration explain how the continued withholding of the documents remains justified since the subject of the communications is already publicly commenting on the matter?
4. Whether the Administration has considered the public interest in maintaining transparency and public confidence in the City of Adelaide, given the perception within the community that the council may be withholding information

REPLY

The following response addresses the question raised, maintaining the original numbering for clarity.

1. No.
2. Under the *Freedom of Information Act 1991 (SA)*, there are no statutory provisions for decisions to be reconsidered in these circumstances.
3. Not Applicable.
4. The *Freedom of Information Act 1991 (SA)* does not contain any statutory provisions that require a public interest test to be applied.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 2 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Part 6 of Question on Notice - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

Noting that part of QoN on the 24th February 2026 for Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders, can the administration please answer the following question that was not answered:-

- '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?

REPLY

The Question on Notice has been responded to as part of Item 20 - Confidential Question on Notice Reply, as listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 2026 and will be distributed separately to Council Members.

- END OF REPORT -