

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2 September 2025

**The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)** took the chair at 11:00.

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, we acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia and their connection to land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to elders both past and present.

**The SPEAKER** read prayers.

### *Members*

#### **MEMBER FOR MOUNT GAMBIER, RESIGNATION**

**The SPEAKER (11:01):** I have today received an email from Mr Troy Bell resigning his seat in the House of Assembly as the member for Mount Gambier. Pursuant to the power invested in the Speaker to issue a writ when a vacancy occurs in the House of Assembly, and consistent with past practice of former Speakers, I exercise my discretion to not issue a writ prior to the general election. In reaching this decision, I sought advice and had discussions with the South Australian Electoral Commissioner and the Clerk of the House of Assembly.

The Electoral Commissioner advised that the earliest dates for the by-election available under the act would be for the polling day to be held on Saturday 4 October, Saturday 11 October, Saturday 18 October or Saturday 25 October. October 4 and 11 are in the school holidays and 4 October is on a long weekend. If 18 or 25 October were selected, by the time the election was conducted and a result determined it would be likely the new member for Mount Gambier would serve for between six and eight days in this place.

The potential cost of a Mount Gambier by-election would be approximately \$950,000. This is a higher cost than the recent Black by-election due to travel and accommodation costs associated with a regional by-election and additional staff required to avoid impacting on preparations for the upcoming state election.

The staff in the Mount Gambier electorate office who have been in place since March 2014 will remain in those roles until the declaration of the poll next March. As everyone in this place knows, electorate office staff carry a large amount of the burden for members and will continue to advocate and follow up inquiries for the constituents of Mount Gambier with government departments, ministers, local government and the private sector.

For those looking for political representation, Mount Gambier is in the enviable position of having two highly regarded and senior members of the Legislative Council, representing the Liberal Party in the Hon. Ben Hood and the Labor Party in the Hon. Clare Scriven. People have that option if they want to contact Clare or Ben, who both live in Mount Gambier.

The people of Mount Gambier at the 2018 and 2022 elections voted for Troy Bell to be their local member of parliament in full knowledge of the charges he was facing and the prospect that the outcome of the court, delivered last week, was always a possibility. I would like to thank the Electoral Commissioner and the Clerk and staff of the House of Assembly for their assistance in reaching this decision.

### *Bills*

#### **NORTHERN PARKLANDS BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 August 2025.)

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11:05):** I rise today to speak in support of the Northern Parklands Bill 2025, which seeks to create a new statutory authority responsible for the new Northern Parklands proposed in the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP). As the member for Ramsay and a local resident in the northern suburbs, I understand how important it is to maintain green open spaces for the community to enjoy.

The Northern Parklands offers us the chance to reconnect with nature and create more green spaces where families can picnic, children can play and the community can come together. In an increasingly busy and digital world, the parklands provide vital mental and physical health benefits. We know that access to green space can reduce stress, promote exercise and improve overall wellbeing. With three interconnected linear parks, including 38 kilometres of walking and cycling trails, a vast array of sporting facilities and countless places for barbecues with friends and family, there will be something on offer for everyone in the Northern Parklands.

I spent my childhood years living in Gawler, where I attended Gawler East Primary School and one year at Gawler high. Many a school trip was taken to the wide-open spaces adjacent Gawler, such as the Para Wirra Conservation Park, which is not too far from where the Northern Parklands will be located. I remember us all piling into a bus and going up to what would be considered a national park to make sure we could connect with nature up there. Having things at a walkable distance and connecting to where we are going to see lots of growth is incredibly important.

I remember as a young person when Clonlea was developed, which is a playground around the Little Para River in Gawler, it was the first time we had a playground that was for teenagers and not for little kids, and that was really well received. So we do know when these parklands go up that they are very activated. We want to see that future generations are able to enjoy similar spaces to what we had.

The vision and the development of the Northern Parklands will transform northern Adelaide's landscape and create a lasting legacy for future generations. It will offer people access to high-quality urban spaces, parklands and facilities that contribute to Adelaide's global reputation. We are the second place in the world to be a National Park City, and we have this very much in the CBD. We are world famous for being a city in a park, but why should people in the northern suburbs not have this same experience?

We know that Linear Park goes out from east to west and people are very active there. As we see this further development in the northern suburbs, this is future planning. I recognise the work of the minister and his forethought in this area. We know that we are having larger houses and smaller backyards, but we also want to keep our kids active and off screens, so we need to think about these things in the future.

The northern suburbs of Adelaide play a pivotal role in accommodating new housing infrastructure as suburbs like Kudla, Angle Vale and Evanston grow. We want the parklands and the natural beauty of suburbs to grow with them. Spanning up to 1,000 hectares, the Northern Parklands will be one of the most significant public open space investments in South Australia's history. However, as I said, this is just a nod to who we are as a state. It is a nod to the kind of community we want to build and it is part of Light's vision and an extension of that. It is a recognition of what people love about South Australia, recognising as we push out into those northern suburbs that people deserve to have that opportunity as well.

The Northern Parklands will span from the ridge line following One Tree Hill Road—the future urban growth areas surrounding Kudla Railway Station—through to the banks of Gawler River via Karbeethan Reserve. The government's vision for the Northern Parklands will be set out in a master plan to be developed over the next 12 months. This process will include extensive community and landowner consultation. The master plan will direct the future development of both the Northern Parklands and the Kudla growth area, serving as a catalyst for private investment and supporting essential housing growth in Adelaide's north.

The GARP marks a significant shift in planning by identifying infrastructure needs, including schools, hospitals and emergency services and parklands, before housing construction begins. This approach gives communities confidence that their new homes will be supported by essential

amenities and services from day one. As much as we look back in history about the importance of having access to green space, we have also learned that if you do not pre-plan for population growth, you are always catching up. This is one of the things I want to say so strongly about the work of the GARP and this future-looking focus on who we are as a state and our growth.

The bill reflects the hard work and dedication of many individuals committed to South Australia's planning system. The development of GARP spanned more than two years and involved more than 1,400 submissions, which played a crucial role in shaping the plan. The Northern Parklands Bill will establish the initial phase of the parklands through a plan lodged in the General Registry Office, known as the GRO. The GRO plan will outline parcels of land currently owned by both state and local governments that will be included in the initial phase of these parklands.

Upon the commencement of the act, responsibility for the land identified in the GRO plan will automatically transfer to the Northern Parklands Trust, placing it under their care, control and management. Careful timing and stage development are essential to the successful delivery and long-term sustainability of the Northern Parklands.

Stage 1 of this project is scheduled for completion by 2030, which will be here before we know it. Under the bill, land identified in the second GRO plan will be acquired within five years of the bill's commencement. This land is currently privately owned. In preparing the second GRO plan, efforts will be made to minimise impact on these landowners while preserving the connection of the Northern Parklands green corridor. Stage 2 is planned for completion by 2040. Additional land comprising both government and privately owned parcels will be identified in a third GRO plan and acquired between 2030 and 2040.

To support the creation and ongoing management of the Northern Parklands, the bill proposes to establish a new governing entity called the Northern Parklands Trust. This trust is based on the proven model of the West Beach Trust, which was established under the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act 1987. Northern Parklands Trust will comprise seven members with a broad range of experience and qualifications that will be vital to the trust's operations. Additionally, the trust will be able to partner with both the City of Playford and the Town of Gawler. This enables use of the existing council workforce for their operations, promoting sustainability and avoiding resource duplication with local government.

The bill also outlines the Northern Parklands Trust's responsibilities for ongoing management and maintenance, including oversight of future developments such as recreational caravan parks and the granting of leases and licences. It grants the authority to impose rates or charges on local councils to help fund ongoing maintenance costs, with councils permitted to recover these expenses through council rates. It requires the trust to prepare both an annual business plan and a long-term strategic plan. It establishes a framework for entering into agreements with local governments to utilise their existing maintenance resources to promote operational efficiencies. There are also safeguards by the Northern Parklands from being sold, and it allows for the creation of additional statutory trusts by regulation.

The Northern Parklands will further incorporate carefully planned commercial uses that contribute to the site's activation. We have seen this very well done in the West Beach Trust, not just the caravan park but the golfing facilities and some of the activated experiences that they have down there. These commercial uses may include nature-based tourism, hospitality and other facilities. I am really excited as Minister for Tourism. This is a great opportunity to activate that space as well.

There are many other things that we need to look at, with a focus on native plants, wildlife habitats and sustainable design. We think it has the potential to attract eco-conscious tourists who seek nature-based experiences, which is the third driver in tourism in South Australia. There are the food and wine events and festivals, and the third driver is that connection to nature. Obviously, there is the opportunity for sporting and recreational activities. There will be the relocation of the South Gawler Football Club to occur within these parklands. This is a major opportunity for the club due to their currently constrained facilities that are no longer fit for purpose in the area.

The parklands also have the potential to play a powerful role in supporting and celebrating our multicultural communities, providing additional spaces for festivals, markets, art installations and performances to be held. I know there is much excitement where we see a lot of new migrant

communities moving to our northern suburbs, but they are looking for facilities—whether it be a community language school or an opportunity to come and gather and celebrate different cultures and traditions.

In the Northern Parklands, we are not just creating a park—we are strengthening our identity as a community that values inclusion, respect and connection to country. I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:16):** I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition and indicate the opposition's support for the bill. In addressing the bill, briefly I now flag there will be some particular areas of interest in the committee stage shortly. The focus of that might be part 4 of the bill and the arrangements that are going to affect those local councils that are impacted by the levy mechanism, the subject of that part.

As we have just heard from the Minister for Tourism and Multicultural Affairs, who happens relevantly to be one of the local members in the near vicinity, the benefit and the financial effect will be something of keen interest I am sure to the member for Ramsay's constituents. We have also just heard that this is a matter clearly to be coming to fruition, certainly not in the short term, and one might really remark that this is already providing for what we will call a park map rather than a road map—but a trajectory out over actual decades.

There is a first stage that is supposed to be coming to fruition just in the few years ahead, but the park map for the second range is not even projected to be finished until 2040 and then there is more to come down the track. So this is really a very long-run program to create these Northern Parklands and the part 4 levy, it might be seen, will have work to do over a particularly long timeframe. Those of us in the rest of South Australia included will be aware of cost-sharing arrangements that apply between the state and the Adelaide City Council in relation to the Adelaide Parklands, and there is fairly wideranging familiarity with open-space contributions and that sort of thing.

But the Northern Parklands levy, the subject of part 4, is directed at those affected council areas, and it will be then, as a matter of importance, for residents in those areas in particular to know what contributions are going to be made by those constituent councils because they are specific contributions—and it might be fully expected that they will sound in rates the particular term for a discrete addition to rates in relation to the contributions by those councils. I do not think any of that is surprising, but it will be I think a matter of particular interest to the residents of those constituent councils. That is all provided for in part 4, clauses 16 to 20.

The balance of the bill is providing for the establishment of those Northern Parklands and the establishment of the trust, and then arrangements to be made in terms of securing the parklands, both as to area and in relation to the finances for the long term—and there might be some reference to that along the way.

I just indicate that there is a relevant interest in the consultation aspects of this, both residents and councils, bearing in mind that this is going to roll out to an area—not an enormous area, but relatively significant; about 1,000 hectares I think—and that is in the Evanston, Gawler River area north-east of Munno Para and then stretching in a sort of serpentine way to the west, following the catchment area, an interesting shape and size of some rather spread out area, much of which is already well-known and recognised open space.

This is coming along, in the context of what we have seen from the government, in analogous circumstances in the Parklands in North Adelaide, where the government is proposing doing some redevelopment work for a golf project there, and that has involved interaction with another council, the Adelaide City Council, that had been involved in a negotiation, as we understand, over a relatively extended period of time, culminating in legislation to bring an end to that and to see that the state is directing traffic and doing so so as to meet timeframes and so on—and we have heard about that along the way—to the extent that there is an analogy here that may be conveniently unpacked in the course of the committee process, with a focus on part 4, as I have said.

The success of a long-term measure such as this is going to depend in a significant way on the identification, community support for ownership, for want of a better word, of the local communities that are going to hopefully benefit from this over the long term, and so understanding

where the financial commitments are and being onboard with those is going to be an important matter.

Of course, the establishment of the parklands, unsurprisingly, might be anticipated to carry benefits, including the maintenance of a green corridor, hopefully capacity for recreation, sports, biodiversity benefits, cultural space and perhaps some tourism and hospitality benefits along the way. All of that is unsurprising, and I do note that this all aligns, we are told, with the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan.

The groundwork is here. We are not in a great big rush, but one might anticipate that levies are to be applied in those particular council areas, commencing fairly shortly and running, one might expect, for a significant period of time. Flagging those interests in particular, I again indicate that the opposition supports the bill. I look forward to the committee stage in terms of that aspect in particular.

**Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (11:25):** I rise in strong support of the Northern Parklands Bill 2025. I must say, given the proximity to my electorate, I really am honoured to speak on this and do thank the minister's office for seeking out my opinions. I also remark on the fact that it is wonderful to see that the opposition is in support of such a momentous bill.

From the outset, I want to place on record the importance of this moment, not only in establishing a new stretch of green space for the north but in shaping how we intend to use it and, most importantly, how we intend to enjoy it. Legislation of this kind is not just about land management. It is about the life that will fill that land, the facilities that will bring the parklands to life and the communities that will call the parklands their own.

Looking into the future, the northern suburbs will carry a high share of population growth. This is not something we resent. It is a responsibility we take on, because we know that it underpins South Australia's prosperity and because it is an important pillar in helping us keep housing affordable for the next generation.

The reality is clear: just building more houses will never be enough if we do not also provide open spaces to give people air to breathe, places to gather and a sense of pride in their community. That is why I see the Northern Parklands as nothing less than a new set of lungs for the north. This will be up to 1,000 hectares of land—not insignificant—an extraordinary investment in health, recreation, culture and nature. It is a legacy that acknowledges our growth but also matches it with generosity of spirit and foresight.

The community that I have the privilege to represent sits almost midway between the existing city Parklands and these new Northern Parklands. The geographic reality creates both opportunity and responsibility. We can be a bridge between the historic vision of Colonel Light's green belt and the new vision of a northern green corridor stretching from One Tree Hill down the Gawler River.

But a parkland is only as good as it is accessible. This is why from day one we must be clear that supporting infrastructure matters. Bike paths, car paths, walking trails and appropriately designed buildings are not intrusions on nature; they are enablers of enjoyment. They turn empty space into community space.

In the past, we have too often seen drawn-out arguments over whether sporting clubs, multicultural associations or community groups should be allowed to use parklands. This bill offers us a chance to move past that. If we accept from the outset that open space must be matched with facilities, then clubs will not be left to fight for scraps or wonder if they belong.

The bill establishes a trust and power to develop and maintain the Northern Parklands for recreation, culture and sport. That means we can confidently say, yes, there will be places for soccer clubs, for netball courts, for festivals and for family events and yes, there will be room for quiet walking tracks, shady trees and contemplative spaces. It is not an either-or. It is about a balance that serves the whole community.

I love nature and I want to see biodiversity thrive, but I also believe that land so heavily locked away that people cannot access it misses the point. I see this with land around Scott Creek where I grew up. In most cases, conservation should not mean exclusion. By establishing the Northern Parklands Trust with expertise in ecology, recreation, cultural heritage and tourism, we ensure that

the land will be protected but also enjoyed. Let me be clear: enjoyment sometimes means events, from cultural festivals to sporting carnivals, from music gatherings to markets. These parklands should be alive. If we want people to care for the land, they must be first invited to use it.

I particularly welcome that the bill aims to reserve lands for cultural purposes. We have many multicultural communities in the north who seek a place to call their own. I think of my time in Darwin, where the suburb of Marrara plays host to hubs of many different cultural groups side by side. It is a model that works. Communities flourish when they have their own space but remain neighbours. It builds harmony, reduces the pressure on residential areas struggling with car parking or after-hours noise and creates an environment of mutual respect.

This bill may well give us the chance to do something similar. We can make the Northern Parklands a space where cultural identities are celebrated, where clubs have certainty and where people see their heritage reflected in the landscape.

The governance structure of the Northern Parklands Trust is one of the most impressive features of this package. The trust will comprise seven members, three appointed by the minister, including a presiding member, two nominated by adjacent councils, one ecologist or Green Adelaide representative, and one Aboriginal person. On top of this composition, members will collectively bring expertise in biodiversity, recreation, cultural heritage, landscape design, tourism, Aboriginal culture, financial management and, of course, local government.

This is a recipe for balance and for harmony. It means decisions will not be dominated by one voice but enriched by many. It gives me confidence that the parklands will be managed wisely, with vision and with respect for all communities.

Another feature worth praising is the guarantee this land cannot simply be sold off by a future government. Any disposal of land would require resolution of both houses of parliament. That is as strong a safeguard as we can provide. This parkland is a gift to the future, and by protecting it from short-term disposal we are making clear that it is meant to endure. This future orientation runs right through the bill. It is not just about today's amenities; it is about planting trees whose shade we may never sit under, about setting aside corridors for species we hope will return, and about creating places for children who are not yet born to play.

I look forward to the master plan that will guide the parklands. Consultation will be crucial. The bill makes provision for long-term strategic planning, but the success will depend on the ideas that come from the ground up. I want as many northern residents as possible to be involved. Out of that engagement, I am hopeful we will see innovative proposals that make these parklands not just adequate but the envy of the world. This bill flows directly from the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. That plan takes a long-term view and sets out how growth should be balanced with infrastructure. It is about ensuring schools, hospitals, transport and green space are all thought of before the houses go up.

This forward-looking approach is what good planning looks like, and it is why I find it so frustrating when some, who choose not to engage with the consultation process, only now raise criticisms. Nearly 1,400 submissions went into shaping the GARP. I myself contributed, and I know many in my community did so as well. To wait until the end and then claim to have better ideas is not only disingenuous but also unfair to those who did the hard yards in the consultation process.

The minister's second reading speech rightfully acknowledges the many stakeholders who have brought us here. The City of Playford and the Town of Gawler deserve praise for their partnership. The State Planning Commission under Craig Holden, the Department for Housing and Urban Development and dedicated individuals like David Reynolds, Sally Smith, Chelsea Lucas, Marc Voortman and Ben Sieben all deserve recognition. Their work has been painstaking but visionary.

This bill is a statement of confidence in the north. It says we are not just about building houses, we are about building communities. We are not just about accommodating growth, we are enriching it. We are not just protecting land, we are inviting people to live within it, celebrate within it and take pride in it. Future generations will look back on this legislation as one of the moments where

a government acted, not for the next election but for the next century. That is why I support the bill wholeheartedly and commend it to the house.

**Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:34):** In 1904, the Australian-born novelist Elizabeth von Arnim wrote:

How good it is to look sometimes across great spaces, to lift one's eyes from narrowness, to feel the large silence that rests on lonely hills!

This is a feeling that I imagine most of us have experienced, and especially those of us fortunate enough to have lived any part of our lives in such a beautiful place as South Australia. There is a soul-stirring joy in looking across an open landscape set under the vast canopy of a big sky. Quality public infrastructure and amenity, including public open space, is highly influential in supporting quality of life for a community. As a population within a particular locality or region grows, the importance of establishing and maintaining high-quality public amenity increases.

Northern Adelaide is experiencing a period of significant population growth. In fact, the northern metropolitan region is the fastest growing area of our state. A 2024 transport study reported that the outer and inner north together have the highest projected population increase in South Australia from 2021 to 2041, with nearly 90,000 additional people projected to live in the outer north in particular and 40 per cent of Greater Adelaide's projected population growth by 2041 occurring in northern Adelaide.

The Northern Parklands Bill seeks to create a new statutory authority that will be responsible for the establishment and maintenance of the Northern Parklands, which are proposed as part of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. With an area of up to 1,000 hectares, as the minister explained in his second reading contribution, the Northern Parklands will be one of the most significant public open space investments in South Australia's history.

The establishment of the Northern Parklands at the current stage in the growth of northern Adelaide aligns with best practice in planning. There are two broad approaches that can be taken in relation to a government's establishment of key infrastructure: we can be proactive or we can be reactive. In established communities, for a variety of reasons, the building and infrastructure often tends to be undertaken reactively, but where communities are experiencing significant growth and expansion or where they are being newly established, there is an opportunity to be proactive in the approach to infrastructure provision.

In new and emerging areas, it is desirable that key infrastructure is in place before the area is fully established with housing. This approach provides opportunity for planning choices to be undertaken in a way that is more deliberate and more effective. It also provides confidence for those who are considering building their first home or their next home in these communities. All of this is applicable when we consider the growing areas of northern Adelaide. Getting the infrastructure in place first will support better outcomes for both emerging and established communities across our northern growth areas.

The benefits that the Northern Parklands will offer the communities of northern Adelaide are numerous and significant. The story of the Adelaide Parklands over their nearly two centuries of history does an excellent job in illustrating the value of public open space as a contributor to the overall quality of a city's built environment as well as its identity, character and reputation. This can also be said of the range of excellent public open space amenity that is enjoyed across other regions of the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The city and inner suburbs have the Adelaide Parklands. The east has the foothills and its conservation parks, in particular Morialta Conservation Park, which offers excellent amenity for a number of uses by members of the public. The south has Glenthorne National Park, Sturt Gorge Recreation Park and plenty of other high-quality curated open spaces. Western Adelaide has the West Beach Parks and an abundance of coastline, which enjoys enhanced recreation amenity thanks to the Coast Park initiative.

The other metropolitan areas of Adelaide offer abundant high-quality opportunities for recreation and sport in curated open spaces. While there are many well-maintained public parks in

the north, we do not yet enjoy the benefit of public open spaces commensurate in scope and quality with what the other parts of the metropolitan area enjoy.

The establishment of the Northern Parklands will strengthen social equity for communities across the north of Adelaide. I think it is reasonable and uncontroversial to say that it is time for our region to have the benefit of amenity that puts us on a fair footing relative to our geographical counterparts. It is valuable and important from many distinct perspectives for people to have access to high-quality public open spaces. Open spaces generate value in a diverse variety of ways at both the individual and community levels.

High-quality open spaces promote and enable physical activity, which underpins not only our physical health but also our mental health and wellbeing. Places for people to engage in physical activity, whether it is formal exercise such as organised sport or informal types of activity, including play, contribute significantly to overall community health. This is especially true for communities with higher levels of disadvantage, where gym memberships may be an unaffordable luxury for many. Supporting the physical health as well as the mental health of such communities aligns with our efforts to make improvements across our health system and to support health and wellbeing for communities across our state.

The opportunity to access high-quality public open space for the purposes of recreation and exercise is important for people of all ages, but it could be argued that children and young people are the cohort for whom it is most important. Regular physical activity helps children build stronger, fitter and healthier bodies. It helps them develop coordination and gross motor skills. It can also help them establish lifelong habits that will set them on the path to living healthier and happier adult lives.

Of course, as with people of every age group, the benefits for children and young people of having access to high-quality public open space are not only physical. The benefits for children's emotional and social health are significant as well. Exercise, recreation and play are good not only for brain development and wellbeing but for social and emotional development as well. Public open spaces offer chances for young people to have fun with friends and family and help them to build stronger social skills and even a stronger sense of self.

For young South Australians the Northern Parklands will offer high-quality, well-designed play spaces in addition to an abundance of open green space. These play spaces will support families and young people to live well, and they will offer enticing opportunities to get off screens and get outside. For young people who are coming into adolescence, having stronger opportunities for recreation and sport can help to steer them away from antisocial behaviour. From every angle of consideration, this investment in the Northern Parklands will offer enormous benefit to the many children and young people who reside in communities across our region.

High-quality public open spaces also promote community connection and social cohesion for every age group. They provide opportunity for people from all backgrounds and cultures to come together and exist harmoniously in the same space or to meet and engage with one another. They are places for everyone to utilise and enjoy on equal terms.

Public open spaces often take pride of place at the centre of our felt sense of community, and if they are well designed and well looked after, they are a significant positive contributor in defining the character of a community. I am confident that the Northern Parklands will become a substantially character-defining element for the communities of northern Adelaide.

Importantly, it is not only visual attractiveness and public amenity that the Northern Parklands and associated works will enhance. The activation of the Gawler River corridor will contribute to significantly strengthened ecological protection, restoration and protection. Biodiversity, in particular, will be supported and protected. The tree planting that is to be undertaken will offer a range of environmental benefits.

During the warmer months, it is of course the case that developed communities tend to experience extra impact from heat, substantially due to the ubiquity of hard, dark-coloured surfaces such as roads and roofs. Establishing a significant environmental corridor within a developed area assists in mitigating this phenomenon. The Northern Parklands will form part of the design of the new suburb of Kudla to boost its resistance to the heat-related impacts of development.



Of course, high-quality green spaces also play an important role in supporting healthy populations of flora and fauna, and they offer our communities increased opportunity to engage with and appreciate them as well. Public green spaces within our communities give us the chance to connect with nature locally in a way that we would otherwise have to travel for. Creating well-established, resilient, attractive and accessible landscapes within our suburban settings is one of the most reliable ways to ensure that nature can still be part of our daily lives, even if we live in a developed area.

The Northern Parklands Bill seeks to ensure that these parklands will be a sporting, cultural and recreational complex of statewide significance. It also embeds a framework for developing and maintaining the parklands so that they support a range of environmental and social values and activities that the Malinauskas government believes should be protected and enhanced.

To create and maintain the Northern Parklands, the bill seeks to establish a new governance body that will be known as the Northern Parklands Trust. The Northern Parklands Trust has been modelled after the West Beach Trust, which was established under the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act 1987.

The Northern Parklands Bill seeks to establish the first stage of the Northern Parklands through a plan to be lodged in the General Registry Office. The plan will set out land currently owned by the state and local governments, which will form part of the initial stage of the Northern Parklands. Upon commencement of the act, the land that has been identified within the plan will come under the management of the Northern Parklands Trust. Stage 1 of the Northern Parklands will be completed by 2030. Further stages, which will involve the acquisition of some private land in addition to the inclusion of further government-owned land, will be completed by 2040.

Among other features, the bill proposes that the Northern Parklands Trust will be required to establish both an annual business plan and a long-range strategic plan for the Northern Parklands to guide their ongoing management and to ensure financial sustainability. Very importantly, it also seeks to ensure the ongoing protection of the Northern Parklands against disposal by a future government. Over the next 12 months, a master plan will be created to guide the future development of the Northern Parklands and the Kudla Growth Area. As part of the master planning process, significant engagement will take place with the community and with landowners who will be impacted.

This is an undertaking that has the potential to significantly transform the character of northern Adelaide. It will enable access to high-quality open green space and facilities, which in turn will provide inviting, welcoming and safe settings for outdoor pursuits, relaxation and social interaction. It will also encourage investment in housing in the north, supporting vital housing supply growth for our community.

The initiative is well-supported by stakeholders, including nearby councils, which will greatly assist in ensuring that the project can be undertaken in a collaborative way and that such collaboration will be ongoing. To enable efficiency and to avoid the duplication of effort and resources, councils will assume a significant level of responsibility in relation to the operation and maintenance of the Northern Parklands. This will occur in agreement with the Northern Parklands Trust and will be funded in part by contributions from the trust itself. This cooperation will mean that the hardworking council workers, who are likely themselves to be members of a community nearby to the area, will feel a sense of pride and ownership in the work and the care that they put into looking after the parklands. I am hopeful, in fact, that all residents of northern Adelaide will have the opportunity to share in this sense of pride.

I believe the residents and communities right across northern Adelaide will very warmly welcome the enormous social, environmental and economic benefits that the Northern Parklands will bring. I greatly look forward to enjoying them myself, alongside people of all ages and backgrounds from my community. I commend and thank all those whose work on the Northern Parklands initiative has brought us to this point and who will continue to work hard to make this excellent concept a reality. I further acknowledge the many people across government who have contributed to the development and the delivery of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:47):** I would like to speak briefly in support of the Northern Parklands Bill. The proposed Northern Parklands will cover an area of about 1,000 hectares

in size. Most of this area is actually in my electorate of Light, and it is also within the Town of Gawler. So, for a start, I think the minister perhaps should think about renaming the parklands to be the Gawler Parklands, which is probably a more appropriate name for the parklands, given that these parklands will be an integral part of the Gawler community. They are an integral part of the Gawler community, and so, while I can appreciate the idea of 'Northern Parklands', I think perhaps 'Gawler Parklands' would probably be a more appropriate name. Names aside, I think it is an important proposal which is worthy of support.

The parklands proposed to be established will go from the ridge line along One Tree Hill Road and the future urban growth areas surrounding Kudla Railway Station through to the banks of the Gawler River via Karbeethan Reserve, which are all areas I have known quite well and which I have actually represented in public life since 1981. That is a long time.

I can say that since 1981 there has been ongoing controversy about the future of this area, and it has taken this government to actually resolve that controversy. It is a proposal which I will not say is actually 100 per cent supported by people who live in that area, but the majority of people do support the proposal—and that has been through the numerous meetings we have had out there with the minister and myself being present. We have engaged with the community. The reason it has been reasonably well received is because of the process we actually followed. We made sure that people understood what was happening and what was proposed. It was also to make sure that any minor issues could be tweaked, or the proposal could be tweaked, and sorted out. Generally speaking, the proposal has been well received.

The development of the parklands not only provides in terms of a whole range of environmental factors but also provides an opportunity for one of the issues I have been working on with my committee, namely, the relocation of the South Gawler Football Club, which will find a new home in these parklands. The South Gawler Football Club is not exactly a hotbed of Labor supporters, but I have been more than happy to work with them. I think the current president was actually a former candidate against me.

Importantly, the parklands provide not only an important character-defining place for the Town of Gawler but also a lot of practical applications in the sense that they provide opportunities for necessary recreational areas for the growing community of not just Gawler itself but the southern end of Gawler around the Kudla areas—Hillier for example, Evanston Gardens, Evanston South, which are all areas that have been identified as growing areas for future populations.

The proposed parklands bill ensures that we have those open spaces which are needed for not only healthy communities from an environmental point of view but healthy communities in terms of spaces where people can congregate, play sport, meet, and a whole range of things. It provides for the development of balanced communities, so it has our support. This proposal is certainly supported by the Town of Gawler and also the adjacent City of Playford which abuts it and is also at the southern end of my electorate.

As I said, to arrive to this point of the parklands, this area has had controversy. The area of Kudla was only named, I think, in the early eighties, and there was controversy about the naming of the suburb, and in the end the name Kudla was chosen. In those days I was just a councillor at the District Council of Munno Para. I think it may have become the City of Munno Para by that stage, but it was the Munno Para council, which no longer exists.

I recall it went to a ballot of all the residents in the area, and the name Kudla was overwhelmingly supported by the local people, compared to the other choice of naming the suburb Stebonheath after the Andrews family—Andrews Farm, Andrews Road, etc. To be quite open about it, Kudla was a community in those days, and it has changed dramatically and has become more diverse now. It was a community of migrants and the thought of having to write 'Stebonheath' on every piece of paper you wrote was very difficult. Kudla was much easier. We had the train station where I caught the train to go to the University of Adelaide years ago, and from work to town, which I still do from time to time, so that was well related.

Historically, there were two councils, both the previous City of Munno Para and the Town of Gawler—not the current council of the Town of Gawler; they have actually come on board but have held up, if you like, the proper planning and future envisioned for this area. There were some on the

council who thought this was prime agricultural land. These allotments start at about two or three acres, and my colleagues who are in farming communities would know that two or three acres would not be enough space for just the homestead and all the other buildings needed, let alone anything meaningful in primary production.

However, there were people on the council who thought this was prime primary production land, cropping land. It would be hard to crop there because there is no water there. When I was a boy out there certainly we had some mixed farms and they did quite well, but that is going back to the late sixties and seventies. The world has changed since then.

**Mr Telfer:** The golden days.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The golden days, yes.

**An honourable member:** Olden and golden.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That is when I was still allowed to go hunting with a shotgun and walk through the paddocks and shoot rabbits and quails, etc. You cannot do that now.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Yes. They did not stop still for me, they were moving.

**Mr Teague:** You shot moving rabbits with a shotgun?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Yes.

**Mr Teague:** How many?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Enough. In those days it was open land, but it was never going to be prime production land, because the development that occurred back in the early sixties was all five acres, 10 acres, and that in itself meant it was going to be dated. By the late seventies most of the farms had closed down, whether they were small dairy farms, pig farms, chook farms—most had closed down because the reality was there was not the economy of scale to make them productive.

The Town of Gawler, in its wisdom, for decades has held on to that view that it is prime production land and should be protected. Unfortunately, they spent tens of thousands of dollars getting reports to support their view. More importantly, they were at odds with the residents and the ratepayers in the area. The people who lived there could see what the future of this area would be, but the Town of Gawler came very late in the piece. Having said that, they have come on board and there have been changes in the council, which has made this process smoother and certainly one that is supported.

I think the idea of linking the Hills face through a corridor to the parkland areas, then through Karbeethan Reserve, then again to the Gawler River and creating a linear park along the river is really an excellent idea.

**The Hon. N.D. Champion:** It was your idea.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, it was not my idea. What is important is that this idea is not a new one. It was proposed back in the mid-seventies, but what is different between now and the mid-seventies is that the mid-seventies proposal had no strategy on how to actually implement it. It said that this will be a green belt. All the area was actually in private hands. Private landowners were supposed to provide the green belt for this whole area. As we can imagine, nothing happened—the area went backwards.

With this recent announcement through the GARP and the minister's intervention and a whole range of things, people are now starting to reinvest in this area, and this area had lacked investment for 20 to 30 years. Because of uncertainty about its future, it was not productive primary production land, and it took one brave government to make the right decision, also to take on the local council, to some extent, but it also took a lot of action by residents at numerous public meetings where they made their views quite clear.

This proposal does actually now bring together both community and public sentiment and the government in sync. That was just by way of a brief history of the area; there are a lot of other things I could talk about, given that I have lived in the area for over 60 years.

**Mr Teague:** Is this a valedictory?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, not quite. It might be for Light, yes. This proposal will be achieved through the establishment of a trust, which is a really good concept, to ensure that governments, councils and the community have a say in it. I think this proposal will enable the appropriate social infrastructure for this new committee, which will develop over time and be provided in time.

If there is one thing we have learnt in this place from even recent events, with which previous Labor governments unfortunately have been associated, is that you need to plan ahead to make sure the infrastructure is in place when it is needed, whether it is physical infrastructure such as roads, water, etc., or social infrastructure such as reserves, schools, police, etc. The whole proposal for this trust is predicated on an idea to make sure this community, when people are there, will be living in a healthy amenity, in both the physical sense and the social sense. With those few words, I certainly endorse this proposal.

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (11:59):** I rise to make a short contribution on this, and I look forward to the committee stage to try to understand a few more of the details. As we have seen with a lot of pieces of legislation that we have debated over this term, there is a broad concept, a bit of a light bulb, but it is what actually happens in the detail that I am interested in, especially with this bill. It is basically putting in place a structure, the capacity for a structure to tell a local government area that they will need to levy a certain amount on their constituents, on their ratepayers—and it gives the flexibility of how to do that—but it is adding an extra impost, an extra cost, onto the communities and the constituent councils.

The last speaker, in his contribution, spoke about the Town of Gawler—he talked about a variety of different subjects, but he spoke about the Town of Gawler and the City of Playford as the two constituent councils. I will be interested through the committee stage to understand a little bit about the engagement with the councils. I am talking about substantive engagement, not just, 'Do you mind this idea? What do you think?'

It is great to have this great big parkland area, but have you considered the obligation of a levy put onto your constituents, onto your ratepayers, because that is basically what this structure is putting in place. It is putting the obligation, the responsibility financially, onto ratepayers at a time when there is a fair bit of pressure on those ratepayers with the cost-of-living challenges that they are facing at the moment. So it is an extra tax, an extra levy, an extra obligation on top of what they are currently having to face. Do they really understand—and know and acknowledge—that that extra obligation is going to come?

There was talk in some earlier speeches that I was listening intently to about not wanting to duplicate effort. There is a great opportunity for council to be able to do this work and not create an extra obligation or an extra layer of maintenance capacity. I think at the moment councils are employing enough garden staff, enough outdoor staff, to be able to do the work that is required of them. With extra work on top, there will be extra staff that will be required, and that extra cost will have to be borne by someone. With the structures that are being proposed here, on my reading, the extra obligation will be upon those ratepayers, this extra levy on top.

We do know that there are levies that are raised by the state government through legislation, but councils are obligated on behalf of the state government to do it through their rating system. The landscape levy is a classic example of it. It is a levy which every single council is legislatively obligated to collect on behalf of the state government. In theory, although the structures in a piece of legislation like this are saying that all the cost burden of the collection of these extra rates can be clawed back by local government, we know the reality of the structures of it, and this is mirrored in the way that this legislation is going.

If there is a certain cohort of ratepayers who are defaulting on their rates—like with the landscapes levy—if they are defaulting on their rates, then the extra obligation has to be borne by

the council somehow. The landscape levy is a classic example and this I assume, and will find out through the process, will be no different. The council have to cover any shortfall in the amount that has been collected. If they are trying to extrapolate it out across the whole of their constituency, the whole of their ratepayer base, and there is a 5 per cent portion who do not pay it, that means they have to cover it in the rest of their general revenue. There is always an extra financial obligation despite the best laid plans in a piece of legislation. I know that from what I have seen in local government. Councils all over tell me that.

Like I say, I think there is a real risk that there are details that are put into a piece of legislation that are not fully understood by those who are impacted. I am sure that the councillors at the Town of Gawler and the City of Playford are aware that there is a plan out. I wonder if they have seen the legislation; I will be curious to find that out. In conversations with some representatives in that area, this was a surprise to them, that this was a legislated thing that was coming through the state parliament. Secondly, has there been discussion and consultation with either community or council or a combination of the two about what the expectations are about a level of financing; that a levy or an additional rate take will be required of the council?

In the end, when we are making laws in this place that affect people's hip pocket, we need to be fully aware of what those impacts are going to be. So there is a whole heap of detail within this piece of legislation that I am cautious about, I am curious about, and I am going to do my best on behalf of local government as the shadow minister to try to get some consistent answers from the government about.

Once again, it is fine to have a conceptual idea, a big picture perspective, 'Look here we are making grand plans for the future of this area' and the contributions that have been given so far speak about that, but what about the impact day to day on the ratepayers and the obligation on councils? To form a Northern Parklands Trust as the managing entity for a significant parcel of land like this is absolutely a structure that could work if we get the frameworks right.

The different representation, which is put out here in clause 12, which we will look at a bit later on, really does try to strike a balance but, in the end, when there is external ministerial involvement, there is always a risk that the decisions that are made with appointments or the decisions that are made about the amount of money that is required, that is levied from those communities, will get out of whack with the expectations of those communities, of the ratepayers themselves.

So with those few words, I look forward, once the second reading contributions are all completed, to be able to unpack a little bit through the committee stage what this legislation actually means and the impacts it is going to have on ratepayers, especially within the Town of Gawler and the City of Playford.

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (12:06):** I am so very pleased to rise today to speak on the Northern Parklands Bill. The north has a rich history of resilience, hard work and innovation. From manufacturing and defence to trades and small business, the north has powered much of South Australia's economic growth over the years and now our secret is out: the north is an excellent place to live, work and play. It is growing and it is growing fast.

By 2050, Greater Adelaide's population is expected to grow by an additional 670,000, which is exactly why the Malinauskas state government has set a clear direction for coordinated and strategic growth by launching the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, also known to us as GARP. This strategic plan identifies where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 30 years and preserves important land for future infrastructure. We need to ensure that Adelaide, including our outer suburbs, remains one of the most liveable cities in the world, which is why we as the government are adapting our policies and protecting what makes our great state so special.

We must plan well for the future, and the future of our beloved northern suburbs is looking so incredibly bright. The Malinauskas state government has already made key investments in the north, including but not limited to: the announcement of a new high school in the northern suburbs delivering high-quality educational facilities for our children now and into the future; much needed investment for the Curtis Road railway crossing; a \$1.5 billion investment in SA Water, which will unlock new housing releases in the northern suburbs; and a brand-new ambulance station in Gawler.

But what I am particularly excited for is that the state government will create the Northern Parklands, and knowing the popularity of our treasured Cobbler Creek Recreation Park, I know my community will be very pleased about this too. Our state is so very proud of our Parklands. They have always been a part of Adelaide's identity and modern history, so it should come as no surprise that the Malinauskas state government will use the biggest ever investment in public open space in Greater Adelaide to create the Northern Parklands.

The creation of the Northern Parklands is no small feat. It will stretch from the ridge line following One Tree Hill Road to the future urban growth areas surrounding Kudla Railway Station through to the banks of the Gawler River by Karbeethan Reserve. In short, it is going to be absolutely enormous. Totalling 1,000 hectares, this green corridor will be 39 per cent larger than the Adelaide Parklands, big enough to make my inner-city colleagues very envious. These parklands will provide much needed recreation, greening initiatives and community spaces, and shape a sustainable and thriving future for our northern suburbs.

They will feature a 70-hectare sport and recreation precinct with ovals, courts and public transport links. I am especially excited about the relocation of the South Gawler Football Club to the Northern Parklands. It will provide them with a major expansion opportunity, due to their current constraints and facilities being no longer fit for purpose thanks to a rapid growth of club members at the sporting club. Sport is, for so many, a home away from home. It is a place to connect with others, to stay active and grow. Most importantly, it plays a vital role in supporting our overall wellbeing. We want to encourage that as much as possible, which is why I am so pleased that it features strongly in our plans for the Northern Parklands.

It will also feature the establishment of a significant green corridor linking Kudla to Karbeethan Reserve and over 760 hectares dedicated to biodiversity, native habitats and environmental preservation; the activation and preservation of the Gawler River corridor, with a 38-kilometre loop of shared use, walking and cycling paths; and a new railway station, a gateway to the Northern Parklands, making it easier for everyone to access green open spaces.

Through engagement with many stakeholders—including our local councils the City of Playford and the Town of Gawler council—we are working together for the north to achieve this significant, character-defining opportunity for our great community. In order to do so, the Northern Parklands Bill seeks to create a new statutory authority responsible for establishing the new Northern Parklands. A new governance body, the Northern Parklands Trust, will oversee its management and future funding through council contributions and development revenue.

There will be seven appointed members of the trust, which will include an ecologist and a First Nations appointee. The trust will explore opportunities to ensure it has a financially sustainable business model that is inclusive of defined commercial activities, like caravan parks and sports. Partnering with our local councils, the Northern Parklands Trust can utilise and develop the existing council workforce for the operation of the parklands, which will create a sustainable operating model.

This development presents a unique opportunity to shape the character of Adelaide's northern suburbs in a way that respects their roots. As the north continues to grow, so, too, must our commitment to the spaces that bring us together. This is an investment in the wellbeing of future generations and will serve as a place for recreation, connection and restoration, a living and breathing part of our expanding community.

This is not just smart planning but an investment in our northern suburbs for the generations to come. It is creating a space where people can build their lives, not just pass through, and the Northern Parklands will become part of the identity of Adelaide's north, a place people are proud to call home. I am so very pleased to commend this bill to the house.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:12):** I rise to make a brief contribution on the Northern Parklands Bill. As I have said many times in this house, I note my family connections through to Gawler River and, previous to that, in 1840 farming at Plympton, of all places. Obviously Plympton was getting built out and we ended up, in the late 1800s, right next to Gawler River; in fact, we owned the land where the Gawler River Methodist Church is, which in recent times was sold privately. My great-grandparents and great-great-grandparents are buried there.

In the discussion earlier by the member for Light he talked about prime farming land. Decades ago it was prime farming land—it probably always has been—but as we see with too much farming land it gets built on over time and developed. That has certainly happened over many, many decades. I go back to conversations with my late father, who was born in 1920; he knew a lot of the history of the opening up of land between Adelaide and Gawler, and then watched what was happening around Angle Vale before he finished farming up there. He was aware of the original farms that were sold for building houses and cities on at Salisbury and Elizabeth back in the day. Certainly, it is some very good country.

As we see with cities like Adelaide that are built right on a river—for obvious reasons, where the early settlers would have needed water—it is some of the best land in the state and, as people moved out to areas like Gawler River and Angle Vale and surrounding communities, it is similar. It almost hurts when you see how much housing development is on that really good country around Angle Vale.

It is interesting that there has been some foresight and there will be a 1,000-hectare park. It is certainly land that my grandfather and father would have been well known to traverse. As I have said before, some of their properties were compulsorily acquired in 1939 and 1950 for defence purposes and they were running out of land to farm, so they did the trek up to a property at One Tree Hill from where they were at Angle Vale. They were sharefarming up there for the Harvey family, so there are certainly a lot of links to my family.

Looking at this legislation, it is forward-looking so that there is some open space kept. Too many times we see in development that land is just built out. I know I have mentioned it here before, but I look at the debacle at Mount Barker. I hope everyone has learnt from these past mistakes, because it is essentially just going to be an Adelaide city suburb mounted on some beautiful hills and valleys up in the Adelaide Hills. Some would say it is progress, but I think we need to have better planning decisions in the future.

As has been mentioned, the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan—and the Murray Bridge expansion that is coming now and into the future over the next 40 years—will provide many tens of thousands of new residents to the area. I know the full strategic planning is going into place, with developers from Victoria heavily involved and going through that process. It will be interesting to see how this rolls out. It is a bit of a shining light to see that some land will not just be built on. Obviously, it will not be used for primary production purposes but will be put to community purposes, which I think will assist.

In terms of recreation, we have heard about the South Gawler Football Club being relocated. With any sporting club developments, I hope people look at what happened at the Summit at Mount Barker. That has not worked very well at all. It is a great oval, but it appears that no-one seems to want to use it because of the high costs. The soccer grounds get used quite regularly and they are excellent soccer grounds. Looking at the facilities at the Summit, I guess you could say they are partly adequate but they do not really have a function room there at an oval of that standard. I hope people look at what has happened. I have not seen what has happened at Lyndoch, but from what I understand it should be a pretty good set-up with \$40 million being invested there.

We need to make sure that our cultural facilities and our sporting facilities are fit for purpose and that we do not scrimp. I know things cost a lot of money and they cost far more than what you think they should—for the layman or laywoman, you usually put in a times two when you are trying to estimate a cost. But this is an opportunity. Let's just hope that we get things right. I know that there will be some questions in committee. This should bode well for people living in the northern areas.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:19):** I rise, I promise, to make a very brief contribution to this bill. I will allow the opposition to interrogate the clauses as they wish, and I hope for a speedy passage for this bill. I have had many conversations with the minister over the last few months about the GARP, about the Housing Roadmap and obviously about the Northern Parklands, which is part of that overall suite of ideas in terms of both improvement to the northern suburbs but also addressing our very acute housing crisis.

As other speakers have mentioned, there will be tens of thousands of new houses immediately north and west of the electorate of Elizabeth. It is really important, and I am pleased that

provision has been made and will be made in this bill for really good and quite extensive recreation spaces along the northern and eastern edges of all of that development, as well as maintaining some of that green belt, which people talk about a lot, between Elizabeth and Gawler.

When I first arrived in Elizabeth in 1981, there was almost nothing from Uley Road in Elizabeth Downs to Gawler. When I say 'almost nothing', of course I assume the member for Light had a house somewhere there, so there were things there, but there was very little in terms of large-scale development. I should not downplay the importance of the member for Light's household. In my conversations with the minister over the last few months about the Northern Parklands, which of course I wholly support, we were reflecting on some of the other green space, particularly around Elizabeth.

For those who drive through Elizabeth, they will know there are what the council call windbreaks on either side of Main North Road. As you drive from around Saints Road all the way up past the Munno Para shopping centre, on both sides of the road there are quite wide, almost continuous reserves of land with trees and so on. At the moment, I have to say that I have become very concerned, and in my conversations with the minister I know he has too, about the upkeep of some of these windbreaks by the council over time.

I remember back in the early eighties they were green spaces. They were full of kids playing on their BMXs and skateboards and so on. They really were both a place to have recreation in or to play in but also to go through and along. They really were parks where people could enjoy the amenity and crisscross the city in a really pleasant way. Now they are places that people largely avoid. They are fairly barren places. There has been some development in terms of minor gravel bike tracks and so on, but really I do not think this is enough.

A conversation has started between me and the minister and some others to try to get back the idea of Elizabeth as a garden city. When it was first developed by the Housing Trust, the idea was that Elizabeth would be called 'the Garden City'. Of course, that got a bit lost in the amalgamation of the councils of the City of Munno Para and the City of Elizabeth to become the City of Playford. However, the original concept of Elizabeth was as a garden city, and I remember growing up with not only those windbreaks but also the areas around Elizabeth City Centre and the railway station and so on being very colourful in terms of the flowers planted. It really was a garden city, and I think that is something we have lost. I did promise I will be brief.

I am writing to the minister this week—it is no surprise, he is expecting my letter—to begin an investigation into whether we can look at declaring some of those windbreaks a linear park, as has been done in other parts of the state, most obviously along the River Torrens up into the eastern suburbs. In declaring it a linear park, of course you would lock that land so that it could not be developed on, as I understand it, without the permission of both houses of parliament.

It could not be developed in any big way, but of course it would be able to be used for various recreational pursuits. I would envision that there would be bike tracks and walking tracks. Having looked now more closely at the map of the Northern Parklands, I notice there is quite a large parcel of it immediately to the north-east of Blakes Crossing. It is not hard to envision that such a linear park, whether it started at Saints Road or John Rice Avenue up the stretch of Main North Road, on either side or both sides or however the consultation phase finally landed, could join to the Northern Parklands up there in that Uleybury quarter.

Obviously, there will need to be lots of consultation with local communities, but I really think it is a vision worth pursuing, realising Elizabeth once again as a garden city. As part of this process, I will also be writing to the minister to see if there is any provision within the Planning and Development Fund to aid in some of that beautification and provide some of the amenity along such a linear park. I look forward to that process taking place, and I look forward to the consultation process with my community about this because I think it will be very popular.

Over the last several years, we have seen some rather unpopular development proposals along some of those parcels of land. In declaring it a linear park, that would put an end to community angst about some of that pretty ugly development which has been proposed along those places. I look forward to hearing a response from the minister, and I look forward to the community consultation involved. In doing so, I commend the Northern Parklands Bill to the house.



**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (12:25):** It has been a really terrific debate, beginning with the member for Ramsay reminding me of her history in Gawler. Of course, I went to high school with the member for Ramsay, so we share a commitment to the northern suburbs and the Mid North just through our longevity and our long association with it. She made some really pertinent observations that Gawler was surveyed not so much by Light but by Light's planning firm, and the survey was done in the year of his death. These linkages between the Adelaide Parklands and what was in the mind's eye of planners then are particularly apparent.

In terms of contributions, we also had the member for Heysen. I do thank the opposition for their support of this bill. As the member for Heysen pointed out, once this bill passes—and there is absolutely no doubt of the urgency—the work to construct the full vision of the parklands will go over many governments and many generations of politicians and, by necessity, it has to be bipartisan, so I do thank the opposition for their support and their thoughtful comments and questions in their contributions.

The member for Playford reminds us that during a housing crisis it is incredibly important that we do not forget the importance of the urban realm, of urban space and of parks in particular. He reminded us of that old adage that those who are thinking about the future are always planting trees that we might never sit under or experience the shade of, but indeed our children and our grandchildren might.

The member for Florey I think is always a thoughtful contributor to the equity question, and there is an equity question in open space. You see it in the north and, frankly, in the western suburbs as well. There is a great disparity in terms of open space and often the quality of open space. It is important for all communities to have access to high-quality parks, but it is especially important for those communities which are challenged by unemployment or low incomes.

It has an even bigger effect for those communities, those working-class and lower middle-class communities, to have access to parks and playgrounds which they can take their children to, which they can play sport in and can seek refuge in, because parks are free, because parks are a public good. In that regard, they can provide great quality to working and middle-class suburbs, whereas the wealthy can always afford to get access to space. That is one of the things that wealth does bring you.

The member for Light made a tremendous contribution. This has been a long march for the member for Light. I was talking to him just before his speech about the naming of Kudla. He has always been a passionate and thoughtful contributor to local government, to this place and especially to the Northern Parklands.

It would be fair to say that the component of the long linear path along the river did come from the member for Light and from his consultations with the community and with the State Planning Commission. I can remember Craig Holden, head of the State Planning Commission, rather excitedly telling me that this had been raised as a point in one of the consultations with the member for Light and his community, and that the commission had thoughtfully taken it up. It reminded me of when I was preselected and first elected. I had asked the member for Light about his recommendations about election commitments, and he recommended to me to put in place a funding commitment for this pathway along the Gawler River.

There had been a community group down there—the Gawler environment group, I think is their name. Lots of really passionate people had been cleaning woody weeds, olives and shopping trolleys out of that river for a decade before that, and Tony had worked with them. We contributed about \$7 million, I think it was, to build some bridges over the river and a bike path; I remember going out and riding it myself just before it was opened and seeing people already using it. It had not been officially opened but it was there, and the number of people using it made me realise what an absolute winner it was. Of course, ultimately it was a winner for the Barossa, too, because it meant that we got on with the next stage, which was Gawler to Tanunda.

The power of bike paths and of good urban realm was an early lesson I had in public office, so I thank the member for Light for his wise counsel, not just in this debate but ones that have gone before it. Quite rightly he says we are going to start out with the South Gawler footy club. If those

opposite want to see a bit of a run-down facility, go to the South Gawler footy club. It has not changed since I played under 17s—not very successfully—a long time ago, in 1988-89. I was not much of a footballer; in fact, my under 17s team lost every game except one against Gawler Central, and I remember that game vividly.

The South Gawler footy club has had, on occasion, some enthusiasm. There has been a bit of cross-pollination with the local branch of the Liberal Party. Tom Zorich, of course, was my opponent in 2013. His sons played A-grade for South Gawler footy club, and it was the only year I ever got beaten in corfluting; they were the most efficient corfluting crew I have ever seen. I did catch up to them and I did win the election, so that was something, but it was a rude shock to me the night the election was called, I can tell you—so a tribute to the Zorich family and that year's A-grade or B-grade teams for outdoing me.

I should also point out that James Agness, Labor's candidate for Light, played for South Gawler, so perhaps he is evening up the bipartisanship for the club. They are a great community club and their facilities are so embarrassingly run down. They have had to expand into the old squash courts, which are pretty run down. They have done a good job, if you like, stretching the life of the grounds at the moment, but there is an opportunity to put them in the new section in the first stage of the Northern Parklands, and it will be a great outcome if we do that.

The member for Flinders quite rightly, I think—and we will get into this in the committee stage—points out that the funding of an urban park is absolutely critical, and the cooperation of the constituent councils is absolutely critical as well. We will not be able to do this process without their enthusiasm and cooperation, and without their workforce frankly, too, which is the other thing on which we will have to seek their cooperation.

I put quite a bit of thought into this because, as the member for Hammond points out, there have been a few mistakes made with multi-user facilities, and I think there have also been some mistakes made with long linear parks in the past where the funding mechanism is not robust enough to properly fund public open space. You get them established and then they either get these big investments that do not work for the community or they get no investment at all.

The member for Hammond made some good points about farming on the Adelaide Plains. I think the only way to have avoided that would have been to prevent Thomas Playford's enthusiastic expansion of the city. It would have been a very different city and a very different economy, I think, had we not had postwar industrialisation.

There are some very good interviews with Thomas Playford in the national sound archive. When you listen to them, you listen to a Premier who had a very methodical and deliberate plan, which originated in the government of Sir Richard Butler but really found its full flourish post war. I do not know whether once those postwar wheels started turning they could be avoided, but it was a good contribution, I think, from the member for Hammond and the member for Flinders.

The member for King made the obvious point that the northern suburbs is a growing community and is one that is taking so much of the growth in the north. It is such a good working-class, middle-class community, with good values, open values and hardworking values. As she and the member for Playford and the member for Florey pointed out, these communities deserve some measure of equity in terms of things.

Finally, the member for Elizabeth is an old friend and, like the member for Ramsay, a person I have had a long association with. I first met the member for Elizabeth when we were at university together, at the now-defunct UniSA Salisbury campus. I suppose we spent a long time rolling around pubs and the uni bar and all sorts of parties out in Elizabeth North and other places.

Of course, Elizabeth is the city of my birth, so I have an emotional and passionate interest in making sure that we honour Elizabeth and we honour that great city. I know the windbreaks are a separate issue, but they are an issue of open space. In my last term in federal parliament, there were proposals to sell them off and open the door for big-box retail to dominate those places, those windbreaks. That open space was deliberately put in place by the Housing Trust when they designed the new town of Elizabeth, and it is unique. No other city in Australia was built with such deliberate, thoughtful planning.

It is in Robin Boyd's book, *The Australian Ugliness*. Its planning is referred to in that book, a thoughtful exposition at the time of Australian planning and aesthetics, but it was mentioned in a very positive way. So you think to yourself that this is not something that one council has a right to sneakily degrade and then sell off. The urban realm of Elizabeth is a function of South Australia's history and of the Housing Trust's history. I ran a campaign and I was pretty tough with the council. I had some tough conversations with some of the councillors—old friends—about that.

Clearly, we have to engage with the City of Playford about that open space, which defines the city. Anybody who is travelling up and down Main North Road gets a bit of a break from the endless development along it. You get this wonderful green corridor as you run through Elizabeth. The council has not helped itself by building a pretty hideous and empty car park on the corner of the land, near the shopping centre and near the council chambers. We all supported that bit of it, but I think it is a financial temptation, frankly, to try to revoke the community land status of that land and do something commercial with it, which will not be acceptable to this government, and I will take the member for Elizabeth's very sensible proposal into consideration.

In closing can I just say, in my mind's eye I have always been able to see a great park forming between Gawler and Kudla, and on any planning criteria Kudla stacks up as the best land to develop; it is close to water, power, public transport and to roads we have already put in, and so to develop Kudla the infrastructure costs are substantially lower.

As the Deputy Speaker observed in his speech, there have been many discussions, proposals, controversy and plans over this land, because of him, because of the State Planning Commission and because of the long and thoughtful public policy work that we went through. Also, the people who live in Kudla, their thoughtfulness about what should happen in the future has meant that we can see the creation of a new suburb, of thousands and thousands of homes, which is important for housing supply. Also, critically, we had to make sure that Gawler kept its identity and that Kudla had an identity of its own as well.

Inherent in that is the interurban break with its substance and meaning. As the member for Light observed, previous interurban breaks have been on private land and so have been functionally meaningless—in fact, they have led to the disinvestment in land rather than the investment in land. What we will see here is private investment being unleashed in Kudla to build homes, communities, shopping centres, and all of those things, but we will also see some of that private investment being matched with some of the public investment to make a great park, and in my mind's eye I can completely see just how great this park can be.

As I said before, it is important for communities, particularly where people are new homebuyers and where there is a diverse range of incomes, to know that that open space will be built in at the start and that they can barrack for the South Gawler footy club or, with the number of people coming in, maybe even the Kudla footy club; there will be new sporting teams formed. It is important that they know that the open space is there and thought about in a meaningful way.

I have looked quite closely at the way urban parks have been formed, because in actual fact the impact of lights on urban planners in this city has been profound. We all understand the power of the Adelaide Parklands. There are many debates about the Parklands, about investment in them and the like, but, broadly speaking, this range of Parklands has stayed intact and it is a beautiful and unique open space that is valued and precious in terms of cities around the world.

However, when you look at it, it is not funded the way it should be. The investment from the City Council—and I am not knocking the City Council—is not commensurate with its greatness. I look at Linear Park and I see a patchwork quilt made up of councils' contributions and the enthusiasm of mayors who come and go with administrations and, frankly, the previous government's contributions in the south around creating parks.

What we are trying to build with the Northern Parklands Trust is an advanced and modernised version of the West Beach Trust, where we set in place a governance model that is both inclusive of councils and inclusive of the broader challenge when we have parks across council boundaries—so a modern governance but also a modern funding mechanism, because parks are only created when there is an appropriate investment.

Investment must come from two avenues, frankly. It must come when the suburb has been created, and that is why we have an open space requirement on developers. There is no doubt that developers in and around Kudla and Evanston and on government land will be providing contributions as they build the homes, but also that requires ongoing maintenance and an ongoing budget to maintain and develop parklands.

We have been very thoughtful, too, about allowing the Northern Parklands Trust to provide some ability to have commercial ventures that might help fund the park. West Beach Trust is deliberately mentioned because they run a very popular caravan park, for which I am minister. The great thing about the West Beach Trust is it never asked government for great wads of budget because they have their own ability to generate revenue. It is a popular one, one that people want to avail themselves of and so it is a successful venture. With the Northern Parklands, I think that some ability to do something similar with some small part of the land that they will eventually have will be sensible because then you get life and activity in them as well.

When we get to the committee stage, we will be able to go through those in some detail, but it is not the government's intention to build funding models that put some unreasonable impost on councils or some unreasonable impost on ratepayers. What we want to do is create a funding mechanism so that people know that they do not have to worry about where the next soccer pitch is coming from or, as the member for Hammond points out, whether sporting clubs can afford to use the facilities that have been built. With the Northern Parklands Trust, we are trying to build a model of inclusive and progressive governance with the ability to actually do things as well.

There is no doubt that this has been the great passion of my ministerial life so far. The creation of these parks is an important thing to do. Subject to the passing of the legislation, we will certainly be getting on with the creation of a park on lands that the government holds and we will be getting on with the creation of the suburb of Kudla. Although this work will go on for decades and in all likelihood go far beyond my political life, it is not something I intend to leave for future generations. It is something that I intend to begin and progress, and it is something that the government is very committed to on behalf of the people of the northern suburbs: to create a model for a park not just for the north but, more broadly, for other suburbs. With that, I close the debate.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

**Mr TEAGUE:** The substantive provisions include reference at clauses 12 and 15. The question at clause 3 is then the definition of constituent council. What councils are constituent councils, bearing in mind the way that works vis-a-vis the establishment of the trust and the annual plan, the subjects of clauses 12 and 15?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** In the initial phases it is Playford and Gawler. There is an ability to extend, if the parklands are extended into other councils' areas.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Just from the point of view of the statute, that is interesting to know, and I might be guided, but I perhaps will just spell it out. The definition of constituent council is a council specified as such in the Northern Parklands Trust's annual business plan. We do not see the Northern Parklands Trust established until we find out its constituent parts in clause 12, and then the business plan gets a mention in some detail at clause 15.

So I am just wondering, as far as the legislative instrument is concerned, how perhaps the nomination process in clause 12(1)(a) gets to occur, in that the Northern Parklands Trust itself cannot get up and running until its members are found, including those two that are to be nominated by the constituent councils. Is the circularity solved somehow so that Playford and Gawler can do their job and then the annual business plan can arrive and then presumably the annual business plan can specify what the—and is that not in reverse?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** In terms of circularity, getting started is always the most difficult thing, is it not? In terms of the Northern Parklands the two main councils, if you look at the map, are Playford and Gawler, so we would write to them asking for a representative, whether it be the mayor or CEO or some other member. They would be appointed to the trust, and then as the minister I appoint some members, and then the Minister for Environment also appoints a member. So in effect the trust will be established, and Gawler and Playford will be the, if you like, founding councils.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think the committee is assisted by the answer. It sounds like there is a commonsense answer to what is intended, at least from the outset. There might be a question arise subsequently about any other additional constituent councils that might find their way to being referred to in the annual plan, in which case they become constituent councils, no worries. But is there not, in light of that, a problem or need to do something about that? I have not been able to find it in the transitional provisions or elsewhere. That might be just because I have not found it, and I am conscious the committee will have an opportunity to reconvene at some stage after a break.

So there is the commonsense point—understanding the expectation as to who the relevant councils are that might be intended at the outset. There is that problem and then there is the problem that somebody has seen fit to go out of their way to say that the constituent councils are the ones referred to in the annual business plan. That might make eminent sense for additional ones, but, in that case, is the definition of 'constituent council' better directed, for those purposes, to be 'additional constituent councils', and is there an initial constituent council mechanism, perhaps, that is required to get that up and going?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** It is sort of an interesting issue of circularisation. From the outset, we have only ever imagined Gawler and Playford as being the two constituent councils. I think there has been some latitude left there if you were to cross the river in any substantial way. Gawler council I think already owns some land across the other side of the river as well, on the riverbank, so effectively that is already done. I do not anticipate that there would be additional councils.

We might just consult parliamentary counsel on the issue of circularisation, and if there is some minor amendment that we need we will do it. But, from the government's point of view, we have essentially been consulting with the Playford and Gawler councils, and they are the councils we imagine to be on the Northern Parklands Trust.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I just indicate that it is not my intent to take the government by surprise. It might just be that there is a necessity to deal with that. As I say, I am ready to stand corrected in case there is actually a reference to those two councils as being the initial ones. If there is a need to change, then it might be to refer to the fact that, at the outset, the constituent councils are Playford and Gawler.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

### **DEFAMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy assented to the bill.

### **CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) (BLOOD TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Act—  
Public Sector—General—2025

Rules made under the following Acts—

Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Environment, Resources and  
Development Court Act 1993, Youth Court Act 1993, Magistrates Court—  
Joint Criminal—No. 9  
Uniform Special Statutory—No. 8

By the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance)—  
Plastic Barrier Bags and Produce Stickers

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close) on behalf of the Treasurer (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

SA Shellfish Quality Assurance Program—Plankton Counts—Correction Report

Regulations made under the following Act—

Fisheries Management—

Demerit Points—Miscellaneous (2025)  
Miscellaneous Broodstock and Seedstock Fishery  
Miscellaneous Exploratory and Developmental Fishery  
Miscellaneous Research Fishery

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. J.K. Szakacs)—

Local Council By-Laws—

Adelaide Hills Council—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Local Government Land  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Cats

District Council of Cleve—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Roads  
No. 4—Local Government Land  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Cats

Mid Murray Council—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Roads  
No. 4—Local Government Land  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Cats  
No. 7—Camping and Mooring

The City of Burnside—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Local Government Land  
No. 4—Roads  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Waste Management  
No. 7—Lodging Houses

## VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to welcome to parliament today visitors in the gallery. We have year 11 students from Nazareth College, who are guests of the member for Cheltenham and Minister for Trade, who you just heard give a brief contribution to the house. We have students from St Mary's College, who are guests of the member for Adelaide, and we have students from St Peter's College, who are guests of the member for Dunstan. Welcome to parliament. I hope you enjoy your time in here today.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:06):** I bring up the 153<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled New Northern Suburbs High School.

Report received and ordered to be published.

#### **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:06):** I bring up the 50<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Petition No. 60 of 2024, South Australian Museum.

Report received.

### *Question Time*

#### **ALGAL BLOOM**

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee our beaches won't be closed for swimming this summer? Does he agree with the views of his environment minister in relation to plans being put in place? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** During a radio interview on 17 July this year, responding to a caller asking if our beaches would need to be closed this summer, the environment minister said:

It's possible and that's one of the plans that we are having to put in place. It is absolutely something we need to prepare for.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:08):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The Leader of the Opposition, I think along with potentially other members of the opposition, has asked this question previously, and we have made clear that the advice that the government is currently receiving around beach closures is that there would not be a reason to expect that would occur. Of course, no one can predict the future but, as it stands today, we are in receipt of advice from our officials that they do not anticipate a set of circumstances under which beaches would need to be closed.

That is not to say that circumstances can't change, but we have no advice, as it stands today, that that would be required, nor would we want that to change. On this side of the house, we are working exceptionally hard to make sure that all judgements the government is making in respect of the harmful algal bloom are done in a way that is consistent with the science and the public health advice that we are frequently in receipt of. We will have another taskforce meeting on Thursday, as we regularly do.

Over the course of late last week I also had more opportunity to spend time with our senior officials in this regard, from both SARDI and the public health section of the SA unit, and they are working collaboratively as a team in conjunction with our officials within the Department for Environment and Water as well.

It would be very unfortunate if we saw, this summer, a diminished number of people being able to enjoy our beaches—not least because it is a great pastime and healthy thing to be doing but also because that would have economic consequences for many of our coastal communities. The

government has worked hard to get in front of that, which is why the Minister for Tourism has released our Coast is Calling campaign, in conjunction with the voucher program that is being rolled out forthwith. We have made clear, on the record, that we are open-minded with regard to other iterations of a voucher campaign in the event that this progresses into summer—which is a very real possibility indeed.

The weather over the course of late last week and the weekend may have had a positive impact on the algal bloom. We look forward to getting updated on that on Thursday, but most recent history tells us that forecasting the behaviour of the algae is a rather precarious exercise. This is dynamic; it is moving, it is changing, and that is likely to occur into the future.

As we get closer to summer we continue our preparations for a summer plan in response to the algal bloom. I have said publicly that we anticipate we would release the summer plan for the algal bloom in October, if required, but that does not stop us from making other announcements, if we see it as appropriate, between now and then.

We have seen a rapid escalation in a range of capacities within the government, particularly testing capacity and particularly around the brevetoxins. We are very pleased to see the rapid effort being applied at Agilex down in Thebarton; it is quite extraordinary what they are setting up in good time. We are constantly investing in our capacity to respond and to monitor the situation and keep South Australians updated as practically as we can.

### ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My question is to the Premier. When, if ever, did Surfing Australia first raise its concerns with the government about relocating the 2025 Australian Junior Surfing Titles from the Fleurieu Peninsula to Wollongong over safety concerns about the bloom? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** On 30 August 2025 Surfing Australia announced, via its website, that the decision to relocate had been made early due to the unpredictability of conditions associated with the algal bloom.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12):** I can speak to this because my office has been directly engaged with the organisers of this surfing event. It is unfortunate that they have chosen to reschedule the event, although we totally understand their reasons for doing so. This is the reality of the circumstances we are now in. We understand, particularly when you are talking about younger people, that event organisers—for both practical reasons but also out of caution for their participants—might choose to take a risk-averse approach.

My office was dealing directly with the event organisers to put forward a couple of things to them. The first thing we wanted to do was make sure that over recent weeks they had access to the public health advice and our officials from SARDI. In fact, my advice is that the event organisers met directly with senior officials from both SARDI and the public health team in SA Health, who were able to provide them with advice around what the circumstances are with respect to the algae and what we anticipate the algae will be doing in that part of our waters later in the year, and furnish them with the modelling that we have available to us.

It is important to note that in the electorate of the member for Finniss, on that southern part of the Fleurieu, we haven't seen algae present for some time. The cell counts have been negative; that is to say we have not had algae in the region for some time. The nature of the oceanography in that particular environment is far more open water as distinct from what we might see in either Gulf St Vincent or Spencer Gulf, which means that it flushes more quickly, so even if the algae was to re-emerge the likelihood of it being maintained or sustained is less than what would be the case if it was on a location, hypothetically, on one of our metropolitan beaches or on the eastern side of Yorke Peninsula.

We were able to provide all that advice, including the public health information around 'even if the algae is present what would it mean for surfers?' The member for Finniss would be able to attest that there are a lot of people surfing down in those southern areas of the Fleurieu at the



moment—and surfing unaffected, which is great to see—so we were certainly hopeful the event could go ahead.

What we also were able to do was offer the organisers of the event potential options around contingency funding in the event that they decided to go ahead with it and cancel. Discussions were had between officials to put offers on the table. The SATC were already making a contribution to the event—from memory somewhere in the order of \$80,000—so we were looking at options of scaling that up if it was required. We were doing everything we could to see the event happen.

But we totally respect the organisers' decision. Like I said, it is a reflection of the circumstances that we now operate within. We have to respond to these realities. We will work with any event organiser along our coastal communities if an opportunity presents itself to do so and make available all the information we have, and then ultimately they will make their own decisions.

### ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My question is to the Premier. What other groups, associations or sporting groups have voiced similar concerns to the government about any impending events that they are planning to hold on Adelaide beaches over spring and summer, and what is the government's current advice to them?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:16):** It would be consistent with the advice that we have provided to the organisers of the junior surfing competition. We will make available all the information we have—we've got nothing to hide; why wouldn't we make it available to event organisers?—and they will make their own decisions.

Only last week we had a community forum with leaders of the surf lifesaving community throughout the state from both regional South Australia and also metropolitan Adelaide. We met with the clubs' secretaries and presidents and leadership from each and every club. We provided a briefing from both public health and SARDI. I was there. We answered all the questions that surf lifesaving clubs had. These are amazing institutions full of really good people.

We talked about the challenges that we collectively share with respect to the algal bloom and how we can work together to respond to it, noting the fact that it is going to be challenging in the event that it is around during summer. As it stands today, surf lifesaving clubs are preparing to operate during the course of summer as they routinely would, including with their volunteers.

VACSWIM bookings are open. I think my kids might have already been enrolled in VACSWIM; in fact, I think that is what has already occurred. Just as is the case with any VACSWIM program, for instance, there will be a safety assessment conducted on the morning of the VACSWIM event to assess the conditions and that will inform whether the event goes ahead during the day. That is routine on any given day for VACSWIM. Now, of course, surf lifesaving clubs in this particular example will have to undertake an assessment about what is happening with algae.

We hope that will not be required, because maybe the bloom will have moved on, but in the event it is around that will be the sort of activity that we see. The point is, whether it is a surf lifesaving club or the organisers of a surfing competition or a sailing club or anybody else, we make available the resources that we have within the government that are responding to the algal bloom to be able to furnish event organisers or parents or anybody else with the information that they might need to be able to make an informed decision. Therein lies the keyword: informed. We want to make sure, to the best of our ability, that people are informed so they can make their own decisions.

The opposite of being informed would be to be ignorant to information or to allow oneself to be overridden by conspiracy or misinformation if you had a motivation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I don't know why you would feel a need to respond to talk of misinformation and conspiracy, unless of course you found yourself sitting uncomfortably next to others who would seek to propel conspiracy and misinformation in the community. That would be a confronting set of circumstances. We are committed to making sure that the South Australian community gets the information they deserve, based in fact, based in science, based in research,

based in serious public policy advice, so that we can deal with this challenge to the best of our abilities.

### ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. Why won't the government release its summer plan? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** The opposition is aware of various groups trying to plan their summer beach programs, which are being hampered by the current uncertainty over health concerns with the algal bloom. My question to the Premier is: does the plan include contingency plans should the government decide to close our beaches?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As we said, there is a number of elements to the summer plan that are being thoughtfully crafted and developed in conjunction with a range of agencies and other organisations. We have announced publicly, and it remains true, that we intend to release the plan sometime during October. There is a lot of work that is going into this effort, and that will continue right up until its point of release. Once it is ready, it will be released, but we anticipate, and we certainly aim, for that to be in the month of October.

### KINGSTON DISTRICT COUNCIL WASTEWATER

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:21):** My question is to the Minister for Housing. Can the minister advise what assistance the government is offering the Kingston District Council in relation to wastewater? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** The council has areas in Kingston and Cape Jaffa without adequate wastewater infrastructure. This is holding back development in the area, which is impacting the housing shortage in the region.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:21):** I certainly thank the member for MacKillop for his question. He has been passionate about regional housing for a long time. While the Office for Regional Housing out of Renewal is a government initiative, it was inspired in part by his very strong advocacy for his community. Of course, Cape Jaffa is a complex challenge to provide water and wastewater. Together, the Deputy Premier and I have been taking action there to make sure that, at the very least, things don't get worse. We have a plan obviously, over time, to make sure things get better.

In regard to assistance given to the council, I met with the council in April this year and I have met with them previously. They are a good council. They are committed to housing in the region, and they want to make sure that they are participants in it. As I understand it, in regard to wastewater they run their own wastewater scheme, as many councils do. SA Water has a pretty limited capacity in the South-East, mainly around Mount Gambier, Naracoorte and Millicent, and we rely on councils to run these wastewater schemes outside of that network. As I understand it, they have applied to the Local Government Finance Authority for a loan to basically improve and expand their network. That is something we are always happy to give advice on, if they require it.

As I understand it, next week Matt Hunt from the Office for Regional Housing is going down to visit the council and to discuss with them what, if anything, we can do. The Office for Regional Housing is there to do precisely this, to assist councils, where we can and within the budget we have, to provide assistance with civil works and other things.

We will see what comes of those conversations, but I would thank the member for bringing it to the house's attention and also thank Ian Hart, the CEO of Kingston District Council, for just being a positive, thoughtful partner in this regard. Of course, we will help wherever we can.

### TRAIN AND TRAM SERVICES

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:24):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the return of train and tram services into public hands, and is he aware of any alternate views?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:24):** I want to thank the member for Badcoe for her question. The member for Badcoe probably knows better than most just how important our train and tram services are. I know that, in the member for Badcoe's electorate, there are I think eight different tram stops and eight different train stops. The reason why I know that is she never misses an opportunity to advocate for improved services or an upgrade to one of those stations, as she well should, because the member for Badcoe appreciates the value of public transport—public transport operating for the interests of people as distinct from overseas profits.

Therein lies a very substantial point of difference between those on this side of the house and those opposite, of course, because those opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition—who has passionately defended their decision to break an election commitment and privatise tram and train services—along with, presumably, many of his colleagues, remain committed to a privatisation agenda when it comes to those types of public services. On this side of the house, we want to see improvements to public transport, and we are already delivering. We have improved the infrastructure, and we have made public transport a lot cheaper for South Australians to be able to access, making it free for all of our seniors, not just for a few hours a day but all day, every day.

**Mr Whetstone:** That's taxpayers' money.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The member for Chaffey interjects saying, 'Well, that's taxpayers' money.' You bet it is. It's taxpayers' money being invested in taxpayers' services—services to be able to participate in our society and our economy. If the member for Chaffey wants to interject again I would very much welcome him to do so, because it again highlights the distinction between us and them when it comes to the commitment to public transport.

On price, we have also invested in making sure that the Metrocard is particularly accessible for families with students, because we want to make sure that young people get the opportunity to catch a train, a tram or a bus to experience the virtue of public transport and develop good habits. Of course, as we all know—especially on this side of the house anyway—when you catch public transport that means less congestion on our roads, it means a better outcome for our environment but also, critically, it means that someone is likely to get from A to B in a safe set of circumstances in a way that should only be more accessible, more accessible and more affordable, which is why we choose to make these investments.

But there's another element, and that goes to control. Every time a government, of any political persuasion, privatises a critical frontline service delivery agency, like public transport, you also lose control, and it's the control that matters most. When you are in government, you should seek to be in control of the services that people rely upon to be able to go about their daily life. We believe in that virtue. So we made a clear commitment. We said that we would roll back and reverse the privatisation made by those opposite if we were given the opportunity to do so. They all said it was impossible, they all said it would create risk, it couldn't be done, yet here we are—at 3am on Sunday morning tram services came back into the control of South Australians, and on the back of train services earlier this year. Promise made, promise kept and South Australian commuters are the beneficiaries of it.

### SEAT OF MOUNT GAMBIER

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** Mr Speaker, my question is to you, sir. Did you consult the Premier or any other government member before you made your decision not to hold a by-election in the seat of Mount Gambier?

**The SPEAKER (14:28):** No.

**SEAT OF MOUNT GAMBIER**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** My question is again to you, sir. Who did you consult before making your determination? Did that include any members of the Mount Gambier community?

**The SPEAKER (14:28):** It included the Electoral Commissioner and the Clerk. Both people's staff did work to present me with options about what might happen in the seat of Mount Gambier.

**SEAT OF MOUNT GAMBIER**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** My question is again to you, sir. What precedent have you used in making a determination that will see the people of Mount Gambier unrepresented for about 200 days? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr TEAGUE:** In 1982, a by-election writ was issued on 17 August for a by-election in the seat of Florey, to be held on 4 September, which in that case was three sitting weeks and estimates before the general election which was held on 6 November 1982. On that occasion, the Speaker, on 11 August 1982, further advised the house of his consultation with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and others.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER (14:30):** Members on my right will come to order. The Premier! You put forward two precedents; I put forward 19 precedents, and they are the 19 times that by-elections have not been called because of the proximity of a vacancy being created and a general election, and in two of those cases, the period of time was seven months.

**SPEAKER, POLITICAL MEMBERSHIP**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** My question is to you, sir. Have you at any point left the Australian Labor Party and, in that case, have you rejoined at any point since your appointment as Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of Government Business has a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You are not answerable to the house for your political membership, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left and my right will come to order. The question is directed to me. I need to hear the question in order to answer the question. The deputy leader.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Thank you, sir. Have you at any point left the Australian Labor Party and, in that case, have you at any point since rejoined since your appointment as Speaker of the house in April last year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr TEAGUE:** By reference to the Register of Members' Interests, the ordinary return, your ordinary return that is stamped as having been received on 26 August 2024, refers to your membership of the Australian Labor Party, despite having been made Speaker in April of that year. Your register of member's interests ordinary return, stamped as having been received on 27 August 2025, just a few days ago, contains no such reference to membership of any political party.

**The SPEAKER (14:32):** Seriously, is this the best you've got? Is this the best you've got? You have had your leader out there saying he was going to ask me questions about this. I want to tell the people of Mount Gambier: at no time has the Liberal Party made any representation to me about conducting a by-election ahead of the general election—at no time. Nor did I receive any from the Labor Party, but it's really important to point out that when you are out there—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I check my inbox. I even got my staff—I said, 'Go down and check the PO box this morning' in case I had a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, in case I had a letter from Tony Pasin, who remains to this day all stunt and no substance. If you want to know about Tony Pasin, go on YouTube and type in the search 'poindexter Pasin Bignell' and you will find something about Tony Pasin. So for you to come in here and try to cast aspersions on my—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr Teague:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I will get to your question now, so on the point of order you can sit down. I am going to answer your question. It is a matter of public record that the day I was made Speaker, I tendered to this house a letter that I had written to the Secretary of the Australian Labor Party SA branch resigning from the Labor Party. That is why it appears in last year's return, because everything in that financial year has to be in there. So I was a member of the Labor Party from 1 July until 21 April, or whatever the date was. I have just filed this year's, which goes from 1 July to 30 June, in which case I was not a member of the Labor Party.

In early August, as is allowable under the act, the Speaker can rejoin the party in the financial year before the next general election. So I went online in August and they charged me the \$80, the Labor Party; I haven't actually received a letter saying I am back in. But that is why it's not in there, because it's from 1 July to 30 June.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my right will come to order. I can't hear the member for MacKillop.

#### UNIVERSAL THREE-YEAR-OLD PRESCHOOL

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for Education.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Florey will come to order. I can't hear the member for MacKillop.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please inform the house what investments have been announced into the rollout of early learning in the state? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Around the state, the new early learning for three and four year olds needs greater infrastructure for the new acceptance of these enrolments around classrooms, teachers, toilets and bathrooms and the like. In MacKillop, we are no different. We need these investments. I would be interested to know what is happening in this space.

**The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:35):** I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and for his interest in the delivery of three-year-old preschool, which of course, as many people, I hope, in this place know, will start from the start of 2026. To give a little bit of context to the member for MacKillop's question around how many places will be offered in what is the first year of our rollout, the good news for members in this place, particularly those in regional parts of our state, is that we will be offering a place for three-year-old preschool for as many as 6,000 three year olds in South Australia next year.

To put that in context, that is about a third of all three year olds in South Australia at any given time and about 2,000 more than we had anticipated originally being able to offer in the first year of the rollout. I am sure that is good news for the member for MacKillop. Having said that, of

course, the point that he makes around the need for investment is a fair one, and we know that. That is why we started this process with a royal commission.

We started with a royal commission that of course was headed up by the Hon. Julia Gillard AC, which delivered some very, very important recommendations about how we would roll three-year-old preschool out, how it needs to be resourced and how those long day care centres and preschools and early learning centres that are partnering with us to make sure we can offer it to 6,000 three year olds for next year will have the infrastructure, the professional development and the staff they need to actually do it.

Of course, the headline figure in terms of what we are committing as a government to the provision of three-year-old preschool I think is something like \$1.9 billion across the life of the rollout, but just recently I was in regional South Australia also announcing other money that would be going towards those centres that are participating. It includes, for government preschools that are part of it, a \$10,000 increase in their funding, a one-off to help them make sure they have everything in place to start offering three-year-old preschool from next year.

I also announced a larger bucket of money, from memory about \$2.8 million, from which infrastructure grants can be sourced for those sites that might currently have a lot of four year olds but not have three year olds and in that transition need to update or upgrade their facilities to be able to accommodate younger children who might, for instance, need more nappy-changing facilities than the four year olds.

I can reassure the member for MacKillop that these are all things that we have taken into account, but I am very happy to sit down and talk about individual sites in his seat that might need extra support. We know that this is a big change. This is the biggest structural change that we have made to our education system in this state since four-year-old preschool was introduced. It is a big undertaking, but I want to reassure the member for MacKillop and other members that we are watching very closely as we edge closer and closer towards the start of rollout in January.

We will be supporting sites to make sure they have everything in place in terms of the staff they need, the infrastructure they need and the professional development they need, to make sure they can offer a really high-quality offering of teacher-led play-based learning for 15 hours for three year olds in South Australia from next year.

## ENERGY POLICY

**Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please explain how cohesion and discipline within a government can strengthen its ability to deliver long-term energy policy outcomes for the people of South Australia, and what the outcome of alternative approaches is?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:39):** On the weekend, I realised someone had stolen my homework. It is a form of flattery, I have to say. When I saw the Liberal opposition announce their energy policy where they were going to essentially underwrite the construction of 200 megawatts of generation, keep Torrens Island open and encourage new gas exploration after having deliberately tried to close the Torrens Island power station, privatise 200 megawatts of generation and ban gas extraction in the South-East, I have to say that was some triple pike twist with a turn at the end.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, I have to say that imitation is the finest form of flattery. I have to say that when I hear the member for Morphett saying, 'You are not talking about hydrogen,' I can say the same thing about him because when he was sitting on this side of the house, he was exuberant, like most Collingwood players happy to make accusations without any real evidence, but the truth is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, the two Collingwood supporters, the last two in South Australia. What I have noticed about the member for Morphett is he's more than happy to have his

own policies but the moment he is in opposition he changes them completely and now he's adopted all our policies again. So I look forward to the private member's bill in the parliament lifting the ban on gas extraction with fracture stimulation in the South-East.

If the government lifted that ban here in South Australia, what would happen then, of course—as industry now takes 10, 15 to 20 years to make these long-term investments—it would need to be bipartisan. Everyone who knows our views on gas extraction would know that we are in favour of it. Members opposite are the ones who instituted the ban. The only way it can be lifted is if members opposite were serious about it. Maybe they would say something about it. They were asked twice last week but refused to give a concrete answer on it. The member for Morphett, who is the shadow energy minister, has said nothing. To have cohesive energy policy you need a platform on which to build it. You need stability and you need no in-fighting.

I have to say that *The Australian* on the weekend was interesting reading. David Penberthy, probably one of South Australia's leading journalists in News Limited, a columnist in *The Australian*—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You can attack David Penberthy as much as you like but the truth is he's got columns in *The Australian* and columns in *The Advertiser* and he's a former editor and someone who is taken seriously and has contacts in both political parties. We are hearing that the Antic group has so fundamentally taken over the Liberal Party that health policy is now preying over people to remove their lactose intolerance. We are hearing that conservatives are now thinking that Nicolle Flint is too moderate and left wing to be part of their group. If Nicolle Flint is too left wing, if she's too moderate, what does it say about the rest of us?

I have to say, the whole group, the whole agitation here, is all about the fact that they are no longer members of parliament, they are wholly owned subsidiaries of Alex Antic who do only what he wants, when he wants and how he wants. He decides what happens in the Liberal Party now. He chooses what the policies are and he also decides the candidates.

**The SPEAKER:** The members for Chaffey and Morphett are on their final warning. That was a little rowdy.

#### SPEAKER, POLITICAL MEMBERSHIP

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43):** Thank you, Speaker; my question, once again, is to you. In light of your previous answer, in case you have left the Labor Party at some stage and then rejoined at another, on what, if any, occasion have you updated your ordinary return or your register of member's interests at those relevant times?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** These questions have been ruled out of order previously by Speaker Tarzia and I understand also by former Speaker Teague. Given the accusation has been made—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Questions about return of interest? Mr Speaker, these questions about your political membership are not a matter that the parliament is responsible for, but given, sir, that we have gone down this path, whether you answer them is a matter for you, but these questions about political membership are unbecoming.

**The SPEAKER (14:44):** I put it on the public record, as I said in my previous answer, that on the day that I became Speaker I tabled a letter in here to the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, South Australian Division, and I made it quite clear in here that after 1 July I would be rejoining the Labor Party, and that is reflected in my register of interest which was filed in August, the same month that I rejoined the Labor Party.

#### SPEAKER, POLITICAL MEMBERSHIP

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** This is a supplementary, sir, once again to you. The question is really quite specific. Bearing all of those things in mind, at what point, if ever, was the ordinary return updated to reflect those facts?

**The SPEAKER (14:45):** It was updated each time I was required to update it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The house was updated.

### REGIONAL ROADS

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:45):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Could the minister please explain to the house what road users can do in regional areas when roads are not acceptable and are damaging vehicles? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** I have asked questions of the minister, and I had good answers and we know we are getting good representation around roads, upgrades and spends. However, in the local area around the Limestone Coast, for example—and it may follow on to other regional areas—we are seeing a lot of damaged vehicles, busted rims and tyres, due to holes and the road breaking up due to the winter that we have just been through. My question is to the minister and the government: what can I do as a member representing these motorists and the damage that is being done out there on our roads?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46):** A very good question, and I know the member has been dealing with the consequences of that privatised road maintenance contract in the South-East by the guilty party opposite, and the people of the South-East are seeing the consequences of that. They are seeing it in burst tyres, they are seeing it in rim damage and they are seeing the damage to their vehicles, and it is just plain unsafe. We do what we can to make sure that road maintenance is upkept.

We recently had a community cabinet meeting in the seat of Ngadjuri, and my chief executive watched and observed the privatised contract members imposed on that community and watched the employees skip every three potholes and fill in a fourth. When it was observed that there was not enough mix in the ute to try to do all that was going on, no, it was just simply cost saving.

When you go to the South-East you see the full consequences of what happened down there, where not only did they privatise the contract and sign a contract for an amount of money that was nowhere near enough to deal with it but then salt the earth behind them by selling and privatising all the equipment we used when we ran our own gangs, just in case we attempted to bring it back into government hands, it was just the same way they tried to do it with the Adelaide 500 when they privatised all the equipment behind it to try to make sure that we could not undo what they had done.

I say to the constituents of the member for MacKillop to contact him if they have burst tyres and burst rims, and if they can show that works were not completed as they should have been completed, the company is liable for that damage. That is a very difficult task to prove, given the road conditions, but I have to say that regional people in South Australia, under that four years of the Marshall government, paid a heavy toll.

**Mr Whetstone:** What about the 16 years of Labor before that?

**An honourable member:** At least they got proper maintenance.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Let's talk about—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey can leave the chamber until the end of question time. You were warned.

*The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As the member was interjecting, when we left office the road maintenance backlog was \$750 million, a manageable amount. When we came back into office, it had blown out to over \$2 billion, just in four years. So, when you hear of conservatives talking about



how they care about regional people and regional communities, don't listen to what they say, look at what they do. They didn't upgrade any jetties, didn't upgrade any regional roads, didn't do more road maintenance, privatised contracts, didn't reinvest in the regions, took them for granted, tried to impose mining regulations on them that they hated. Hence they had a backbench revolt, hence they had division in their own party because they didn't care about regional communities, and it's coming back now to haunt them, and they don't like it.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Point of order, sir.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That's why they use points of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader has a point of order.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Leaving aside editorials about reasons for raising points of order, it's standing order 98(a). The minister needs to answer the substance of the question. He's descending into gratuitous debate, and permissibly.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, did you want to resume your comments, bearing in mind the—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, yes. Look, regional road maintenance is something that I am passionate about. I would say to the member for MacKillop: please keep a detailed log of people who come to you who have had these events. They can call the contractors, who are meant to be repairing these. If they are made aware of road damage and a car is damaged subsequently, they are liable for it. Of course, there are tests of reasonableness written into the contract by your former colleagues, who have written them a very generous contract and you can get out of as much responsibility as possible. I would again push that, and let me know so I can take it up on their behalf, because otherwise, if left to the devices of the Liberal Party, they will never get anything out of them.

#### FEE-FREE TAFE

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the member update the house on fee-free TAFE and its role in skilling more people to build more homes?

**The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:51):** I thank the member for King for her question and also her advocacy and interest in vocational education and training in the north-eastern suburbs. It was my great pleasure yesterday to give an update to the South Australian public about the success so far of not just fee-free TAFE in terms of how much it has saved South Australians in course fees but also the newest tranche of fee-free courses, which is an additional 1,600 fee-free places, 1,200 of which are being offered by TAFE but the other 400 being offered by other training providers as well in areas that are huge priorities for our state. I know the member for Taylor, the Minister for Housing, would agree with me when I say that we have got a big challenge in front of us in terms of building the new homes, increasing supply that we need in South Australia but making sure that we actually have the skilled workforce to do that.

So far, we have delivered, through fee-free TAFE and our partnership with the federal Albanese government, in excess of \$50 million in saved course fees for South Australians. That includes about 22,500 students across TAFE and other non-government RTOs, who have been delivering those courses, which is I think a huge number. It comes at a particularly important time for our state, when we are dealing at the same time with a cost-of-living crisis and a skills crisis. Fee-free courses and fee-free TAFE I think is one of the very few policies that can address both those things at the same time.

The thing that has told me, as the minister and asking the questions you would expect me to ask around whether or not fee-free courses have been a success, is where we are seeing the highest level of enrolments. I think it will make again the member for Taylor very proud to know that when we went away and pulled the figures on where we were seeing the highest level of enrolments in fee-free TAFE, it was the suburbs of Andrews Farm and Davoren Park, where we obviously historically have seen higher levels of unemployment. I think that tells us everything we need to know about the fact that this is of benefit to so many South Australians. It easy for us to take for granted that a subsidised course training cost of perhaps \$1,800 to some South Australians might be very

affordable but to others it is an enormous barrier to accessing the training they need to get the jobs that are there.

We are at a positive time in South Australian history, where we have seen historically low unemployment. As the Treasurer said, in this place just a couple of weeks ago, we have seen record job vacancies of around 20,000. Those jobs are there, but the barrier that is in the way of people who are seeking to access those jobs is often the training. The fact that fee-free TAFE is being taken up in such high numbers by people in parts of our metropolitan area that have traditionally not had the household income that has enabled them to access that training I think is a fantastic thing.

In terms of these 1,600 places in construction particularly, as I said we are seeing 1,200 delivered by TAFE but 400 delivered by non-government private RTOs as well. Those RTOs, I would like to mention, include ATEC, ARO, Career Employment Group, the Civil Contractors Federation, Flexible Construction Training Assessment, the Housing Industry Association, and North East vocational education college—which, of course, will be of great interest to the member for King and the member for Newland as well.

Most importantly, in terms of making sure we have that workforce there to build the new homes, the courses are being offered in the following areas: landscaping, civil construction, carpentry, concreting, brick and block laying, plumbing, electrotech, air conditioning and refrigeration. These are all vital trades and vital skills that we need more of if we are going to have a chance of being successful in increasing that housing supply we so desperately need in South Australia

It was a great pleasure yesterday to actually come and join some of those apprentices who have accessed these fee-free courses under this new tranche of construction and building, listen to them about the difference that fee-free course has made to them in terms of being able to get into a course which will lead them not just to a great job but a job that is in such a high priority area for this state.

#### ALGAL BLOOM

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:55):** My question is to the Premier. What advice or reassurances has the government provided to Surfing Australia regarding their Australian Boardriders Battle event scheduled to take place on the Fleurieu Peninsula on 18 October 2025?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:56):** I want to make sure I give the member for Morphett an accurate answer to his question. Is that the same event, the junior event—

**Mr PATTERSON:** No.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** A different one again? The advice, as I referred to earlier, that we are providing to event organisers in any coastal context will be consistent. I am happy to make clear and repeat our willingness to make available any official advice and access to public health officials to appropriately ascertain, from their perspective, any information they require to be able to make decisions going forward.

Obviously we have a dynamic situation; it is evolving, and people want access to information. We can't provide definitive advice where we don't have it, we can't make up science that doesn't exist, we can't operate on conjecture and conspiracy. We can only offer information based on what we have got available to us at the time. We will continue to do that with any event, whether it be the one that the member for Morphett has mentioned or any other event that will potentially be affected by the algal bloom.

#### ALGAL BLOOM

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:57):** My question is again to the Premier. What does the government anticipate the estimated dollar amount of foregone economic activity will be in the Fleurieu Peninsula as a result of Surfing Australia cancelling their 2025 Australian Junior Surfing Titles?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:57):** We will get some advice on that question. That is something we did contemplate when increasing our offer of support to the

events organiser prior to their decision to cancel it. It also speaks to why it is so important that we do two things.

One is to invest in the drivers of economic activity and the way our coastal communities have been affected: hence the Coast is Calling campaign and the voucher program we have released. It is why it is also really important that every member of this place who has access to informing public opinion treats that responsibility seriously, because it would be exceptionally unfortunate if the economic impact on coastal communities were larger than it needed to be.

Down on the Southern Fleurieu at the moment there is no reason why people cannot enjoy the coast. Our most recent advice is that there is no algae down there. People can enjoy the beach, they can enjoy walking along the beach, they can enjoy surfing in the water if they so choose, because there is no algae down there—and it is really important that every person in this place does not seek to unnecessarily catastrophise the algal bloom.

I do not say those words in any way, shape or form to diminish the algal bloom; where it exists it represents a real challenge, and it is having a serious impact on those communities, for reasons that are obvious. But where the algal bloom doesn't exist and where people are suffering the impacts of that, this is exclusively because of perception, which is propelled through misinformation and disinformation. We won't be pushing that on this side of the house, and I don't think anybody anywhere else should be doing that.

We want people to visit the Southern Fleurieu or parts of Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula that are completely unaffected by the algal bloom, or KI. For those places that are affected we want to provide, where we can, economic assistance to families to go there and enjoy them in safe circumstances.

We have a collective responsibility. It would be an exceptionally unfortunate set of circumstances where businesses and coastal communities were suffering hardship as a result of the algal bloom even though there is no algae there. Think about how perverse that would be. It would be like providing drought assistance to areas that aren't affected by a drought. It would be like providing flood assistance to areas where there is no flood or bushfire assistance to where there is no bushfire. We don't want to end up in that situation. Others might be motivated to do that; we aren't, because that would be exceptionally unfortunate for those communities but also for taxpayers. That is why we are dealing with this as deliberately and as thoughtfully as we can.

For communities on the Southern Fleurieu, I stand here as Premier of the state and say to all South Australians: get down there. Most recently, there isn't any algae. There is no reason why Victor Harbor shouldn't be doing quite well at the moment, or as well as it can in the cooler months. But certainly as we get closer to the summer months, it is our sincere hope—I hope it is everyone's hope—that we don't see the algae returning to these communities, so that summer down there can be as normal as possible.

### **ALGAL BLOOM**

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Will nippers be able to swim at the beach this summer?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01):** Consistent with what the Premier has answered in a number of different questions today, the government is providing all the possible health advice to event holders, sporting clubs and, of course, surf lifesaving clubs. The Premier himself attended a forum recently that was also attended by our public health officials with surf lifesaving clubs, to give them all the best possible health information and all the best scientific information that we can. We will continue to work with surf lifesaving clubs across the state leading into this year's summer.

### **RSV IMMUNISATION**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:02):** My question is also to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister provide an update on how the government is protecting newborns and infants from RSV this season?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02):** Thank you very much to the member for Torrens. I thank her for this very important question in terms of how we can protect our youngest babies here in South Australia from RSV. Of course, RSV is a very dangerous disease, particularly for young infants.

Each year we see a significant number of young South Australians diagnosed with RSV and having to go to the emergency department, and sadly some of those pass away following complications with this infection. It impacts breathing, it impacts feeding and the ability to maintain oxygen levels, and of course it can be particularly concerning for infants under the age of one. This is why we are very delighted that this year the Malinauskas government has partnered with the Albanese federal government to introduce a two-phase way of helping to protect our young babies in South Australia.

Firstly, there is a maternal vaccine that is now being offered from the federal government through the National Immunisation Program. We are certainly recommending that all pregnant women get access to that maternal vaccine to protect their babies from RSV. We have seen a big uptake of that. We have seen many thousands of women going forward to receive that vaccine, and we are really positive about the uptake.

The element that the state government is providing—something that isn't eligible under the National Immunisation Program, because we really need to change those rules at the federal level about what is eligible—is what is called a monoclonal antibody. That monoclonal antibody can be given to infants to protect them after they are born. Where women haven't had the opportunity to be vaccinated during their pregnancy, we are now giving that monoclonal antibody to their infants.

Since this program has been rolled out, we have now seen that more than 3,400 infants have received that monoclonal antibody in South Australia. The results have been very positive. This, of course, gives protective antibodies to those children either, firstly, through the maternal vaccine, which will go from the mother through the placenta, providing important protection right from birth, or, secondly, directly to the child through the monoclonal antibody.

What we have seen is that this is helping to reduce infections and helping to reduce hospitalisations here in South Australia. For example, already for 2025 there has been an almost 50 per cent reduction in notifications for RSV for infants under one, compared to 2024. This result is despite there being no significant reduction for other age groups, which clearly shows the impact of that intervention for this age group.

At this time last year, there were 1,617 infants under the age of one who recorded a positive RSV notification, compared to 9,500 across all age groups. Although this season started later than in 2024, as of the data from last week, we have seen 818 infants under one with a positive RSV notification. That represents a significant decrease compared to last year.

What's really pleasing is that there has also been a 50 per cent reduction of those numbers in terms of infants who need hospitalisation. So we have reduced by 50 per cent the positive notifications, and we have reduced, of that 50 per cent, the number who have had to go to hospital. So it is about a 72 per cent reduction now of those young babies having to go to hospital with RSV.

At this stage in 2024, 284 infants under the age of one were hospitalised with RSV. That has dropped now to 79. That is a significant difference from the introduction of this program—a 72 per cent reduction of infants under the age of one who have had to go to hospital. I want to thank all of our healthcare staff who have rolled this out and all of the parents who have made sure that they are protecting their young babies.

#### **MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:06):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Could the minister please inform the house of his visit recently to Mount Gambier on Friday 29 August, what has opened up in the Mount Gambier hospital and what it will mean for the Limestone Coast and the greater area and, importantly, for the residents and constituents of MacKillop?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:06):** Thank you to the member for MacKillop. It was good to see him last week in Mount Gambier, where we were

able to open the new short stay unit at the Mount Gambier hospital. This is an addition to the emergency department in Mount Gambier. It is the first time there has been a short stay unit in the emergency department there. This is open as of yesterday. This is operational now at Mount Gambier hospital, and it is providing, critically, additional beds for our team and, of course, additional staff going with that to make sure that they can care for the busy workload that that hospital sees, and the broader Limestone Coast community sees, as the major hospital in the region.

It is particularly focused on patients who need a longer length of stay than just a short stay in the emergency department but don't necessarily need a long, lengthy stay in a ward environment. It might be for somebody who has had a fall. It might be for somebody who has had an infection and needs antibiotics. I was very happy to meet the doctors and nurses down there who have been working very hard in getting this up and running. They are very positive about the impact that this is going to have in terms of helping people in the emergency department.

Of course, this was an \$8 million investment from our \$24 million investment that we made at the last election as an election commitment. We were able to divert that money from what was a \$662 million commitment to a previous city basketball stadium, of which we said—

*Mr Patterson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morphett can leave the chamber for half an hour.

*The honourable member for Morphett having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** There is clearly still some support for that \$662 million basketball stadium in the house, but we decided to put that money into health, including over \$100 million of it directly into Country Health, and \$24 million of that to the Mount Gambier hospital.

We were also able to inspect works that are underway for the new mental health beds at Mount Gambier hospital. This is going to double the mental health capacity of Mount Gambier hospital. Those beds are going to be coming online in the next few months and providing an excellent environment for people to be able to get proper mental health rehabilitation in the Limestone Coast.

As well as that, the first ever drug and alcohol detox beds to be based outside of Adelaide in South Australia are going to be built as well, and we were able to inspect the works of those which are underway as well. So some really positive developments for Mount Gambier hospital are coming about through those election commitments, coming about through that \$24 million. I want to thank all of the construction team who have helped deliver that, but of course the doctors and nurses who are helping to make it a reality.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

*Grievance Debate*

#### **RIVER MURRAY FLOOD**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:10):** I rise to reflect on the 2022-23 River Murray flood and its obvious effect on river communities from the Victorian border down to the mouth of the river. Certainly, there were many different reactions and many different management styles in regard to managing different places along the river, and I certainly want to reflect on as part of that the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area (LMRIA) and the women of the LMRIA, who held an event recently rising up from the floods. It was a great portrait show of photographs from during the floods to show how people managed situations, whether their houses were cut off, whether they were part of the thousands of hectares that were flooded or other activities they had to do to manage their properties.

Obviously, Mannum to Wellington is where the Lower River Murray levees are. It is 107 kilometres. Some are government levees and some are private levees. There are 27 levees, and 20 of these levees were overtopped or breached. Certainly, in regard to the different

management structures up and down the river, depending on who was in charge and how bureaucratic it got, they were managed in quite different ways.

I remember talking to the chief executive officer of the Renmark council, and it was interesting that during the floods you really saw how Renmark is an island—literally an island—and the only way they protected that was getting right into it. I said to him, 'How many tonnes of clay did you move?' He said, '150,000 tonnes.' I said, 'Where did you get it?' He said, 'Wherever we could.' They did all they could to protect their community. I saw that repeated at Berri Barmera, where they had to do work and put a levee bank at Lake Bonney as well. At Waikerie, work was done on levees there as well. You then get down to Mannum where the government put in DefenCell to protect the town along the riverbank.

We get to Mypolonga, and on a Friday afternoon I was notified by a constituent I needed to talk to: Ash Martin. There was a real issue about to hit Mypolonga. Anyway, I went down, sorted it out and contacted John Schutz directly. He was the head of the department of environment at the time. He said, 'I will contact the council.' He contacted the Rural City of Murray Bridge, and they said there was not a problem. Well, there was a problem. I connected Ash Martin to John Schutz. I also sent a text to Minister Szakacs at the time and the Premier. I had contact with someone over the weekend and even talked to the mining and energy minister on the Sunday. So between the Friday and the Monday we managed to get things cleared off so that we could dig that clay and get that 700 metres of levee bank built at Mypolonga, and I thank the government for their support in getting that done.

We get to Murray Bridge, where the rowing club was co-funded by state, federal and local government. Initially, the local government were only going to get DefenCell in front of the rowing club and I said, 'What about the community club right next door?' Next thing that was supplied, thankfully, so that the community club could be saved as well. But I think where bureaucracy really got in the way was there were some pumps under the Swanport Bridge for the local Murray Bridge Racing Club and a local irrigator, and I rang Chris Beattie from the SES and I said, 'We need some DefenCell.' He said, 'Yes, I will get it.' We had that supplied. All we needed was for the Rural City of Murray Bridge council to fill them up. Well, they would not do it—too much risk. So guess what happened? There were 70-year-old volunteers down there filling 36 tonne of sandbags so that they could protect those pumps from flooding. This just exemplifies the different way things were managed along the river.

The Mid Murray also did some amazing work, working all weekends and into the night protecting assets, especially when their rowing club got flooded. We must get bureaucracy out of the way when the reality is things are happening and we must protect people and people's assets. I must say during the emergency management time I could work directly with heads of government agencies to make sure things happened.

### **WALKERVILLE YMCA**

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:15):** I rise to give an exciting update on one of the key election commitments I took to the 2022 state election, and that was to bring back community sport and recreation services to the heart of Walkerville.

There was the former YMCA at Walkerville in Smith Street, which had an incredibly long history, one that was obvious to me during my time campaigning for the seat of Adelaide when I was knocking on doors and literally every person in the township of Walkerville would tell a story about their connection to the YMCA, whether it was their own, whether it was their children's or their grandchildren's. Everybody had a strong connection to this important community hub.

It is easy to see why. It had a very long history in our township. It first began in the 1950s at the local RSL. It became so popular that they had to expand the area for recreation services, but then it came to the point where they realised they needed a brand-new centre. In the early 1960s the club started fundraising for that effort with one of the locals, the RSL YMCA President at the time, Mr Gordon L. Northcott, raising £2,000 which was a significant amount of money when you consider it was the 1960s which actually earned him a Father of the Year nomination from the club as well.

The women's committee worked incredibly hard during that time, running gala days, social events and bottle and paper drives to raise money, and eventually in 1965 they were able to open the new YMCA at Walkerville.

That served our community for generations, but sadly in late 2020 the then Town of Walkerville council decided not to renew the lease of what was then the INEA YMCA and they sadly moved out. I will never forget standing there on that day that they moved out with bits of gymnastic equipment strewn outside, a 'Save the YMCA' T-shirt hanging off the front gate, because it did mean that after generations we were losing sport, rec and community services in the heart of Walkerville.

So we got to work. We held forums, we fought plans at the time to potentially redevelop the site, ensuring that the land remained in community hands, and I was able to work and secure a \$5 million commitment that, if elected, we would return sport, rec and community services to the heart of Walkerville. After my election we were able to partner with the Town of Walkerville, a new look Town of Walkerville after the council elections, who worked with us to develop a new plan for the 39 Smith Street site.

They matched that commitment, so we had \$10 million to be able to work together to bring back sport, community and recreation services to the heart of Walkerville. We undertook extensive community consultation and were able to contract Hutchinson Builders to build a brand-new Walkerville Recreation Centre. So that work is now well underway. Just a couple of weeks ago I was able to have a tour of the Town of Walkerville, with councillors, with Mayor Melissa Jones and also CEO Andrew Johnson and it was wonderful to see the progress of the new centre.

It will provide a two-court stadium for indoor sports—so think basketball, netball and also indoor soccer and gymnastics. Just on Friday, expressions of interest closed for those community and sporting groups to put forward their interest for operating out of the new centre.

It was wonderful last week to also join the Walkerville Netball Club in their celebration. They have just recently been accepted to the Premier League. They also unveiled a new logo and they are very excited about having this new home in this new two-court stadium in the heart of Walkerville that will provide for so many budding netballers into the future.

The construction of the centre is due to be completed towards the end of the year, and so we very much look forward to officially opening the centre early next year. I also want to give a shout-out to the local—we will announce them later in the week through the Town of Walkerville—who won the YOU Name It! competition to find the brand-new name for our new Walkerville recreation centre.

Congratulations to that local. They have a very longstanding history with the site. They used to take their grandchildren to the former YMCA at 39 Smith Street, and so we are very proud to announce that the new centre will be called The W. We will finish construction later this year, and I cannot wait to welcome locals to our new facility early next year to start making new memories.

#### FROME ELECTORATE

**Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:20):** I would like to update the house on a few activities that have been taking place in my electorate of Frome, and in particular some special visits that I have been able to coordinate in the town of Kapunda. Most recently, I happily welcomed the member for Morphett, the shadow minister for mining and energy, who had been waiting for quite a while for an opportunity to catch up with a very special business, a partnership, a husband and wife team, Leon and Philippa Faulkner of EnviroCopper, who have kept me abreast of their aspirations for the copper lode in Kapunda. For a number of years now, we have had ongoing conversations, but their association with the town of Kapunda extends over the last eight years.

They have had a very thoughtful, sensitive and inclusive approach to working with the residents of Kapunda, setting up a shopfront in the Main Street and making sure that, through their own level of expertise and knowledge of the in situ recovery (ISR) technology and extraction procedures, not only as a community have we been learning a lot more about ISR but the community of Kapunda has been able to slowly socialise themselves and educate themselves about what it means to be a town of such rich history, going back to 1844 or thereabouts, when Kapunda first

discovered it was sitting on the mother lode—the copper lode—that we understand really established the boom economy for our early colonial state.

We have been educating ourselves not just about the copper lode that exists but about the opportunity to develop a new economy for Kapunda and the Light region through the in situ recovery process. For a number of visits, I have had the fortune to walk out beyond the quarry, walk out into paddocks and see the diameter of a piece of PVC pipe that goes down into the ground in this liquefied extraction process that is cutting edge. It is used by BHP and other copper mining behemoths around the nation, a modern, innovative, environmentally friendly approach to extracting copper that we understand extends right across the state.

This is an economic opportunity for our state. The government recognises that, and I am really proud that Leon and Philippa Faulkner of EnviroCopper have established themselves within the Kapunda community to display and project forward what those economic opportunities might be as energy and mining in copper ISR steps through the processes that are laid out.

Kapunda has so much potential in so many areas. JT Johnson's hay baling plant is just across the road. I had the good fortune to find that the Japanese Consul General, Mr Furuya, accepted my invitation to visit my electorate so that I could share with him those export trade and tourism opportunities, not just in the Light region, not just in Kapunda, but further north in the Clare Valley as well.

We did visit JT Johnson's, the biggest employer in Kapunda, to explore those trade relations that are so important to our state as we continue to invest in our primary industries and in our capacity to grow our local economies, and also to recognise the rare commodities that we have throughout the state. I am proud that the primary industries of Frome are so strong.

I want to give a shout-out to a little business that I have loved to call a neighbour. 2B Nourished has certainly nourished me over the years. They have since been able to relocate their business further up Main Street into a bigger footprint. Kylie, her family and her team have now expanded their footprint to the Kapunda Strength Studio, which is next door to the coffee shop—a pretty good arrangement, if you ask me—and their grand opening was yesterday. I could not be with them but I wish them well as they deliver a new era of wellness for Kapunda.

**The SPEAKER:** Another little spot to put on the 'must call in and taste something delicious' list.

### GIBSON ELECTORATE

**S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:25):** I am delighted to report that just last month Australia sent a men's under-20 team to the world championships in lacrosse. It is remarkable that Brighton Lacrosse Club had four young men participate in that Australian team. It really shows what a high-performing club it is but also one that is incredibly proud of its history and one that has long family connections to it. I want to give a shout-out to that men's Australian under-20 team in lacrosse because they came home with a bronze. We have four young men in Brighton who now proudly wear a bronze medal around their neck after representing Australia. It is really an incredible achievement.

As we know, August is the month for SALA and it is a great opportunity to recognise living artists all across our community. There were three exhibitions that I made a point of going to during the month. Firstly, Tutti, which is a brilliant arts centre in Brighton and one that I have been visiting ever since I got elected. It has always been important to me to support local artists.

This year, their exhibition Holey Surreal had an extraordinary amount of paintings and different genres displayed. It was fantastic to see the crossover now of the development of those artists because Gallery M had their contemporary art prize also last month. Gallery M is at the Marion Cultural Centre, brilliantly managed by Ann Marie Green, who extraordinarily not only manages Gallery M but also has brought the Sharing the National Collection exhibition to the gallery. You can go to Marion and you can see a Fred Williams and you can see a Jeffrey Smart.

Back to the contemporary prize that was held last month, a Tutti artist was displayed as one of the finalists and actually won a prize there. So congratulations to Lewis Constantine. His star has been rising. He only started painting a few years ago once he retired from work and it has been



incredible to watch him shine. I am also pretty pleased that a couple of years ago at a previous Tutti exhibition I bought one of his pieces and have that proudly displayed on my office wall. In my office, I have made it a point to only have local artists I have supported displayed on the walls.

Finally, another exhibition that I was so pleased to go to was Dogs of Brighton. This was by the artist Jennie Lawes. She asked if she could paint a portrait of my dog Freya. Of course, I said yes. It was just so special that she reached out and had about a dozen dogs of Brighton represented on the walls of the Alimentary Eatery cafe on Jetty Road at Brighton.

On opening night a lot of the dogs came along as well, whose portraits are on the wall. Not only did she paint a portrait but she also wrote up a little bio of each of the dogs. So she did acknowledge Freya and how she has gone blind over the last year and the travails that she experienced, as well as being much loved in our family. I really thank Jennie Lawes for the opportunity to have Freya on the walls in the gallery.

I would also like to give a shout-out to the Marion Rams women's team, once again grand finalists and winners of the grand final last month. They have gone from strength to strength under coach Paddy, so I would really like to celebrate their achievements. Ladies' days have been happening across sporting clubs as well in the electorate. For anyone who supports a partner in sport, we all know the sacrifices you make, and that is certainly the case for ladies in football.

### REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:30):** It should go without saying but regional people deserve access to open and reliable emergency care, exactly the same as people in the city do. We rely on our emergency departments being accessible in our time of need, and when there are regular closures it understandably causes extraordinary angst in communities. Unfortunately, that is what my community in the Barossa Valley is experiencing.

We are seeing ongoing, last-minute closures of the Angaston emergency department. It is of great concern to my local community. Today, we were dealt another blow, because this morning at 11.02am the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network shared a post to Facebook advising that the Angaston ED would be closed at 6pm and reopened at 8am on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. This is extraordinarily upsetting for my local community.

I went back to the Facebook post of the Barossa Hills Fleurieu LHN to see if I could compile a list of how many times these closures had been impacting my local community. You can imagine that I was pretty surprised when I found that the majority of the posts had been deleted, which I think is a shame. People need to see, with a transparent view, how many times closures have occurred. These closures have been rolling in my community since January, so it has been nine months that my community has been experiencing uncertainty when it comes to accessing care in critical times of need, and that is very concerning.

Each week over this nine-month period I have been speaking with people about their experiences at local hospitals. Whilst no-one can fault the hardworking nature of all of our doctors, nurses and health professionals in these hospitals, we do need to see the Angaston ED open 24/7 exactly as it is supposed to be.

I previously shared an experience of someone in my local community whose son suffers from epilepsy, and he suffered a seizure after school. It was lucky that the emergency department was open that day, and that is certainly how the mother explained the experience to me, but it really should not come down to luck as to whether people in regional communities can have access to emergency care.

Another experience that I would like to put on the record of parliament today is one of Hayley Laney who spoke to the country cabinet in Kapunda last week held in the community of the member for Frome. Hayley is the mother of three children, two of whom have complex special needs. She has lived in regional South Australia her entire life and has been a Barossa Valley local for 20 years. She spoke really passionately about the concerns and experiences that she had had. She addressed the Premier and the health minister specifically, and I want to share some snippets from her speech:

Our family now has a written plan to bypass local hospitals altogether and go directly to the Lyell McEwin Hospital or the Women's and Children's when [their youngest] Averley is unwell.

This might keep her safer—but it leaves me wondering: how many other families in the Barossa also avoid going to their local hospitals, or delay care altogether, because they know that the services simply are not there?

We are told our closest hospitals cannot take paediatric patients. We are forced to travel between 30 minutes and 90 minutes one way just to see doctors and specialists. And all the while, Angaston Hospital's emergency department has been forced to close suddenly at least five times this year alone. Imagine driving there in crisis, only to find the doors locked. Families cannot rely on these hospitals, and the trust in our health system has been shattered.

She went on to say:

I should be able to trust that when I take my child to hospital, they will be cared for safely. Instead, I fear they will be sent home, placed at risk, and I'll receive a bill for care that was never properly provided.

At the end of the day, this isn't about numbers or infrastructure alone. It's about children—children like mine, who deserve the same chance at safe, local healthcare [like] any child in Adelaide.

I think that is a pretty powerful message for the chamber to hear because it is not just ensuring that kids in the city have access to reliable emergency health care. We must do more to ensure that people in the regions, people in regional communities like mine, can have access to that same level of care. I do fear that if the government does not step up to the task of attracting and retaining more doctors and nurses to regional communities we will see a gradual deterioration of emergency care across regional South Australia, and that is not something that either side of this chamber should be accepting. We must do more. We need to see emergency care in my local community.

### NEWLAND ELECTORATE

**Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:35):** I thought today would be a really good opportunity to update the house and my community on the progress of a number of election commitments that were made in the lead-up to the 2022 election, which are very pleasingly plodding along very well. Of course, one of the first things that we did in terms of election commitments in my community was bring in legislation to stop paid parking from coming in at Tea Tree Plaza. That is something that I still get stopped in the street and have people comment about on a very regular basis, particularly because I think community members, no matter their politics, really understood the impact that the toll of bringing in paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza would have on them and their families.

I spoke at length to residents about the suggestion of the introduction of paid parking in my community, and we had thousands of people come on board with a petition against that. It was a really proud moment for me when we did bring in that legislation, not just as a local—I can see Tea Tree Plaza from my house—but as someone who worked at Tea Tree Plaza as a student for some years.

We also saved Modbury Service SA. We all remember all too well when it was on the chopping block by the Marshall Liberal government. Not only did we save Modbury Service SA but we extended trading hours and services, and it is now open on Saturdays. I was very pleased about the Saturday opening hours when I went to renew my own driver's licence on a Saturday morning last year and saw a line out the door of individuals doing the same.

We are also well underway with our huge project to transfer 4,700-odd homes onto SA Water mains from the Tea Tree Gully community wastewater management scheme. This has been a massive project not just for the individuals who have septic tanks at their homes but, of course, for our entire community, who are bearing with me, as there is a lot of construction work going on in our community. I have been teaching students, when I go to visit them, that construction means progress.

That does not mean it has not been a challenging time. I do want to give a shout-out to all those residents who have been incredibly understanding about the works that are going on, because they know it needs to get done. We hit a really important milestone in our project a couple of months ago, and we have transitioned now over 1,000 homes onto SA Water mains, which is a huge milestone and one that has been incredibly well received by residents in my community.

We are also finally seeing the completion of upgrades to a number of massive sporting clubs in my electorate. In the next few months, we will see the completion of the Modbury Sporting Club, home to the footy and cricket clubs and the Tea Tree Gully Tennis Club, home to tennis and also to two netball clubs: Tea Tree Gully netball and my netball club, the Strikers Netball Club. We will see

the completion of Tea Tree Gully Gymsports and the completion of upgrades to the Hope Valley Sporting Club as well. This is an incredibly exciting time for sports in Tea Tree Gully.

We already saw the opening of the Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club's new building a couple of months back, and I am incredibly excited to see all of those buildings finally complete. I have been on a bit of a tour of the Modbury Sporting Club and Tea Tree Gully Gymsports in the last few weeks, and I am so excited. These buildings look incredible, and that was thanks to election commitments from our government and also co-contributions from the City of Tea Tree Gully.

I would also like to mention, of course, progress on works at Modbury Hospital. Modbury Hospital is having one of the biggest upgrades in its history, with a brand new cancer centre, 44 mental health beds and, of course, a new car park with over 300 parking spaces. That was all part of our three-point plan with respect to parking in the Modbury precinct: (1) delivering a brand-new, bigger park-and-ride at the back of the Tea Tree Plaza interchange, (2) stopping paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza, and (3) building a 300-space car park at Modbury Hospital. I am really excited; again, I can see those works going on from my house if I am on my tippy-toes on my balcony, and I am very, very pleased to see that over the next coming months that work will continue to progress.

We did have a bit of a walkaround a couple of months ago and got to see the views from the new building at the back there at Modbury Hospital, and I know that not only will it be incredible for individuals in our community to access the services they need but also, I think, it will be a really warm environment with a beautiful setting, which is really important while people receive the care they well and truly deserve.

I would also like to mention that on the weekend we held our open day at The Heights Tech College, and we had over 350 people come through on Saturday for the open day of that incredible tech college in Modbury Heights. I am well and truly looking forward to that being open next year for students in my community and beyond.

#### *Private Members' Statements*

#### **PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (15:40):** As my time in this chamber draws to a close I am pleased to have the opportunity, in sessions such as this, to say thank you for some of the extraordinary work that is done in my community of Morialta. The group I would like to highlight today is the Greek Orthodox Parish of Saints Raphael, Nicholas and Irene at Athelstone.

Father Efthymios Efthymiou became the parish priest just before I became the local member for Morialta, and he and all of the committee and volunteers, and all of those who have served our community through the Greek Orthodox Parish of the Saints Raphael, Nicholas and Irene have done a terrific job over that time.

Every year we appreciate the parish feast day held on the first Tuesday after Easter Sunday; 22 April this year. Scott Kennedy, the Liberal candidate, and I very much enjoyed that. The open day, the Greek Festival, was just the weekend before last and, of course, the souvlaki, the loukoumades, the baklava were exceptional. My kids love all of those, and will continue to in the years ahead.

To all of those people involved in the volunteer work who contribute to the broader community and, of course, particularly Father Efthymiou, who nurtures the faith of the congregants in the parish, I am very appreciative. I also highlight all of those who donated so much money, support and labour to give the church the beautiful Byzantine style it has now. It is a real landmark in our electorate and much appreciated by the community. Thank you to all of you.

**Mr DIGHTON (Black) (15:42):** Last Tuesday I attended the Kauwi-marnirla Field River Conservation Park open day and volunteering event. The event was organised by National Parks and Wildlife, Green Adelaide and the Kurna Firesticks team. It was very well attended; in fact, it was at capacity for the day. It was fantastic to see so many members of our community attend the day to learn more about the newest conservation park in our area.

The volunteers on the day learnt more about the park, its significance and the work that has already occurred to restore and rehabilitate this unique place. It was the rehabilitation of the park that

formed the main activity of the day and, in particular, the removal of olive trees. The Kurna Firesticks team demonstrated how to remove olive trees in a manner that does not involve the use of poison or chemicals, and hence that is better for the environment and its long-term restoration. I appreciated the opportunity to practise this olive tree method, although my back is still very sore from it (perhaps demonstrating my lack of gardening experience).

Thanks to Rayne Simpson and the Kurna Firesticks team for their olive tree removal demonstration, sharing a little bit about the cultural significance of the Field River for Aboriginal people. Through the work of the Firesticks team, Green Adelaide, National Parks and Wildlife and community volunteers, and the \$13 million from the Malinauskas government for this park, it will become a significant and special place for all people, especially those in my community who live next to it.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:44):** I rise to pay tribute to Operation Drought Relief, that was started in 2018 to transport hay from one side of the country to another. On Friday the Rapid Relief Team rolled into Paruna with much grandiosity and bravado, with trucks and road trains. They transported 1,070 big bales of vetch hay, which was much appreciated by the Mallee farmers. On the Friday morning I was there at 6am to meet Rod Martin, the national Director of the Rapid Relief Team. He brought the great gesture that they do when they roll into town: they bring breakfast, they bring good coffee and they bring the farmers out for a conversation.

In the Mallee, particularly at Paruna, it has been very dry this year. They have been experiencing some of the worst drought conditions on living record. What it did show me was that a number of farmers who had come out on that day had not been outside of their homes for a couple of weeks, waiting for it to rain. The wind had been blowing and it had created a huge amount of damage. It just gave a great opportunity to bring farmers out to grab the hay and also have that conversation.

I want to thank the Rapid Relief Team volunteers for their hard work and dedication. It is a Christian philanthropic organisation and they do a great job. They come to town, they are self-sufficient and everything is in trucks on skids. I want to thank them on behalf of my farming community for the hay that they have dropped off and for giving those farmers some level of hope for the really trying situation that we are currently facing.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:45):** Last Wednesday I had the good fortune to attend the Clare Agricultural and Horticultural Society's official unveiling of the Angas Gates at the entrance of the Clare Showground. The gates are an enduring tribute to the Angas family, whose donation of land in 1890 laid the foundations for the society and its cherished show. The gates were opened in the presence of Angas descendants Catriona, Hamish, Charles and Janet. It was a reminder of the legacy of generosity and vision that continues to shape Clare's history.

The Clare Show is owned and run entirely by its members and volunteers, and the making of the Angas Gates is an example of what can happen when a community comes together with purpose and heart. The gates project started when former president Frank Nicholls sourced a set of gates to kickstart the project that had long been on the agenda of the show society, with Steve Sanders given the gates as he continued sourcing support.

There were a number of contributions made to the building and installation of these gates. In total, over \$10,000 worth of donations were received to make the gates possible. They included Steve Sanders' son, Joel, who is a skilled boilermaker; Darren Scott, a local shed builder; and a sandblaster from Blyth. Ray Fabian, a newcomer to Clare, and his team donated a full day to prepare and pour the concrete foundations. Clare Quarries made a contribution, as did Mintaro Slate. Wade Hogg constructed the fence rails, and Exact Cut donated the Angas metal signage. This is an example of community coming together for the benefit of the community.

#### *Bills*

### **NORTHERN PARKLANDS BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 4.

**The CHAIR:** The minister was going to look up some things during the break, from memory. Is that correct? He was going to talk to parliamentary counsel, if I recall correctly.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Just in relation to the member for Heysen's questions beforehand on clause 3, clause 47 allows for a transitional regulation to be created, which will effectively get us around the lacuna or the circularity issue that was raised by the member for Heysen and which temporarily stumped us. We had some advice from parliamentary counsel which alerted us to that particular clause.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I appreciate the minister's answer. Far be it from me to cavil with that or to give advice. I am not here to do it, and I am not in a position to, either. The first point is I have had a quick look at clause 47 and the regulations and so on. They are very wideranging. That said, they do contemplate a range of categories of regulation of certain aspects that are otherwise dealt with on the merits in the course of the bill. It would therefore be a regulation, as I see it, that is reliant on clause 47(1) in its broad generality, but that is not where the problem is, it seems to me.

I completely understand, and we all understand, what is intended and who those constituent councils are going to be: Playford and Gawler, for the foreseeable future. The trouble is, even if it was possible to regulate—it may well be—you are still stuck with a definition of a constituent council that says that it is a council specified to be such in the Northern Parklands Trust's annual business plan. In the period prior to the annual business plan coming into existence, you are going to be reliant on the regulations. The question might be: is it not easier to just amend the definition to say it is Gawler and Playford, and then subsequently it is any other council you see named in the annual business plan?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I talked about the advice given by parliamentary counsel. Apparently, this is not an unknown issue, and transitional regulations were what were used to do it. In the spirit of bipartisanship and for the sake of completeness, I am happy to work with the member and the opposition to perhaps come up with a form of words between the houses that might absolutely cement the issue, because there is no doubt from the government's perspective they are the two councils that we want to be on the Northern Parklands Trust.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Flinders, do you want to say something on clause 4?

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 3—are we still on clause 3?

**The CHAIR:** No, we finished clause 3 before lunch.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Almost as a point of order, we have heard from the minister. What has just now happened has been an exchange in relation to something that the minister has brought back to the committee in relation to clause 3. Otherwise, I appreciate what the Chair has just said. That is the context in which we have just been dealing with what a constituent council is.

**The CHAIR:** We have actually dealt with clause 3. That has come and gone. However, if the member for Flinders wishes to raise a question specifically to the advice given by the minister and that alone, I am happy to allow it. If it is beyond that, I will not allow it.

**Mr TELFER:** It is beyond, but I am happy to go to clause 4. If clause 3 is already formally passed, then I am happy to go to clause 4.

**The CHAIR:** But I was happy to have a clarification on the advice brought back by the minister. Do you want to go to clause 4?

**Mr TELFER:** Yes. If clause 3 is passed already, then clause 4 is the natural next step for me.

**The CHAIR:** I don't know, it could have been 47!

**Mr TELFER:** I want to be thorough, sir.

**The CHAIR:** Well, 46 then!

**Mr TELFER:** It is sort of broaching across the two, because within clause 3 we saw a definition of 'eligible land', and clause 4 thus refers to eligible land, of which the definition was given in clause 3. Minister, in working through what is the expectation of eligible land from the government, I reflect on clause 3 and am asking my question on clause 4. Eligible land, as put in clause 3, refers to unalienated Crown land or land owned by or under the control of the minister—e.g., the state—or land owned by or under the care, control or management of a council.

Do you envision that there is a process within this aspect in particular where a council has the power to appeal the inclusion of eligible land within the area? What is the process as far as allocating what the eligible land would be? It is pretty broad in the definitions that we are reflecting on. What capacity does a council have or what powers does a council have perhaps under the bill to object or to appeal a decision to remove council control pursuant to the bill over a parcel of land?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** If you read on a little further, in clause 4(3) it says that the minister must consult with councils and must give due consideration to their views and submissions. What I would say is that this mainly involves land along the river that is currently held by Gawler Council. They have been slowly purchasing sections of the river themselves to form a linear park, but quite slowly. There is also Karbeethan Reserve, which is a sporting field—soccer and other sports—which is also subject to that.

Obviously, we are going to be consulting very closely and have been already with Gawler Council who are, if you like, the main council, because they cover the areas of both Gawler and Kudla. If you like, Playford is also in the trust because they look after Angle Vale, and there is a section of river coming down to Angle Vale as well. So that gives you a bit of the geography around it, but the intention is to work with councils. We have already had a huge amount of consultation as a result of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, and also on a whole range of other issues that are going on regarding the Kudla code amendment, which will require a great deal of consultation and agreement with the Gawler Council.

**Mr TELFER:** On my reading of the bill—and you talk about what the intention of the bill is and what land to include—it is not limited to the land that you are particularly talking about; it is any council land potentially. Am I reading this wrong? This is the bit where the intention is not necessarily, from my perspective, reflected in the legislation of what it is trying to achieve. It is quite broad in its scope of the parameters that the legislation has put forward.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** A point of clarification, because we have been quite deliberate with the establishment of the GRO plans: are you talking about land that might not be contiguous or related to the Northern Parklands?

**Mr TELFER:** Yes. The scope within this part of the legislation seems fairly broad, and it could include any council land which may be included under that umbrella, on my reading of it.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** For the acquisition of the land (a), there is a process in there to follow, and (b), it would have to be for the purposes of the parklands. I do not think you could then extrapolate from that that you could seize the town hall or something like that. It would have to be for the purposes of the Northern Parklands Trust.

**Mr TELFER:** I am just following the bouncing ball a little bit with the legislation. Paragraph (b) provides:

a variation to the Northern Parklands may not be made unless the Minister—

with the parameters under that including having to give 'written notice of the proposed variation to any council that would be affected by the variation'. You talked about consultation; this is talking about 'notice'. 'This is the final decision, this is what we are doing, here is written notice.' What do you envision that process looking like? I would not say that the current minister would do something like this, but within this legislation these powers would be absolutely vested in the minister to give written notice of a proposed variation to a council or to Crown lands, or otherwise, to include a parcel of land, a portion of land, into the Northern Parklands area.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Clause 4(3)(b)(iv) provides that the minister must have given:

consideration to any submission made in response to a notice under this paragraph within a period (of between 3 and 6 weeks) specified by the Minister in the relevant notice;

So there is a process there, in effect, for the council to make submissions and be given a hearing, and obviously the minister has to consider that, but we are talking about the creation of a park and the act is quite clear in what it is attempting to achieve. It is attempting to achieve a Northern Parklands. In both the initial GRO and the subsequent GRO those plans have both been out there in the public domain.

**Mr TELFER:** I get that bit, but I am reading the legislation as it stands alone, and the purpose of the parklands, as you speak about it, even that in itself is very, very broad. It could be sporting, entertainment, biodiversity or tourism. It is quite broad and thus the scope within the legislation that is given potentially includes whatever is at the whim of a minister. Are there safeguards, or greater parameters that should be put in place—and we are talking about a process which is going to be going for years, for decades—to ensure that there is not any ambiguity around what, firstly, the intent is, but secondly, what the powers of a minister are when considering what may be adapted, be changed or be added into the process?

You are talking about between three and six weeks, but three and six weeks goes pretty quickly when it comes to trying to work out a process. If you have a headstrong minister who may just want to make a decision on the fly, they could be making a decision about the construction of a sporting facility, a building, or whatever it might be. That is the aspect which I am cautious about when forming the basis for what this legislation is trying to achieve.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I think the safeguard is that even if a future minister was to become too headstrong or wilful the land falls to the trust. It does not fall into the minister's control. It falls into the trust's control, and the councils have representatives on the trust itself. The safeguard is twofold. The first thing is you have a process at the beginning, and that process would undoubtedly be a public process, given what we know about councils and ministers and the like. The second thing is that the land would only ever fall into the Northern Parklands Trust and that, in and of itself, is a safeguard for the public interest. I guess the member is worried about some future circumstance where a minister is wilful or—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Whatever it might be, perhaps idealistic in a sort of headstrong way.

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Yes, that can happen too, but anybody who has dealt with councils as a minister and anybody who has dealt with boards or trusts as a minister understands the extent of their powers, as they should, and so I think that is a safeguard in the legislation.

**Mr Telfer:** The minister can direct the trust, though.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Well, that is true. We will get to the directions issue later on, but again that is a standard thing in many of our boards and trusts as well. That is the answer for you.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Just quickly, from the point of view of the drafting of this provision and in line with what the member for Flinders has already contributed, we have a definition of 'eligible land' that is basically a definition of land as such. It is a general definition. It is not saying eligible land is land that is characterised by anything other than its status as unalienated, but it could be, on the face of that definition, Crown land anywhere in the state. Then you have to go to the clause to find out the process by which that is added to the Northern Parklands, and it is a bit of a one-way journey, because getting it removed from the Northern Parklands later is a harder process, in that it requires the houses of parliament to do that.

In neither one of those is there a delimiting area or nature of the land within its broader definition or any criteria around the minister forming a view, so you might expect to find that in clause 4, in order to add it, the minister first has to form a view that it is appropriate or something. You do not have it in the definition section, and so you are just left with, as the member for Flinders

has put it, more or less any land in the state and the minister following the steps necessary in order to add it to the Northern Parklands.

It is not implausible that, in some future interpretation of the world that might abide at that time, Northern Parklands could be anywhere. There is no indication that there is any intent that it be contiguous. It could be broadly somewhere in the north and this mechanism could be used to add it to then what is known as the greater Northern Parklands. Who knows? It is not a wild hypothetical, in my view as well. That is, though, what we are left with on the face of the bill.

I just draw attention to, possibly, the desirability either to have eligible land defined as something that is sort of relating it to the land that has already been defined in subclause 1 and/or some sort of stipulation that the minister has to be satisfied that it is somehow meeting some merit criteria, not just following the necessary process.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I understand members' questions but this is modelled on the Linear Parks Act. It is more or less word for word, a very similar clause. We have not seen abuse by ministers in the Linear Parks Act. We have only seen the Linear Parks Act be useful for positive outcomes from governments of all persuasions.

I understand the motivations for the questions but first of all there is already something in the Linear Parks Act. It is more or less word for word, a similar clause. Secondly, there is already a range of powers in the planning act, in the Urban Renewal Act and a range of other acts, which allow for the purchase of land in one form or another. Again, those powers have been mostly not used by ministers and if they have been used they have been used judiciously. I understand the concern outlined by the opposition but I do not think that their worst fears are warranted.

**Mr TEAGUE:** By reference first specifically to subclause (1) but then to the process that is contemplated in subclauses (2) and subsequently, has the government received any advice about whether either of those has an effect of alienating any native title, and is there any native title involved? And in the broad, has the government consulted the Local and State Voice about the bill? This might be a convenient point to ask.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I have not sought specific advice about the native title aspect of it but I have not been alerted to any issues in regard to native title. What we have done, and we might get to this later on about the composition of the board, is there is a specific reference to having a First Nations person as defined by the First Nations Voice Act 2023. I think it is a very important aspect of the bill that we do that. Obviously, in every river area or everywhere there is water, humans tend to congregate around rivers and around fresh water generally. Indeed, that was the way Adelaide was situated for just that reason. We see that that representation is very important. It has elevated to the board level and we think that is sufficient to deal with any issues that might come up.

**Mr TEAGUE:** To perhaps reiterate but bearing in mind in particular that importance, has the Local or the State Voice been consulted about the bill at any point?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** There has been no specific consultation on it.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, this leads on from the questions that I have been asking about the previously put clauses. Clause 6 here gives the minister power to establish new parklands simply by depositing a plan in the GRO without many other restrictions. You referred to the Linear Parks Act, and the Linear Parks Act is more definitive, on my reading of it, and this one speaks specifically about the River Torrens and adds a level of parameter within that definition.

The concept of the Northern Parklands is somewhat in the eye of the beholder really. Is there any restriction to the parts of South Australia that this could apply to? You speak about basically copying and pasting from the Linear Parks Act, but could the minister simply by depositing a plan in the GRO take control over council-owned land in Port Lincoln or Mount Gambier or Murray Bridge?



**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** The Linear Parks Act talks about the Torrens but allows for other linear parks to be created, if you look at it, and it is exactly the same in this act as well. This act establishes the Northern Parklands Trust and the Northern Parklands. It then allows for other trusts to be created—we have yet to get to the clause but there is a fairly strong mechanism around that. The answer to your question is technically yes, but a government minister would be unlikely to do so because it is clearly ridiculous: under the Northern Parklands Trust, I am going to try to take the town square in Kapunda. I think that would be a bridge too far.

The ultimate test on a minister would be obviously the broad public interest. But why would you do that when, if you wanted to establish a park somewhere else, there is a Linear Parks Act, there is a range of other acts where you could do that, and there is also the ability under this act to create another trust which would better reflect that local area. If you were going to do it in a country area you would obviously have different constituent councils and, just for the good order of things, that is what you would do.

What we clearly want is for the Northern Parklands to be created and the Northern Parklands Trust to administer it. We have defined the councils quite clearly in the debate. If you were going to try to replicate it somewhere else you would set up a separate trust, which is provided for in the act.

**Mr TELFER:** Once again, this is reflective of the legislation and not the current minister. Does the bill contain powers—you speak about the powers it does contain and say technically, yes—for the state government to take control of the Adelaide Parklands?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** We specifically exclude the Adelaide Parklands. The reason we do so is not because I do not think a trust model might not be appropriate, but I do think the Adelaide Parklands are an established parklands. It is already Crown land and is under the care and control of the council, and has been for many, many decades, and I think to include it in this act would be not an appropriate mechanism, so we have deliberately excluded it.

**Mr TELFER:** In the comparisons that we are doing with the Linear Parks Act, the other obvious difference for mine is that the Linear Parks Act does not have the capacity to require the raising of a levy or costs from a council. You said that technically, yes, this could give the minister the capacity to take land and include it within. Also, with that other aspect of the cost-raising, could it be used by the government to take control of a piece of land, wherever it might be—you spoke about the intention of the legislation—and then compel local councils to pay for the management of that land with that additional aspect, which is in here, as opposed to the Linear Parks Act?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I will begin with your fears first, and then I will answer the technical aspect of the bill.

**Mr Telfer:** I don't fear; I am just asking questions.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Your fear is, or your question is: could the government take control of a piece of land and force the council to pay for it? Essentially, the Linear Parks Act allows the minister to declare a linear park, and then the council is forced to take care of it because they end up with care and control.

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, just hear me out. There are already provisions that effectively work the way the member talks about, but in reverse. What we are trying to do with this bill is set up a trust. We already have a trust model, the West Beach Trust, that has been operating for many, many decades. It has local government representation; it has a way of funding itself. What we are trying to do with this trust is to provide a new model for urban parks—and it is a new model—that allows the trust itself to have a small ability to raise revenue, and the purposes for which it can spend that revenue are stipulated, and there are a whole lot of safeguards around that.

The idea is not to rob local government or burden them but, rather, to create good urban parks that run past or along many council boundaries. It is an ability, if you like, to create revenue. The revenue for the Northern Parklands Trust and for the acquisition of land will also come from the code amendments and the open space requirements in the development of Kudla. There will be a

huge requirement to provide open space in Kudla anyway, so some of that will be created in the Northern Parklands.

The other bit of it is obviously to be able to pay for the trust to maintain the parks, much in the same way as the council maintains the parks, and that is by getting a sustainable funding mechanism. Obviously, there will have to be, for both the trust and the council, a good working relationship because the council is on the board of the trust. Also, we are going to require Shared Services agreements around workforce and the like to make sure we get the efficiencies that we need. These clauses are about the creation of a new model for urban parks, but in effect they amalgamate a few different acts, or ideas or clauses from a few different acts, to be able to do that.

**Mr TELFER:** Clarification from my comments attached to my question: you are talking about the Linear Parks Act having the power to obligate ownership of councils, so the requirement for them to do the upkeep, etc. The difference is that within this legislation there is now a middle entity—being the trust—that will obligate the level of service, the level of what it expects the Northern Parklands will look like. It is not councils.

You speak about the membership on the board, but it is only two of seven from constituent councils, so obviously not a majority. You are giving power to a trust with minority representation from a council to decide on a level of service and thus decide on the level of contribution from the councils that they will then be obligated to pay. We talk later on in the clauses, whether I ask questions or not at the time, where it sets out the capacity of the trust to be able to hold a debt against the council's name. It can rack up a bill, and if there is a disagreement between a council and the trust the power is all within the capacity of the trust.

This is the bit where I am wondering what capacity there is for a council to ensure that there is not a situation where its ratepayers are being expected to take on an extra obligation from what their expectations are, because this is where the Northern Parklands Trust have decided the level of service or the level of input is required and thus require it of the council and its ratepayers.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I think the member has been reading forwards, but he should also read forwards to clause 15, which outlines that the trust has to establish these things in its annual business plan. Its annual business plan has to be approved by the minister, and that ultimately can be disallowed by both houses of parliament. That is the standard way this parliament provides a level of scrutiny and oversight to ministerial or executive power that is appropriate.

Later on in the bill there is a very clear clause about how and when the trust can apply such levies, and it is not just simply that the councils are outvoted on the board. It is that the trust has to come up with a business plan, and the business plan has to be approved by the minister and both houses of parliament. That is the standard way in which we make sure, in this parliament, the many, many things that hit the disallowance motion over in the other place. That is the accountability mechanism that prevents what the member fears.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

**Mr TELFER:** How many statutory trusts does the minister envisage will be created pursuant to this bill, and what are they?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** As you would have heard in my second reading speech, my singular passion is the Northern Parklands Trust and the establishment of the Northern Parklands. That will be a large endeavour in and of itself. However, just as with the Linear Parks Act, we have left capacity for future ministers and future governments to establish new trusts if they so wish.

Just looking at the workload alone for the Northern Parklands and for the establishment of Kudla, I would not anticipate much appetite for any other trusts at this point. Equally, part of the legacy of this legislation is not just to leave a very good urban park in the northern suburbs, but a new model for urban parks. If it is successful—and I have every reason to believe it will be—we want to leave the capacity for the minister and the government of the day, and indeed the parliament, to be able to establish new ones.

**Mr TELFER:** So there is no limitation within this legislation to the number of statutory trusts that can be created under this bill?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** They are established by regulation and, again, they can be disallowed, so in that respect there is always parliamentary oversight and control. Just as in the Linear Parks Act, the exact same provisions occur. We have one linear park around the Torrens, and that was obviously why the act was created, but they have left capacity for other linear parks to be created if governments wish to do so.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Apart from this being modelled on another form of parks legislation, is there any example of how this might be deployed—a second or multiple trust associated with the Northern Parklands?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, because this is an entirely new proposition. As I said before, this is taking the combination of a number of other acts—West Beach Trust, Linear Parks—and putting them together. I would think that would give some assurance to the opposition that in actual fact we are acting broadly in a long continuum of the creation of parks in this. Obviously, the Northern Parklands and the Northern Parklands Trust is the first. It might be the only. If it is successful, it might be replicated.

Just as an aside, I have a planning report from the late 1950s-early 1960s that has a section on metropolitan parks. It hints at this sort of model. I think that was probably the origin story of the West Beach Trust. Parliament set that up. It is a very, very good model but it is a smaller model and it maintains itself out of its commercial activities—as I know the member knows, because he has been minister as well.

**Mr Teague:** I have been criticised for my appointments to that—

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I did. In a moment of intemperate—

*Mr Teague interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, I have reappointed some of those appointments. I thought you had forgotten about that, my moment of intemperate criticism of you. I would not make it with this level of experience now; I know how difficult these things are.

The issue is to create a new model for an urban park. Make no mistake, this has not been done before, but we are using established legislative models, if you like, and combining them to be able to create this. The Northern Parklands, in both its stage 1 and stage 2 forms, is such a large amount of work. We are not trying to walk before we run here, let us put it that way.

**Mr TELFER:** Just for clarification and reflecting on those answers, future trusts that could be formed from this clause in particular do not need to be in northern Adelaide—they could be anywhere in South Australia? If so, with the powers and the capacity that this legislation gives the minister, it could be any council within South Australia that could potentially have exposure to the powers of this legislation under the capacity for it to be able to form a statutory trust, as put in this clause in particular but obviously in the title and the explanation of the bill?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** We might be getting ahead of ourselves, because there is a whole clause 21 later on.

**Mr TELFER:** It will save you questions later.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I just think it is probably easier from a debate point of view, because I do not want to move forward. Effectively, the purpose of this bill is to set up the Northern Parklands and the Northern Parklands Trust. As with other acts, it allows for the establishment of other trusts. Clause 21, later on, gives us all of the criteria that one might have to go through to do that.

Of course, I cannot speak for future ministers or for future governments out decades as to what they may or may not do in that regard. I can only tell you this government's intention, and our intention is to create a model for urban parks in particular, because I think there are other mechanisms for parks in other parts of the state which provide for high-quality urban amenity and high-quality parks which communities want. The northern suburbs want ovals, they want sporting

fields, they want walking tracks desperately, so this is a mechanism to provide that in a sustainable way.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

**Mr TELFER:** This particular clause provides for the sale of land. The sale of land can only come after the acquisition of it. It states:

...land within trust parklands may not be sold or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

It is a robust process. But in reflecting on the powers of this bill, setting aside the intention, would those powers, plus the capacity within clause 8, be used to take control of a piece of council land—which I think we reflected on earlier in clause 4—have it for a period of time within a trust and then dispose of the land, with a gap in between or otherwise?

You give me a furrowed brow, but I look at the legislation as it is presented. It gives the capacity for unalienated land to be acquired from a council, and then at some point in the future, whatever that point may be—one day later or 50 years later—they could then onsell sale that land. Am I reading this legislation correctly, or is it another example of, 'Trust me, we're not going to do it, and hopefully no-one in the future does'?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Again, it has been modelled on the Linear Parks Act. The reason why we do that is that we do not want to establish parks and then have them privatised or disposed of. I think there was some debate with the member for Elizabeth talking about how that exact proposition has occurred in Elizabeth. This clause is there to protect, if you like, the parklands. It is established. In regard to the scenario that the honourable member puts forward, why would a minister put themselves through such a strange pathway when there are already powers of compulsory acquisition under both the planning and urban renewal acts? Why would a state minister—

**Mr TELFER:** It is just naming it within the GRO.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** You pose a hypothetical question to me, and I am just posing a hypothetical question back. Why would a minister who wanted to effectively compulsorily acquire land from a council and then dispose of it again use this act when they have a range of other acts where they could do it far more quickly and efficiently? You would not use this act if that was your intent. Indeed, most of these acts require a degree of looking at the whole act, looking at its intent and also looking at what it is modelled on in the Linear Parks Act, and I do not think in this case it is modelled on that clause or similar clauses.

**Mr TELFER:** I am not responding to the question but reflecting on that question itself. On my reading of it, the acquisition of an allocation of land is not that complicated within this act and, also, there is no obligation for any level of compensation, whereas within other acts there is that requirement to be able to do so. Although you reflect that this might be the hardest piece of legislation to require it, this is a way for the ownership capacity to be transferred into the trust without a level of compensation to a council.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I am trying not to be a bit frustrated, but if you look at clause 45 it deals with the Land Acquisition Act. It is important that we go clause by clause. You do not say, 'Well, you could do this fanciful scenario' when a later clause would prevent that. Those other acts that you talk about have exactly the same reference to the Land Acquisition Act. If you want to discuss clause 45 at clause 45, let's do that, but it is hard to in committee stage—and I am thankful for the bipartisanship, and I understand the legitimate concerns, but we have built into this bill safeguards to prevent adventurous ministers, if you like, from exceeding commonsense initiatives.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

**Mr TELFER:** This clause specifies the roads aspect in particular. Could the powers of this bill be used to build or even maintain a road in the trust parkland and require that obligation for

councils without the agreement of the council? You talk about the business plan aspect, which we will get to in a bit. Does it provide that obligation on councils to have to cover infrastructure costs in a linear park? This is about roads, but it is also probably legitimate when talking about stormwater infrastructure or bridges within a park or whatever it might be. On my reading of it, that extra obligation is baked into this legislation.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Again, it is from the Linear Parks Act, so it is almost clause for clause and word for word but then adjusted for the trust. It is so that the trust can undertake roadworks and maintain them. That is why the clause is there. I want to assure the member that state governments have to work with councils on parks—they have to work with them all the time. This is another level of working with them, no doubt about it, but the provision here is in the Linear Parks Act which allows essentially councils to do the roadworks. In this instance, it will be the trust doing the roadworks.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

**Mr TELFER:** I have just a quick question on this clause, specifically clause 10(4), where it says:

Land may be included in trust parklands (and placed under the care, control and management of a statutory trust) even if the land has been dedicated under another Act or law for a purpose and despite that purpose.

This is one about which I would not mind an explanation. Would it include university lands or airport lands or the Waite Trust even, theoretically?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** It could not include airport lands, because the airport lands are owned by the commonwealth and we have no planning control over them at all.

**Mr Telfer:** That's Adelaide Airport.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, it is nearly every airport I think. Anyway, we can check that. We can have a debate about airports, but certainly the airports in Adelaide—Parafield and Adelaide Airport—and I think all the other airports were privatised under the same act. So even if they were council owned they would still retain very similar powers.

Basically that clause is there if a minister, sometime in the future, wanted to establish a trust over a linear park, for instance, or an established park. That would be if a minister decided, at some point in the future, to establish a trust over a linear park. That is there to enable this legislation to allow that to occur.

**Mr TELFER:** The other aspect here in clause 10(5) is the revocation of community land. The Local Government Act obviously contains very prescriptive requirements for the revocation of community land, and there has been some public discourse around the state about some of that action or the proposals. Can community land be transferred to the trust parklands without the mandatory requirement to consult with local communities, as councils have to do within their legislative requirements under the Local Government Act?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Yes, that is exactly right. Essentially, the processes under this act override the community revocation process, which, as you point out, is controversial and often long. It is a difficult process for councils; I have seen them go through it. However, the protections in this act, and creating a parklands under this act and having the previous clause which requires both houses of parliament to accede to any sale, essentially puts a high level protection arrangement around the parklands. So it comes out of the community pool and it goes into the parklands pool and into the trust and it is then protected by this act as opposed to the other one.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 13 passed.

Clause 14.

**Mr TELFER:** We have touched a little bit on the functions and the seemingly wide scope that has been provided within this. In particular, it provides:

- (a) to administer and develop the Northern Parklands in accordance with its long-term strategic and annual business plans—
- (i) as a sporting, cultural and recreational complex of State-wide significance;

We heard some of the contributions in the second reading speech. Could the Northern Parklands Trust use powers under the bill as presented to build an international-scale sporting facility, a museum or a major hotel with an associated golf course within the parameters of the trust functions as set out here—tourist attraction and resort, etc.? The parameters here are fairly wideranging. Can you reflect on that and on the specifics in particular?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** First of all, these clauses have been modelled on the West Beach Trust, which, as I said before—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Bear with me. You are right—that is a limited area—but the West Beach Trust punches well above their weight. I should put on record my affection for the West Beach Trust, because they are an easy organisation for ministers. They do not ask for terribly much money and they are a great asset to the state. It is actually a terrific model, and so we basically modelled this clause on what they do.

That said, the trust still has to have a long-term strategic plan. It still has to have an annual business plan and it still has to go through the normal planning controls and planning system. It cannot just roll up and build something, and obviously they also have to operate within budgets and the like. There would not be the capacity to go off on some act of adventurism, I do not think.

But could they run a caravan park? Could they run some profit-making entity that helps to fund other aspects of the Northern Parklands? Yes, and indeed, we want the trust to do that. We want the trust to run, as the West Beach Trust does, sensible arrangements, sensible entities to actually add value to the Northern Parklands. That said, it is not just a commercial activity. There is a whole range of other things that they need to do and, as I said before, they would have a strategic plan, an annual business plan and the objects of the act to abide by.

**Mr TELFER:** There is also, upon my reading of this aspect, the capacity for them to outsource those commercial activities under a lease arrangement. Subclause (3) provides:

...the Northern Parklands Trust must not grant a lease or licence over the Northern Parklands, or a part of the Northern Parklands, for a term exceeding 20 years without the approval of the Minister.

It could be up to 20 years that they can just, at the discretion of the Northern Parklands Trust, lease over some or all of the parklands area, as designated within the legislation, to a commercial entity, and also the provision is here between 20 and 50 years for a lease—so up to 50 years—purely with the approval of a minister.

So there could be an aspirational commercial operation within the Northern Parklands area. Maybe for a period of 50 years the Northern Parklands Trust will lease out an area of their Northern Parklands for the development of a world-class golf course or high-rise hotel, if the business case fits those investors. Then, absolutely, for a term exceeding 50 years there are additional provisions and parameters that are required for a minister. Up to 20 years, purely at the discretion of the trust and between 20 and 50 years, purely at the discretion of the minister.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** The trust has a power of up to 20 years, as you point out. That is the same as the West Beach Trust. And that, I guess, is one of the reasons why the trust is at the direction of the minister, too, in that regard. That 20-year period actually stops a lot of investment because it is too short. The West Beach Trust has those powers. I do not think that the Northern Parklands Trust will operate them any differently from the West Beach Trust; that is, they will only do it if it is in the interests of the trust.

The second thing is: is 20 years long enough if you are dealing with big capital investments? Well, probably not. We have picked 50 years but only with the agreement with the minister. Yes, they can do these things but we have had a long experience with the West Beach Trust in this regard with 20-year leases. There are areas that have been leased down at West Beach Trust and I am sure the member for Heysen has had briefings about this on one occasion or another.

Having to create commercial entities to fund the other facilities, inherent in that is having to make these judgments about value and worth. The trust will be best placed to do that for leases up to 20 years and for longer than that, at the approval of the minister.

**Mr TELFER:** Reflecting on your comparisons between the West Beach Trust and the Northern Parklands Trust, obviously the West Beach Trust is, I think, around about, from my memory in local government times, 130 hectares, give or take off the top my head, and we are talking about a significantly larger—

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** We could look it up.

**Mr TELFER:** I am sure we could find it pretty easily. It is a significant landholding here. The restrictions of the existing parameters of the West Beach Trust land obligations obviously do restrict the potential commercial operations within that footprint. A 1,000-hectare site ranging across a pretty significant swathe does open up the potential for a variety of different potential commercial operations that could be run for 20 to 50 years, or even the associated stormwater infrastructure or whatever it might be. Is there capacity for there to be commercial operations within the footprint of the Northern Parklands legislation? Does that line up with the perspective of the government that you are putting out that this is all about providing public amenity to community to build that community structure around?

We reflect on some of the speeches that were made and the necessity for there to be publicly accessible available land. If you are saying there is scope within this legislation for the trust to decide to lease out to commercial operators or an otherwise significant swathe or all of the Parklands, is that not a bit back to front with what the public perspective is of what this legislation is trying to achieve?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** The West Beach Trust is actually a very significant piece of land and very well located. In that respect it is illustrative that, albeit smaller, it is still a substantial park, substantial land, and what would be seen to be very high-value land because of its proximity to the beach. It runs a very successful caravan park that has very successful occupancy which helps to fund all the other functions of the park. The golf course there is, again, very successful post COVID, so that is a good thing.

I envisage the Northern Parklands Trust operating in exactly the same way, but I would imagine that the Northern Parklands Trust would utilise less of its land for commercial activities. That said, there is a strategic plan which has to come to the minister, and there is an annual business plan that has to come to the minister, and I doubt any minister would agree to the commercialisation of the whole of the Northern Parklands as, obviously, that would be a contradiction in terms.

The reason for this ability is to run the park. It is to provide facilities that make profit so that you can run the rest of the park, or assist the rest of the park, and take the pressure off ratepayers and take the pressure off, if you like, sporting clubs and the range. This is all about a sensible ability for both the trust and the minister to provide centres which you can get significant investment into and draw significant profit from so that you can do all the other functions of the park, which no doubt we will talk about later.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

**Mr TELFER:** This clause is obviously pretty significant. In the reading of it, it seems to give the Northern Parklands Trust enormous powers, really, when it comes to the publishing of its annual plan: powers to expand the scope of its own power, plans to increase the amount of land that it controls, to increase the number of councils that it charges and to impose new property taxes, essentially. Do you have any other examples of legislation where such broad powers have been granted to a statutory authority?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** It is modelled on an act that you would no doubt be familiar with, the Landscape South Australia Act. With the mechanism we use, again, we have tried to be consistent with other acts. You cannot build such a big, significant set of parklands without public investment. Public investment always comes from somewhere, as we know.

What we are trying to do in the first instance is to use significant amounts of government land—and that should be noted. This is land that we could have just put on the market and sold, done the normal open space requirement and that would have been job done. But we have deliberately used government land that was bought in the seventies, two years after I was born or thereabouts. We have used that land, and we are obviously looking at some of the council portions, and then what we will do is use open space and infrastructure contributions from the rezoning of Kudla, which will create significant value for landowners and developers.

What we are simply going to do is use some of that money to establish a more significant Northern Parklands. This allows the trust to sustain that because we do not want to make a big investment at the start and then have it all fall away. The easy thing to do would have been to vest this back to council, too. We could have just done a linear park and vested it back to council, and then it would be all of Gawler council's problems, all of Playford council's problems. They would have paid the whole lot and they would still—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, but the effect would have been the same. With such long linear parks, which stretch over a couple of council boundaries and which are of state significance, we think it is best to have a trust manage them. Obviously, you have to establish them and then you have to be able to fund them. The landscape levy, that has been modelled out of that act, allows the mechanism to do that in a transparent and known way—because we have done it in other parts of the state—that will be familiar to those in local government. In that respect, it is a stable and known initiative.

**Mr TELFER:** Does this clause set out the requirements for the trust to consult with the council before imposing any charges? Does it require the trust to look at the financial sustainability perhaps of a council or its ratepayers before imposing charges? It talks about clearly showing requirements of contributions from constituent councils, but what mechanisms are in place for councils to perhaps raise concerns about the level of costs that are being required of them to contribute to the trust?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Subclause 5(b) and (c).

**Mr TELFER:** I was looking at that particular aspect earlier, but it does not require the trust to take it into consideration. It talks about taking steps to consult with each constituent council in accordance with any requirements of the minister, but to require them to actually adapt to any of the aspects. You speak about paragraphs (b) and (c) and the requirement at the end of the consultation to 'prepare a report to the Minister on the outcome of those processes in that consultation'. If there is a minister or a trust that wants to have a certain outcome for a certain level of levy to be raised, it does not fill me with a lot of confidence that the concerns and perspectives of the ratepayers of particular councils will be appropriately adhered to.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** In clause 15, subclauses (9), (10) and (11) outline the mechanism of this house to oversee the application of this levy. I made a slight mistake before when I said the other house as well, but that relates to another part of the act, so I will correct that—it is what happens when we jump ahead. In terms of that, what greater protection could one have than this assembly and the ability for the opposition to ask questions, debate and bring scrutiny to those things, in the same way council rates are set now? The honourable member would have had the joy of that process. This will have, if anything, a higher level of scrutiny because it comes here.

**Mr TELFER:** A higher level of scrutiny but based on a lesser knowledge of the intricacies of the finances. You did make the point that, within the aspects to follow, the subclauses empower the House of Assembly but not the Legislative Council to disallow a prescribed levy proposal.

I am curious on this, in particular. We know the intricacies of the work between the houses. Why, within this legislation, is the Legislative Council denied the important power to be able to disallow the exercise of very broad administrative and taxation powers and rather vest that within the House of Assembly? As we could often consider, if there is a perspective of a minister, the minister will always have the power of the numbers in the House of Assembly. Although you talk about the vigour of a process that is followed, the minister will always have the numbers here but not



necessarily in the other place. Why not include either house within this part of the legislation in particular?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Again, I have to admit my plagiarism of other acts. This comes exactly from the Landscape South Australia Act 2019. It is very similar; in fact, it is exactly the same process with exactly the same provisions.

**Mr TELFER:** Just reflecting then, minister, on the effect of clause 15(13) if we look at passing a resolution. If the House of Assembly disallows a levy that levy will have to be paid by councils anyway. It is a bit of a camel of a bill you have been describing to me: a bit from the Landscapes Board, a bit from the West Beach Trust, a bit from Linear Park and a bit from the wisdom of the minister, or otherwise. Is clause 15(13) really just highlighting that the power of the house to disallow the levy is a bit of an illusion?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** There is a clear provision: if you disallow then the prescribed levy ceases to have effect. Then there is clause 15(13)(b), which obviously allows the business plan to provide for an increase to the amount being paid, adjusted for CPI. So there is a strong provision there which, as I said before, is modelled on the Landscape South Australia Act.

I would not say I am putting a camel together here. I would say that what we are doing is taking a range of legislative instruments and building a Ferrari. If those opposite were in government they would at some point, no doubt, get to do sections of this great park—and why wouldn't you? It would be a great shared project together.

As I said before, you have to be able to fund the park, establish and fund it, and the mechanisms under this act are all known mechanisms from other acts. That should give some faith to the member that there are safeguards and provisions within it.

**Mr TEAGUE:** At clause 15, but on the theme we have addressed in relation to the constituent councils in circumstances where, for example, subclause (4) is permitting—or more than that, requiring—that the annual business plan is the place where you find the requirements for contributions from constituent councils, and in numerous provisions throughout the balance of the clause relating to obligations on constituent councils, I come back to the definition of constituent council, which is wholly and solely to be found by it having been described as such or specified to be a constituent council in the annual business plan.

I am just wondering about the intent of the statutory structure there, because there is nothing in clause 15 that says, 'And another key purpose of the annual business plan is to provide a mechanism by which the trust can deliberate and bestow upon a council: guess what? Lucky you, you are a constituent council now and therefore you are up for things like contributions to levies and so on.' But for all that to do any work, presumably that is all in contemplation and that is where you would find it. You would have the trust deliberating, perhaps there has been some land added, there is another council that might be involved, and yet clause 15 is silent about what, if any, deliberation is to be attendant upon a council deriving that status and therefore all the obligations that will flow from it.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** We are back to subclause (5)(b): if a council was made a constituent council under subclause (5)(b), you can take it that there would be steps to consult and at the conclusion of the processes, as subclause (5)(c) reads on:

...prepare a report to the minister on the outcome of those processes and that consultation.

I understand the member's apprehension. Because it is disallowable as there is a minister there and there is a disallowance ability for this chamber, that is enough control to prevent adventurism in regard to 'hypothetically speaking we name some council in some other part of the state.' I understand the scenario, but it is my guess that even if it was proposed it would be unlikely to be successful.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Sorry, but subclause (5)(b) might be the central means. If all we have is (5)(b), then the difficulty is that by the time you are at (5)(b) the trust is proposing payments by constituent councils but it is not providing the means by which a council becomes a constituent council. It is

proposing arrangements under which a constituent council is going to be called on to make a contribution.

It is a bit like saying to someone, 'I have just deemed you a member of this organisation and now I'm going to tell you all about the contribution that you are going to have to make, and in those circumstances I'm going to take steps to consult with you.' But it is like it misses a step and we are left relying on subclause (5)(b), much in the same way as we seem to be missing a step on the face of the whole bill as to where we get the constituent councils from in the first place.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I guess a key obligation of when the rubber hits the road in terms of becoming a constituent council is when you are obliged to pay the levy, which is when the consultation is. The thing that I suppose would give some comfort to the opposition is (8), (9) and (10), but (8) in particular. If you are a minister, we all understand what happens the moment a council is consulted: they arrive at the minister's door if they feel they are aggrieved in any way.

**Mr Teague:** Is that right? Is that the first they will hear of it?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** In circumstances where subclause (5)(b) occurs, that is when the consultation occurs. That is the point at which it would be of relevance to them too. As I said before, subclauses (8), (9) and (10) are very strong provisions to prevent the scenario where councils are roped in in a way that is unfair or unjust.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I appreciate the answer, and it might be of benefit for the public record and for those people, including those in the Local Government Association—responsible officers and so on—who are looking to navigate the practicalities of this. The point is not so much the practicalities of safeguards and negotiation about what is going to be imposed on whom but how this is going to happen in the first place, especially given the definition of a constituent council.

You would sort of think that there might be some body of subsection within this clause that says, 'If ever the trust considers adding a constituent council, it would go through the following steps, etc.' Yes, subclause (8) says the minister has to approve the annual business plan. So if the minister does not like the sound of a business plan that says, 'By the way, new constituent councils X, Y and Z'—there are subclauses (8), (9) and (10), sure—there is just not a primary process by which you become a constituent council that I can see on the face of the clause and therefore limited, if any, guidance for the proper process by which the trust is expected to go about determining an additional constituent council.

Again, bear in mind what has gone before about the intent being that Playford and Gawler are the two. Playford and Gawler might be left at a bit of a loss and say, 'Hang on, we think next-cab-off-the-rank council ought to be a constituent council. Do we just proceed with a (5)(b) consultation with them and then refer to them being constituent in our business plan now as sort of an ipso facto situation?' Or is this dialogue in committee the furthest that goes and otherwise it is subclause (5)(b) and let it all go along?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I think the point at which you become a constituent council is the point at which you pay levies. You will not be a constituent council unless you pay a levy. The point at which, if you are in local government, this becomes real is the payment of a levy, so subclause (5)(b) provides that consultation. Subclause (5)(c) requires a report to be prepared to the minister for the outcome of those processes, and in subclause (8) the business plan requires the approval of the minister. All those provisions mean that there is adequate consultation and adequate approval mechanisms to make sure that it would not be an issue in practice, I do not think.

**Mr TELFER:** Do you envision, minister, the prescribed levy proposal between constituent councils would be the same, or is there going to be the potential that a Town of Gawler, who has a bigger buy-in to the park area, may be required to contribute a larger amount, as opposed to the City of Playford?

You spoke about it being based on the landscape board levy in particular. The difference with the landscape board levy is that baked into the legislation there are protections around limiting the increase to CPI, whereas within this proposal there is not any sort of additional protection. Although one aspect of it may be comparable, there are those additional protections that are not in this piece of legislation.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** You have jumped forward to clause 16, and the answer is clauses 16(2) and 16(4), which deal with both those issues.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

**Mr TEAGUE:** We are here at part 4 and the Northern Parklands levy: clauses 16 to 20. I might do my best to ask a couple of questions that are likely to have some relevance across the balance of part 4. Perhaps in the broad, and bearing in mind that we now know that the constituent councils are Gawler and Playford, and that might be the case for the foreseeable future, and I think the contributions by those constituent councils are likely, if not inevitably, to sound as a specific addition to the rates charged to ratepayers in those two council areas, is the minister satisfied that arrangements are in place, first of all for those councils to divide between themselves such imposition of additional costs, and that ratepayers are sufficiently aware and satisfied as to the merits of that and content to pay those additional costs that councils are going to be passing on?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** In clause 15, there is actually a provision for the publication of the business plan and whatever contribution, so that specifically allows for public participation in that, and the second thing is the consultation that was done on the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan.

We did a huge amount of work on the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. People understand the establishment of parks is part and parcel of the development. In this case, you have to remember that Kudla, which is going from a very, very low population base to over 10,000 homes, is going to generate a huge number of (a) ratepayers, but (b) it is also a huge number of open-space contributions as well. While these provisions are there for, if you like, sustainment, establishment of the park will be done out of the process of the rezoning as well. So there are obligations in the rezoning process and huge uplift for landowners and we are seeing evidence of that already out there.

*Mr Teague interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Well, it is a good thing. As the chair said, there was disinvestment in this land for 25 to 30 years, so it is a good thing. But as part of that code amendment process—and the other member talked about stormwater—stormwater will be paid for out of infrastructure schemes. The government has been quite clear that we intend to apply infrastructure schemes to public infrastructure that needs to be put in place and not leave it solely for councils to decide. We have seen this in Mount Barker, everybody talks about Mount Barker, but it is much worse in Angle Vale, I can tell you.

So we do not want to repeat the mistakes of the past, and we want to make sure there is an interlocking set of mechanisms that make sure that when you create a suburb you create facilities for a suburb. My experience with residents/ratepayers is that, as long as they know that the money they are paying is going to a real outcome, they might grizzle about it on the edges but they are happy to pay for it.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Just this further question then, which is in three parts. That is forward-looking, but we do not hear anything there about, 'No, I can give the ratepayers that assurance because they are already on notice that this is the size and shape of it.' It sounds like, no, that is to be seen but the merits are all there, so it will stack up down the track for them.

I guess there are three concerns. One is that it is a bit late by the time you see it in the business plan, because that is down the track if it is first seen there. Secondly, at least for the time being, the what might be front-loaded costs of the establishment of the park are likely to be borne by relatively fewer residents if the costs are annualised, which they are going to need to be to some extent. You have future growth of the local area to spread that burden, but at the outset if there is to be a contribution that the debt is then passed on to ratepayers, you have that smaller number at the beginning growing to a larger number down the track, but greater costs at the beginning that might pan out over time.

The third aspect of that is that as presently advised we are not to know whether those contributions are effectively all of the costs, or whether the state is going to be chipping in at the

outset and/or continuing to chip in. Presumably we are going to find that out in the business plan as well, but can the minister perhaps address whether or not there is any equity balancer for current residents and/or indication of sharing by the state in terms of any of those costs at least before the business plan gets published?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** If you look at other stages of the bill, it talks specifically about three GRO plans. The first plan is basically related to council land and government land. It is likely that the first stages of the establishment of the Northern Parklands will be done on government land and that land is basically north of Main North Road up to the hill. We already hold that land and the land adjacent to it, so it is land adjacent for the parklands and then land adjacent to it.

Once we resolve some of the water and sewer questions—and they are, as with all these things, a substantial question—effectively the development agreement that will be done by Renewal SA for the sale of that land for housing will fund the first stages of the Northern Parklands. People talked about the South Gawler footy club. At the moment the South Gawler footy club is on a bit of council land that is prime land for development. The relocation of that club will come with a contribution no doubt from council, so that will occur.

So the first stages of the parklands actually will be far more traditional in terms of park creation, the open space requirements out of the sale of the land for housing, and then the second GRO plan plots how we will get from that land down to the river. As I said, Gawler council has already been buying up sections of the river to provide for a linear park, but just very slowly.

Again, when we get into that second GRO phase, we are likely to be doing concurrently, or parallel with it, the code amendment—and the honourable member has been through this process because he was a planning minister—which sets down all the infrastructure charges and open space requirements. Some of that open space requirement will be used to create the Northern Parklands to create it as contiguous, to fund the acquisition of, or developers and landowners will join together and say, 'We will provide this section so we can develop the other parts of our land', and that will develop as the code amendment process occurs.

In actual fact, the first stages of this—and I understand members are concerned about the council levy aspect of it—will be funded either by government developing its land or through the code amendment process and the infrastructure requirements that are around the development of land as part of that. That is why, if you like, the establishment will be done that way. This aspect of the levy is all about sustainment in the long term, because I do not want to establish a beautiful park and then have it fall away.

By nature, that will allow the trust to be appointed and to set up its first business plans, and its annual plans, and they have to be published. There will be a pretty regular rhythm, and I am sure people in Gawler and Playford keep an eye on these things. They are very cost conscious, so I am 100 per cent sure that this process, in a practical way, will operate in a very sensible way to create and sustain one of the great parks.

**Mr TELFER:** I seek clarification on a few of the points that you made in answer to the previous clause. The first one is around the obligation of the contribution by councils. This clause speaks about specifying the amount to be contributed by constituent councils. It will take into account all those different aspects that the councils are required to provide to assist. Subclause (2) states:

Liability for the amount to be contributed by constituent councils for the Northern Parklands region will be shared between them according to a scheme set out in the Northern Parklands Trust's annual business plan.

It does not say 'shared equally', so my assumption is that there is scope within this part of the act for there to be an unequal obligation that is decided, as I was putting before, between the contributing constituent councils. There could be a greater or lesser obligation, depending on what the trust decides is appropriate. Is that correct?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Yes, that is correct. It is the trust with the approval of the minister. If you look at the way the parklands is constructed, the majority of this is in Gawler and Kudla, which is the Gawler council area, and then there is a large allotment of land in the Playford council as well. Ultimately, the river will become a link between Gawler and Angle Vale and everything that is developed alongside of it.

One could have just created a linear park and be done with it, and then all of the cost falls on the council. What we are attempting to do, though, is to set up the trust, because West Beach Trust works so well, because it is a big park and there is a shared boundary. In the end, the aim is to have councils as partners, not as opponents or anything like that. That is why we put the councils on the board. It is a balanced board, and we anticipate that this will be acts of cooperation as opposed to anything else.

**Mr TELFER:** The other aspect I was inquiring about in the previous clause was around the capacity to restrict the increase to CPI, and you pointed to those clauses on page 13. On page 14, subclause (5) states:

The Minister may allow the Northern Parklands Trust to require the constituent councils for the Northern Parklands region to pay more than the amount that would otherwise be payable...for a particular financial year...

Does subclause (5) basically give power to the minister to say it is fine to increase over and above CPI because you could justify it?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Subclause (5)(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) all give context to that ability, and again you fall back on the minister must approve and the House of Assembly must also not disallow. So, yes, there is flexibility there, but subclause (5)(a) talks about long-term infrastructure; (b) talks about a natural or environmental disaster, which happens on the Gawler River from time to time; (c) talks about an increase in the size; and (d) talks about substantial new or replacing sporting, cultural or recreation facilities.

**Mr TELFER:** What about paragraph (f)?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Yes, paragraph (f), too, and paragraph (e)(i) and (ii). No-one is trying to get around it. You can go above CPI but there are conditions applied, and the ultimate condition is you have to publish a plan and it has to come here ultimately. That is sensible and no different to the setting of rates or any other charge around the place.

**Mr TELFER:** I pointed out paragraph (f) to you while I was sitting down because it provides:

- (f) other circumstances exist such that the benefits in allowing the Trust to impose more than the amount that would otherwise be payable under subsection 3(a) in the financial year outweigh the fact that additional costs are to be imposed on the relevant community in that financial year.

This is obviously all in the eye of the beholder. You could have a situation where a minister says, 'Well, I think the benefits outweigh the additional costs, so happy days. I'm going to allow you to increase it by more than CPI.' This is the difference between the legislation that you referred to with the Landscape Board and this as has been put in this legislation.

You spoke about the significant investment that the government are going to be making especially in the capital contribution at the front end. Clause 16, which we are looking at at the moment, talks about contributions by constituent councils in what I am assuming is considered operational expenses. Subclause (1) provides:

The constituent council for the Northern Parklands region are responsible to make a contribution towards the costs of the Northern Parklands Trust performing its functions under this Act...

And it goes on. Will the constituent councils be the only contributors to the operations of the Northern Parklands Trust, or do you envision there to be an ongoing contribution from the state government to the operating costs of the Northern Parklands Trust?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** The whole purpose of the way the bill is constructed is to create a financially sustainable model over the long term. One of the virtues of the West Beach Trust is they do not generally ask for contributions from the state government. They have recently received one grant from the Planning and Development Fund to clean up a water course, but that is a rare occasion. Whereas if you look at other parks, including the Adelaide Parklands and the Linear Park, most especially the Coast Park, both Liberal and Labor governments have spent \$50 million on the Coast Park—which is a good thing—but it gives you an idea of the sorts of contributions that can go on over a decade or so into these substantial parks.

What we are trying to do is get the ball rolling undoubtedly on government-held land, held by Renewal SA. It is no different from what we are doing in Playford Alive, for instance, or in Noarlunga, where as we develop we make contributions to open space.

The second thing we would do is utilise the government land, council land. We then go into the development phase, which is where we utilise developer fees and the whole rationale is to create a sustainable park, a sustainable model that does not put endless demands or requirements from state government. I cannot predict what a future government might do, but obviously our aim is to create a financially sustainable model.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 passed.

Clause 19.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 19, minister, speaks about the imposition of the levy by councils and provides that a constituent council must impose the Northern Parklands levy on rateable land, which obviously is a new tax on property owners. What were the government's policy considerations in deciding to impose this new additional tax on this particular part of South Australia? We often dance around the promise, pre election, of no new taxes, but this is an additional tax burden that has been imposed. What were the considerations by the government when trying to work out the scope and the structure for this additional levy which is being imposed?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** It is largely as I have already said, and as I said before, one could, if one were so minded, just use the Linear Parks Act, put it all on Gawler council—job done. That could be done, but what we are trying to do here, and the reason why we have used relevant sections of acts, is we want to set up a financially sustainable model for open space. It is new. This is a Northern Parklands Trust that is deliberately created to provide for financial sustainability.

To set it up in the initial stages, we are using government land to get started, and the second stage is part of the redevelopment of Kudla, which is the best placed land for redevelopment in the state bar none, absolutely—close to public infrastructure, close to public transport, public roads on the main sewer line, not far from water. It is much cheaper to get water there, although no provision of potable water is cheap.

We are developing a whole new suburb, but what we want to also do is create a new model for delivering parks and that is one that is financially sustainable. We are setting up a trust, but everybody understands, every person in this room understands—you have been mayor; you understand that no park is—

**Mr Telfer:** You, sir, indeed.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** You, sir, certainly understand. He has been a mayor too—a double mayor. Everybody understands where their rates go: your rates go for parks, your rates go for collection of rubbish. So, it is the same thing again. What we are talking about here is a modest levy, which has plenty of protections around it to sustain the Northern Parklands as a Northern Parklands Trust, and it is a trust for the public good, for the provision of open space for the northern suburbs.

**Mr TELFER:** You speak of a modest levy, minister. What do you envision the levy amount would be if you are to call it modest?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** It is too early to be commenting on an exact figure.

**Mr Telfer:** You said 'modest' that is all.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Just hear me out, though. First of all we have to do the first two GRO plans, and second of all we have to do a master plan for the Northern Parklands. Obviously, that requires a great deal of public consultation. Part of that public consultation will be to ask: what do people want? It will be guided by the public, and we all understand that process. It is one that you have to do genuinely and go and talk to the community. It will also be dependent on, if you like, the Kudla code amendment, and the associated infrastructure schemes around that as well.

It might well be that the levy, if any—the Northern Parklands Trust does not have to charge a levy. It could take in-kind contributions from the relevant councils in terms of their blue-collar workforce. All this provides for is a levy to be charged if it is needed.

**Mr TELFER:** The reason I ask is that you speak about 'modest' and you are making a presupposition. It does also say within this clause that it 'must impose a levy' rather than what you just said—'must' as in subclause (1). Was there consideration given for the state government to be the one to actually collect a levy, say, the likes of the emergency services levy, for instance, rather than imposing that obligation on the councils? As I said in my contribution speech in the second reading there are additional costs which always seem to come with the imposition of the local government sector to be collecting a levy on behalf of the state government.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** You say they 'must' impose a levy, but clause 19(1) is only if they put it in the annual business plan. It is important, though, because the trust puts out their annual business plan, they do not have to put a levy in it, they can choose to and, if they do, this is the way it works from there. You need to actually read—we have had a couple of circumstances where the honourable member has said, 'What about this?' and then we find out it is in other sections of the act—

**Mr Telfer:** This is the process of the committee stage.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, and the same with this. The Northern Parklands Trust has to put it in their annual plan and their annual plan has to be published, then this process kicks off, and it has to be approved by the minister, and it can be disallowed by the House of Assembly. What we are doing is establishing a Northern Parklands Trust and we are establishing the Northern Parklands. There is a process for investment, government and developer contributions, and if the trust decides, and if they publish a plan, then a levy can be applied, but there are safeguards around that levy as well about CPI—

**Mr Telfer:** I have a feeling a levy will be imposed.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** You have feelings about a whole range of things, but you often ignore—

**Mr Telfer:** I am happy to put money on it.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, you often do this: you pick out one section and you run off with a fanciful notion. You need to put this in an appropriate context because what we are trying to do is set up—

**Mr Telfer:** We have found a whole bit where it does not work.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** —a sustainable model to provide high-quality parklands in the northern suburbs.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think that answer is perhaps of some assistance to the committee in that I think there are a couple of sensible step questions that have been asked about what the mandatory imposition of a new tax is that is then, rather than being directly imposed a la emergency services levy or something else coming directly from the state, set down the line via the contributing councils. But, curiously, and I am on board with the bulk of what the minister was saying before he started going after the member for Flinders—

**Mr Telfer:** Unfairly.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Unfairly, I think. We are there embracing what the intent of all this is going to be, because you cannot possibly envisage the contributing councils—and let's keep it vanilla flavoured—Gawler and Playford doing their annual business plans and saying, 'Oh, guess what? Our annual business plan is going to contain no relevant amounts that might attract the application of clause 19(1); therefore, no levy. The business plan is great and no levy is to be imposed on those councils; therefore, there is nothing to be mandatorily passed on and we are all hunky-dory.' That is not going to happen.

The minister's previous answer has just indicated that that is not the plan. The whole idea is to establish a structure that is sustainable via this very imposition of a levy. But in all of those

circumstances why is the mandatory obligation there in clause 19(1) to impose a levy, in addition to whatever consideration might be the subject of arriving at the annual business plan? If it is not really just a tax that is passed directly down the line with that contribution, why is it not left to the discretion of those councils as to how they might deal with the recovery of those costs?

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** It is worthwhile talking about what happens at the moment with the establishment of open space in the suburbs. The developer will put it in, create it and then vest back to council, then ultimately ratepayers pay for that park in their rates. That is what happens at the moment. In this case, because we are setting up the Northern Parklands Trust, the Northern Parklands Trust will be doing the work alongside councils to establish, maintain and build the park, so we have put in this power to be able to recover the costs of running the park. The levy is just based on the most efficient mechanism that we could find, which is the Landscape South Australia Act 2019.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2025**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### **MENTAL HEALTH (COMMUNITY VISITOR SCHEME) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### **GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION (TRIBUNAL PROCEEDINGS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 3 September 2025 at 10:30.



*Answers to Questions***EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT**

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (27 June 2024).

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning)**: I have been advised:

SA Water has sought, and continues to seek, engagement with Barngarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation RNTBC (BDAC) on cultural heritage matters related to the proposed Eyre Peninsula Desalination Plant, to be located at Billy Lights Point, Port Lincoln.

**MOUNT BARKER HIGH SCHOOL**

In reply to **the Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel)** (18 June 2025).

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning)**: The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport has advised:

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport continues to work closely with the Department for Education to ensure that impacts resulting from the Mount Barker roundabout upgrade are resolved. Discussions between the agencies are ongoing.