

Councillor Maher - QoN - Behavioural Standards Panel Report 25BSP-0005

Tuesday, 8 September 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Patrick Maher

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Patrick Maher will ask the following Question on Notice:

'In light of the recent resignation of former Councillor Davis and findings of the Behavioural Standards Panel, does Council have any ability under the Local Government Act 1999 or any other relevant legislation to refer the matter to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT), notwithstanding that the individual is no longer a serving member of Council?'

REPLY

1. The relevant authority concerning the jurisdiction of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**SACAT**) in respect of former council members is *McMahon v Knight* [2024] SACAT 45 (**Knight**). The decision is directly relevant to the present circumstances, as it considered whether SACAT has jurisdiction to hear and determine a complaint against a person who is no longer a member of a council.
2. The case was presided over by SACAT President Hughes, a Justice of the Supreme Court of South Australia.
3. President Hughes' findings in *Knight* significantly constrain Council's ability to refer a matter to SACAT where the subject of the complaint has ceased to hold office as a council member.
4. In *Knight*, SACAT considered proceedings involving a former elected member and ultimately determined that its jurisdiction does not extend to complaints against former council members. President Hughes held:
"It is consistent with the context of the provision as an incident of a disciplinary regime that the council's role and powers are extinguished when the member ceases to be a member, absent an express conferral of statutory power signalled by the inclusion of 'former member' or other similar term in the grant of power."
5. President Hughes further observed that the statutory scheme is directed toward the regulation of persons in their capacity as current members of a council and noted the absence of any express legislative provision extending those powers to former members.
6. The relevance of *Knight* to the circumstances involving former Councillor Davis is clear. The Behavioural Standards Panel (the **Panel**) findings relate to conduct that occurred while Mr Davis was a serving member of Council, however his subsequent resignation means he is no longer a "member" for the purposes of the

¹ *Knight* at [44]
Council – Agenda – Tuesday, 8 September 2026

relevant provisions of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) (the **Act**). Consistent with the reasoning in Knight, SACAT does not presently have jurisdiction to hear a complaint against a former member.

7. The Panel observed at paragraph 188 of its decision that:

"Should Cr Davis not comply with the Panel's orders the Council is required to lodge this matter with the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal."

8. Council does not consider this statement to constitute an order or direction requiring Council to commence proceedings in SACAT. Rather, it is properly characterised as an observation reflecting the operation of section 262W(4) of the Act, which provides that, where a member fails to comply with an order of the Panel, a council is to ensure that a complaint is lodged with SACAT. As recognised in Knight, these provisions are framed by reference to a "member" of a council and do not expressly extend to former members.
9. Accordingly, Council's position is that the operation of the statutory scheme has been frustrated by Mr Davis' resignation. The outcome identified by the City of Tea Tree Gully in Knight, namely that a councillor may avoid the consequences of the disciplinary regime by resigning before a matter reaches SACAT, is now reflected in these circumstances. SACAT itself rejected an interpretation that would allow it to retain jurisdiction over a former member in the absence of an express legislative provision to that effect.
10. The circumstances highlight a gap in the current legislative framework. There is a strong case for legislative reform to enable complaints concerning former members to be referred and determined after resignation, particularly where findings have already been made by a regulatory body. Consideration should also be given to expanding SACAT's jurisdiction so that sanctions and disciplinary outcomes remain capable of enforcement notwithstanding a person's resignation from office. Such reforms would address situations where the legitimate determinations of bodies such as the Behavioural Standards Panel or Ombudsman are rendered ineffective because the individual concerned is no longer a serving member of council.
11. For these reasons, it is considered that Council does not presently have the ability to pursue a referral to SACAT in relation to former Councillor Davis under the current legislative framework, and any change to that position would require amendment of the relevant legislation.

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 -

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - QoN - Precinct Review and Strategic Planning

Tuesday, 8 September 2026
Council

Council Member

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor
Carmel Noon

Public

Contact Officer:

Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Carmel Noon will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Could Administration please advise:

1. What is the current status of the Precinct Review and associated strategic planning process, including what has been completed, what is underway and what remains outstanding?
2. Who has been engaged or appointed to coordinate the process, whether internally or externally, what is the scope and value of that engagement, and which Council officer is responsible for delivery?
3. Noting that the strategic planning process was expected to commence prior to the beginning of the 2026/27 financial year, when did it actually commence and, if delayed, what has caused the delay?
4. What is the proposed timetable for consultation with each Precinct Association, including engagement with Presidents and Boards, preparation of draft plans, review, finalisation and implementation?
5. How will governance, financial reporting and funding arrangements be addressed through the Review, including accountability for Council funding, reporting requirements, acquittals, future funding models and any proposed changes to the role or responsibilities of Precinct Associations?
6. What is the current and proposed role of the City's Place Coordinators in supporting the precincts, including how their responsibilities will interface with Precinct Associations, AEDA and other areas of Administration?
7. When will the Review and strategic planning outcomes return to Council, including recommendations on governance, funding, roles and responsibilities, implementation and measures of success?

REPLY

1. Current status of the Precinct Review and associated strategic planning process:
 - 1.1. Completed - The original Precinct Review was completed by KPPM Strategy.
 - 1.2. Completed - Council adopted a revised precinct support funding model in January 2026, including:
 - 1.2.1. increasing annual Precinct Group funding from \$25,000 to \$40,000
 - 1.2.2. establishing a future contestable precinct funding framework.
 - 1.3. Completed - All Precinct Groups have now received their 2026/27 funding allocation of \$40,000 following submission of activity/action plans.

- 1.4. Completed - KPPM Strategy has been re-engaged to support development of Precinct Strategies.
- 1.5. Completed - A Precinct Review Project Team has been established to oversee implementation and strategy development.
- 1.6. Underway - Development of precinct-wide strategic planning methodology and engagement approach.
- 1.7. Underway - Development of a city-wide stakeholder survey and targeted workshop program.
- 1.8. Underway - Engagement planning involving Place Partners and broader precinct stakeholders.
- 1.9. Underway - Development of overarching place-based Precinct Strategies aligned to differing precinct functions, economic maturity, growth opportunities and strategic priorities.
- 1.10. Outstanding - Stakeholder consultation program (September-October 2026).
- 1.11. Outstanding - Development and drafting of Precinct Strategies.
- 1.12. Outstanding - Development of contestable funding guidelines and criteria.
- 1.13. Outstanding – Proposed AEDA Board endorsement of Precinct Strategies.
- 1.14. Outstanding – Presentation to Council of final strategies and future funding framework.
- 1.15. Outstanding - Implementation of contestable funding to enable access from July 2027.
2. Engagement of external and internal resources to progress the Precinct Review implementation:
 - 2.1. External - KPPM Strategy, which undertook the original review, has been re-engaged to support implementation and development of Precinct Strategies. KPPM continues to provide external project support including implementation advice, development of Precinct Strategies, and development of future contestable funding criteria. The engagement is valued at \$54,450 inc GST.
 - 2.2. Internal – A Precinct Review implementation project team was established in August 2026, with the General Manager AEDA as Project Sponsor.
3. Practical commencement of the precinct strategies process commenced during July-August 2026 with establishment of the Project Team, re-engagement of KPPM, commencement of survey and workshop design, and engagement planning with Place Partners and precinct stakeholders.
4. The proposed timetable for consultation with each Precinct Association, including engagement with Presidents and Boards, preparation of draft plans, review, finalisation and implementation is:
 - 4.1. September-October 2026
 - 4.1.1. City-wide stakeholder survey released.
 - 4.1.2. Data collection and analysis undertaken.
 - 4.1.3. Targeted workshops conducted for engagement with Precinct Groups, business stakeholders, community stakeholders, and key individuals with interests in precinct economic development.
 - 4.2. Late 2026
 - 4.2.1. Analysis of survey and workshop findings.
 - 4.2.2. Draft Precinct Strategies to be prepared.
 - 4.3. Early 2027
 - 4.3.1. Precinct Strategies developed and refined through collaboration between AEDA, Place Partners, KPPM, and stakeholders.
5. Governance, financial reporting and funding arrangements, and role of Precinct Associations:
 - 5.1. Current - Precinct Groups have received 2026/27 funding of \$40,000 based on activity/action plans submitted through the application process. Reporting and acquittal requirements remain unchanged, requiring precinct groups to describe delivery on commitments in their funding application, and financial acquittal.
 - 5.2. Future - Precinct Strategies will inform future precinct funding priorities.
 - 5.3. Future - a contestable precinct development fund is proposed to commence in FY2027/28.
 - 5.4. Future - future funding criteria and guidelines will be developed, consistent with Council's Funding Programs Policy.
 - 5.5. Future - contestable funding will be available to eligible applicants, including Precinct Groups.

- 5.6. Future - the Strategies are intended to provide the framework for future funding decisions and investment priorities.
- 5.7. Governance – It is proposed that the AEDA Board endorse the completed Strategies and be involved in their development. Council will be presented the endorsed Strategies and funding framework.
- 5.8. Specific future acquittal arrangements, accountability measures and reporting requirements have not yet been publicly finalised and are expected to be developed through the funding criteria work.
6. The current and proposed role of the City's Place Coordinators in supporting the precincts is:
 - 6.1. Current role - Place Partners remain within the City Community portfolio. They have been formally engaged in the strategic planning process. They will play a key role in stakeholder identification, stakeholder engagement, survey participation, workshop participation, and ensuring local precinct input informs strategy development.
 - 6.2. Proposed future role - Precinct Strategy development will help determine future precinct support structures. Place Partner roles are expected to evolve towards a stronger economic development focus. Future deployment, governance arrangements and organisational alignment remain under consideration. No formal decision has been made regarding where they are placed within the organisational structure.
7. Council will be provided the outcomes of the Strategic Planning process and implementation recommendations as follows:
 - 7.1. Stakeholder consultation is planned for September-October 2026. Development of Precinct Strategies is planned through late 2026 and the first half of 2027. The objective is to have Strategies completed in early 2027 with AEDA's Board being asked to endorse the completed Strategies. The Strategies will then guide contestable precinct funding, precinct planning, and precinct-related Council investment decisions from July 2027 onwards.
 - 7.2. No formal Council meeting date has yet been nominated for Council to receive the final package. This will occur following AEDA Board endorsement and prior to implementation of the FY2027/28 contestable funding program.

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 -

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - QoN - Torrens Lake Water Quality Management: Current Measures, Costs and Outcomes

Tuesday, 8 September 2026

Council

Council Member

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor
Carmel Noon

Public

Contact Officer:

Tom McCready, Director City
Infrastructure

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Carmel Noon will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Could Administration please advise:

1. What measures are currently being used to manage and improve water quality in Torrens Lake, including biofiltration, monitoring, managed flow releases and any other treatment or maintenance measures?
2. Who is currently contracted or engaged to undertake this work, what are the contract terms and costs, and what measurable deliverables, performance standards or water-quality outcomes are they required to achieve?
3. What has Council spent on Torrens Lake water-quality management over the past three financial years, including capital works, contractors, monitoring, maintenance and other interventions?
4. What evidence is available that the current measures are improving water quality and reducing the frequency or duration of Lake closures, and what measurable indicators does Council use to determine whether the current approach is successful?
5. Where existing measures are not achieving the intended outcomes, what process does Council use to review their effectiveness, contractual performance and value for money, and to consider alternative evidence-based approaches, including technologies being successfully trialled or implemented by other Australian local governments, such as the nanobubble oxygen and ozone technology developed by South Australian company and used at Lake Albert by Wagga Wagga City Council in NSW, where following an extended trial Council has endorsed its continued use and authorised negotiations to purchase the installed technology?

REPLY

1. Water quality in the Torrens Lake / Karrawirra Parri is managed through a combination of monitoring, catchment management, pollutant reduction measures and reactive interventions.
2. As a member of the Torrens Lake Cyanobacteria Advisory Committee (TLCAC), the City of Adelaide (CoA) works collaboratively with the Department for Environment and Water (DEW), Green Adelaide and the Environment Protection Authority (EPA), on water quality management initiatives. The current agreed management approach continues to recognise managed flow releases from Kangaroo Creek Reservoir as the most effective and practical intervention available when cyanobacteria levels (blue green algae) are elevated. These releases are considered to be the most environmentally sound method to reduce the outbreak of blue green algae from the river system without causing harm to the various ecosystems that we must protect.
3. The CoA also undertakes a number of operational activities aimed at reducing pollutants entering the River Torrens. Council currently maintains 21 Gross Pollutant Traps (GPTs) across its stormwater network, 16 of which directly relate to the River Torrens. GPT's are designed to capture litter, organic matter and other

pollutants before stormwater enters the river system. Over the past three financial years, Council has invested \$312,800 in the programmed cleaning of these GPT assets.

4. In addition, Council undertakes dredging activities to remove accumulated sediment deposits that enter the lake system from upstream catchments, particularly following periods of significant rainfall. Over the past three financial years, Council has spent \$412,297 on dredging works to maintain lake capacity and remove silt build-up.
5. Council is also progressing the development of a comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan, which has been underway for the past two years. The Plan is expected to identify a range of future water quality improvement initiatives, including both end-of-line treatment measures and in-line stormwater management solutions. Potential opportunities being investigated include additional GPTs, constructed wetlands, upgrades to open swales, increased use of Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) infrastructure such as bioretention rain gardens, and measures to improve permeability within Council-managed parks, reserves and squares.
6. Together, these measures contribute to a broader catchment-based approach to improving water quality outcomes within the Torrens Lake and reducing the volume of pollutants entering the river system
7. As noted above, water quality management within Torrens Lake is undertaken through the collaborative governance framework of TLCAC, which comprises representatives from the CoA, Green Adelaide, DEW, EPA, SA Water, Coastal Board, and the City of Charles Sturt. Under the current arrangements, TLCAC's primary function is to provide coordinated advice regarding the management of cyanobacteria and the use of managed flow releases from Kangaroo Creek Reservoir. Their Terms of Reference can be viewed [here](#).
8. The CoA does not currently engage or contract a third party to undertake a specific water treatment process within Torrens Lake. Rather, the city continues to work in partnership with the participating State agencies represented on TLCAC, which collectively provide the scientific, regulatory and environmental expertise required to manage the health of the broader River Torrens system. All participating agencies contribute staff resources and expertise in-kind, and there is no payment schedule established under the agreement.
9. Accordingly, there are no current contracts relating to a specific treatment technology, and therefore no associated contract terms, performance-based payments, prescribed water quality outcomes or technology-specific deliverables that the City can report on.
10. The current management approach endorsed by TLCAC continues to focus on water quality monitoring and the use of managed flow releases, which the Terms of Reference identify as the most successful proven method currently available to reduce cyanobacteria concentrations and maintain recreational use of the lake. The Terms of Reference also acknowledge that managed flow releases are not a long-term sustainable solution and support the exploration of alternative control measures where sufficient evidence exists
11. In relation to emerging treatment technologies, Administration understands that DEW, Green Adelaide and the EPA remain open to considering new and innovative approaches that may improve water quality outcomes. However, any proposal must be supported by robust scientific evidence, appropriate regulatory approvals and a demonstrated understanding of environmental risks.
12. Administration notes that TLCAC previously considered a proposal to trial ozone nanobubble technology in May 2025 and did not support the proposed trial based on the information available at that time. Advice received from the Chair of TLCAC indicated that the committee's concerns included uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of the technology, potential ecological impacts within a biodiverse flow-through river system, regulatory requirements, and the cost of undertaking a scientifically robust monitoring program. Based on the information presented at that time, the participating State agencies formed the view that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the technology could be introduced without unacceptable environmental risk to the River Torrens ecosystem.
13. The City of Adelaide does not consider itself the authority responsible for independently assessing or approving emerging water treatment technologies for use within the River Torrens. Accordingly, the City has recently requested that TLCAC invite the proponent of nanobubble technology to present any updated scientific evidence, approvals, monitoring methodologies and trial results directly to a future TLCAC meeting. This will provide the appropriate forum for DEW, Green Adelaide, EPA and other committee members to assess whether there is sufficient merit for a formal proposal to be progressed through the relevant governance, regulatory and environmental assessment processes.
14. As per the following cost breakdown, Council has invested directly and indirectly into the management of the Torrens Lake. This includes capital investment in the weir to ensure operational control on flows and lake levels, dredging excessive sediment levels, water quality testing to ensure safety for active users of the lake, along with indirect expenditure to remove urban contaminants before they enter the river system, such as the city-wide cleaning of underground stormwater infrastructure and street sweeping which reduces the amount of contaminants entering the stormwater system.

15. Over the past three financial years, Council has spent the following:

Expenditure Type	Impact to water Quality	Project Type	Total 3 Year Actual Spend	Total 3 Year Planned Budget (includes 2026/27)
Capital	In-direct	Refurbishment of Weir Gates (combined South and North Gates)		\$3.2M
Operational	Direct	Monitoring Water Quality (includes all water bodies as well as the Lake)	\$548,601	
Operational	Direct	River Dredging - Reduction of Silt levels	\$412,297	
Operational	Direct	City Wide GPT Cleaning (16 GPT's of a total 21 GPTs are in River Torrens catchments)	\$312,800	
Operational	Direct	Stormwater Maintenance of upstream Open Channels, Underground Conduits, and Pit cleaning. Includes CCTV inspection.	\$2,360,043	
Operational	In-direct	Street Sweeping	\$10.3M	

16. As noted above the primary measure currently used to manage cyanobacteria risk and prevent lake closures is the managed flow release program coordinated through the TLCAC. It is important to note that the last managed flow was in 2019. The cyanobacteria levels have not been of a level which has required TLCAC to make a formal request to the Minister for a managed flow release.
17. While the City of Adelaide undertakes a range of direct and indirect activities that contribute to improving environmental outcomes, including stormwater asset maintenance, gross pollutant trap cleaning, sediment removal and the development of long-term stormwater quality improvement initiatives, Council does not currently measure water quality outcomes directly against these individual operational activities. As such, it is not possible to quantify the specific water quality benefit attributable to any one Council program or maintenance activity.
18. It is also important to recognise that lake closures are influenced by a broad range of external factors that extend beyond the City of Adelaide's boundaries and responsibilities. The River Torrens catchment receives urban runoff from numerous upstream Council areas before reaching the Torrens Lake. Consequently, a significant proportion of nutrients, sediment, litter and other urban contaminants entering the lake originate from upstream catchments and are transported downstream during rainfall events.
19. In addition to catchment inputs, climatic conditions play a significant role in influencing water quality and cyanobacteria, enterococci and Ecoli growth. Factors commonly associated with elevated counts include:
- 19.1. Extended periods of warm summer temperatures.
 - 19.2. Low-flow conditions and prolonged dry weather.
 - 19.3. Periods without rainfall followed by storm events.
 - 19.4. Significant rainfall events that mobilise nutrients, sediment, organic matter and litter from upstream catchments into the river system.
20. These factors collectively contribute to the conditions that can promote cyanobacteria, enterococci and Ecoli growth and increase the likelihood of lake closures.
21. Recognising the importance of addressing pollutant sources across the broader catchment, the Lord Mayor convened a workshop on 22 May 2026 with Mayors and Chief Executive Officers of Council's and key stakeholders who have direct interest in the management of the River Torrens. The workshop aimed to discuss opportunities for coordinated action to reduce urban contaminants entering the River Torrens. The intention is to establish an ongoing collaborative approach across local government to improve catchment management and water quality outcomes, with quarterly workshops proposed moving forward.

22. The CoA's primary responsibilities relate to managing infrastructure surrounding the lake environment, maintaining stormwater assets, monitoring lake water quality on behalf of TLCAC and user groups of the lake, managing the Torrens Weir, and dredging to improve amenity and enable commercial opportunities such as Popeye. Responsibility for broader aquatic ecosystem health, environmental regulation, biodiversity management and water quality policy rests largely with State Government agencies, including DEW, Green Adelaide and the EPA.
23. Consistent with this approach, the CoA has requested that TLCAC invite the proponents of the nanobubble technology to present any advancements since their May 2025 presentation. The CoA will continue to advocate for an evidence-based assessment of emerging technologies through the appropriate TLCAC and State Government processes so that DEW, Green Adelaide and EPA can consider any new scientific evidence and determine whether a formal application for a trial warrants further consideration.
24. The table which can be viewed [here](#) depicts the past three years of Ecoli and Enterococci levels on a quarterly basis. The various readings are all subject to temperature and rainfall variances. Those readings shaded, are those that exceed the Public Health Secondary Contact level of 2500. The data indicates that the water quality is more often well within exceedance levels.
25. Under the TLCAC governance arrangements, participating agencies undertake annual reviews of the cyanobacteria management program, including review of monitoring results, season outcomes, managed flow release effectiveness and broader program performance. TLCAC also acknowledges that managed flow releases are not a long-term sustainable solution and supports the ongoing investigation of alternative measures to inhibit cyanobacteria growth within the lake.
26. From a CoA perspective, the effectiveness of operational activities such as gross pollutant trap maintenance, stormwater infrastructure maintenance and dredging works is generally assessed against operational objectives, asset performance and service delivery requirements rather than against measurable lake water quality outcomes. This is because the City is only one contributor within the broader River Torrens catchment, and water quality outcomes are influenced by significant upstream catchment inputs, climatic conditions and environmental factors beyond Council's direct control.
27. Where opportunities for improvement are identified, Council works collaboratively with State agencies and local government partners through TLCAC and other regional forums to consider alternative evidence-based approaches. This includes ongoing participation in catchment-wide discussions aimed at reducing nutrient, sediment and litter loads entering the River Torrens from upstream catchments.
28. The COA is also developing a Stormwater Management Plan that will examine a range of future water quality improvement initiatives, including additional gross pollutant traps, wetlands, Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) infrastructure, bioretention systems, open swale improvements and other stormwater treatment opportunities. These initiatives are intended to improve pollutant capture and reduce contaminant loads entering the river system over time.
29. In relation to emerging technologies, Administration understands that DEW, Green Adelaide and EPA remain open to considering new evidence-based treatment options. However, any proposal must demonstrate scientific merit, environmental safety, regulatory compliance and a clear management benefit. Administration notes that TLCAC considered a proposal for ozone nanobubble technology in May 2025 and did not support a trial based on the information available at that time, citing uncertainty regarding effectiveness, potential ecological impacts, regulatory requirements and the costs associated with a scientifically robust monitoring program.
30. Recognising ongoing community interest in this technology, the CoA has requested that TLCAC invite the proprietors of the nanobubble technology to present any updated scientific evidence, approvals, trial outcomes and monitoring methodologies to a future committee meeting including how this technology would operate in an urban environment as opposed to a rural setting. This would enable DEW, Green Adelaide, EPA and other TLCAC members to assess whether there is sufficient merit to warrant a formal proposal and further consideration through the appropriate governance, environmental and regulatory assessment processes.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 18.5 hours.
--	--

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Martin - QoN - South
Australian Motorsport Board

Tuesday, 8 September 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Phillip Martin

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Phillip Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

‘Could the Administration advise what information was published by the City of Adelaide in relation to the South Australian Motor Sport Board’s consultation, occurring from June 5, 2026 until June 15 2026, on their proposed 2026 motor sport event(s), in accordance with the South Australian Motor Sport Act, 1984, including any email addresses that were published and whether these email addresses were/are public information?’

REPLY

- 1. On 5 June 2026, the City of Adelaide published a [webpage](#) promoting the South Australian Motor Sport Board’s (SAMSB) consultation on the proposed 2026 Adelaide Grand Final and Associated Motorsport Event prescribed works period, declared period and declared area.
- 2. The City of Adelaide also published social media posts promoting the consultation across its social media accounts on 5 June 2026.
- 3. The information published by City of Adelaide directed persons affected by the proposed event to provide feedback directly to the SAMSB as the organisers. An email address was provided, which is the address publicly identified as the ‘contact us’ email address, on the [landing page](#) of the South Australian Motor Sport Board’s website. The email address was samsb@sa.gov.au.
- 4. Following discussions between City of Adelaide and SAMSB, an alternative SAMSB email address will be provided to the community for future queries or concerns related to the bp Adelaide Grand Final event.

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 Martin - QoN - Chinese New Year Celebrations

Tuesday, 8 September 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Phillip Martin

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Phillip Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Could the Administration confirm if it has advised the organisers of Chinese New Year Event that the 2027 celebrations will not be able to be conducted in Gouger Street and, if so:

1. specifically why?
2. what impediments are there are to isolating any section of the street to enable the Chinese New Year celebrations to proceed in 2027 in the precinct in which they have always been held?'

REPLY

1. Chinatown Adelaide of South Australia Inc are the organisers of the Lunar New Year Street Party, which is ordinarily held in Gouger Street and Moonta Street each year.
2. The Gouger Street Revitalisation project procurement process is in its final stages. Subject to Council approval and contract execution, construction is anticipated to commence in Q2 2026/27.
3. Staging of construction works will be finalised upon engagement of a contractor with a view to minimise disruption where practical, however safety is paramount and disruption is to be expected.
4. It is envisaged that works will commence at the Morphett Street section of Gouger Street working from West to East.
5. Holding a large public event in Gouger Street in February 2027, during the proposed works period, has not been considered feasible for public safety and event operation reasons. The works are expected to involve staged construction areas, traffic management, site fencing and changes to pedestrian, vehicle and servicing access. Administration does not wish for the event organisers to be compromised in what they are seeking to achieve through the Lunar New Year event, given the planned works on Gouger Street.
6. The organisers have been involved in the consultation process for the Gouger Street Revitalisation plans for some time. A meeting was held in February 2026 with Administration and the Lunar New Year event organisers to discuss the need for an alternate location to be considered in 2027, given the Gouger Street Revitalisation works are planned to commence in late 2026.
7. Subsequent meetings have since been held with the organisers and temporary alternate locations (such as Victoria Square/Tarantanyangga) have been presented to the organisers and Administration continues to work with them constructively on planning for their 2027 event.

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 -

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - QoN - City CCTV Network

Tuesday, 8 September 2026
Council

Council Member
Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor
Carmel Noon

Public

Contact Officer:
Ilia Houridis, Director City Shaping

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Carmel Noon will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Of the 2026/27 Business Plan and Budget approved by Council on 23 June 2026, can the Administration please confirm:

1. Can Administration advise the last time there was a review with SAPOL of the City CCTV network?
2. Are there currently any plans to add capacity to the City CCTV that is operated by SAPOL?
3. How are additions to the CCTV network considered and administered?
4. What is the process to address requests for CCTV installation?
5. Can the Administration advise, based on current information, if there is sufficient CCTV coverage?
6. How are additions to the CCTV network funded?'

REPLY

1. Can Administration advise the last time there was a review with SAPOL of the City CCTV network?
 - 1.1. The City of Adelaide and SAPOL meet regularly to discuss the City Safe CCTV Network (CSN), including operational and strategic matters and the identification of priority locations.
 - 1.2. The CCTV network was recently upgraded as part of the Adelaide City Deal.
 - 1.3. \$3.0 million was allocated within the agreement with the Federal and State Governments to deliver the CCTV Smart Technology Project, upgrading software and replacing CCTV hardware.
 - 1.4. The project was completed in 2024, noting that whilst the network is regularly reviewed to assess where enhancements can be included, the last time a full evaluation of the City Safe CCTV Network (CSN) was undertaken by the City of Adelaide and SAPOL was in 2003.
2. Are there currently any plans to add capacity to the City CCTV that is operated by SAPOL?
 - 2.1. As part of the Main Street Revitalisation projects, there have been early discussions with SAPOL regarding public CCTV camera coverage, locations and priorities.
 - 2.2. The O'Connell Street Main Street Revitalisation project scope includes the installation of two new public CCTV cameras, with additional conduit infrastructure also included to support potential future provision of public CCTV cameras at identified priority locations.
3. How are additions to the CCTV network considered and administered?
 - 3.1. All requests for new public CCTV cameras are provided to the CCTV Strategic Group for review and prioritisation.

- 3.2. The CCTV Strategic Group includes relevant senior level representatives from the City of Adelaide and SAPOL and meets regularly to discuss strategic matters regarding public CCTV in the CBD and North Adelaide.
- 3.3. Installation of new public CCTV cameras is subject to budget and funding considerations by the City of Adelaide and SAPOL.
4. What is the process to address requests for CCTV installation?
 - 4.1. As noted above, all requests for public CCTV are provided to the CCTV Strategic Group for review and prioritisation.
 - 4.2. Recommendations for the installation of new public CCTV cameras are based upon SAPOL intelligence, including but not limited to, rates of crime against the person and risks to the personal safety of citizens.
5. Can the Administration advise, based on current information, if there is sufficient CCTV coverage?
 - 5.1. Based on information available to the Administration, existing CSN coverage is focused on areas with high pedestrian activity across the city centre and North Adelaide. While this provides good visibility in those locations, there are opportunities to expand coverage into other areas of the city and North Adelaide, where high levels of crime against the person or risks to citizens' personal safety are identified, subject to budget considerations and agreement between the City of Adelaide and SAPOL.
6. How are additions to the CCTV network funded?
 - 6.1. The majority of upgrades and additions to the CSN have been funded through a combination of State and Federal Government grants.
 - 6.2. At times, the City of Adelaide has also invested in expanding the network and associated infrastructure and, on occasion, has been gifted CCTV cameras from various Government Departments as part of broader projects.

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