CITY OF ONKAPARINGA

Councillor questions on agenda items (informal questions) – Council meeting agenda 15 September 2026

In accordance with the Code of practice - proceedings of meetings' Procedure 3.2.4 Informal questions - pre-meeting process, the below summarises questions from councillors and the responses provided.

Item no.	Item	Councillor	Questions and response
6.1	MAYOR'S REPORT	Update	Additional correspondence to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Waste seeking support for the topic of tyres to be raised at the next Environment Ministers' Meeting. (Refer Attachment 1)
10.1	UPDATE REPORT PROPOSED FUTURE USE AND LEASE OF PEAR TREE PADDOCK, WILLUNGA	Themeliotis	*1.What specific performance measures will be used at the six-month and 12-month reviews to determine whether the trial has been successful? For example, will there be defined thresholds for complaints, compliance breaches, occupancy, wastewater issues, traffic impacts and volunteer capacity?* If Council approves the proposal, WRPI will be requested to capture certain information for future reporting purposes. This will be included as key performance indicators (KPIs) incorporated into the lease agreement and may include but not limited to - maintaining a register of compliments and complaints received, site utilisation details, traffic impacts, and volunteer capacity. An assessment of the overall performance of the trial, including if issues raised can be effectively managed and if the RV park can continue to operate safely, compliantly and sustainably. The outcomes of the six-month and 12-month reviews will inform any decision regarding the continuation, modification or cessation of the trial. *2.Will the outcome of the 12-month trial come back to Council before any further lease of up to four years is entered into, or can that decision be made entirely under the proposed CEO delegation?* It is recommended in the agenda report at 3e that Council authorise the CEO or their sub-delegates to negotiate and enter into a further lease term for up to four (4)-years following a successful completion of the twelve (12) month trial period, having regard to the lessee's performance and compliance. *3.How will community feedback during the trial be captured and weighted as part of the review, particularly from nearby residents?* During the trial period, community feedback could be captured in several ways. The Compliments and Complaints Register maintained by the lessee, enquiries, submissions and direct feedback received during the trial. Particular consideration will be given to feedback from nearby residents; however, feedback will be assessed based on the nature, frequency and substantiation of issues raised, alongside objective operational and compliance data. This information will inform the review of the trial and any decision regarding its continuation, modification, or cessation. *4.Will Council receive a formal report showing actual utilisation, complaints, incidents, compliance issues and local*

			economic benefit before any longer-term commitment is made? A formal Council report is not proposed as a prerequisite to considering any longer-term arrangement. However, site utilisation, complaints, incidents, compliance matters, operational performance and any demonstrated economic benefits will be considered as part of the assessment of the trial outcomes. To keep Elected Members informed, Council administration proposes to publish a Weekly News item at the conclusion of the six-month and 12-month review periods outlining the trial outcomes and any proposed future arrangements. *5.The report says Council bins are still being investigated. Who will meet any ongoing waste collection costs if Council bins are ultimately provided?* As part of the lease arrangement, Council administration will work with WRPI to develop a waste management plan addressing the most appropriate approach to waste management at the site, including ongoing servicing requirements and costs. The options currently being considered are: • no bins, with only fully self-contained RVs permitted and users required to remove all waste on departure; or • limited waste bins, subject to the waste management plan and consideration of ongoing servicing requirements and costs. The preferred approach will be determined through the waste management planning process in consultation with WRPI. *6.Has any cap been placed on the number of RVs that may occupy the site at one time during the trial?* Yes. The trial will permit a maximum of 15 fully self-contained RVs on site at any one time, subject to development approval being obtained. This reflects the anticipated maximum occupancy under a future long-term arrangement and will allow council administration and the lessee, WRPI to assess whether the site, infrastructure and management arrangements can sustainably support the proposed use. *7.What arrangements will apply if WRPI's volunteer capacity proves insufficient between scheduled review points. who monitors this and how quickly can Council intervene?* If WRPI's capacity becomes insufficient to operate the site in accordance with the lease and approval conditions, Council can require corrective action and, where the issue cannot be satisfactorily addressed, terminate the arrangement. Council officers will monitor performance throughout the trial through ongoing liaison, compliance monitoring and consideration of complaints received. Council can intervene at any time where operational capacity or compliance becomes inadequate.

10.1	UPDATE REPORT PROPOSED FUTURE USE AND LEASE OF PEAR TREE PADDOCK, WILLUNGA	Jew	*if the site is for short term stays, how is it proposed that longer term people will be managed if people stay beyond their paid period?* Willunga Recreation Park Incorporated (WRPI) as the operator will be responsible for monitoring compliance with maximum stay limits and enforcing the conditions of use. Non-compliance will be treated seriously and may result in visitors being excluded from the facility and, where necessary, the operator may seek assistance from relevant authorities including SAPOL to address unauthorised occupation.
10.3	EVENT ROAD CLOSURES	Update	Recommendation 2 of the 3 recommendations currently reads: *2. Delegates to the Chief Executive Officer, pursuant to section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999, authority to provide ongoing consent to temporary road closures and approval for the use of temporary traffic control devices associated with:* *· the Adelaide Rally* *· the Adelaide Hills Rally* *· the Willunga Hillclimb* *where the event is proposed to operate on roads under the care and control of the City of Onkaparinga and the required legislative and event management requirements have been satisfied.* This will be updated to the below wording and a verbal update provided in the chair tomorrow night. The wording has been updated to reflect that the CEO already has delegations in place under the *section 33(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1961 in relation to road closures.* ***2.*** *Notes that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) will exercise their delegation under section 33(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1961 in relation to road closures, ongoing for the:* • *the Adelaide Rally* • *the Adelaide Hills Rally* • *the Willunga Hillclimb* *where the event is proposed to operate on roads under the care and control of the City of Onkaparinga and the required legislative and event management requirements have been satisfied.*
10.4	OPPORTUNITIES TO STRENGTHEN URBAN GREENING AND BIODIVERSITY OUTCOMES	Themeliotis	Question #1: What are the measurable outcomes Council will use to determine whether the roadmap is actually improving biodiversity, rather than simply increasing planting activity? Response: The measurable outcomes are not only the number of trees planted, but the ecological improvements those plantings deliver. The Roadmap recognises that

different sites require different greening approaches depending on the desired biodiversity outcome. For example, one site may require scattered trees to support the regeneration of native grasslands and understory species, while another may require dense creek-line planting to create habitat, cooling, and wildlife movement corridors.

Ultimately, the success of the roadmap could be measured by whether sites improve in condition, are more diverse and better-connected ecosystems over time, as well as planting outcomes. This aligns with the roadmap's focus on restoring high-value natural areas, strengthening ecological corridors, and improving biodiversity resilience across Council-managed land.

All actions are subject to resourcing implications, as outlined in attachment 2.

Question #2: Council has a citywide green-cover target of 40% by 2055. Will interim targets be established so Council can assess whether it is on track before 2055?

Response: There are no current plans to set interim targets, however Council has adopted performance measures to assess progress for its canopy targets, two of which are relevant to the green-cover target:

Performance Measure	How we will measure success
Green cover to increase by at least 2 percentage points every five years	Aerial mapping program planned and co-ordinated by the state government.
Increase native vegetation species diversity, habitat quality and connectivity through the landscape	Continue annual condition assessments to complete remaining baseline condition assessment to reach 60% of mapped remnant vegetation by 2030

Question #3: The report says future investment should be directed to areas of greatest environmental, social and climate resilience benefit. What methodology will be used to identify those priority areas, and will that prioritisation be publicly available?

Response: The report proposes that methodologies for prioritising action will be developed through strategic co-ordination and integration of multiple data sources, considering

				factors such as biodiversity condition, ecological connectivity, canopy cover, urban heat, social vulnerability and asset data. These will be balanced with resourcing implications to identify priority areas for investment. It is yet to be determined which prioritisation methods will be strategic and publicly available, and which are more operational in nature.
			Question #4:	What is the anticipated cost and timeframe for developing the Biodiversity Strategy and Green Infrastructure Management Plan, and will Council separately approve those plans and their resourcing?
			Response:	The Biodiversity Strategy has not yet been scoped. It is anticipated to be one part of a broader Environment Strategy, which will be developed following the finalisation of the current Climate Change Response Plan 2022 – 2027. Costs are yet to be determined, and Council will separately approve this plan and its resourcing. The Green Infrastructure Plan (GIP) has not yet been scoped, however it is intended to define what, where and how much Green Infrastructure we have, and in turn identify areas for improvement. It is intended to be scoped and delivered using existing operational resources, such as the Green Infrastructure Planner and meant for internal use - much like our other Asset category asset management plans. Therefore there is no current or future cost expected in developing this plan. Should any cost, budget or service level impacts be documented they will be captured by the Strategic Asset Management Plan (SAMP) and therefore included in Long Term Financial Plan and annual business plan processes for Council endorsement.
			Question #5:	How will Council report the amount of tree-removal fees, developer contributions and other funding being reinvested into greening and biodiversity outcomes?
			Response:	Tree removal related income is managed through several dedicated funding streams, each with a specific purpose and accounting treatment. This includes the arboriculture budget, which offsets recurrent operating expenditure; the Urban Tree Fund, where revenue is transferred to a reserve and drawn down to fund greening initiatives through the annual budget and budget review processes; and Native Vegetation Clearance Offset funds, which are held against a corresponding expenditure budget until required for offset projects. Developer contributions received in lieu of open space are similarly held in a reserve and allocated to eligible

				projects through Council's annual budget and budget review processes.
10.5	STRATEGIC LAND RATIONALISATION PROGRAM UPDATE	Themeliotis	Question #1: Response:	Why are individual disposal processes being progressed before the strategic assessment of all Council-owned land is completed in mid-2027? The report is not proposing the commencement of new disposal processes. Rather it proposes it recommence the revocation processes for 2 Rialto Street, Morphett Vale and 14 Margaret Street, Port Noarlunga. Both properties were declared surplus to Council requirements in 2020, and the revocation processes were commenced at that time before subsequently being placed on hold. Progressing these outstanding matters provides an opportunity to resolve legacy processes that have remained incomplete for several years. The 2020 assessments for both sites have been reviewed and confirmed that the properties remain surplus to Council's current and foreseeable operational requirements. By contrast, our review of the Highwray Drive site identified merit in deferring any disposal decision until further information becomes available, particularly the outcomes of the proposed Expression of Interest process for the former Roopena Kindergarten site. Deferring consideration of Highwray Drive will enable Council to make a more informed decision regarding its future value. Question #2: Response: How do we ensure the annual $3 million revenue target does not create an incentive to classify land as surplus primarily to meet a financial target rather than on its strategic merits? The annual $3 million target is a financial planning target only and is not a criterion used to determine whether land is surplus to Council requirements. The identification of land as surplus is ultimately a decision of Council. Any proposal to declare land surplus is brought to Council through a formal report seeking approval to commence the community land revocation process. Before any such recommendation is made, an internal assessment is undertaken to determine whether the land is required for current or foreseeable future strategic, operational, environmental or community purposes. This assessment considers the

				specific characteristics and value of the site, including its potential contribution to Council services, open space outcomes, environmental objectives and other community benefits. These assessments are informed by Council's adopted strategic plans, including the Open Space Strategic Management Plan 2025-2030, which consider future community needs, population growth and demographic change. In addition, any land that contains, or may be required to support, community facility assets are considered in accordance with Council's Community Facilities Framework. The internal assessment process is being strengthened via the strategic assessment of all Council-owned land, currently underway as part of the Strategic Land Rationalisation Program As a result, the decision to declare land surplus is based on a strategic assessment of Council's current and future requirements, with any potential financial return considered only after it has been determined that the land is no longer required for those purposes. Question #3: What criteria must be satisfied before land is classified as surplus, and how are future population growth, service needs and open-space requirements factored into that assessment? Response: Refer question 2 above. Question #4: Will the strategic land assessment identify areas where Council should actually acquire or retain additional land, rather than focusing only on disposal? Response: Yes. The strategic assessment of all Council-owned land, currently underway as part of the Strategic Land Rationalisation Program, is intended to consider the long-term strategic role of Council's land portfolio, rather than simply identifying land for potential disposal. Through the Great Places Program, this work brings together the Strategic Land Rationalisation Program, Community Facilities Network Planning, and Council's property and leasing functions. This integrated approach will provide a more comprehensive understanding of how Council's land and property assets are currently being used, where there may be gaps or emerging future needs, and where

				opportunities exist for land or property to be retained, repurposed, activated or strategically managed to support future service delivery and community outcomes.
			Question #5:	What are Council's current annual holding costs for 2 Rialto Street and 14 Margaret Street, and how do those costs compare with the likely net proceeds from sale?
			Response:	Council's annual holding costs for 2 Rialto Street and 14 Margaret Street are minimal and primarily relate to ongoing property and facility costs such as insurance, maintenance including illegal dumping clean up, building compliance, security and utilities. A current market valuation has not yet been undertaken for either property. Refer question 6 below. The net proceeds will be determined by the contract price less deduction of the costs associated with the disposal.
			Question #6:	Will the December report provide elected members with valuations and an assessment of alternative community uses before Council is asked to make a final disposal decision?
			Response:	The December report is intended to provide Council with the outcome of public consultation and enable Council to determine whether revocation and disposal should proceed. Under Council's endorsed Acquisition and Disposal of Land Policy, land is to be disposed of at or above its current market valuation. A valuation is valid for six months and costs approximately $2,500 ex GST per site. To ensure the valuation is current at the time of disposal and to avoid incurring valuation costs where Council may ultimately decide not to revoke the land, a valuation will be obtained once Council has resolved to proceed with revocation. This approach is consistent with the process applied to previous strategic land revocation matters.

			Question #7:	Where proceeds exceed the annual $3 million target and are transferred to the Future Investment Reserve, what governance framework determines when and for what purposes those funds can subsequently be used?
			Response:	An Investment and Commercialisation Strategy will be presented to Council in October 2026, which provides a framework for a staged approach to establishing and building the Reserve for the purpose of undertaking investment and commercialisation opportunities. The Strategy will set out the proposed governance underpinning the different stages of maturity of the Reserve.
			Question #8:	What's councils current position on proceeds that exceed the annual $3million target?
			Response:	The resolution for item 10.10 (Acquisition and Disposal of Land and Other Assets Policy) from the Council meeting held 19 May 2026 states that Council *endorses the inclusion in the policy that surplus proceeds from the sale of land assets will primarily be directed to a Future Investment Reserve, to be used for strategic investment opportunities that support Council's long term financial sustainability.*
10.6	QUARTERLY FINANCE REPORT INCLUDING BUDGET REVIEW 4	Themeliotis	Question #1:	Of the $5.08 million favourable movement in the operating result, how much reflects genuine recurring improvement versus timing differences, one-off revenue, accounting adjustments or revenue received in advance?
			Response:	The most significant driver of the favourable movement is the timing of Financial Assistance Grants, with $5.69 million relating to the advance receipt of 2026–27 funding in June 2026. If this timing impact is excluded, the result would be approximately $2.28 million favourable to budget; however, this remaining amount still includes several non-recurring or timing-related items, including Alternative Water Supply Efficiency Measures (AWSEM) grant and expenditure recognition ($1.1 million) and expensing of items previously held in Work in Progress (WIP) ($3.2 million).
			Question #2:	What would the underlying operating result be if those one-off and timing items were removed?
			Response:	The underlying operating result would be an estimated $4.6 million surplus, once the identified one off and timing related items are removed. This is lower than the draft reported surplus of $7.09 million, reflecting the exclusion of the Financial Assistance

				Grants timing impact, AWSEM grant and matching expenditure and WIP accounting adjustments. On this basis, the adjusted result provides a clearer indication of the underlying operating position, although it remains subject to final audit review.
			Question #3:	Year-end borrowings were $94 million rather than the previously forecast $109 million, partly because Financial Assistance Grants were received early. What would borrowings have been at 30 June without the brought-forward grant payment?
			Response:	The debt position would have been $99,708,737.
			Question #4:	What reduction in 2026-27 interest expense is now expected because opening borrowings are lower than budgeted, and when will that saving be formally incorporated into the budget?
			Response:	The difference in interest cost for the financial year equates to approximately $0.93 million at the current rate of 5.85%. The interest rate market remains uncertain, and movements in borrowing rates may impact future finance costs. Budgeted borrowing costs will therefore continue to be closely monitored through the quarterly budget review process, with any material changes reported to Council as required.
			Question #5:	How much of the $17.86 million in carry-forwards relates to projects delayed, versus projects where expenditure simply spans financial years as planned?
			Response:	Planned multi-year projects account for $10.6 million of the total proposed carry forwards. A further $0.995 million relates to projects being carried forward due to construction delays.
			Question #6:	Are any of the carried-forward projects behind their originally approved delivery timeframe, and if so, which ones?
			Response:	By definition, a carry forward relates to expenditure that was previously approved, not incurred within the original budget period, and subsequently authorised for use in a later period. As such, most projects proposed for carry forward are, by their nature, being delivered outside their originally approved delivery timeframe. Attachment 3 of the Quarterly Financial Update Report outlines the reasons for each proposed carry forward. Of particular significance are the road reconstruction

				projects at Alice and Carol Roads, Morphett Vale, and Collins Parade, Hackham, along with the GPT installation at Pedlers Creek, all of which were delayed due to inclement weather.
			Question #7:	Budget Review 4 moves $2.95 million of capital project underspends into cost-escalation contingency. What evidence supports retaining nearly $3 million as contingency rather than reducing borrowings or returning funds to other priorities?
			Response:	Given the current global uncertainty, including ongoing geopolitical tensions in the Middle East and the potential for associated impacts on fuel and petrochemical products supply chains and pricing, it is proposed that a contingency provision of $2.9 million be carried forward to the 2026-27 budget. This provision would be available to address higher than anticipated market cost escalations should they arise during the delivery of the capital works program. This equates to approximately 5% of the capital expenditure program for 2026-27.
			Question #8:	What approval or reporting controls apply when that cost-escalation contingency is subsequently allocated to individual projects?
			Response:	When cost pressures are identified, they are escalated through Council's financial delegation and reporting processes and managed through the quarterly budget review cycle. This includes the formal assessment and approval of contract variations, which may result from changes to project scope, pricing, timelines or other contract conditions. All contract variations must be documented, assessed for budget impacts, and approved in writing by an officer with the appropriate financial delegation. To strengthen governance and financial oversight, Council has implemented a contract variation register, approval form and standardised variation documentation, ensuring that emerging cost pressures are identified early, appropriately authorised, and incorporated into budget reviews where required.
			Question #9:	Has Council assessed whether repeated project carry-forwards indicate that the annual capital program is larger than the organisation can realistically deliver?
			Response:	Council continually reviews the resources required to deliver the annual capital works program, including through budget development, quarterly budget reviews and ongoing project monitoring. Carry forwards are assessed to understand the reason

				for deferral, including whether they relate to planned multi year delivery, external factors, market conditions, approvals, resourcing constraints or other project specific issues. Since 2020, Council has delivered annual capital programs ranging from approximately $48 million to $69 million, demonstrating a sustained capacity to deliver significant capital works while continuing to monitor whether the approved program remains realistic and achievable. Where delivery risks or capacity constraints are identified, these are considered through future program planning and budget review processes.
			Question #10:	The report notes $5.84 million of asset-sale proceeds against an $8.2 million forecast, with the difference attributed largely to a delayed settlement. Has that delayed settlement now occurred, and if not, is there any risk to the 2026-27 forecast?
			Response:	The settlement for Taylors Road, Morphett Vale was successfully finalised on 8 September (delayed from June 2026), for a value of $3.077 million. In addition, three other parcels of land are scheduled to be placed on the market in 2026-27.

CITY OF ONKAPARINGA

14 September 2026
Our ref: 9068640/ab

Hon. Emily Bourke MLC
Minister for Climate, Environment and Waste
minister.bourke@sa.gov.au

Dear Minister Bourke

I am writing as Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga to seek your support for tyres to be raised at the next Environment Ministers' Meeting (EMM), and for Ministers to agree to progress a cost-benefit analysis for a mandatory national tyre product stewardship scheme.

Illegal tyre dumping is costing councils and communities

For the City of Onkaparinga, end-of-life tyres are not an abstract policy issue. They are a physical, recurring and increasingly expensive problem for councils to manage. When tyres are dumped on council land, councils are left to investigate, make sites safe, arrange collection and transport, and pay for recycling.

National research supported by the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) estimated that local governments cleaned up around 300,000 end-of-life tyres in 2022–23 at a cost of more than $6.5 million.

City of Onkaparinga has direct experience of this burden. The table below demonstrates the numbers of illegally dumped tyres collected across our city per financial year over the last three years and the cost to our ratepayers.

Financial Year	Number of tyres collected	Cost to recycle illegally dumped tyres
2023-24	2,659	$35,872
2024-25	2,840	$34,639
2025-26	3,040	$36,899

These costs ultimately fall on our ratepayers. Consumers already pay disposal fees when they replace their tyres, yet councils and communities often pay again when tyres are dumped.

Clean-up is only part of the cost to communities

Beyond the direct cost of removing dumped tyres, councils must manage the wider consequences for local services and public spaces. Dumped tyres create fire and mosquito-breeding risks, reduce local amenity and divert council funds away from roads, facilities and community services.

Supporting sustainable procurement for council infrastructure

Local councils manage over 70% of Australia's road network and are significant purchasers of infrastructure materials. The City of Onkaparinga spent $19 million on roads in 2025-26 and has the responsibility to maintain over 1500km across the city.

A mandatory scheme would make it easier for councils to procure tyre-derived materials for roads and infrastructure projects by creating stronger markets, more reliable supply and greater confidence in product availability. Reform would ultimately help councils deliver more sustainable infrastructure outcomes, increase material circularity, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and make greater use of recovered tyre materials in local roads and public infrastructure.

Councils support a national mandatory scheme for tyres

The current voluntary approach is not solving illegal tyre dumping or addressing the inequities faced by regional and remote communities. Councils should not be left paying for a problem they did not create.

The House of Representatives Tyre Inquiry heard clear and consistent evidence from local government. Seventeen submissions from councils and regional council groups represented 63 individual councils, with further submissions from local government associations representing councils across Australia. The evidence was consistent: illegal tyre dumping is an unfair and growing burden on local government, and councils support moving to a mandatory national tyre product stewardship scheme.

A mandatory scheme would place responsibility with tyre importers, rather than leaving the cost burden with councils and ratepayers. Councils support reform that provides stable funding for collection, transport, processing, compliance, community education and market development, while reducing incentives for dumping and improving transparency across the supply chain.

A cost-benefit analysis is the next practical step

Tyres have been on the Minister's product stewardship priority list since 2022, and the Western Australian Government's National End-of-Life Tyres Options Project was tabled with Environment Ministers in November 2024. Environment Ministers have had the finding that a CBA is the next step before them for more than two years. A cost-benefit analysis would not commit governments to a final regulatory model. It would give Ministers the evidence needed to assess costs, benefits and design options, including how a mandatory scheme could reduce dumping, improve tyre recovery and shift costs away from councils and ratepayers.

The next step is not more consultation to learn what we already know; it is testing reform options through a formal cost-benefit analysis.

Councils can't afford to wait any longer

I respectfully ask that you support tyres being raised at the next EMM and urge you to work with your ministerial colleagues to agree to a cost-benefit analysis for a mandatory tyre product stewardship scheme. I am available to meet with you or your team and provide further information on the local impacts being experienced by the City of Onkaparinga.

Please contact my Liaison Officer if you wish to discuss further via mail@onkaparinga.sa.gov.au or telephone 8384 0666.

Yours sincerely



Moira Were AM
Mayor