



COUNCIL

Minutes

for the meeting on

Tuesday, 24 February 2026

in the Council Chamber, Adelaide Town Hall

© 2026 City of Adelaide. All Rights Reserved.

Our Adelaide.
Bold.
Aspirational.
Innovative.

Present – The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, Dr Jane Lomax-Smith (Presiding)

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon

Councillors Abrahamzadeh, Cabada, Couros, Davis, Freeman, Giles, Maher, Martin, Dr Siebentritt and Snape

1 Acknowledgement of Country

At the opening of the Council meeting, the Lord Mayor stated:

'Council acknowledges that we are meeting on traditional Country of the Kaurna people of the Adelaide Plains and pays respect to Elders past and present. We recognise and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land. We acknowledge that they are of continuing importance to the Kaurna people living today.

And we also extend that respect to other Aboriginal Language Groups and other First Nations who are present today.'

2 Acknowledgement of Colonel William Light

The Lord Mayor stated:

'The Council acknowledges the vision of Colonel William Light in determining the site for Adelaide and the design of the City with its six squares and surrounding belt of continuous Park Lands which is recognised on the National Heritage List as one of the greatest examples of Australia's planning heritage.'

3 Prayer

The Lord Mayor stated:

'We pray for wisdom, courage, empathy, understanding and guidance in the decisions that we make, whilst seeking and respecting the opinions of others.'

4 Pledge

Councillor Snape entered the Council Chamber at 6.32 pm.

The Lord Mayor stated:

'May we in this meeting speak honestly, listen attentively, think clearly and decide wisely for the good governance of the City of Adelaide and the wellbeing of those we serve.'

5 Memorial Silence

The Lord Mayor asked all present stand in silence in memory of those who gave their lives in defence of their Country, at sea, on land and in the air.

6 Apologies and Leave of Absence

Nil

7 Confirmation of Minutes - 10/2/2026

Moved by Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon,

Seconded by Councillor Maher -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 10 February 2026, be taken as read and be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings.

Carried

8 Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Councillor Martin declared a general conflict of interest in Item 17.1 [Councillor Cabada - MoN - Advocacy to State Government for increased homelessness response], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) as he has a relative who works for an agency associated with a group providing services to rough sleepers, but that he would stay in the room, participate in the discussion and vote on the matter.

Councillor Abrahimzadeh declared a general conflict of interest in Item 17.1 [Councillor Cabada - MoN - Advocacy to State Government for increased homelessness response] and Item 17.2 [Councillor Maher - MoN - Kerbside and Parking Management Policy], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) as he works for a not for profit organisation which provides a range of services including homelessness services, but that he would stay in the room, participate in the discussion and vote on the matter.

Councillor Maher declared a general conflict of interest in Item 17.2 [Councillor Maher - MoN - Kerbside and Parking Management Policy] and Item 17.3 [Councillor Snape - MoN - ParkSafe Program] and Item 9 [Deputation], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) as one of his activities is rideshare, he has a residential parking permit and he holds a City of Adelaide permit for a nominated vehicle, but that he would stay in the room, participate in the discussion and vote on the matter.

9 Deputations

9.1 Deputation - Mr John Hall - Kerbside and Parking Management Policy in 26/27FY

Mr John Hall addressed the Council:

- Regarding opportunities to improve pick up and drop off locations within the City of Adelaide for rideshare drivers.

The Lord Mayor thanked Mr John Hall for his deputation and response to Council Members questions.

9.2 Deputation - Mr Lindsay Prodea - Residential Parking Permits

Mr Lindsay Prodea addressed the Council:

- To discuss residential parking permits and the limitations of residential permit parking spaces, with respect to the impact of adjacent developments.

The Lord Mayor thanked Mr Lindsay Prodea for his deputation.

It was then –

Moved by Councillor Maher,
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt –

That the deputations be included in the minutes of the meeting.

Carried

The deputations can be found for information at the conclusion of the Minutes of the meeting.

10 Petitions

Nil

11 Recommendations of the Audit and Risk Committee - 6 February 2026

Moved by Councillor Siebentritt,
Seconded by Councillor Snape -

11.1 Recommendation 1 – Item 6.1 – 2025-26 End of Year Financial Reporting Process & External TimetableTHAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the endorsement by the Audit and Risk Committee that the External Audit Plan, as contained in Attachment A to Item 6.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 6 February 2026, is consistent with the scope of the External Audit engagement and relevant legislation and standards.
2. Approves the proposed 2025-26 End of Year Financial Reporting process and External Audit Timetable as contained in Attachment A to Item 6.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 6 February 2026.
3. Notes the External Auditor's independence declaration in relation to the audit engagement for the year ended 30 June 2026 as detailed in Attachment B to Item 6.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 6 February 2026.
4. Approves the External Audit Letter of Engagement as contained in Attachment B to Item 6.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 6 February 2026.
5. Authorises the certification of the financial statements, in their final form, to be signed by the Chief Executive Officer and the principal member of Council as set out in Part 4 (14) of the Regulations.

11.2 Recommendation 2 – Item 6.5 – 2025/26 Business Plan & Budget Q2 updateTHAT COUNCIL

1. Receives the City of Adelaide 2025/26 Business Plan and Budget Quarter 2 update as contained in Attachment A to Item 6.5 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 6 February 2026.
2. Approves adjustments for the 2025/26 Business Plan and Budget (BP&B) as identified in this report and contained in Attachment A to Item 6.5 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held 6 February 2026.
3. Notes the year-to-date Operating (Financial Performance) for the quarter ending 31 December 2025, which includes:
 - 3.1. An operating surplus of \$12.515m (\$6.468m higher than the budget of \$6.047m, for the period)
 - 3.2. Total operating revenue of \$128.712m (\$1.667m higher than the budget of \$127.045m, for the period)
 - 3.3. Total operating expenses (including depreciation) of \$116.197m (\$4.801m lower than the budget of \$120.998m, for the period)
 - 3.4. Total Capital Expenditure of \$33.516m (\$0.122m lower than the budget of \$33.638m, for the period)
 - 3.5. Net cash surplus position of \$9.803m.
4. Approves budgeted year end Operating Position, which includes:
 - 4.1. An operating surplus of \$8.541m (consistent with the adopted budget of \$8.541m)
 - 4.2. Total operating revenue of \$253.282m (\$1.711m higher than the adopted budget of \$251.571m)
 - 4.3. Total operating expenses (including depreciation) of \$244.741m (\$1.711m higher than the Q1 budget of \$243.030m).
5. Approves total capital expenditure of \$120.663m for 2025/26 year (\$1.630m lower than the Q1 budget of \$122.293m).
6. Approves total borrowings of \$50.677m projected to 30 June 2026 (\$1.141m lower than

the Q1 projected borrowings of \$51.818m to 30 June 2026).

7. Receives the Council Subsidiary Quarter 2 updates as contained as Attachments B, C, D and E to Item 6.5 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 6 February 2026.

Carried

12 Recommendations of the City Finance and Governance Committee - 17 February 2026

Moved by Councillor Siebentritt,
Seconded by Councillor Maher -

12.1 Recommendation 1 - Item 7.1 - Use of Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI Policy

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Adopts the "Use of Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI" Policy as contained in Attachment A to Item 7.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the City Finance and Governance Committee held on 17 February 2026.
2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to make any minor editorial and formatting changes as required to finalise the "Use of Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI" Policy as contained in Attachment A to Item 7.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the City Finance and Governance Committee held on 17 February 2026.

12.2 Recommendation 2 - Item 7.2 - 2025/26 Business Plan & Budget Q2 Review

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Receives the City of Adelaide 2025/26 Business Plan and Budget Quarter 2 update as contained in Attachment A to Item 7.2 on the Agenda for the meeting of the City Finance and Governance Committee held on 17 February 2026.
2. Approves adjustments for the 2025/26 Business Plan and Budget (BP&B) as identified in this report and contained in Attachment A to Item 7.2 on the Agenda for the meeting of the City Finance and Governance Committee held on 17 February 2026.
3. Notes the year-to-date Operating (Financial Performance) for the quarter ending 31 December 2025, which includes:
 - 3.1. An operating surplus of \$12.515m (\$6.468m higher than the budget of \$6.047m, for the period)
 - 3.2. Total operating revenue of \$128.712m (\$1.667m higher than the budget of \$127.045m, for the period)
 - 3.3. Total operating expenses (including depreciation) of \$116.197m (\$4.801m lower than the budget of \$120.998m, for the period)
 - 3.4. Total Capital Expenditure of \$33.516m (\$0.122m less than the budget of \$33.638m, for the period)
 - 3.5. Net cash surplus position of \$9.803m.
4. Approves budgeted year end Operating Position, which includes:
 - 4.1. An operating surplus of \$8.541m (consistent with the adopted budget of \$8.541m)
 - 4.2. Total operating revenue of \$253.282m (\$1.711m higher than the adopted budget of \$251.571m)
 - 4.3. Total operating expenses (including depreciation) of \$244.741m (\$1.711m higher than the Q1 budget of \$243.030m).
5. Approves total capital expenditure of \$120.663m for 2025/26 year (\$1.630m lower than the Q1 budget of \$122.293m).
6. Approves total borrowings of \$50.677m projected to 30 June 2026 (\$1.141m lower than the Q1 projected borrowings of \$51.818m to 30 June 2026).
7. Receives the Council Subsidiary Quarter 2 updates as contained as Attachments B, C, D and E to Item 7.2 on the Agenda for the meeting of the City Finance and Governance

Committee held on 17 February 2026.

Discussion ensued

The motion was then put and carried

13 Recommendations of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee - 17 February 2026

Moved by Councillor Maher,
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt -

13.1 Recommendation 1 - Item 7.1 - Public Realm Greening Program - 5 Year Tree Planting Overview

THAT COUNCIL

1. Requests the following issues be addressed in a revised 5-Year Green Infrastructure Plan, to be considered at the May 2026 meeting of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee:
 - Inclusion of a diversity measure aligned to the Santamour diversity index to guide tree selection
 - Provision of a map identifying 5 year indicative planting priorities and identifying the location of existing WSUD supported tree locations
 - Identification of how species are selected for planting to maximise potential canopy spread at planting locations
 - Proposed street level canopy targets in addition to Council wide and Park Lands targets
 - Prioritisation methodology used to determine the proposed planting locations and approach
 - Full cost estimate to 2035 including WSUD interventions and operational costs/savings associated with ongoing maintenance.

13.2 Recommendation 2 - Item 7.2 - Capital Works Monthly Project Update - January 2026

THAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the Capital Works Program Update for January 2026 as contained within this report and Attachment A to Item 7.2 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee held on 17 February 2026.

Discussion ensued

The motion was then put and carried

14 Reports for Council (Chief Executive Officer's Reports)

14.1 Local Government Elected Member Conflicts of Interest

Moved by Councillor Abrahamzadeh,
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt -

THAT COUNCIL

1. Receives and notes the correspondence from the Ombudsman SA regarding local government elected member conflicts of interest as contained in Attachment A to Item 14.1 on the Agenda for the Council meeting held on 24 February 2026.

Discussion ensued

The motion was then put and carried

15 Lord Mayor's Reports

Nil

16 Councillors' Reports

16.1 Reports from Council Members

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon addressed the meeting on her attendance at the Helpmann Academy awards and exhibition, SAPOL community concert at the Adelaide Town Hall, opening of the 2026 Fringe Festival, Lunar New Year Fire Horse art installation at Chinatown, 80 yrs of the Children's Book Council of Australia (CBCA) Awards, speech at the Lunar New Year street party and the media statement by the State Government regarding the MotoGP.

It was then –

Moved by Councillor Couros,
Seconded by Councillor Cabada -

THAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the Council Member activities and functions attended on behalf of the Lord Mayor (Attachment A to Item 16.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2026).
2. Notes the summary of meeting attendance by Council Members (Attachment B to Item 16.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2026).
3. Notes that reports from Council Members tabled at the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2026 will be included in the Minutes of the meeting.

Carried

17 Motions on Notice

17.1 Councillor Cabada - MoN - Advocacy to State Government for increased homelessness response

Moved by Councillor Cabada,
Seconded by Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon -

That Council:

1. Notes increasing community and business concerns regarding the adequacy of supports for people experiencing homelessness in City and North Adelaide.
2. Notes that the number of homeless people in the community is not reducing and that the supply of transitional and permanent housing for individuals who are homeless does not meet the levels required to adequately manage this issue.
3. Notes Council's Strategic Plan 2024-2028 targets to:
 - 3.1 Reduce the incidences of people sleeping rough or experiencing homelessness to functional zero by 2026 in line with Council's Homelessness Strategy.
 - 3.2 Support 29 State Government housing outcomes per month in the City of Adelaide for people experiencing homelessness to 2026 in line with Council's Homelessness Strategy.
4. Notes the City of Adelaide's Homelessness Strategy seeks to work with the State Government and others on transitional accommodation options and long-term strategies to address housing outcomes.
5. Notes the City of Adelaide's comprehensive database and support for local place-based approaches to homelessness through funding support for the Adelaide Zero Project.
6. Requests that the Lord Mayor write to the Premier calling on the State Government to:
 - 6.1 Fund and deliver permanent supportive housing options for people experiencing homelessness.
 - 6.2 Fund and deliver support services to people experiencing homelessness to ensure that their transition is sustainable.

- 6.3. Increase support for local evidence-based approaches to homelessness in the City and North Adelaide.
- 6.4. Build on the strong foundations established by non-government organisation partners by accelerating and scaling targeted programs and pilots that contribute to sustained, long term progress toward functional zero homelessness.
- 6.5. Institute immediate approaches to establish programs and pilots that result in long term outcomes to reach functional zero homelessness.
- 6.6. Provide permanent housing outcomes that include modern methods of construction to fast-track residential building construction that could result in the timely development of new, or repurposing or existing building stock to deliver housing outcomes for people experiencing homelessness.
- 6.7. Provide advice from the Departments of Human Services and Housing and Urban Development on programs and initiatives (including joined up proposals) that are to be delivered that progress housing and support services for individuals experiencing homelessness.

Discussion ensued

Undertaking - Councillor Cabada - MoN - Advocacy to State Government for increased homelessness response

In response to a query from Councillor Couros, an undertaking was given to include relevant Ministers in the email distribution when sending the letter to the Premier.

The motion was then put and carried unanimously

17.2 Councillor Maher - MoN - Kerbside and Parking Management Policy

Moved by Councillor Maher,
Seconded by Councillor Freeman –

That Council:

1. Notes a Draft Kerbside and Parking Management Policy has been submitted for Council consideration as part of the 2026/27 Business Plan and Budget process.
2. Requests the development of the Policy includes a review of principles and priorities for parking spaces and controls relevant to specific segments of the City and North Adelaide.
3. Requests the review considers relevant data sets and reflects the differing parking needs of residents, workers, visitors, businesses, those with disabilities, and those seeking short term/drop off spaces.
4. Notes the work that charities and service organisations deliver in the city, particularly for vulnerable members of our community.
5. Requests Administration prepare a report outlining potential parking options to support charities and not-for-profit service organisations, for Council consideration in 2026 – ahead of the Draft Kerbside and Parking Management Policy.

Discussion ensued

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Martin,
Seconded by Councillor Couros –

That the matter be adjourned to the next meeting of Council.

Carried

17.3 Councillor Snape - MoN - ParkSafe Program

The following motion was moved by Councillor Snape -

That Council:

1. Notes community concerns regarding the use of mobile "ParkSafe" camera vehicles for

digital expiation within the City of Adelaide and the specific issues that have been raised.

2. Requests that the CEO and administration review the operation of ParkSafe, including the legal framework, the application of human oversight and discretion prior to expiation, relevant enforcement data, and options to strengthen fairness, proportionality and transparency in the digital expiation process.
3. That the resulting report outlines any financial implications associated with recommended changes, for consideration as part of the 2026/27 Budget process.
4. That this be presented to Council by 28 April 2026.

Discussion ensued, during which the Lord Mayor advised the motion would need to be moved as a Motion without Notice.

18 Motions without Notice

18.1 Councillor Snape - MwN - ParkSafe Program

Moved by Councillor Snape,
Seconded by Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon -

That Council:

1. Notes community concerns regarding the use of mobile "ParkSafe" camera vehicles for digital expiation within the City of Adelaide and the specific issues that have been raised.
2. Requests that the CEO and administration review the operation of ParkSafe, including the legal framework, the application of human oversight and discretion prior to expiation, relevant enforcement data, and options to strengthen fairness, proportionality and transparency in the digital expiation process.
3. That the resulting report outlines any financial implications associated with recommended changes, for consideration as part of the 2026/27 Budget process.
4. That this be presented to Council by 28 April 2026.

Discussion ensued, during which Councillor Couros left the Council Chamber at 7.47 pm and re-entered at 7.48 pm.

The motion was then put and carried

19 Questions on Notice

19.1 Councillor Abrahamzadeh - QoN - Tower Crane Air Rights

19.2 Councillor Martin - QoN - Aquatic Centre Car Park Size

19.3 Councillor Martin - QoN - Mainstreet/Precinct Strategic Plans

19.4 Councillor Martin - QoN - AEDA Strategic Plan

19.5 Councillor Maher - QoN - Residential Parking Permit Zones adjacent developments

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

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

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

The Questions and Replies having been distributed and published prior to the meeting were taken as read.

The Replies for Items 19.1 – 19.8, are attached for reference at the end of the minutes of the meeting.

20 Questions without Notice

Councillor Maher - Question without Notice - Greening Program

In response to the following Question without Notice from Councillor Maher, the CEO advised that it would be taken on notice and a response given at the next meeting of Council:

Noting that Councillors were provided with the following information regarding 'the loss of [on-street] parks over the duration of the greening program':

'To date, (across the 2024/25 and 2025/26 financial years) there has been a loss of four on-street car parks. The loss of car parks has been a result of the rationalisation of car parking zones where no line marking was in place. This occurred in the following streets: Gawler Place, Ifould Street, Bewes Street and Logan Street. In these cases, trees have been incorporated into the parking zone with car spaces now line marked as per Australian Standards.'

Can the Administration please respond to the following questions:

1. As the zones were not individually marked to standard, it may have been possible to park, for example, 3 average cars in the zone, 4 small cars in the zone, or even 1 large truck in the same zone. If the zone was not rationalised, how did Administration determine how many parking spaces existed in the zone prior to rationalisation?
2. Would the rationalisation of these zones to mark individual spaces per Australian Standards have resulted in the same 'loss' of parking spaces regardless of the addition of any trees?

Undertaking - Councillor Cabada's – QoN - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders

In response to queries from Councillors Davis and Couros, the CEO gave an undertaking to provide Council Members with further information regarding Question 6a of Councillor Cabada's – QoN - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders.

Undertaking – Former Bus Station site

In response to a query from Councillor Martin, the CEO gave an undertaking to provide further information to Council Members on whether the recent announcement by the State Government of the ABC headquarters and arts hub at the former bus station site, reduces the defined housing component agreed to during the tender process.

Undertaking – Australian MotoGP

In response to a query from Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon, the CEO gave an undertaking to provide further information to Council Members on any breach by the State Government of any agreement or legislation in regard to the management of the Adelaide Park Lands, by the lack of communication by the State Government in securing the Australian MotoGP.

21 Exclusion of the Public

Moved by Councillor Martin,
Seconded by Councillor Couros -

ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 22

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Having taken into account the relevant consideration contained in section 90(3) (b) and section 90(2) & (7) of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)*, this meeting of the Council dated 24 February 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 22 [Adjourned Business - Confidential Recommendations of the City Community Services and Culture Committee – 3 February 2026] listed on the Agenda in a meeting open to the public would on balance be contrary to the public interest.

Grounds and Basis

The disclosure of information in this report may adversely impact project viability, prejudice the ability to undertake/participate in future negotiations on the proposal and

prejudice the Council's commercial position and opportunity for Council to participate in future like considerations or discussions.

Public Interest

The Council is satisfied that the principle that the meeting be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed in the circumstances because the disclosure of this information may severely prejudice Council's ability to discuss/participate or influence a proposal for the benefit of the Council and the community in this matter and in relation to other contract negotiations.

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 24 February 2026 orders that the public (with the exception of members of Corporation staff and any person permitted to remain) be excluded from this meeting to enable this meeting to receive, discuss or consider in confidence Item 22 [Adjourned Business - Confidential Recommendations of the City Community Services and Culture Committee – 3 February 2026] listed in the Agenda, on the grounds that such item of business, contains information and matters of a kind referred to in section 90(3) (b) of the Act.

Carried

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Cabada,
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt –

ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 23

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Having taken into account the relevant consideration contained in section 90(3) (i) and section 90(2) & (7) of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)*, this meeting of the Council dated 24 February 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 23 [Confidential Recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee – 6 February 2026] listed on the Agenda in a meeting open to the public would on balance be contrary to the public interest.

Grounds and Basis

This Item is confidential in nature because the report includes information on Council litigation. The disclosure of information in this report could reasonably be expected to prejudice the outcome of Council's actual litigation.

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 24 February 2026 orders that the public (with the exception of members of Corporation staff and any person permitted to remain) be excluded from this meeting to enable this meeting to receive, discuss or consider in confidence Item 23 [Confidential Recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee – 6 February 2026] listed in the Agenda, on the grounds that such item of business, contains information and matters of a kind referred to in section 90(3) (i) of the Act.

Carried

It was then –

Moved by Councillor Martin,
Seconded by Councillor Cabada –

ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 24

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Having taken into account the relevant consideration contained in section 90(3) (b) & (d) and section 90(2) & (7) of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)*, this meeting of the Council dated 24 February 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 24 [Confidential Recommendation of the City Finance and Governance Committee – 17 February 2026] listed on the Agenda in a meeting open to the public would on balance be contrary to the public interest.

Grounds and Basis

These Items contain commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret) the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to identify the proponent and to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the council is conducting business and prejudice the commercial position of the council, with the potential to confer a commercial advantage to a third party competitor of a person with whom the council is conducting business.

Public Interest

The Committee is satisfied that the principle that the meeting be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed in the circumstances because the disclosure of this information may result in release of information prior to the finalisation of 'commercial in confidence' negotiation with the proponent and because the disclosure of Council's commercial position may severely prejudice Council's ability to discuss/participate or influence a proposal for the benefit of the Council and the community in this matter and in relation to other contract negotiations.

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 24 February 2026 orders that the public (with the exception of members of Corporation staff and any person permitted to remain) be excluded from this meeting to enable this meeting to receive, discuss or consider in confidence Item 24 [Confidential Recommendation of the City Finance and Governance Committee – 17 February 2026] listed in the Agenda, on the grounds that such item of business, contains information and matters of a kind referred to in section 90(3) (b) & (d) of the Act.

Carried

Councillor Maher, members of the public and corporation staff not involved with Items 22, 23 and 24 left the Council Chamber at 8.08 pm.

- 22 Adjourned Business - Confidential Recommendations of the City Community Services and Culture Committee – 3 February 2026 [S90(3) (b)]**
- 23 Confidential Audit and Risk Committee Report - 6 February 2026 [S90(3) (i)]**
- 24 Confidential Recommendation of the City Finance and Governance Committee - 17 February 2026 [S90(3) (b), (d)]**
- 24.1 Recommendation 1 - Item 10.1 - Delegation to Award Contracts (Christmas Tree Lighting and Structure Renewal; and Flagstone Pavers) [S90(3) (b), (d)]**

CONFIDENTIAL

The meeting reopened to the public at 8.22 pm.

Item 22 - Adjourned Business - Confidential Recommendations of the City Community Services and Culture Committee – 3 February 2026 [s 90(3) [(b)]]

Confidentiality Order

Authorises that, in accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA) and because Item 22 [Adjourned Business - Confidential Recommendations of the City Community Services and Culture Committee - 3 February 2026] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2026 was received, discussed and considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA), this meeting of the Council do order that:

1. The report, the discussion and any other associated information submitted to this meeting and the Minutes of this meeting in relation to the matter remain confidential and not available for public inspection until 31 December 2032.
2. The confidentiality of the matter be reviewed in December 2026.
3. The Chief Executive Officer be delegated the authority to review and revoke all or part of the order herein and directed to present a report containing the Item for which the confidentiality order has been revoked.

Item 23 - Confidential Audit and Risk Committee Report - 6 February 2026 [s 90(3) [(i)]]

Resolution and Confidentiality Order

THAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the report.
2. Authorises that, in accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA) and because Item 23 [Confidential Audit and Risk Report – 6 February 2026] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2026 was received, discussed and considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(3) (i) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA), this meeting of the Council do order that
 - 2.1. The resolution become public information and included in the Minutes of the meeting.
 - 2.2. The report, the discussion and any other associated information submitted to this meeting and the Minutes of this meeting in relation to the matter remain confidential and not available for public inspection until 31 December 2032.
 - 2.3. The confidentiality of the matter be reviewed in December 2026.
 - 2.4. The Chief Executive Officer be delegated the authority to review and revoke all or part of the order herein and directed to present a report containing the Item for which the confidentiality order has been revoked.

Item 24 - Confidential Recommendation of the City Finance and Governance Committee – 17 February 2026 [s 90(3) [(b), (d)]]

Recommendation 1 - Item 10.1 - Delegation to Award Contracts (Christmas Tree Lighting and Structure Renewal; and Flagstone Pavers)

Confidentiality Order

Authorises that, in accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA) and because Item 24 [Confidential Recommendation of the City Finance and Governance Committee – 17 February 2026 – Recommendation 1 - Delegation to Award Contract (Christmas Tree Lighting and Structure Renewal; and Flagstone Pavers)] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2026 was received, discussed and considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(3) (b) and (d) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA), this meeting of the Council do order that

1. The resolution, the report, the discussion, and any other associated information submitted to this meeting and the Minutes of this meeting in relation to the matter remain confidential and not available for public inspection until 29 February 2036.

2. The confidentiality of the matter be reviewed in December 2027.
3. The Chief Executive Officer be delegated the authority to review and revoke all or part of the order herein and directed to present a report containing the Item for which the confidentiality order has been revoked.

Closure

The meeting closed at 8.22 pm

Dr Jane Lomax-Smith
Lord Mayor

Date of confirmation:

Documents Attached:

Items 9.1 – 9.2 - Deputations

Item 19.1 - 19.8 – Question on Notice Replies – Distributed Separately

Minute Item 9.1

Good evening Lord Mayor and Councilors,

My name is John Hall, and I am one of the administrators of the Adelaide Rideshare Drivers Group, a community of more than 4,200 local drivers. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight about an issue that affects our members and thousands of residents and visitors who move through the City of Adelaide every day.

I recently sought feedback from our membership about opportunities to improve pick-up and drop-off — or PUDO — locations within the city. The response was strong and very clear.

As of June 2025, there were approximately 7,041 registered rideshare operators in Adelaide, compared to around 1,007 current taxi licenses. That is a dramatic shift in the composition of the point-to-point transport industry in just over a decade.

The South Australian Taxi and Chauffeur Vehicle Industry Review, conducted by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, confirms what we see on the road every day: rideshare is now the preferred option for many members of the public.

Yet our city's parking and passenger loading framework has not kept pace with that reality.

The current parking policy dates from 2017 and was developed during a period of transition in the industry. Rideshare had only launched a few years earlier in August 2014. It does not reflect the scale of rideshare use today, nor the reduced demand for traditional taxi ranks compared with a decade ago.

The core issue raised by our members is simple: there is a lack of safe and legal places to pick up and drop off passengers, despite clear and growing public demand.

In many of the city's highest-demand areas, it is not currently legal for rideshare drivers to stop, even briefly, without risking an expiation. This places drivers in a difficult position. We are trying to provide a lawful service to paying passengers, but the infrastructure does not support us to do so safely.

Key hot spots consistently identified include Currie Street and Grenfell Street — on both sides — as well as King William Street and Pulteney Street near Rundle Mall.

One example of good design already exists: the four passenger spaces in front of Legends Bar on the western side of Pulteney Street. That zone works. It reduces congestion, improves safety, and provides clarity for both drivers and passengers. Duplicating that zone on the eastern side of Pulteney Street would be a logical and low-cost improvement.

A new PUDO zone straight after turning left onto Grenfell Street from King William Street would also help manage the constant demand at that intersection.

On Hindley Street, a four-space PUDO zone opposite the Mayfair would significantly improve safety in a busy nightlife area.

And on Morphett Street, a PUDO zone near 185 Morphett Street would better service the growing accommodation precinct in that location.

On North Tce, The Oaks Embassy has a yellow line and no standing zone right out the front.

Another consistent concern relates to taxi zones. At present, taxi zones can only be used by taxis. Yet the overwhelming majority of passenger movements are now carried out by rideshare vehicles.

We are not asking to occupy taxi ranks while waiting. We do not need to queue. Our business model is different — we arrive, pick up, and depart within minutes.

If rideshare vehicles were permitted to use taxi zones for immediate pick-up and drop-off only — under rules similar to “No Parking” — it would dramatically improve compliance and reduce illegal stopping.

We also ask: could rideshare vehicles be permitted to stop anywhere for an instant set-down or pick-up, provided it does not obstruct traffic flow? This would reflect the practical reality of urban transport and reduce the current tension between compliance and service delivery.

Importantly, the Council already holds valuable data that can help guide these decisions. Expiation data and Park Safe vehicle data will clearly show where drivers are being fined and where demand is highest. That information could inform the placement of new passenger loading zones.

This is not about special treatment for rideshare drivers. It is about aligning city policy with transport reality.

It is about improving safety by reducing illegal stopping.

It is about reducing congestion by providing clearly marked, well-located PUDO spaces.

It is about supporting residents, businesses, hotels, and the night-time economy.

And it is about ensuring Adelaide remains a modern, accessible, and visitor-friendly city.

In closing, we respectfully request that Council undertake a review of passenger loading zones and parking policy with direct input from industry representatives, using available enforcement data to guide evidence-based changes.

We stand ready to work with Council staff to identify practical, low-cost improvements that will benefit drivers, passengers, businesses, and the broader community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Deputation by Lindsay Prodea to Adelaide City Council, 24-2-2026

Lord Mayor and Councillors,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I have lived in Adelaide for 12 years on Hume Street, a small street just off Hutt Street. Your after-hours team would know it well with our frequent late night calls asking for parking inspectors.

Just on Hume street, there are enough buildings with permit eligibility for up to 11 permits. However, there are currently only four partially-timed permit parks (arguably three and a half, as one was shortened during apartment construction). I don't know the exact number of permits issued on the street, but there are at least a dozen regular permit-holding vehicles competing for those spaces. With only 3.5 permit spaces, it only takes one or two people to ignore the signage or park across the middle of bays, and residents are left circling the whole neighbourhood.

The parking limits and allocations have not changed since I moved to Hume Street in 2014. However, I have witnessed first-hand how development has reshaped parking accessibility over this time.

And with the introduction of "Park Safe" cars issuing fines, there is no longer an immediate deterrent of a paper ticket so visitors can change their behaviour.

During weekdays between 8 and 4, 100% of the parks on the street are occupied at least 95 percent of the time. You might secure a park on a weeknight evening, but from Thursday through Saturday, it becomes almost impossible. Sunday mornings are also difficult due to Life Church at the end of the street. During major events such as the Adelaide Fringe or any car racing or sporting event, the pressure increases again.

The City of Adelaide's interactive parking map shows only one unrestricted parking area within the city boundary, outside St John's Anglican Church on St John Street. However, Hume Street ALSO has eight unrestricted parks near the intersection of Hume and Cardwell Streets.

The difference here is Hume Street sits immediately adjacent to Hutt Street, surrounded by restaurants, businesses and new developments. It is also home to an eight-storey serviced apartment building, built in 2014 (inexplicably approved above the six-storey height restrictions). That building added 31 serviced apartments to the street with no off-street parking. As you know, developers are not obligated to include off-street parking in their developments, and there is little motivation for them to do so as it would eat into their profits.

As a result, the eight unrestricted parks are almost permanently occupied. Workers come from as far as Calvary Adelaide, walking ten minutes in scrubs to secure an all-day space.

The effect is that residents without off-street parking can't reliably park near their homes for the majority of the time. This pressure will only increase with more developments and more events. You can imagine my joy this week of hearing how SA has "won" the MotoGP event. Who knows how bad this will get with the change in height restrictions in the residential zone from 3 storeys to 20 storeys?

Parking on Hutt Street is also set to be reduced as part of redevelopment, and, a new 10-storey development at 144 Hutt Street, on the corner of Hume Street, Hutt Street and Allen Place, is

scheduled to begin construction early next year. I welcome development and activation of the city but this must not come at the direct expense of existing residents.

I've seen this before. During the Karidis eight-storey build on Hume Street, parking became impossible for residents for nine months. Councillor Michael Henningsen intervened and introduced temporary permit parking *at all times* to several spaces. That helped, but workers frequently ignored restrictions.

While guidelines may state that contractors are not permitted to use on-street parking beyond short-term loading, my lived experience tells me this is not observed.

My request is practical and proportionate. First, increase permit spaces on Hume Street to at least six, one outside each eligible residence. This would provide a one-to-one ratio with eligible properties, even if not 1:1 ratio of parks to permits.

Second, convert permit zones to "permit parking at all times" during major construction periods, including the upcoming Hutt Street development. Some nearby streets – Cairns St, Allen Pl, already have these in place.

Third, review the eight currently untimed spaces on Hume Street. Introduce time limits to discourage all-day parking by non-residents. When trades or services are required, we as residents can apply for temporary permits

Finally, I implore you to proactively review residential parking *before* redevelopment. Tom McCready at the council has advised me there is a current 12 month wait for review of parking conditions, but waiting for crisis conditions places avoidable strain on rate-paying residents.

I accept that on-street parking is a shared community asset. My request is not for exclusivity. It is for reasonable access to park near my home, in a street that has experienced sustained densification without any corresponding parking review.

Twelve years ago when I moved in, parking zones may have been appropriate. Today, they are not.

I ask Council to act proactively, not reactively, so that residents are protected during ongoing development and infrastructure change. Mine is a very personal example, but I imagine a city-wide challenge.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

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 -