



COUNCIL

Minutes

for the meeting on

Tuesday, 24 March 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 and Dr Siebentritt

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.'

Councillor Maher entered the Council Chamber at 6.06 pm.

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.'

Councillor Giles entered the Council Chamber at 6.06 pm.

4 Pledge

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

Leave of Absence:

Councillor Snape

7 Confirmation of Minutes - 10/3/2026

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

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

Carried

8 Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Councillor Freeman declared a general conflict of interest in Item 15.1 [Councillor Cabada - MoN - Feasibility Assessment - Scramble Crossing at East Terrace and Rundle Street/Rundle Road], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* as her employer Department for Infrastructure and Transport would be consulted, but that she would stay in the room, participate in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Abrahamzadeh declared a general conflict of interest in Item 11, Recommendation 3 [Road Renaming Request], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999 (SA)* as his employer owns and/or manages property in the vicinity of Queen Street, and that he would withdraw his Chair and leave the room for consideration of the item.

9 Deputations

Nil

10 Petitions

Nil

11 Recommendations of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee - 17 March 2026

Having declared a general conflict of interest in the matter, Councillor Abrahamzadeh left the Colonel Light Room at 6.09 pm.

It was then –

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

11.1 Recommendation 1 - Item 7.1 - Capital Works Monthly Project Update - February 2026THAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the Capital Works Program Update for 28 February 2026 as contained within this report and Attachment A to Item 7.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee held on 17 March 2026.

11.2 Recommendation 2 - Item 7.2 - Community Consultation Outcomes - Victoria Park Commercial LeasesTHAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the findings of the Community Consultation outcomes on the draft Key Lease Terms as contained in Attachment A to Item 7.2 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee held on 17 March 2026.
2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a Lease Agreement with La Dolce Vita Event Management & Catering Pty Ltd for The Bookmakers.
3. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a Lease Agreement with Lola Café Bar Pty Ltd for The Victoria Park Kiosk.
4. Authorises the Lord Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to sign and affix as necessary the Common Seal to the Lease Agreements and all associated documentation to give effect to the above-mentioned decisions.

11.3 Recommendation 3 - Item 7.3 - Road Renaming RequestTHAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the report outlining the request from the family of Sister Janet Mead to rename a portion of Queen Street located between Angas Street and Carrington Street to Sister Janet Mead Street.
2. Notes that the family of Sister Janet Mead do not wish to pursue the naming of an unnamed private road after Sister Janet Mead, as they believe that the unnamed private roads are not suitable to reflect her life and contributions to society.
3. Resolves to proceed with the request to rename a portion of Queen Street between Angas Street and Carrington Street as outlined in Attachment A to Item 7.3 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee held on 17 March 2026, to Sister Janet Mead Street, subject to the consultation process prescribed in paragraph 33 of the report.

Carried unanimously

Councillor Abrahamzadeh re-entered the Council Chamber at 6.10 pm.

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

Nil

13 Lord Mayor's Reports

The Lord Mayor addressed the meeting on the following:

- Zonta Club, Women's Achievement Awards
- Study Adelaide, Welcome Gala dinner
- Opening of the 37th annual Alliance Française French Film Festival
- Christ Church North Adelaide, Commonwealth Day Choral evensong
- Citizenship ceremony

During the discussion, Councillor Maher left the Council Chamber at 6.11 pm.

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Abrahamzadeh,
 Seconded by Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon –

That the report be received and noted.

Carried

14 Councillors' Reports**14.1 Reports from Council Members**

Councillor Freeman addressed the meeting on her time on the jury for the City of Adelaide Prize.

Councillor Davis addressed the meeting on the pastors comments on Commonwealth Day.

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Abrahamzadeh,
 Seconded by Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon –

THAT COUNCIL

1. Notes the Council Member activities and functions attended on behalf of the Lord Mayor as contained in Attachment A to Item 14.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 2026.
2. Notes the summary of meeting attendance by Council Members as contained in Attachment B to Item 14.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 2026.

3. Notes that reports from Council Members tabled at the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 2026 will be included in the Minutes of the meeting.

Carried

15 Motions on Notice

15.1 Councillor Cabada - MoN - Feasibility Assessment - Scramble Crossing at East Terrace and Rundle Street/Rundle Road

Moved by Councillor Cabada,
Seconded by Councillor Davis -

That Council:

1. Notes the significant pedestrian volumes at the intersection of East Terrace and Rundle Street / Rundle Road, particularly during peak periods, major events and weekends.
2. Notes that this location connects Rundle Park, the East End precinct, major event spaces and cycling corridors, resulting in high multi-directional pedestrian movement.
3. Notes the importance of ensuring pedestrian crossings and intersection treatments are appropriate to current and projected usage, particularly in high activity areas.
4. Requests that the CEO undertake and present a feasibility assessment of the most appropriate pedestrian crossing treatment at the intersection of East Terrace and Rundle Street / Rundle Road, including:
 - a. Whether this intersection has previously been assessed for upgraded crossing treatments and the outcome of any such assessment.
 - b. Traffic modelling implications, including impacts on vehicle throughput, freight movements and bus routes.
 - c. Pedestrian safety considerations and potential reduction in vehicle-pedestrian conflict points.
 - d. Required signal infrastructure changes and associated capital costs.
 - e. Recommended crossing solution based on safety, efficiency and user experience.
 - f. Potential funding pathways, including external or grant opportunities.
5. Requests that the assessment also identify other high pedestrian risk locations across the City, including school zones and high activity precincts, and provide advice on appropriate crossing treatments at those locations.
6. Requests that the feasibility assessment be treated as a priority and be based on current pedestrian and traffic data.
7. Requests that the completed feasibility assessment be presented to Council as soon as practicable and no later than Tuesday 26 May 2026.

Discussion ensued, during which:

- Councillor Maher re-entered the Council Chamber at 6.13 pm.
- With the consent of the mover, seconder and the meeting, the motion was varied:
 - to add 's' to the word solution in part 4 e
 - to delete part 5
 - to remove the words 'and no later than Tuesday 26 May 2026' from part 7.

The motion, as varied, was then put and lost

16 Motions without Notice

Nil

17 Questions on Notice

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

- 17.2 Councillor Cabada - QoN - Commercial Property Valuations and Rates Objection Process**
- 17.3 Councillor Cabada - QoN - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders**
- 17.4 Councillor Cabada - QoN - Vehicle Theft in the Adelaide CBD**
- 17.5 Councillor Abrahamzadeh - QoN - Motions and Questions**
- 17.6 Councillor Couros - QoN - Freedom of Information - SAPOL Communications**
- 17.7 Councillor Couros - QoN - Part 6 of Question on Notice - Application of Endorsed Parklet Fee Schedules Across Permit Holders**

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

The Replies for Items 17.1 – 17.7, are attached for reference at the end of the minutes of the meeting.

Councillor Davis raised a Point of Order that the Lord Mayor's ruling that some of Councillor Cabada's Questions on Notice not be answered as they were vague and improper and is not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, was incorrect.

The Lord Mayor ruled against the Point of Order.

Councillor Davis raised a Point of Order that the Administration not answering some of Councillor Cabada's questions due to the Lord Mayor's ruling that some of Councillor Cabada's Questions on Notice not be answered as they were vague and improper and is not to be answered in accordance with Regulation 9(6) of the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, was incorrect.

The Lord Mayor advised Councillor Davis to submit a complaint.

Councillor Davis raised a Point of Order that the Lord Mayor's ruling that some Council Members questions be answered whilst others of a similar nature were not constituted bullying and that he would put in a complaint.

18 Questions without Notice

Discussion ensued

Councillor Martin called a Point of Order in relation to Councillor Davis behaving in an improper and disorderly manner.

The Lord Mayor ruled in favour of the Point of Order and warned Councillor Davis about his behaviour.

Undertaking – Rates Induction Material

In response to a query from Councillor Maher, an undertaking was given to circulate rates induction material to all Council Members.

19 Exclusion of the Public

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

ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 20

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 March 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 20 [Confidential Question on Notice Reply] 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 being considered in confidence as it contains commercially sensitive information relating to business-specific invoices and commercial arrangements as it contains.

Public Interest

The consideration and release of this information is contrary to the public interest, as disclosure could reasonably be expected to prejudice the commercial position of the businesses concerned, undermine confidentiality obligations, and compromise Council's ability to conduct fair and effective commercial dealings.

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA) (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 24 March 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 20 [Confidential Question on Notice Reply] 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

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

ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 21THAT 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 March 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 21 [Confidential Recommendation of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee – 17 March 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 commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret), the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting business, prejudice the commercial position of the Council and prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied the information and confer a commercial advantage on a third party.

The disclosure of information in this report could reasonably prejudice the commercial position and identity of the proponent who supplied 'commercial in confidence' information containing a business case and capability to undertake a promotional opportunity for evaluation by Council at the request of the Council for which 'commercial in confidence' discussions have been undertaken and remain current. Disclosure of this information 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 result in the release of information prior to the finalisation of commercial Lease negotiations with the preferred proponents and competitors receiving the information to the detriment of the proponents who supplied information at this point in time, may materially and adversely affect the financial viability of the proponent for any future projects and 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 commercial Lease negotiations.

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the Local Government Act 1999 (SA) (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 24 March 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 21 [Confidential Recommendation of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee – 17 March 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

Members of the public and corporation staff not involved with Items 20 and 21 left the Council Chamber at 6.57 pm.

20 Confidential Question on Notice Reply [S90(3) (b), (d)]

**21 Confidential Recommendation of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee –
17 March 2026 [S90(3) (b), (d)]**
**Recommendation 1 - Item 10.1 - Bonython Park Kiosk Expressions of Interest Outcomes
[S90(3) (b), (d)]**

The meeting reopened to the public at 6.59 pm.

Item 20 - Confidential Question on Notice Reply [s 90(3) [(b) & (d)]

Confidentiality Order

In accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) and because Item 20 [Confidential Question on Notice Reply] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 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, report and the discussion and any other associated information submitted to this meeting and the Minutes of the meeting in relation to this 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 21 - Confidential Recommendation of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee – 17 March 2026 [s 90(3) (b), (d)]

Recommendation 1 - Item 10.1 - Bonython Park Kiosk Expressions of Interest Outcomes

Confidentiality Order

In accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) and because Item 21 [Confidential Recommendation of the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 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, report and the discussion and any other associated information submitted to this meeting and the Minutes of the meeting in relation to this matter remain confidential and not available for public inspection until 31 December 2026.
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.

Closure

The meeting closed at 6.59 pm

Dr Jane Lomax-Smith
Lord Mayor

Date of confirmation:

Documents Attached:

Item 17.1 – 17.7 – Question on Notice Replies – Distributed Separately

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

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

REPLY

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

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

The following response maintains the original numbering for clarity.

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

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

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

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

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

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

REPLY

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

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

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

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

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

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

See answer to question 1, above.

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

See answer to question 1, above.

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

3. When a commercial ratepayer lodges an objection:

a) Which organisation assesses and determines the objection?

See answer to question 1, above.

b) What is the average timeframe for resolution?

See answer to question 1, above.

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

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

See answer to question 1, above.

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

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

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

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

a) The 2023–24 financial year

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

b) The 2024–25 financial year to date?

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

6. Of those objections:

a) How many resulted in a reduction in valuation?

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

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

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

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

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

a) If so, how many?

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

b) What were the outcomes of those matters?

A reduction in valuation in both related matters.

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

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

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

See answer to question 1, above.

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

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

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

- ‘6. *For the parklets in Question 1, detail Every invoice sent to the parklet owner and include the date and amount of the invoice.*
- a. *Was any invoice ever amended, corrected or withdrawn in relation to the parklets in Question 1?*
 - b. *If yes to question 6a, what were those amendments and why were they amended.’*

REPLY

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Cabada - QoN - Vehicle Theft in the Adelaide CBD

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Alfredo Cabada

Public

Contact Officer:
Iliia Houridis, Director City Shaping

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Alfredo Cabada will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

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

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

REPLY

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

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Abrahamzadeh - QoN - Motions and Questions

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating
Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Arman Abrahamzadeh will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

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

REPLY

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

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

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

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

- END OF REPORT -

Councillor Couros - QoN - Freedom of Information - SAPOL Communications

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

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

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

REPLY

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

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

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

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 24 March 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Mary Couros

Public

Contact Officer:
Jo Podoliak, Director City
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Mary Couros will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

- '6. For the parklets in Question 1, detail every invoice sent to the parklet owner and include the date and amount of the invoice.
 - a. Was any invoice ever amended, corrected, or withdrawn in relation to the parklets in Question 1?
 - b. If yes to question 6a, what were those amendments and why were they amended?

REPLY

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

- END OF REPORT -

Document is Restricted