



# COUNCIL

## Minutes

for the meeting on

Tuesday, 8 September 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, Freeman, Giles, Maher, Martin, Dr Siebentritt and Snape

**1 Acknowledgement of Country**

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

‘The City of Adelaide acknowledges the Kaurna People of the Adelaide Plains as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we meet today.

We acknowledge and honour their spiritual and cultural stewardship of this Country and recognise their deep and enduring relationship with its lands, waters, the sky, and all living things.

We pay our respects to Kaurna Elders past and present and recognise the important role of emerging leaders in sustaining and strengthening culture.’

**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 Giles entered the Council Chamber at 6.56 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.’

**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**

Nil

**7 Confirmation of Minutes - 25/8/2026 & 1/9/2026**

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

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 25 August 2026 and the Minutes of the Special meeting held on 1 September 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 14.1 [Adelaide Oval Precinct Community Land Management Plan for Public Consultation] and Item 17.4 [Councillor Martin - MoN - Frome and North Terrace Intersection], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) as the matters involve the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, which is her primary place of employment, but that she would stay in the room, participate in the discussion and vote on the matter.

Councillor Abrahamzadeh declared a general conflict of interest in Item 13.1 [Recommendation 1 – Item 7.1 - Light Square / Wauwi Traffic and Safety Assessment], pursuant to Section 74 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) as his employer's offices are located on Light Square, but that he would stay in the room, participate in the discussion and vote on the matter.

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon gave a personal explanation to acknowledge the recent tragedy of the floods in Nepal, to stand with the community and extend sympathy and support.

**9 Deputations**

Nil

**10 Petitions**

Nil

**11 Advice of the Kadaltilla/ Adelaide Park Lands Authority - 27 August 2026**

Moved by Councillor Snape,  
Seconded by Councillor Martin -

**THAT COUNCIL**

1. Notes that Kadaltilla /Adelaide Park Lands Authority met on 27 August 2026.
2. Notes the advice of the Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority from the meeting of the Board held on 27 August 2026, contained in Item 11 on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 8 September 2026 in relation to:
  - 2.1. Cor Infinitus Returned and Services League of Australia SA Branch - Memorial Proposal
  - 2.2. Kadaltilla / Adelaide Park Lands Authority 2025/2026 Annual Report

Discussion ensued

Carried

**12 CEO Performance Review Panel Report - 31 August 2026**

Moved by Councillor Maher,  
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt -

THAT COUNCIL

1. Notes that the CEO Performance Review Panel met on 31 August 2026.

Carried

### **13 Recommendations of the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee – 1 September 2026**

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

#### **13.1 Recommendation 1 - Item 7.1 - Light Square / Wauwi Traffic and Safety Assessment**

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Notes that the City Plan identifies a Light Square / Wauwi upgrade as essential to supporting significant residential and employment growth expected within the north-west of the CBD towards 2031, which requires improved transport networks and access to additional green space.
2. Notes the traffic and safety assessment of Light Square / Wauwi prepared by the City of Adelaide with the support of Wallbridge Gilbert Aztec (WGA), as contained in Attachment A to Item 7.1 on the Agenda for the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee held on 1 September 2026.
3. Notes that the traffic and safety assessment confirms that both Option 1 and Option 2 in the draft Light Square / Wauwi Master Plan are feasible, but due to existing constraints on the road network, full delivery of either Option 1 and Option 2 would need to be taken as part of a broader precinct and network scale transport solution.
4. Notes the Light Square / Wauwi Active Travel Report as contained in Attachment B to Item 7.1 on the Agenda for the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee held on 1 September 2026.
5. Notes the City of Adelaide's application under Stream One of the Australian Government's Urban Precincts Partnership Program (UPPP) remains under consideration for broader precinct and network scale planning for Light Square / Wauwi.
6. Notes the short-term works package to target high-impact traffic and safety improvements for Light Square, is currently an unfunded item and will be incorporated into the prioritised program of transport related upgrades currently being developed by the Administration as part of the Integrated Transport Strategy Implementation Plan Item 4.1.4. for funding consideration in future Business Plans and Budgets processes.
7. Requests that the Administration develop concept plans for the short term safety enhancement works with funding through Council's quarterly budget review processes in 2026/27, including the Quarter 1 review process, and future Annual Business Plan and Budget processes.
8. Requests the Administration bring a report back to the November 2026 City Planning, Development and Business Affairs, to finalise and adopt the draft Light Square / Wauwi Master Plan.
9. Notes that the Administration will seek grant funding for the short term works package following the development of the concept plans.

#### **13.2 Recommendation 2 - Item 7.2 - Assessment of Long-term Vacant and Underutilised Sites for Housing**

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Receives the outcomes of the 2025/26 strategic project investigating the long-term vacant properties and underutilised land and buildings in the City of Adelaide as contained in Attachment A to Item 7.1 on the Agenda for the meeting of the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee held on 1 September 2026.

2. Notes that the 2026/27 Economic Development Strategy implementation project will explore options to mitigate building vacancy.
3. Notes that the findings of the Vacant and Underutilised Sites Assessment will be shared with the State Planning Commission and the Productivity Commission Inquiry into Housing Regulation.
4. Asks the Administration to report to Council no later than December 2026 on Administration's recommendations in relation to the consultation team's recommendations (at para 22), and resourcing required.

Discussion ensued, during which:

- Councillor Giles left the Council Chamber at 7.07 pm and re-entered at 7.09 pm.
- With the consent of the mover, seconder and the meeting part 4 of Recommendation 2, was varied to read as follows:  
 '4. Asks the Administration to report to Council no later than December 2026 on Administration's recommendations in relation to the consultation team's recommendations (at para 22), resourcing required and reporting on the alignment of the recommendations with Council's Strategic Plan.'

Undertaking - Recommendation 1 - Item 7.1 - Light Square / Wauwi Traffic and Safety Assessment

In response to a query from Councillor Freeman, an undertaking was given to provide Council Members with information on what constitutes a black spot.

Motion, as varied, carried unanimously

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

### **14.1 Adelaide Oval Precinct Community Land Management Plan for Public Consultation**

Discussion ensued

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Martin,  
Seconded by Councillor Snape -

THAT COUNCIL

1. Receives the correspondence dated 18 August 2026 from the Minister for Planning as contained in Attachment A to Item 14.1 on the Agenda for the Council meeting held on 8 September 2026, that confirms his support for the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority's request for greater flexibility in how events at Adelaide Oval 2 are configured and managed, including greater flexibility for events occurring over consecutive days, and encourages Council to consider this position in finalising the draft Community Land Management Plan for the Adelaide Oval Precinct part of Tarntanya Wama (Park 26), for public consultation.
2. Approves the draft Community Land Management Plan for the Adelaide Oval Precinct part of Tarntanya Wama (Park 26) Attachment B as referred to in paragraph 16 as Option 2, including references to the amendments to the existing event restrictions, referred to in Item 14.1 on the Agenda for the Council meeting held on 8 September 2026, being released for statutory consultation for a period of 28 days.
3. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer, or delegate, to authorise minor edits to the draft Community Land Management Plan for the Adelaide Oval Precinct part of Tarntanya Wama (Park 26) Attachment B.
4. Notes that the results of statutory public consultation will be presented to Kadaltilla and Council prior to approval of the Community Land Management Plan.

Carried

**14.2 Appointment of City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee Chair**

Moved by Councillor Maher,  
Seconded by Councillor Snape -

**THAT COUNCIL**

1. Notes the term of appointment for the position of Chair for the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee will be from 9 September 2026 until the conclusion of the Council term.
2. Notes that the method of appointing a Council Member to the position of Chair for the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee will be undertaken in accordance with the Code of Practice for Council Meeting Procedures as follows:
  - 2.1. The Presiding Member of the Meeting will call for nominations, which must be accepted or declined by the Council Member who is subject of the nomination.
  - 2.2. The Chief Executive Officer as Returning Officer is authorised to declare the successful candidate appointed to position of Committee Chair or Deputy Chair.
  - 2.3. In the event of only one nomination to the office, the candidate is appointed to the position of Committee Chair or Deputy Chair, announced by the Returning Officer.
  - 2.4. In the event of there being more nominations than required, an election by voting ballot of Council Members present will be undertaken.
  - 2.5. If the votes for two or more candidates for the relevant position are equal, a revote by ballot between tied candidates will be undertaken.
  - 2.6. If the votes for two or more candidates for the position remain equal, lots must be drawn to determine which candidate or candidates will be excluded.
  - 2.7. Upon completion of the ballot process, the successful candidate is announced by the Returning Officer as appointed to the position of Committee Chair or Deputy Chair.

Carried

The Lord Mayor called for nominations to the position of Chair for the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee from 9 September 2026 until the conclusion of the Council term.

Councillor Cabada nominated Councillor Freeman, who accepted the nomination.

Councillor Maher nominated Councillor Cabada, who declined the nomination.

There being no further nominations, Mr Michael Sedgman, Returning Officer advised the meeting that Councillor Freeman was appointed to the position of Chair for the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee from 9 September 2026 until the conclusion of the Council term.

**15 Lord Mayor's Reports**

The Lord Mayor addressed the meeting on the following:

- 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Rundle Mall
- 185<sup>th</sup> anniversary of JPE Design Studio
- 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Encounter Youth's Hindley Street Support Program
- Welcoming delegates to Adelaide for the Planning Institute of Australia's 75th Anniversary conference
- Citizenship Ceremony
- Singapore National Day celebration with Singapore's High Commissioner, Anil Nayar
- City South Adelaide AGM
- Tour of Youth 110

- To acknowledge the resignation of the Deputy Lord Mayor from the City Planning, Development and Business Affairs Committee and to thank the Deputy Lord Mayor for their contribution to the committee and the work undertaken during her time in the role.

It was then –

Moved by Councillor Cabada,  
Seconded by Councillor Giles –

That the report be received and noted.

Carried

## 16 Councillors' Reports

Councillor Siebentritt addressed the meeting on his attendance at the 'Topping out' of the Avive Adelaide, Mental Rehabilitation Hospital on Hutt Street, Adelaide.

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Giles,  
Seconded by Councillor Cabada –

That the report be received and noted.

Carried

## 17 Motions on Notice

### 17.1 Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - MoN - Night-Time Safety Infrastructure

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

That Council:

1. Notes that current and future Mainstreet and public realm upgrades provide a timely opportunity to consider safety infrastructure, including lighting, CCTV coverage and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles, as part of project planning and delivery wherever appropriate.
2. Requests Administration prepare a report on lighting informed by:
  - 2.1. current and planned Mainstreet and public realm projects;
  - 2.2. any existing Council safety and CPTED assessments; and
  - 2.3. relevant safety and security audits, walk-arounds, forums, workshops or reports undertaken by City precinct associations.
3. Requests that the report highlight:
  - 3.1. inadequate, non-operational or poorly positioned lighting;
  - 3.2. priority laneways, transport areas, late-night precincts and other identified safety hotspots;
  - 3.3. issues and recommendations already identified through precinct-led safety and security work; and
  - 3.4. existing asset plans and opportunities to incorporate improved lighting into planned infrastructure and Mainstreet works where practicable.
4. Requests the report back to Council by November 2026 to incorporate improvements into planned Mainstreet and public realm works, opportunities for State Government or other co-funding, and any matters requiring consideration as part of the 2027/28 Business Plan and Budget process.

Discussion ensued, during which with the consent of the mover, seconder and the meeting Part 4 of the motion was varied to read as follows:

- '4. Requests the report back to Council by December 2026 to incorporate improvements into planned Mainstreet and public realm works (excluding Park Lands), opportunities for State Government or other co-funding, and any matters requiring consideration as part of the 2027/28 Business Plan and Budget process.'

Undertaking - Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - MoN - Night-Time Safety Infrastructure

In response to a query from Councillor Abrahamzadeh, the CEO gave an undertaking to schedule a late night city review for Council Members.

Motion, as varied, carried

## 17.2 Councillor Maher - MoN - Behavioural Standards Panel Report 25BSP-0005

Moved by Councillor Maher,  
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt -

That Council:

1. Notes the Behavioural Standards Panel Final Report Panel Reference 25BSP-0005, and paragraph 188 of the report.
2. Notes the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1999* Member behaviour—Part A1, and section 262W(4).
3. Notes the Question on Notice response at Agenda Item 19.1 of this meeting, and the decision of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal in *McMahon v Knight* [2024] SACAT 45.
4. Urgently commences advocacy for amendments to the *Local Government Act 1999* regarding referral of former elected members to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

Discussion ensued

Amendment -

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

That the motion be amended by the inclusion of an additional Part 5 to read as follows:

- '5. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to submit a motion to the next Local Government Association General Meeting seeking sector-wide support for the legislative reform outlined in point 4.'

Discussion ensued, during which with the consent of the mover, seconder and the meeting the amendment was varied to include the words 'exercise best endeavours' after the word 'Officer'.

Amendment, as varied, carried

Motion, as amended, carried

## 17.3 Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - MoN - Torrens Lake Water Quality Pilot Trial

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

That Council:

1. Notes the recurring water-quality issues and closures affecting Torrens Lake and the resulting impacts on recreation, tourism, businesses and the amenity and reputation of the City.
2. Notes that, under section 25 of the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005*, Council has the care, control and management of the Torrens dam and the water held by it, subject to the *Landscape South Australia Act 2019*.

3. Notes advice that nanobubble oxygenation and controlled ozone technology has been used successfully in particular the experience of Wagga Wagga City Council at Lake Albert, where between 25 November 2024 and 9 June 2026 Council progressed this technology from an initial six-month trial, through further monitoring and extension, to continued use of the technology and that a six-month independently monitored research trial involving the University of Adelaide, Monash University and appropriately qualified scientific oversight has been proposed. Further notes that TLCAC remains open to considering new scientific evidence and that the Chief Executive Officer has requested that relevant representatives be invited to present updated evidence and information to TLCAC.
4. Supports in principle the development of a proposal for a controlled six-month pilot trial of nanobubble oxygenation and controlled ozone technology in Torrens Lake during the 2026–27 spring/summer period, incorporating independent scientific monitoring, baseline testing, defined success criteria and appropriate environmental and public-safety safeguards.
5. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to coordinate progression of the pilot proposal, in consultation with TLCAC, relevant State Government agencies and regulators, including engagement between the proponent/s, participating universities, and to identify any approvals, permits or authorisations required by law and the pathway for their consideration. Where an impediment to the proposed trial is identified, Administration is requested to advise Council of the legislative, regulatory, scientific or safety basis for that position and the available options or pathway to address it.
6. Requests the Chief Executive Officer, as a matter of priority and within Council's responsibilities, to ensure the current accumulation of rubbish, litter and organic debris within Torrens Lake is removed and, as part of preparations for the proposed trial and Council's broader water-quality response, work through TLCAC and with adjoining councils, relevant State Government agencies and other relevant stakeholders to strengthen upstream monitoring, prevention, gross-pollutant interception and response measures to reduce rubbish, organic debris and other pollutants entering the river and accumulating within the Lake, recognising their potential contribution to degraded water quality and to conditions associated with water-quality warnings and closures, as well as their impact on amenity, local businesses and visitor experience.
7. Requests a report to Council by 24 November 2026 setting out the proposed scope and location, scientific methodology and monitoring, consultation outcomes, environmental and public-safety safeguards, required approvals, indicative costs, external or research funding opportunities, proposed commencement date and any further Council decision required; and notes that any subsequent permanent deployment or long-term procurement of the technology would be considered separately following receipt of the independent results.

Discussion ensued, during which:

- Councillor Maher left the Council Chamber at 8.09 pm and re-entered at 8.14 pm.
- With the consent of the mover and seconder, the Lord Mayor advised the motion would be taken in parts.
- The Lord Mayor sought leave of the meeting to continue the meeting past 8.30 pm, until all items have been considered.

Moved by Councillor Maher,  
Seconded by Councillor Giles –

That the meeting continue past 8.30 pm, until all items have been considered.

Carried

It was then -

Moved by Councillor Cabada,  
Seconded by Councillor Couros –

That the motion be put.

Lost

Part 1 of the motion carried

Part 2 of the motion carried

Part 3 of the motion lost

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon requested that a division be taken on Part 3 of the motion.

Division

For (3):

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon and Councillors Freeman and Snape

Against (7):

Councillors Abrahamzadeh, Couros, Cabada, Giles, Maher, Martin and Siebentritt

The division was declared against Part 3 of the motion

Part 4 of the motion lost

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon requested that a division be taken on Part 4 of the motion.

Division

For (4):

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon and Councillors Freeman, Siebentritt and Snape

Against (6):

Councillors Abrahamzadeh, Couros, Cabada, Giles, Maher and Martin

The division was declared against Part 4 of the motion

Part 5 of the motion lost

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon requested that a division be taken on Part 5 of the motion.

Division

For (3):

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon and Councillors Freeman and Snape

Against (7):

Councillors Abrahamzadeh, Couros, Cabada, Giles, Maher, Martin and Siebentritt

The division was declared against Part 5 of the motion

Part 6 of the motion lost

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon requested that a division be taken on Part 6 of the motion.

Division

For (3):

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon and Councillors, Siebentritt and Snape

Against (7):

Councillors Abrahamzadeh, Couros, Cabada, Freeman, Giles, Maher and Martin

The division was declared against Part 6 of the motion

Part 7 of the motion was not voted upon as it was ultra vires

**17.4 Councillor Martin - MoN - Frome and North Terrace Intersection**

Moved by Councillor Martin.

Seconded by Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon -

That Council;

Asks the Administration in collaboration with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) to review the recent changes to the intersection of Frome Road and Frome Street with North Terrace with a view to assessing the performance of the intersection and potential improvements that could enhance the safety and efficiency of the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, including avoiding queuing.

Discussion ensued

Carried

**18 Motions without Notice**

Nil

**19 Questions on Notice****19.1 Councillor Maher - QoN - Behavioural Standards Panel Report 25BSP-0005****19.2 Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - QoN - Precinct Review and Strategic Planning****19.3 Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - QoN - Torrens Lake Water Quality Management: Current Measures, Costs and Outcomes****19.4 Councillor Martin - QoN - South Australian Motorsport Board****19.5 Councillor Martin - QoN - Chinese New Year Celebrations****19.6 Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Noon - QoN - City CCTV Network**

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

The Replies for Items 19.1 – 19.6, are attached for reference at the end of the minutes of the meeting.

**20 Questions without Notice**

Discussion ensued

In response to a query from Councillor Martin, an undertaking was given to investigate if Chinese New Year could be held in part of Gouger Street, rather than the entire street.

In response to a query from Councillor Freeman, an undertaking was given to provide Council Members with information on if discussions were held with other Main Street Groups for the installation of CCTV upgrades and only O'Connell Street was selected.

Councillor Abrahamzadeh left the Council Chamber at 8.55 pm.

In response to a query from Councillor Maher, an undertaking was given to provide urgent communications to the community regarding the plan of action for the cleanup of the Torrens.

Mr Michael Sedgman, Chief Executive Officer declared a material conflict of interest in Item 22 [Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel - 31 August 2026] and Item 23.1 [CEO Employment Contract], pursuant to Section 75 of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) as he was the subject of the reports, left the meeting at 8.56 pm.

**21 Exclusion of the Public**

Moved by Councillor Cabada,

Seconded by Councillor Martin -

ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 22

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Having taken into account the relevant consideration contained in section 90(3) (a) and section 90(2) & (7) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA), this meeting of the Council dated 8 September 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 22 [Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel - 31 August 2026] listed on the Agenda in a meeting open to the public would on balance be contrary to the public interest.

Recommendation 1 - Grounds and Basis

Consideration in confidence is sought because the confidential 360 Degree Review conducted by Hender Consulting contains information the disclosure of which would involve the unreasonable disclosure of the views of elected members, staff and stakeholders into the personal affairs of Mr Michael Sedgman, Chief Executive Officer, City of Adelaide.

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 would involve the unreasonable disclosure of the views of elected members, staff and stakeholders into the personal affairs of Mr Michael Sedgman, Chief Executive Officer, City of Adelaide.

Recommendation 2 - Grounds and Basis

Receipt and discussion of this report and attachments associated with this Item is required in confidence to protect the personal affairs of the Chief Executive Officer.

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 would involve unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person.

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 8 September 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 [Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel - 31 August 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)(a) of the Act.

Carried

Moved by Councillor Maher,  
Seconded by Councillor Siebentritt –

## ORDER TO EXCLUDE FOR ITEM 23.1

THAT COUNCIL:

1. Having taken into account the relevant consideration contained in section 90(3) (a) and section 90(2) & (7) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA), this meeting of the Council dated 8 September 2026 resolves that it is necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public as the consideration of Item 23.1 [CEO Employment Contract] listed on the Agenda in a meeting open to the public would on balance be contrary to the public interest.

Grounds and Basis

Receipt and discussion of this report and attachments associated with this Item is required in confidence to protect the personal affairs of the Chief Executive Officer.

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 would involve unreasonable disclosure of information concerning the personal affairs of any person.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, 8 September 2026, at 6.55 pm

2. Pursuant to section 90(2) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) (the Act), this meeting of the Council dated 8 September 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 23.1 [CEO Employment Contract] 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)(a) of the Act.

Carried

Members of the public and corporation staff not involved with Items 22 and 23.1 left the Council Chamber at 8.56 pm.

- 22 **Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel – 31 August 2026**  
[s 90(3) [(a)]
- 23 **Confidential Reports for Council (Chief Executive Officer's Reports)**
- 23.1 **CEO Employment Contract [s 90(3) [(a)]**

The meeting reopened to the public at 9.27 pm.

**Item 22 - Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel – 31 August 2026 [s 90(3) [(a)]**

**Recommendation 1 – Item 7.1 - 2025/26 CEO Performance 360 Review**

Confidentiality Order

Orders, in accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) and because Item 22 [Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel – 31 August 2026] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 8 September 2026 was received, discussed and considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(3) (a) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA), 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 31 December 2031.
2. The confidentiality of the matter be reviewed in accordance with section 91(3) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA).
3. The Chief Operating 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.

**Recommendation 2 – Item 7.2 - 2025/26 CEO Remuneration Review**

Confidentiality Order

Orders, in accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) and because Item 22 [Confidential Recommendations of the CEO Performance Review Panel - 31 August 2026] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 8 September 2026 was received, discussed and considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(3) (a) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA), that:

1. The discussion held in confidence in relation to the matter remain confidential and not available for public inspection until 31 December 2031.
2. The confidentiality of the matter be reviewed in accordance with section 91(3) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA).
3. The Chief Operating 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 received.

**Item 23.1 - CEO Employment Contract [s 90(3) [(a)]**

Confidentiality Order

Authorises that, in accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) and because Item 23.1 [CEO Employment Contract] listed on the Agenda for the meeting of the Council held on 8 September 2026 was received, discussed and considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(3) (a) 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 31 December 2031.
2. The confidentiality of the matter be reviewed in accordance with section 91(3) of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA).
3. The Chief Operating 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 9.27 pm

Dr Jane Lomax-Smith  
Lord Mayor

Date of confirmation:

Documents Attached:

Item 19.1 – 19.6 – Question on Notice Replies – Distributed Separately

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

Tuesday, 8 September 2026  
Council

**Council Member**  
Councillor Patrick Maher

Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating Officer

## QUESTION ON NOTICE

**Councillor Patrick Maher will ask the following Question on Notice:**

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

## REPLY

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

---

<sup>1</sup> *Knight* at [44]  
Council – Agenda – Tuesday, 8 September 2026

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

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

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

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

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

---

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 8 September 2026  
**Council**

**Council Member**

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor  
Carmel Noon

Public

**Contact Officer:**

Anthony Spartalis, Chief Operating  
Officer

## QUESTION ON NOTICE

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

'Could Administration please advise:

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

---

## REPLY

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

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

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

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

---

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 8 September 2026  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor  
Carmel Noon

Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Tom McCready, Director City  
Infrastructure

## QUESTION ON NOTICE

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

'Could Administration please advise:

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

---

## REPLY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

– END OF REPORT –

Councillor Martin - QoN - South  
Australian Motorsport Board

Tuesday, 8 September 2026  
Council

Council Member  
Councillor Phillip Martin

Public

Contact Officer:  
Jo Podoliak, Director City  
Community

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Phillip Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:

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

REPLY

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

|                                                  |                                                                                           |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply | To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4.5 hours. |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- END OF REPORT -

## Councillor Martin - QoN - Chinese New Year Celebrations

Tuesday, 8 September 2026  
Council

**Council Member**  
Councillor Phillip Martin

Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Jo Podoliak, Director City  
Community

## QUESTION ON NOTICE

**Councillor Phillip Martin will ask the following Question on Notice:**

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

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

---

## REPLY

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

|                                                  |                                                                                           |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply | To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 4.5 hours. |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

---

- END OF REPORT -

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

Tuesday, 8 September 2026  
**Council**

**Council Member**  
Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor  
Carmel Noon

Public

**Contact Officer:**  
Ilia Houridis, Director City Shaping

## QUESTION ON NOTICE

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

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

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

---

## REPLY

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

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

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