Public Questions
2026 - Current

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** The City's submission to the State Government local government reform proposals (refer OCM 15 Dec 2021 C2112-1) opposed the publication of the CEO's Key Performance Indicators (KPI) however fortunately these objections were ignored and City's CEO's KPIs are now published, however the City's CEO KPIs are lacking appropriate measurement targets or percentage (for example delivery of 80% of capital works program against agreed timeframes and budgets) and will Councillors ensure actual measurable targets or percentages be added to the City's CEO's performance indicators?	Under the Local Government Act, Council is to establish a CEO Performance Review Committee, which the City has. CEO KPIs have been developed and endorsed by the committee which comprises of the Mayor and four elected members. They are also approved by full council. The KPIs consider key budget outcomes and other factors important to Council.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** For well over a decade the City's budgeted capital works voted by Councillors are consistently and inefficiently delayed and FY25 continues the trend and, - how has the CEO been held accountable or measured for continual capital works underperformance, delays and over-runs given it is an actual CEO performance indicator?, and - why is the FY25 actual capital expenditure of $12m again so low compared to the budget of $19m?, and - are there actual implications to administrative staff for these poor capital works tender scoping, project execution failures, and overall poor budgeting practices?	The City has planned and budgeted for a strong program of capital works, which is in response to extensive engagement with elected members, the needs of the community and the City's ongoing asset renewal program. While on occasion projects or programs may be delayed or require rephasing due to other competing priorities, they remain in the program to be completed. The city has recently undertaken a review of project management practices and is reviewing how we align project delivery with the capital budget that is made available annually.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 3:** What properties are being sold in FY27 for $20m as stated in the City's Long Term Financial Plan that the administration proposed and Councillors voted their approval?	This is in relation to the proposed sale of the existing depot site as part of future redevelopment plans for the City's operations centre. This information is available in the City's long term financial plan.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 4:** In FY25 the City made a loss of $6.3m not that this is highlighted in any of the annual report financial summary text, and clearly indicates the City's assets are being run down with insufficient funds being spent on infrastructure and asset renewal and upkeep and in which year will there realistically be investment by the City in existing assets equivalent to the City's depreciation expense?	Noting you are referring to the statement of comprehensive income, while it does indicate a non-cash book loss of $6.3m, no part of the financial statements should be reviewed in isolation. The Financial Activity Statement provides a more comprehensive view of the City's overall financial position and indicates the City ended 2025 with a positive closing position of $9.58m. This is in relation to the proposed sale of the existing depot site as part of future redevelopment plans for the City's operations centre. This information is available in the City's long term financial plan. Noting you are referring to the statement of comprehensive income, while it does indicate a non-cash book loss of $6.3m, no part of the financial statements should be reviewed in isolation. The Financial Activity Statement provides a more comprehensive view of the City's overall financial position and indicates the City ended 2025 with a positive closing position of $9.58m. Regarding depreciation expense, the City experienced a sharp and rapid increase in asset values a number of years ago, and consequently depreciation expense also increased. It is a priority to address this via increased investment into renewal programs, and this is outlined clearly in the long term financial plan, however is not something that can be addressed immediately as the City will need to manage this increased investment responsibly, over time, and in line with its current and future financial capacity.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 5:** The City's $2.5m carrying value of the Resource Recovery Group (RRG) investment at 30 June 2025 is overstated and the financial report has picked up incorrectly the actual RRG audited results, and - why weren't the correct audited RRG financial report figures utilised as stated on the column header of note 22?, and - why is the $2.5m not written off in FY25 and being deferred to FY26?, and - as RRG has now ceased trading how much equity is actually being returned to the City?	The RRG was operational at the balance date for FY25 and is only just in the process of winding up now. The City will be guided by the auditor on appropriate accounting treatments. The City's reported value for its investment in Resource Recovery Group (RRG) at 30 June 2025 was based on the most up-to-date financial information available when the City's financial statements were prepared. RRG's audited figures were not finalised by the City's reporting deadline, so the latest available figures were used. This is a normal and accepted practice when timing does not allow audited information to be included. The investment was not written off in the 2024/25 year because, at that date, there was not enough confirmed information to support a full write-down under accounting rules. The City's withdrawal from RRG occurred after 30 June 2025. The amount of equity that will be returned to the City will only be known once RRG's wind-up process is complete. If there is any financial impact, it will be reflected in the City's 2025/26 financial statements.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 6:** As pointed out previously the City does not disclose in line with best practice Heritage Land and Heritage Buildings separately in the financial report so as to be significantly more meaningful to the financial report readers and significantly more helpful in the asset revaluation process. Why can't this disclosure be done in FY25 similar to the City of Perth to both highlight and showcase the heritage assets of Fremantle to indicate the Councillors appreciate heritage assets?	It is noted this has been raised previously on several occasions. While you have previously informed that another Local Government may separate these, as per previous responses to this question there is no requirement to do so, and it has not been identified as a priority for the City of Fremantle at this time.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 7:** Why is there lack of contingent liability disclosure wording in note 19 in the FY25 financial report for the South Fremantle landfill site or more correctly even a provision for remediation?	In prior years the South Fremantle Landfill site has been disclosed in note 19 as a contingent liability as per the requirements of AASB 137. This was the City's preferred treatment for FY24/25 and was communicated to the auditor by the City via a position paper as part of the 2025 audit, however the OAG requested a change to this disclosure and the City subsequently accepted the auditors guidance on this occasion. We will however continue to engage with the auditor on this matter as part of the 2026 audit process.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 8:** When will the business case or cost benefits analysis of the South Fremantle underground power project be prepared and, - is the Western Power co-funding agreement actually signed, and - despite starting to levy service charges from ratepayers does the City even know the Western Power repayment schedule and if so, why not disclosed, and - does the City need to borrow funds to meet this repayment schedule?	The South Fremantle Targeted Underground Power Project (TUPP) is being delivered and heavily subsidised by Western Power. The program offered by Western Power is to either replace poles at no additional cost to the community or undertake a heavily subsidised underground power project. The City of Fremantle signed a memorandum of understanding with Western Power in July 2023 to progress to a detailed design which is currently underway. A significant program of community engagement was undertaken prior to the commencement of the collection of service charges. The City's Long Term Financial Plan clearly indicates estimated cashflow and timings for contributions to Western Power as part of the project. There is currently no intention to borrow funds for this project. This is why the City has commenced collecting its service charge for the works from this financial year, to ensure payment milestones for Western Power may be met without the need to borrow and add borrowing costs to the project.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 9:** The original civic centre business plan voted on by Councillors stated there would be no pressure on rate payers as the lease income from tenants for rented areas of approximately $1m pa would cover the $20m funds repayments, and during FY25 what was lease income received, fit out costs incurred by the City, and rent free periods provided to tenants.	Space being made available for commercial lease within the Civic Centre is now fully tenanted. Fit out costs and City contributions towards this have been negotiated on a case-by-case basis as leases have been finalised which is standard practice in commercial leasing. The final practical completion for fit out works is currently still being finalised however base tenancy fit out cost across all leased spaces is estimated to be approximately $1.5m. Tenanted commercial spaces within the WCC are being estimated to generate approximately $250,000 per annum in 2026/27 noting that some of the leases may not yet be paying full rent due to rent free periods that were provided as part of commercial negotiations. Additionally, the 250K does not factor in any additional turnover rent that will be generated, which will be the case for two of the larger tenants who are on turnover rent arrangements.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Most of the native bushland, coastal and inland reserves in the City of Fremantle rely heavily on the Friends groups of volunteers for tasks such as planting, hand weeding, watering, rubbish clean ups, and reporting vandalism. The department that is in charge of these areas is seriously under resourced and has been for quite a long time. Why has the City not invested in human resources to oversee and manage the conservation of the City's natural areas?	The City has a team specifically for the natural environment reserve management. Resources are allocated depending on priority and capacity of the team, contractors and any grant funding received for specific targeted works. The natural areas team has a number of operational programs occurring on various sites across the City, including weeding, revegetation, bush fire mitigation, and other routine servicing. The City will consider the use of external contractors as part of future budget discussions.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Given the City's ownership interest in the Resource Recovery Group (RRG) is supposed to be valued at 21% as of the last audited report, what is the total dollar value of the 'Investment in Associate' that will be written off in the 2025/26 financial year as a result of the RRG liquidation	The final position of the RRG is being quantified through the winding up process which is underway now and is not anticipated being concluded until closer to the end of this financial year (FY26).
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** Why is the RRG investment valued at $2.5m at 30th of June given that we knew it was closing and those assets were being handed off, now taken by the ReGroup at no cost?	The Resource Recovery Group (RRG) ceased receiving waste on the 30th of November 2025 and is now in the process of winding up. As per auditors instructions, the value of the group at balance date for the 30th of June 2025 was recorded and carried through with the current financial statements. The City expects the value to change this financial year, and as mentioned in a previous question is expected that it will be wound up prior to the 30th of June 2026
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 3:** As of June 2025, the City provided a bank guarantee for their share of $1.7m debt for the RRG office leasing facility in Booragoon. What is the status of this loan following the RRG windup, and has the sale of these assets given a share of that liability or will the ratepayers be required to fund any shortfalls?	There are assets, cash reserves, liabilities to work through. Some of the assets and liabilities are being transferred to other entities including ReGroup and City of Canning as part of the winding up process and agreements with the RRG. The Booragoon office will be sold. The City anticipates the office sale will satisfy the outstanding loan balance for this facility. Part of the proposal over the 20-year term with ReGroup to continue using that facility is that some assets are transferred to them and then they'll be liable to upgrade them and the Cities of Fremantle, Melville and Canning will be able to access those facilities into the future. Ongoing costs of waste are still to be determined. The City is getting better gate fees for recycling, taking some relevant waste directly to the waste to energy supplier - which has decreased this cost, and FOGO is still continuing with ReGroup which comes at a reduced cost.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 4:** The new contract involves a $12.5m upgrade to the Canning Vale facility. If the ReGroup fails to meet that 94.6% recovery target or faces operational insolvency, what specific legal or financial step back rights does the City have to protect the $9.5m currently budgeted for waste initiatives from escalating?	The contract sum of $12m is to upgrade the recycling plant. That is through a $5m grant being provided from the state government, which the City's of Fremantle and Melville accessed and will transfer across to ReGroup who will provide the balance, which is part of the negotiated outcome of the lease with ReGroup.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 5:** Have requests been made to the ReGroup for any liabilities arising from the environmental remediation of the Canning Vale site caused by the City and it's co-users, and what is the estimated worst case financial exposure for the ratepayers should the site require soil or groundwater treatment?	The City of Canning has taken over responsibility of the RRG site which is within their Local Government area. It is a matter between the City of Canning and ReGroup to determine any future remediation liability.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 6:** In regards to the presentation of the Annual Report, is there a way to provide a simpler format for the average ratepayer to present the figures and stats?	The presentation of the Annual Financial Statements is in accordance with the requirements of the Australian Accounting Standards and the Local Government Act 1995. The information provided in the Annual Report is the format in which council presents the information in a more general style. Monthly financial reports presented in council agendas are also a good way for the community to review and interpret financial information.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Why does the Long Term Financial Plan 2025-35 make zero mention of the Resource Recovery Group, despite the organisation being formally wound up in November 2025?	The Long Term Financial Plan is a high level view of the future financial needs of the City. Waste provision is provided for in a general high level allocation without detailed analysis of each part of this service. Each annual budget provides better detail in relation to each element of the waste services and costs.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** What was the final financial outcome of Fremantle's withdrawal from RRG, specifically: - How much of the $2,461,763 investment as at 30 June 2025 was recovered? - In which financial year will this investment be written off?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 3:** What are the ongoing annual costs of waste management services now that RRG is no longer operating? - How do these costs compare to Fremantle's previous annual contributions to RRG? - Where are these increased costs reflected in the LTFP projections? - Who is now providing these waste management services?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 4:** Can you confirm that the '$20m Proceeds Disposal of Assets' shown on page 22 of the LTFP includes the sale of the City Depot site at Knutsford Precinct and what other properties?	Yes, the $20m only relates to the sale of the existing depot site.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 5:** Why is this asset not identified on page 22 where the $20m figure appears? Why is there no cross-reference to page 42 of the LTFP?	Individual assets are not disclosed line by line in the Statement of Financial Activity. However, a more detailed reference to this figure can be provided on page 42 when the LTFP is updated as part of the annual budget process.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 6:** Has the decision to dispose of the depot site been formally discussed and disclosed with elected members prior to being included in the LTFP?	Yes, the proposed sale of the existing depot site and redevelopment of the operations centre has been discussed with Elected Members prior to being included in the LTFP.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 7:** What is the $20m valuation based on? Has the site and other properties been formally valued? By whom and when?	The valuation is based on advice from independent valuers and property experts as part of the due diligence currently being undertaken by the City while a business plan is being developed. This work has been underway over the past 12-18 months. Funds are transferred to and from reserves annually to fund a variety of projects and initiatives.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 8:** The LTFP shows $22.1m transferred TO reserves in Year 2, and $21.6m withdrawn FROM reserves in Years 3-4. Please explain: - If the depot sale ($20m) funds depot construction ($20m), why is $22.1m transferred to reserves (not $20m)? - Where does the extra $2.1m come from? - Why is $21.6M withdrawn from reserves when only $20M is needed for depot construction? - Which specific reserves are being used for these transfers? - Are the depot sale proceeds being ring fenced in a specific reserve, or are they being mixed with general reserves?	As articulated in the LTFP priorities, it is the City's intent to re-build the balance of its reserves. The $2.1m being referred to is the estimated provision for that year (in addition to the proceeds received from the sale of the depot site), as is the $2.7m in 2027/28 and 2.3m in 2028/29. As is the case with transfers to reserves, transfers from reserve will include use of funds for the delivery of other projects, not just the Depot redevelopment. It is anticipated that a reserve specific to the operations centre redevelopment will be established in the appropriate financial year.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 9:** Why does the unrestricted cash position return to near baseline levels by Year 4 ($13.7M vs $12.9M in Year 1) if the $20M asset sale is supposed to improve financial sustainability?	Assumptions are considered and adjusted at the beginning of each year as part of the annual budget process. As stated, the intent of the $20m asset sale (the current depot site) is to fund the redevelopment of the new operations centre.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 10:** Are any other significant asset disposals planned in the 10 year period covered by the LTFP? If so, please provide details. For example, the Fremantle Leisure Centre.	Asset disposals will be incorporated into the LTFP as and when decisions are made to do so. The LTFP is a dynamic document which will be updated annually to reflect the priorities of Council and the community at that particular time.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Can you confirm that the City's underlying operating position (excluding capital grants and asset sales) shows deficits of $6-11 million per year throughout the Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) period?	Page 22 of the LTFP document indicates an operating deficit varying from $6m in 2026-27 to $11m in 2028/29, however from 2028/29 onwards demonstrates a transition towards a positive operating result. The operating position being referred to incorporates depreciation expense and other non-cash book items. After non-cash amounts are excluded from operating activities, the amount attributable to operating activities remains in excess of $10m for the entirety of the LTFP. As previously stated the City ended 2025 with a positive closing position of $9.58m. Year 1 included provision for the delivery of a one-off fully grant funded major event to the value of $3.4m. This amount was included in Year 1 based on timing advice from the State Government however they have since delayed the event for the foreseeable future. The 1.0%-1.5% referenced in the LTFP refers to growth in rate base, not increase in rates. It is proposed in the LTFP that costs associated with any proposed borrowings would be offset by additional operating revenue generated via the redeveloped oval precinct. As per question 1, the city ended 2025 with a positive closing position of $9.58m. The LTFP currently demonstrates a transition towards a positive operating result
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** If the City has structural operating deficits of this magnitude, what is the plan to achieve sustainable operating surpluses?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 3:** The LTFP shows Materials & Contracts decreasing from $40.8M (Year 1) to $35.8M (Year 2) - a reduction of $5 million. Please explain: - What specific cost reductions account for this $5M decrease? - How is this decrease reconciled with the additional waste management costs following RRG's wind-up? - Are maintenance programs being deferred or services being reduced? - What 'efficiency gains' are assumed to achieve this reduction?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 4:** The LTFP projects rates increases of only 1.0-1.5% per year, which is below inflation. How will the City fund increasing costs with below-inflation revenue growth?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 5:** The new $20M Fremantle Oval loan will add approximately $1.1M per year in debt service costs (principal + interest). Where in the operating budget will these costs be funded from?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 6:** Years 2-3 of the LTFP show $117M in non-operating grants (primarily for Fremantle Oval and Depot projects). After these one-time grants end, Years 4-5 show operating deficits of $11M and $9.8M respectively. What is the plan to address these ongoing deficits once temporary grant funding ceases?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 7:** Can you provide a reconciliation showing how the City moves from the current structural operating deficit position to sustainable operating surpluses?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** We are going to be asked to pass or receive the budget tonight. If you are so certain it is a good, true and accurate record, why don't we say this is an honest and true record and put it to a vote?	The AGME was about discussing the annual report, and not the budget. Every year at the Annual General Meeting of Electors is asked to receive the Annual Report in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1995.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Specific to the North side of the port can the Council give the total number of financial income, revenue in any shape or form, from the top of the port at Qube to the ocean. Capturing but not limited to the terminals, per annum?	Approximately $3.5m in rate revenue is collected from within the footprint of the port area (including the section northwest of Tydeman road).
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Where is the money collected for the South Fremantle underground power project shown in the accounts?	This is collected via a service charge and will be held within a reserve. The amounts are recorded within the monthly financial statements, presented to Council. They are not within the 2024/2025 Annual Report as collection only commenced in 2025/26.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Will The City of Fremantle please support and agree to work with us/members of the community to convene a proper public meeting consistent with the 2025 AGME motion, preferably to be held in the Fremantle Town Hall in late April or May 2026?	The City would support the Stop Aukus Group hosting a meeting in the Town Hall, and where possible, will provide support to promote this meeting.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Can the City provide a definite yes or no as to whether Pindone was used at any time during the 2024/2025 financial year? If so, why was a non-toxic alternative not used instead, given the stated shift in policy?	Pindone was not used by the City in the 2024/2025 financial year.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** Will the Council stop using Pindone and similar chemicals, or does it plan to continue such practices?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 3:** The City has been trialling the use of alternatives to Glyphosate such as weeding and steam for six years. Has this been long enough to give an answer, or will the City continue to spend ratepayers money on Glyphosate?	We use an integrated weed management approach, which means combining different methods to suit each location and target species. The methods used include manual control (hand-pulling), suppression (mulching and planting), mechanical control (mowing and slashing), non-chemical control (steam treatment) and targeted chemical control (herbicide use).
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 4:** Can the City point to a specific date in the current Strategic Community Plan where the City will become 100% Glyphosate free for all of our parks, footpaths, verges, playgrounds, and common areas?	While the City does not have a target date for ceasing the use of Glyphosate, it has implemented practices such as steam weed control in playgrounds and footpaths, and minimising herbicide use in school holidays in response to community concern. Glyphosate is registered for use in Australia by the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) regulations and the City utilises it as an effective weed management tool in its integrated weed management approach.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 5:** Will the Council publish chemical use maps of the City to allow residents and visitors with children and pets to make an active decision of avoiding these areas?	The City displays signage on site around the boundary of treatment areas in accordance with requirements to notify of herbicide application to allow the public to decide on whether they avoid the area. Providing maps is not an effective measure as applications can change at short notice due to weather conditions, site usage or other variables.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** What portion of Victoria Hall is being disposed of for $7500 per annum? Is it by way of lease, licence or sub licence, specify which one it is?	The $7,500 refers to an annual lease agreement for the lessor hall, which is the back room at Victoria Hall. This is being leased out as a community gallery space and three adjoining studio spaces.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** Is the portion under this agreement for commercial or community use?	The rest of Victoria Hall is available for hire by community, cultural, commercial and arts hire.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 3:** There is a document available online that sets out terms and condition for commercial and community hire use. Do the same terms and conditions also apply to leases, licences or sub licenses?	The City have received a large number of bookings for Victoria Hall in the last 6 months, and forecast the same for the first 9 months of 2026. It is Leased privately to Bennet Miller for an arts and culture use. There are similarities but Lease conditions are outlined in the Lease document itself and negotiated between the parties before signing.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 4:** Are the presently unused portions of the Victoria Hall available for hire/lease, licence or sub licence to other interested parties?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 5:** How many portions of VH are available by way of lease, licence or sub licence?	Refer to the above
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Why has an activist statement been inserted into the well-established Welcome to Country at every Council meeting now? Is this allowed under the Local Government Act or any standing orders?	There are many different versions of Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Country.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 2:** Urban Winery has extended their alfresco area right out to the front of Victoria Hall. Are they paying a lease?	This is an activation trial over the summer period. Because of the nature of Victoria Hall, it may often appear closed even when leased, so activation in front of the Hall is positive for High Street. After summer the trial will be reviewed and any ongoing activation will incur costs.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	**Question 1:** Can Council give an update on the effectiveness of the tree retention policy, in relation to the number of trees retained or declined, since it was implemented? Can this data be made public online?	The City's LPP 2.26 Tree Retention has been in use since its adoption in March 2025. Applicants for relevant sites have been required to provide detailed justification for tree removal, supporting technical arborist reporting to ensure the protection of trees during construction and redesign proposed developments to retain significant trees. Where significant trees are proposed to be removed for valid reasons, applicants have been required to plant trees in replacement. The City Planning team intends to provide a review of the policy to Council in 2026 to further refine its provisions and support the protection of significant trees. It is considered that there is insufficient data at this point in time to conduct the review and publish findings.
25 February 2026	11 March 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 1:** Will the City increase in-house Natural Areas staff to properly manage and conserve the City's natural areas?	Natural Areas are managed by an in house team of 3 (Team Leader and two field staff) supported by Contractors for works. The inhouse staff are responsible for management, monitoring, reporting, Friends of Group liaison, minor works and contract management. They are supported by a range of Contractors for seasonal, specialist and larger works such as bushfire mitigation works, weed control, pest management, sand drift management, beach raking, tree works and larger works such as fencing or track maintenance. The annual budget adopted for contracted works in the 25/26 financial year is $432,000. The City balances funding and resources across a range of operational areas to deliver prescribed service levels and management requirements.
25 February 2026	11 March 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 2:** What is the total cost of using contractors for Natural Areas management?	Refer to the above
25 February 2026	11 March 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 3:** Would employing additional permanent staff be more productive and cost-effective?	Refer to the above
11 March 2026	25 March 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 1:** Installation funding is likely to be fully covered by the state government with newer projects operating with forecasted maintenance costs. Given this, I ask why has Council not treated this as an urgent issue for our community?	Following the review of potential locations for a safe swimming enclosure at locations in Fremantle (and the subsequent resolution to progress Bathers Beach), Council did request that the Harvey Beach location be further investigated. This was completed and highlighted that whilst depth, space and access to amenities continue to present challenges for the Harvey Beach site, it was also noted that the beach maintains several features compatible with the installation of a protected swimming area. A feasibility study and then community consultation would be the next stage.
11 March 2026	25 March 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 2:** Why has this not progressed to consultation and action and when will it finally happen?	Officers have proposed a budget allocation to progress to the next stage as part of the City's budget process. This proposal currently sits in the Long-Term Financial Plan for 2028/29 financial year.
11 March 2026	25 March 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 3:** Our community cannot wait another 2 years for action, lives, safety and community wellbeing are at stake. Will Council act now or continue to wait?	Progression will be subject to prioritisation and Council approval as part of the annual budget process.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 1:** We are told there is low usage on the path, how was that conclusion made?	Site visits were conducted in order to undertake a visual assessment of usage. Although some tracks were present, they did not indicate frequent informal use of the route.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 2:** Has anyone verified the City of Fremantles own data? We've got a bike counter right next to that site and there's a photo of it in the attachments.	The bike counter collected data on usage for the existing path and does not measure informal usage on the subject site. The bike counter was vandalised and has been out of use since 2024.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 3:** Where are the easier and more direct entrances mentioned throughout the report?	Page 66 of the report shows the alternate routes to the shopping complex.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 4:** Will the addition of a bike path increase illegal camping and dumping issues or how will it?	The area has limited visibility and has minimal lighting and surveillance.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 5:** Why was the first pillar of the cities strategic community plan not considered in the report particularly the connected city objectives?	Officers' assessment responded to a specific proposal and examined its viability in the context of the site.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 6:** How was it concluded that there was no demand for additional pedestrian route?	
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 7:** How was limited anticipated use determined?	
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 8:** How much vegetation will actually be cleared?	It is unknown how much vegetation will be cleared until the design is completed.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 9:** How does the path have the potential to facilitate antisocial behaviour?	The area has limited visibility and has minimal lighting and surveillance.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 10:** Has the Council used its own data from its own bike counter on the footbath to verify the independent report?	The City considered data collected from the bicycle counter near the site however given it has been out of service since 2024, it was a reference point only. It is also noted the bike counter collected data on usage for the existing path and does not measure informal usage on the subject site.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 11:** Has the Fremantle BUG been consulted?	No the City has not consulted the BUG, however the City welcomes the BUG's feedback on the matter.
25 March 2026	8 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 12:** Why has future use of the area been overlooked?	The Lease includes a redevelopment provisions, allowing the City to consider the site for an alternate use in the future.
8 April 2026	22 April 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	**Question 1:** Does the council actually do any research before approving the installation of 5G towers or just blindly rely on what ARPANSA says is safe?	These facilities are regulated under Commonwealth legislation, specifically the Telecommunications Act, with health and safety standards set by the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Authority (ARPANSA) as the independent national expert body. The City is not able to assess, approve or refuse applications regarding the transmission component of this type of infrastructure. ARPANSA can be contacted via its website with contact details available at www.arpansa.gov.au
13 May 2026	13 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Can the City provide a copy of the arborist report that determined the tree had reached end of life? 2. Was more than one arborist assessment obtained, and if not, why not given the size and significance of the tree? 3. What alternative options were considered prior to removal (e.g. root zone remediation, permeable treatments, design adjustments)? To what extent were these considered, e.g. meetings/ reports? 4. As this project is part-funded by Main Roads WA (MRRG), can the City confirm: o whether any portion of the tree removal was co-funded, and o if not, how costs were separated from the roadworks budget? 5. Will the City commit to publishing arborist reports for significant tree removals to improve transparency?	The City has been monitoring the health and decline of the Moreton Bay Fig Tree (Duoro/South) for a number of years. In 2023 - the City's Parks and Reserves team developed a tree management plan. This was implemented and monitored through until 2025. Unfortunately, the tree continued to decline; the subsequent arborist report in (Feb 2025) observed the decline and reducing crown and from a health and safety / risk perspective, recommended a number of significant (unsafe) limbs be removed. Given the treatments and the ongoing declining health, the City made the decision to remove the tree in accordance with the City's Policy. This to include replacement with a number of trees in a planting succession plan. The tree removal was not done as part of the Duoro Rd project, and all tree related works were paid for by the City. The City would not normally release consultancy reports of this nature to the community.
13 May 2026	13 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	Can you please justify the increase in the differential rate for the Short Term Rental rate payers while the other differential rates for commercial and residential have gone down?	The City has identified a number of residential properties being used for unhosted short-term accommodation, which has been primarily commercial in nature. The rate in the dollar has been set to better reflect that use and the higher cost in servicing that use.
13 May 2026	27 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Will the City confirm it is aware that the area known in the proposed Policy as the City triangle belongs to the St John's Church and ensure the City abides fully by the terms of its lease? 2 Guarantee that the history and significance of the Church in that City triangle is protected and not defaced?	Yes. Adoption of LPP3.1 is a 'tidying up' of old planning policies to better guide future development across the City and has no impact regarding land ownership or Lease. The City will maintain terms of a lease agreement. This is covered in the current draft lease agreement recently developed and discussed with the Church. It would also be covered by heritage legislation.
13 May 2026	27 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Does the City intend to change its processes so that information on possible regulated trees is investigated? Does the City intend to mandate inspection of any new area which is newly designated as high density before any Developer can take the felling of trees into their own hands? Does density automatically preclude all large trees? 2. Does the City intend to look at current regulations and penalties for noncompliance is adequate to stop actions like this?	The City continues to refine how the Regulated Tree policy is embedded into its processes and operations and always welcomes information from the community. The City does not undertake its own survey of privately owned land/sites following any re-zoning / up-coding. The City works with all applicants to try and retain mature trees as part of the planning process (even though some land designated as high density falls outside of the Regulated Tree Policy). Infringement levels for non-compliance are pre-set under the Planning Regulations. The Courts determine level of fines for cases that are subject to prosecution.
27 May 2026	27 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. What is the City doing to actively communicate LPP 2.26 to residents? 2. Mr Mayor, would you consider promoting the Tree Retention Policy regularly on your Facebook page over the coming months? 3. Could the City consider a visible public notice about the Tree Retention Policy, such as a half-page advertisement in the Herald? 4. Would the City of Fremantle consider establishing its own register of AQF5 arborists, so that only appropriately qualified reports are accepted? 5. Could the Council consider strengthening the replacement planting requirement from a 2:1 ratio to a 3:1 ratio, to better support long-term canopy growth. Where this cannot be achieved on-site, council the equivalent contribution be directed into a dedicated greening fund, to support planting by groups with limited capacity to do so?	Response by Mayor Ben Lawver: I manage my own social media as they are my personal pages. Tree canopy is important to me, and I commit to making posts to share the City's Tree Canopy Policy, however I have to say it will happen eventually. Response by the Director Planning, Place and Urban Development: The Local Planning Policy 2.26 is currently under review and has been out for public consultation, along with the Significant Tree Register which is an older policy. The City is happy to take the comments raised and consider them as part of the analysis. The policy is expected to come back to Council for further consideration in July or August.
27 May 2026	27 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. The road safety audit was clearly completed to ensure safe movement of vehicles but doesn't mention pedestrian safety. Do the auditors have any experience and credentials in pedestrian movement or are they just traffic engineers? 2. The Safety Audit team conducted the site visit at 4:30pm and 7:15pm on a Monday, likely the quietest time of the week. How has the current situation been assessed for pedestrian movement and safety? 3. Is the loss of 2 parking bays on the western side of South Tce offset by an additional parking bay on the eastern side? 4. The recent resurfacing works have increased the hard surface area around the roundabout, particularly on the northwest corner. Can the City of Fremantle ensure planting and urban greening are prioritised during infrastructure and concrete projects and address this here?	The locations of pedestrian crossing points are assessed and proposed based on providing safe crossing points at pedestrian desire lines. The number and spacing of pedestrian priority crossings such as zebras or wombat crossings are subject to Main Roads standards and approval and require a wider strategy. The auditor does look at the whole street, and officers will actively engage with Main Roads in respect to this. The road safety audit was carried out by an independent, fully qualified professional. Traffic engineering road safety audits are carried out to assess the situation in respect to all traffic which actually includes pedestrians and cyclists. So pedestrian safety, movement and their interfaces are all part of the assessment. Congestion and movement of vehicles are considered during the audits as they have a direct impact on pedestrian and cyclist safety. The City understood the audit time was scheduled during a busy period, but the City would be happy to have a look at that and see what the sort of levels of traffic flow being assessed were. The Council have chosen the option to move forward with the proposed full width wombat crossing at Douro Road. In line with that considerations on congestions, accidents and sight lines will remain important, and risks do still exist; but subject to the endorsed proposal, community feedback, and final Council approval of the design, officers will engage with Main Roads to seek approval and Main Roads will consider these aspects as part of their assessment. Should a crossing be installed at the proposed location, there would be a requirement to lose two parking bays. The demand on South Terrace for parking would need to be looked at and the City would consider offsetting the loss of bays by investigating opportunities on the opposite side of the road. The City's intention is to soften the streetscape with planting trees and roadside furniture. The extent and the location of soft landscaping is subject to final decisions on the proposed raised crossings and the approved locations. Design works will follow and in doing that the City will try and ensure safe sight lines and paths of travel are maintained. The City acknowledge that the busier locations. The connection points and the key desire lines along South Terrace and Marine Terrace will absolutely inform preferred priority locations for crossing points.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
27 May 2026	27/05/2026 / 10 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. My questions on notice last week weren't in the minutes or the agenda when I handed those papers in, so I seek clarification on that? 2. Why is the council using this draft local law to enforce an aggressive high penalty compliance framework on suburban households for wanting the exact same operational simplicity that the West End has? 3. Given that the West End ratepayers are built on a compounding rate base that includes the cost of the regional FOGO framework, why have many of these properties never physically received their third organic bin that they are charged for? 4. Why is the city continuing to calculate waste service charges to a compounding percentage based on property valuation formulas which forces two households putting out the exact same amount of trash to pay wildly differing fees entirely based on their assets value rather than shifting to a transparent equitable flat fee utility fee? 5. In relation to Containers for Change, why does the city insist on burning ratepayers funds to protect a bloated loss-making municipal operation instead of offloading the service to a weathered grassroots community charity such as the scouts who would run it with minimal overheads while ensuring the 10 cent deposit are given directly back into their own youth programs? 6. From my questions last meeting, what is the rate percentage and why hasn't it been released?	Response by Mayor Ben Lawver: The draft Waste Local Law is going out for public comment, so there will be plenty of time for the public to submit their feedback. Questions that are asked during public question time are included in the minutes or the next agenda. You have received an email reply to the questions that you submitted separately. Response by the Director Infrastructure: The intent of the draft Waste Local Law is for the City to is to modernise the recycling and waste collection practices, which is really important to the City. The City's primary objective is to be good at waste management and we do that through commitment to recycling and waste education, which are our primary tools. Infringement will be a last resort. The roll out of FOGO has progressed in phases and the coverage across the City is roughly 95%. The last remnants of areas that are still on the tubing system from a residential perspective are purely logistical challenges in difficult access areas. But the education team is still working with those properties. In relation to waste service charges, the City has not charged a separate rubbish charge for many years. One advantage of this approach is that pension holders can claim a rebate on their rate charge, whereas rubbish charges are not able to be claimed for rebate. The state government has considered mandating that rubbish charges are separated from rates in the future, the City will consider this further when it is required to do so. The containers for change program is currently managed through the City and is managing to break-even or make a small surplus. Response by the Director City Business The draft 2026/27 budget proposes a 5.5% increase in revenue generated by rates. It is intended the increase remains in line with or close to CPI which at the time that proposed differential rates were advertised was estimated to be 5.5% as at 30 June 2026.
27 May 2026	10 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. What has changed in the past two years for the administration to completely reverse its recommendation for the council and committee structure? 2. In view of the uncertainty and inconvenience to members of the community of possibly and unpredictably having to attend both committee and council meetings on a single issue, why has there been no community consultation on this important matter? 3. Given that papers would have to be prepared and other arrangements made for two committee and one council meetings per month under the new proposed option, why does the report state that there are no financial costs of the now proposed change?	The City and Council regularly review the most appropriate processes for Council to undertake when considering and making decisions. The process for the decision making needs to be appropriate and effective for council as much as the public. Currently, the Council considers it appropriate to move to a committee system to enable adequate consideration, discussion and review of Council reports for decision making.
27 May 2026	27 May 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Can the city provide certainty to the Fremantle City Dockers Junior Football Club that the 2027 season will not impacted by the delays to the pavilion and oval, and give me the confidence to assure our members that we'll be back at Dick Lawrence for round one 2027?	The City can commit to the dates that were provided in the tender and assure you that the City are pushing really hard to secure the tender and the subsequent works for the rest of the thriving suburbs program. It is tight, but the City will look at the dates and get in contact with you and the club to confirm.
10 June 2026	10 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.In Town Teams surveys, who were the 60 people consulted about their crossing experiences at the South Terrace / Douro Rd roundabout? 2.Where exactly do the survey sample live and for how long have they lived there? 3.How much of the Town Teams grant was allocated to collect this data? What's the exact figure, please? 4.Has there ever been a serious accident at this roundabout? 5.What is the date of your traffic automatic traffic count? 6.Will you be conducting an up-to-date ATC on all directions of the roundabout? 7.The ADT speed approach of 85% at the Eastern Douro Rd approach to the roundabout, being 46.68km/hr. Is this particularly fast, given that no speed humps are in place, fast enough to justify switching the pedestrian crossings to the western side? 8.Do we have data on all other sides of the roundabout? If not, why not? 9.Will you be placing traffic counts any time soon?	The Town Teams survey was conducted independently of the City in December 2025, and we do not have those details available to us. Regarding the traffic crash data, over the last five years there have been 15 recorded incidents. These figures are comparable to those at other roundabouts. The last physical traffic count was conducted on Douro Road in February 2026. These counts were taken at midblock locations along Douro Road, not immediately adjacent to the roundabout, and should therefore be considered representative of speeds at the roundabout entries rather than at pedestrian crossing locations. We do, however, have information on all sides of the roundabout through various other measures, including physical counts and GPS-recorded vehicle speeds. Other comments raised related to pedestrian priority crossing points. These locations will be finalised following consultation. There have been no physical changes to these at present. The existing rubber speed cushions on the approaches have been removed to allow resurfacing works to occur and will be replaced with permanent asphalt treatments. All approaches will have permanent traffic calming measures installed following the completion of the works.
10 June 2026	24 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.Will the Council formally acknowledge that the fatal pedestrian accident used to justify "urgent pedestrian interventions" did not happen at the South Terrace roundabout where the trees are marked for removal, and explain why they community is being given a false choice between pedestrian safety and heritage canopy retention? 2.In the interest of financial cultural responsibility to Fremantle ratepayers, will the Council disclose the full business case and risk assessment profile for the J Shed eviction plan or admit the council is sacrificing proven cultural assets for an uncosted unverified ideological agenda?	The City's consideration of pedestrian improvements at the Douro Road / South Terrace intersection has been based on site-specific traffic, pedestrian movement and safety assessments relevant to that location. A fatal pedestrian incident has not been incorporated into, nor has it formed part of, officers' assessment or justification for the proposed works at the Douro Road / South Terrace intersection. There is a record of a fatal pedestrian incident on Douro Road (September 2022) near the Hampton Road intersection. Officers are not aware of a fatal pedestrian incident at the Douro Road / South Terrace intersection. Existing tenants are all eligible to apply for a lease under the EOI process. In accordance with a previous Council resolution, the City has been developing a management plan to guide the revitalisation of the Manjaree area. The plan provides a framework for the planning, operation and ongoing management of the precinct. The plan has been informed by the recent community engagement findings and incorporates findings from the benchmarking of comparable cultural precincts across Australia and internationally, and identifies site-wide infrastructure needs, along with an assessment of existing facilities and natural area management.
10 June 2026	24 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.This situation with the J Sheds, who is driving it? Is it officers or is it Council? 2.Are we taking the right track going this way releasing these longstanding tenants? 3.Why is the city not doing something to house the homeless?	The item discussed at council regarding an EOI process over units in the Manjaree / Arthur's Head area was in response to community consultation. Existing tenants are all eligible to apply for a lease under the EOI process. The City is in constant contact with State and not for profit agencies to assist in support services and housing.
24 June 2026	24 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Is the engagement report interactive map data? 2. Before relying on interactive map data as evidence, does the city assess it for duplicate or repeat participation, common addresses, businesses, or email accounts of a similar name? 3. If desire lines are the route people take most naturally and frequently, why is pedestrian traffic being shifted from naturally occurring eastern design lines to the lesser used west? 4. Is this wise when we have only had one pedestrian minor crash at the roundabout over the last 5 years? 5. Does changing design lines create unforeseen safety risks? 6. Why is the west being described as the pedestrian design line when the available data is indicative otherwise?	In terms of My Say, the interactive mapping is used as a fact-finding tool that supports data collection and informs the consultation process. For our online surveys, officers will flag where multiple entries are observed with similar names and email addresses, and this will be taken into consideration during the development of the reporting. Regarding your question on desire lines, the City is not seeking to shift pedestrian movements or routes. While pedestrian surveys have recorded higher crossing volumes on the eastern leg of the roundabout, movements were reasonably balanced. The proposal to include a formal pedestrian crossing facility must also consider a range of additional factors, including traffic volumes, vehicle movement, sight distances, accessibility, cycling, bus movements, and compliance with Main Roads data. The eastern side of the roundabout carries higher traffic volumes and presents a number of operational and geometric constraints, which make that location more problematic and challenging for a pedestrian crossing. As a result, the preferred location should a crossing be implemented, is on the western leg. This has been identified based on the balance of all relevant engineering considerations. In terms of safety risks, any proposed changes to pedestrian crossing locations are carefully assessed to ensure they do not introduce unacceptable risks. As part of the design process, pedestrian and vehicle movements, sight distances, and accessibility requirements are all considered. The intent is not to create new conflict points, but rather to achieve the most appropriate balance between safety, accessibility, and compliance. The proposal has undergone a thorough review by an independent road safety analyst and has also been reviewed by the engineering design team.
24 June 2026	24 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Has the city assessed the full environment value of the northern trees including their potential contribution to the blacktail cockatoos habitat and food sources and how long it would take for replacement plantings to provide the same benefits?	No environmental assessment has been carried out on those northern trees. We would, of course, be reluctant to remove any trees and acknowledge that all trees provide amenity, environmental, and habitat benefits. If it is deemed necessary for the purpose of creating a crossing, our Parks team would aim to replant with endemic and native species where appropriate, to help minimise the impact. However, it is acknowledged that it will take time to mitigate that impact.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
24 June 2026	24 June 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Given these 118 year-old Norfolk Island pines predate the motor car, why do these trees not qualify for heritage value under the council's own register of significant trees? 2. On the independently commissioned Shawmac safety report, the recommendation was to remove trees that impact the site distance at the pedestrian crossing. Given this report fails to evidence that the trunk of these trees do indeed block the sight lines. I'm wondering when that process will occur?	In respect to the Significant Tree Register, this is a planning policy that relates to trees on lots of private land. Trees situated within the road reserve are managed in accordance with the City's Trees on Managed or Owned Land Policy. Where trees do unfortunately need to be impacted, we will endeavour to replace them at a minimum ratio of two to one. In terms of the road safety assessment, the independent assessment did include a sightline survey, and a subsequent survey was also carried out by the City's design engineers. It is reasonably clear that the trunks of the Norfolk Island pines do obscure sightlines, and we are confident that this risk would need to be addressed in accordance with the parameters set by Main Roads in respect to sightlines.
8 July 2026	8 July 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1. Could the City please advise the budget allocation for the APACE Native Plant Subsidy Scheme in 2024–25, 2025–26 and 2026–27? 2. Given the Fremantle allocation of the APACE Subsidy Scheme sells out well before the advertised closing date due to strong community demand, has Council considered increasing allocation in future budgets so more residents can participate, or use alternative sources, such as Trillion Trees? 3. Has the City benchmarked its funding for the APACE Subsidy Scheme against neighbouring local governments who participate, and if not, would it consider doing so before preparing next year's budget? 4. Has this year's budget allocated any funding to progress Council's review of the Significant Tree Register, including any scientific or arborist assessment required to strengthen the register? 5.Given the Urban Forest Plan fell behind partly because of operational capacity and resourcing, what new investment in this year's budet is specifically aimed at accelerating canopy growth and helping Fremantle try to move closer to our 20% target and to neighbouring councils who have already achieved around 20% canopy cover? 6.Of the existing trees that meet the Significant Tree criteria, approximately how many are there across the City, and how much funding is allocated in this year's budget to administer, assess, monitor and maintain the Significant Tree Register?	The City has increased the budget for the Apace Subsidised Plants Scheme from approximately $15,000 in previous years to $34,000 in 2026/27 and this has been in response to the high community demand. Last year the City subsidised approximately 8,000 plants and this year the City will subsidise approximately 11,000 plants. The City does monitor demand and Council can review and updae the budget as part of the annual budget process. The City does not benchmark itself against other Councils but this could be considered in the future. The Significant Tree Register relates to trees on private land and any advice and support is managed internally and does not require a budget. The City has increased the focus and resources into our urban forest program. The aftercare program has improved significantly and tree survival. The Significant Tree Register Policy is currently being reviewed and will be presented to July's Ordinary Council Meeting for adoption.
8 July 2026	8 July 2026	Strategic and General Services	1. Now, the 'preferred' option includes: " a major mixed use development opportunity incorporating residential, commercial and education uses,... to be delivered by an external partner and not assessed for feasibility in this business case". However, the agenda report states that "Long-term development opportunities... have been identified with a majority short-stay accommodation development modelled within the Business Case as a leasing revenue opportunity". Which statement is correct? 2. How have the risk factors been addressed in the Business case? 3. Why has the Fremantle community not been acknowledged as a stakeholder in the business case?	The residential and commercial component of the business case is obviously a supplementary stage to the initial redevelopment proposal and has been proposed to happen sometime into the future. It could be student accommodation, residential, or purely commercial, this has not been decided. Risk factors have been included the business case and the need to change the MRS will occur at the stage where the City might need to change the purpose of the Oval into the future. In the past, Council has discussed with the State government on whether a piece of that land should be carved out and provided into ownership, either with Council or another State entity. At the moment, it is a reserve for the purpose of sport and recreation. The market research you referred to, was only received by the City on Monday evening and put in as a late supplementary document so that Council could see some of the results of that market research.
12 August 2026	12 August 2026	Strategic and General Services	Youth Strategy – The City will be doing smaller Pride events and I would like to know if youth will be involved, particularly engaging sexual and general diverse young people in the planning for programs and events. The City has contacted all stakeholders involved with the event regarding the cancellation to discuss alternative planning for 2026. The City will promote Pride month events through our social channels. Why was the funding was pulled? Was the discontinuation of funding due to the Department of Communities rejecting the funding or was the discontinuation of funding due to the City not continuing to seek that funding. Or another alternative option?	The City is planning a number of events over that month at various venues. The program will include youth focus events and opportunities for people to engage with Pride month over those 4 weeks. The City has contacted all stakeholders involved with the event regarding the cancellation to discuss alternative planning for 2026. The City will promote Pride month events through our social channels. The City did apply for funding from the Department of Communities. Unfortunately, the City did not get the funding for this year's event.
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	The amphitheatre project commenced in 2002, and I was a member of the design committee. The facility was completed in 2004, and we were able to host three very successful performances in the space before it was subsequently closed. Is there any opportunity to move this project forward?	The project and its delivery phasing can be reviewed by Council as part of the annual budget process.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Despite a 54% increase in annual rate revenue, why does the LTFP forecast six years of operating losses, and will Council publish those results both including and excluding depreciation? 2. What is the complete ten year cost of Hilton Park, what is the ultimate source of the City's $3.75m contribution, and which stages are funded or grant dependent? 3. If the anticipated $25m in asset sale proceeds is not realised, what projects, services or reserves will be deferred or reduced? 4. Will Council amend clause 2.1(i) and require arborist assessments, removal justifications, design alternatives and replacement plan to be published before approving projects affecting significant public trees?	In relation to the transport question, at this point in time the City has not received a response other than advice that the matter is still being considered. Part of Council's comments on this item tonight will feed back into that process, and the City will keep the community informed of any updates. At this stage, the Commission has not committed to a date for the item to go through its committees and, as previously advised, the matter has been delayed while it awaits feedback from the City and the community. In relation to the confidential submissions, when the Commission forwarded those through in August last year, it was for preliminary comment from the City. When the City is asked for comment, there are delegations in place that allow officers to provide those comments. However, the City understands this is an important community issue, so the submissions were also provided to Council for its consideration and comment. As they were not City documents and had been provided on a confidential basis, the City was not able to make them publicly available. The LTFP clearly identifies the various areas of revenue and expenditure within the document. Audited operating results will be published in accordance with this. The City's 10-year plan currently includes a forecast estimate of approx. $21m for the central and southern sections of Hilton Park. No funding is yet secured against these forecasts. The current northern section has a $3.75m municipal funding contribution. A further $3.75m is grant-funded. This asset disposal relates to the sale of the current operations centre. Any proceeds will be used to fund costs for the proposed new operations centre and Investment Reserve. The City's Parks and Landscapes team use arborists and consultants to provide expert advice on any City proposal for tree removal. This is undertaken prior to the commencement of projects. The outcome of these assessments are provided within project plans. Therefore, there is no need for amendment to 2.1(i).
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Why have you not adhered to the Place Plan in terms of less turf and more canopy? 2. Why can't you give us a dedicated walking area under the trees? Why does this Council appear to cater only to the sports teams?	The project was developed to accommodate a range of users and focuses on both active and passive recreational pursuits. The relevant considerations and action items identified through the Place Plan are being addressed through the development and implementation of the Master Plan and the proposed works. In relation to the functionality of the junior oval space, it has been designed to cater for dog walkers and includes fencing, as well as paths and walkways. One of the key objectives of both the Place Plan and the Master Plan was to improve permeability throughout Hilton. The space, facilities and environment have been developed to accommodate a range of users.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.Can Council please confirm the total area of the junior oval currently proposed for construction? 2.Can Council confirm whether the mapped area the community walked around includes the entire construction footprint required to deliver the oval, including the recommended 3-metre runoff areas, earthworks, boundary fencing, lighting, drainage, spectator areas and coaching areas? 3.Will Council commit to providing the community with an updated tree impact plan showing the complete construction footprint of the junior football oval so that the full extent of the proposed works and their impact on existing mature trees can be clearly understood? 4.Can Council maintain the halt on proceedings until the community has had time to consider any new findings?	The dimensions of the junior oval are 96 metres by 76 metres, including provision for runoff areas. Those dimensions were marked out on the ground during the site visit conducted the other week. The marked area included provision for grading and levels, and the 26 trees previously identified are those affected by the construction of the works. There are no plans to extend beyond that area or impact any additional trees.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Can all options considered in the more extensive options analysis be presented and released for public review, including the reasons they were not considered further? 2. Considering the objections raised by large parts of the local community, as represented at meetings last Wednesday, last Friday and again tonight, regarding the construction of the junior oval at the Dick Lawrence Ovals, which is Council's preferred location and would result in the removal of a significant number of mature trees, will the City of Fremantle revisit all options to determine whether a more suitable location for the junior football oval can be identified?	A number of options were initially explored and were refined to six scenarios, which were documented and considered by the reference groups. The reference groups reviewed those six options and developed proposals. Some of the Master Plan options included junior AFL ovals, while others focused on ecological outcomes, had a soccer focus, or provided a more balanced approach. The more balanced option was identified by the reference group as the preferred scenario and was subsequently developed through the Master Plan process. These options were tested with community groups and members of the community. Feedback on the preferred scenario has generally been positive, and it is the option that has been used for community engagement. As part of the analysis, the Master Plan considered the whole of Hilton Park, although the current proposal relates only to Stage 1, being the northern section of the park. Analysis was undertaken regarding usage, including soccer, the Kennel Field and other areas of the park. This option was considered to represent the best compromise outcome, having regard to the feedback received from the various stakeholder groups.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Did the final Hilton Park Precinct Master Plan reflect what the community was consulted on and what they were told? 2. Approximately when did the City become aware that the preferred design would require the removal of a substantial number of established trees, and when was this disclosed to the community? 3. Can the City provide the total expenditure on Hilton Park consultation and community engagement undertaken during 2023 and 2024, and any other relevant years, broken down by consultant, provider and financial year? This should exclude costs associated with master planning, design, engineering, technical studies and construction, and include any engagement costs paid directly or indirectly through Realm Studios, Shape Urban, or any other consultant or subconsultant involved in community engagement.	The engagement process was considered comprehensive and was undertaken in accordance with the City's Engagement Policy. The potential impact on trees was discussed at working group meetings throughout the process. However, the extent of any tree impacts could not be fully defined until the later stages of developing the preferred scenario through the Master Plan process. The City has committed to continuing to refine and review the design to minimise impacts on trees wherever possible and has sought to do so throughout the project. This approach will continue during the detailed design and construction phases, with the contractor being challenged to minimise the project footprint and impacts on existing trees. The proposed tree removals are also proposed to be offset through the significant tree planting commitments included as part of the project. The financial questions have been taken on notice. For the master planning and engagement phase of the project, the budget provision for consultant fees was $200,000. This included sub-consultants for community engagement whose fee was $53,000.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. What discussions and decisions occurred during the four months between the endorsed Place Plan and the final Master Plan that resulted in the significant changes to the area being discussed today? Who participated in those discussions? 2. Can the City provide the minutes, project team records, consultant advice, or other documentation recording how those decisions were reached? 3. The Master Plan received only 22 responses. Was that low response rate identified and discussed by the project team, consultants, administration or Council? 4. Did anyone question whether a response rate of approximately 0.05% of the Fremantle population provided sufficient confidence to proceed with a redevelopment of this scale and cost, being nearly $8 million? If it was discussed, can the City provide a record of those discussions? If it was not discussed, why was such a low participation rate not considered significant? 5. Three earlier stages of the Hilton Park engagement process used up to five different methods of disseminating information and seeking community participation. Why were the Place Plan and Master Plan stages subsequently communicated primarily through MySay? Who made that decision and why? 6. According to the City's Annual Report, MySay had 2,800 registered users in 2022-23. Of those registered users, how many were residents or ratepayers of Hilton, Beaconsfield or the City of Fremantle? 7. Noting that registration for MySay is also open to people outside the City, was any assessment undertaken or discussion held regarding whether MySay alone would provide a sufficiently broad or representative sample of residents for the Place Plan and Master Plan consultations? If such an assessment occurred, can the City provide it?	Place Plans are not spatial plans, they are early ideas and goals gathered from community engagement that provide a vision statement. Masterplans build on Place Plans. These were developed through engagement to provide a city / consultant-balanced spatial and temporal early layout for a site. A Masterplan serves as a flexible framework to facilitate design development rather than as a rigid, unchangeable blueprint. Design development has been progressed by City officers and will be refined and finalised by the successful contractor. Appendix E of the Engagement Report (which is published online) includes all relevant working group meeting minutes. It is the go-to record for decisions made. Final endorsements and decisions made by Council are available in the published Council Agendas and Minutes. These documents are also available on MySay. The Master Plan received 22 comments, which was felt to be a good indication of progress. The reach and extent of engagement was more substantial. A full list of engagement activities and the number of people engaged is available in the Engagement Report. MySay is only one form of engagement. There were other opportunities to engage. Participants' feedback was captured and recorded. The Working Group, which met regularly, also included members of the community. When it comes to how the City conducts community engagement, it is important not to just take one metric over another, but to view all activities and engagements as contributing to the overall picture. Engagement reports are an important part of the information that goes to Council, which makes the final decision on projects. Updates on the Hilton Park Masterplan have been communicated through the City's MySay page and through its other communications channels extensively. The City will continue to utilise these channels for future updates. MySay is one of the ways in which the City conducts community engagement. It is designed to gather feedback on projects, plans or proposals, which then assist Council in making decisions. MySay is not, in and of itself, a decision-making tool. The power to make decisions rests with Council. People who participate in the City's community engagement activities, either on MySay or in-person, are not required to register or reveal where they live or whether they are ratepayers or not. As the MySay database has grown substantially since 2022-23, it is no longer possible to extract data regarding residential or ratepayer status from that year. MySay is used as a tool to assist Council in its decision-making. Engagement reports typically indicate where respondents live, if respondents choose to disclose that information. In addition to MySay, officers and Elected Members also engage with the community on projects in person or through correspondence. A full list of engagement activities and the number of people engaged is available Engagement Report for the Hilton Park project.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Given the grant's explicit timeline constraints, has this resulted in the City of Fremantle needing to fast-track the junior oval development, which is tied to the Stage 1 works, at the cost of significant mature tree loss and without proper consultation, as has been discussed in detail tonight? 2. My second question relates to the requirements and strict deliverables attached to the Commonwealth funding of $3.75 million, which the City of Fremantle must match dollar for dollar. While the deliverables include native green spaces, social connection and community cohesion, has this significant funding influenced the City's emphasis on catering for the tenant clubs? 3. Has the potential income stream from tenant clubs contributed to the City's decision to increase the footprint allocated to tenants at the cost of retaining mature trees?	It is worth noting that the objective of the Thriving Suburbs Program is to increase community participation in both active and passive recreation, with a particular focus on inclusive and gender-neutral facilities and supporting increased participation in women's sport. This has been a key consideration for the City in working with tenant clubs and other stakeholders throughout the planning process. The City will continue to engage with the funding body and ensure that all project timelines and milestones are appropriately managed. The project has not been fast-tracked and has proceeded in accordance with the established program. The tree removal preparatory works were initiated as scheduled to support delivery of Stage 1 of the project, being the northern section of the park, noting that the City has commenced with an asbestos-related pre-works package.
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. I request that Council provide a tree protection plan prepared by a qualified consulting arborist that clearly shows the actual impact of the proposed works on the mature trees within the area. There are a number of very large mature trees on the edge of the proposed development site and, in my professional opinion, their retention may be incompatible with the current plan. Can this information be provided to the community before the works commence?	The City engaged a professional Consultant who provided a comprehensive Environmental Management Plan, which is available on the City's website. This includes advice on trees, flora and fauna – this document will guide and inform final design parameters and contractor works.
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Could Council provide the total line-item cost to ratepayers for removing the 26 mature trees, including stump grinding, and outline how the loss of an estimated 1,000 years of combined tree growth is reflected in the City's asset registers? Can Council state what formal impact study was undertaken regarding the impact on local birdlife, specifically the loss of mature roosting canopy, foraging sites and tree hollows used by urban species? What will happen to the trees if they are ultimately removed? 2. Regarding the local arborist bidding and quoting process, was the tree removal contract awarded through an open and competitive quotation process? Were Fremantle or other local arborist companies given the opportunity to quote for the work? How many companies submitted quotations or tenders before the contract was finalised? 3. Given that heavy machinery and stump grinding can disturb ground containing asbestos materials, what air quality monitoring will the City require around the perimeter fencing and in response to changing wind directions affecting neighbouring residential streets, including Lefroy Road and Carrington Street? Will the daily monitoring logs prepared by the independent occupational hygiene monitor be published to allow the public to review and verify the results?	The initial costs for tree removal were estimated at approx. $35,000. This is subject to variation and amendment. The City has completed an Environmental Management Plan, which is available on the City's website. The City will seek to reuse as much material as possible. Suitable hardwood trees may be retained for use as nature play elements, habitat logs for local fauna, or future landscaping projects within the City of Fremantle. Material not suitable for reuse may be converted into mulch and used on-site to support revegetation, suppress weeds, improve soil health, and assist with dust control. The works will progress via Parks and Landscapes tendered supplier. FCC605/22. It was awarded July 2022. The City has engaged a suitably qualified professional asbestos removal contractor. All relevant and necessary monitoring and management provisions will be in place for the duration of the works.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. What form and condition is the asbestos in? 2. If the clearing goes ahead, are there better methods that could be used, such as a double tent, extractor fans with HEPA filters, surrounding misters and sprinklers operating 24 hours a day? 3. Will Hilton and Beaconsfield residents be given advance notice of the clearing dates and the proposed duration of the works? 4. Will there be a large exclusion zone to prevent walkers and other park users from accidental exposure? 5. Will there be air quality monitoring undertaken during the works?	The City is acutely aware of asbestos and the risks associated with it. The removal and management of asbestos will be closely monitored throughout the works, and the contractor engaged to undertake the work is highly qualified and experienced in asbestos management. The City is well aware of the controls that need to be implemented and how the works must be managed, and will continue to monitor and manage these requirements throughout the delivery of the project.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Relating to fauna protection if the project goes ahead, does the City acknowledge that it has no legal grounds to bypass standard environmental impact assessments under State and Federal legislation, namely the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 and the Commonwealth EPBC Act? 2. Has the City obtained formal environmental approvals to remove the trees that provide habitat for black cockatoos and boobook owls? 3. How has the City satisfied its due diligence in mapping the entire ecosystem associated with the 26 trees, ensuring that small native birds, such as honeyeaters that may be nesting in the lower canopy or understorey, are protected during the ground-level asbestos works? 4. Has the City calculated the cumulative impact of losing multi-species habitat that simultaneously supports top-order nocturnal predators, such as owls, and threatened seed-eating species, such as endangered black cockatoos? 5. How has the City justified excavating contaminated soil beneath 26 habitat trees, given that the excavation process risks mobilising asbestos fibres into the air, potentially contaminating bird hollows, the canopy, local wildlife and their insect food sources? Further, how has Council mitigated the risk of birds coming into contact with asbestos fibres and dispersing that material beyond the project site?	The City has completed an Environmental Management Plan for the site, which identifies the relevant risks, required precautions, legislative requirements, and the measures that need to be implemented to address them. The City has undertaken this work and will ensure those requirements are met. In relation to asbestos, as noted earlier, any works involving asbestos will be carried out in accordance with the applicable Australian standards, guidelines and regulatory requirements.
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. What would it take for Council to take back the two Electors' Meetings and adopt or initiate a plan and design that does not mean the removal of irreplaceable 70-year-old trees, which are not replaceable by replanting two more? 2. What would it take for Council to reconsider a decision that some believe has been determined by bureaucracy and would rather make a bad decision now, which is irreversible, than make the right one? 3. Does Council acknowledge that this, and other destruction of tree canopy in Fremantle, greatly contradicts the tree canopy retention policy that the Mayor himself designed, and that Fremantle residents had faith in Council to represent and uphold green city policy interests? 4. Does Council acknowledge concerns that this act, the perceived hypocrisy, the misleading information regarding the number of trees to be removed, and the lack of community engagement in decision-making, may not encourage the community to have faith in the current Council to make decisions on behalf of the many rather than the few? 5. How does Council respond to concerns raised by the 580 signatures collected over four days, and for those that cannot speak, including the birds, the trees and the environment? 6. What would it take for Council to go back and redesign the Master Plan in a way that would reinstate the feeling of trust the community had in Council? 7. When did public space become private enterprise?	Subject to the Motions from the Electors Meeting, Officers will prepare a report for Elected Members to consider at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 23 September 2026. The project plan for the Hilton Park Masterplan has provided tree replacement in accordance with the the policy which outlines the requirements of the planting replacement program when trees are required to be removed. More than twice as many trees will be planted than removed. The City conducted an extensive community engagement process for the Hilton Park project, which was well-documented and publicised widely. Decisions of Council are available in the published Council Agendas and Minutes. The Council has arranged a Special Electors Meeting for 15 September 2026. Hilton Park is classified a District Sports Space.
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. The Hilton Park Place Plan states, and I quote, "Reducing the amount of turf on site is an important part of ensuring the long-term resilience of Hilton Park." If reducing the amount of turf is an important part of the park's long-term resilience, how did we end up with a Master Plan that includes a new oval and more turf?	Final endorsements and decisions made by Council are available in the published Council Agendas and Minutes. The project will provide for better quality and better managed turf on the ovals. There is an overall reduction of turf, and increased mulching / revegetation and hydro zoning; this will reduce water usage (irrigation) and maintenance costs.
26 August 2026	26 August 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. Will you go back and review the proposal? Can we work together to find a solution that is mutually agreeable? There must be a solution to this, and it does not have to be a dichotomy between sport and non-sport users. My question is: will you help us find it?	An Electors' Meeting will be held, and a report arising from that meeting will be presented to Council for consideration. Council will then make a determination on the matter.
26 August 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1. When was it written in Council records that asbestos was in the ground that needed to be levelled for a planned oval? That, to me, seems a little counterproductive, to plan an oval where there are two mounds of asbestos which are safely contained at the moment. Was that asbestos removal included in the Master Plan? 2. What was the reason that four Councillors declared a disclosure of interest when voting on the Fremantle Oval development in November 2024 due to their football club memberships, and yet those same four Councillors did not declare an interest when voting for the Hilton Park Football Oval three months earlier? 3. How many of the 10 Councillors who voted in favour of the Master Plan in 2024 had a membership to a football club, or someone in their family did?	Through the master planning and design development process, site investigations identified the presence of the asbestos mound. It was only after investigations were undertaken at the preferred location that this was discovered. This information was then taken into account as the proposal was further developed and alternative options were considered. Elected Members are required to declare financial, proximity, and impartial interests in items presented to Council and Committee under the Local Government Act 1995 and Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021. An impartial interest does not require an Elected Member to leave the meeting for the discussion or vote of an item. It is at the Elected Member's discretion to declare an interest if relevant.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
23 September 2026	23 September 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.How does removing existing mature canopy satisfy the commitment to safeguard the existing canopy? 2.Can the City please report the actual canopy area being lost versus the projected canopy area being gained, rather than simply comparing 26 trees removed with 61 trees planted? 3.The endorsed Masterplan showed the junior oval at 80 × 60 metres. The current design is 96 × 76 metres, an increase of approximately 2,500 square metres, or 52%. How many of the 26 trees now proposed for removal would have been retained if the junior oval had remained at the endorsed 80 × 60 metre dimensions?	At this point in time the City have not measured the tree canopy against the specific 26 trees, nor has the City estimated the projected canopy against the 61 trees. This is anticipated to be completed as the City progress through the new tree planting program. One of the scenarios and the options did reference a junior oval at 80m x 60m. However, through refining the master plan for approval and through design development to meet junior AFL requirements for under twelves, the junior oval was confirmed at 96m x 76m including a 3m run off. Through that design development phase, sizing modifications on the junior oval were tested along with position realignment and orientation testing and these impact the number of trees differently and importantly had different implications on the ecological value of the trees that they may affect as well. The City has progressed with the current preferred alignment given the dimensions and the alignment in respect to the requirements of a junior oval and the City feel that that still provides the minimum impact on trees both in terms of numbers and values. Officers will present an update report at the upcoming Special Meeting of Council next week.
23 September 2026	28 October 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.Considering the place plan used for the face-to-face engagement is different to the master plan and that 22 responses falls far short of a representative sample of your residents, why didn't Council consider this low response as unrepresentative? 2.Why didn't council seek more feedback to ensure it moved forward with a real community mandate? Noting that community views of the place plan do not count as views on the master plan which now had an oval in it. 3.Please show me, not tell me, the metrics and assessment criteria that were used to decide to take half of the northeast corner of the park away from the recreation space users? 4.The need for more playing fields has been based on the projected growing numbers of formal sport and their needs for space. Where is the same consideration for residents recreation activities? By this I don't mean your idea to cram the recreation options of the master plan into the space that you plan to leave us. I mean why did you want to take this space away from us in the first place?	Community Engagement supported preparation of both a Place Plan and Master Plan for the Hilton Park Precinct. Its purpose was to involve existing users, surrounding community, sporting and community organisations, Aboriginal Elders, Elected Members and City staff in progressively defining the precinct's values, priorities, vision and future physical layout. Engagement was extensive, with activities running over four rounds from August 2023 until May 2024. When it comes to how the City conducts community engagement, it's important not to just take one metric over another, but to view all activities and engagements as contributing to the overall picture. Engagement reports are an important part of the information that goes to Council to assist it in its decision-making. Community members may choose to respond or comment if they wish, but are not required to do so. The number of individual responses at each point of the engagement process is not necessarily an indication of successful community engagement. It is the cumulative outcome that supports council decision making., The process from Place Plan to Masterplan developed how and where different elements of development would occur. As described in your q1 above, this was a cumulative and progressive conversation which led to the outcome. The conversation for a new junior oval was part of the community consultation process. The Masterplan looks to improve both passive and active recreational spaces at Hilton Park and improve amenity of both.
23 September 2026	28 October 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.In February 2023, Council was presented with a city report proposing the development of Hilton Park. That report revealed that before broader community engagement had even begun, the city had already consulted with sporting clubs to understand their needs. That consultation had been summarised in a desktop review prepared by the community development team. I've not been able to find that document online and I asked that it be made publicly available? 2.What action did the City's community engagement team take to the little community participation to the working group meetings?	The City has a Hilton Park Precinct Club Information Database, compiled by the Community Development team, which summarises each club's history, membership, facility use and consultation feedback gathered prior to broader community engagement. This is the document referenced in the February 2023 report. It contains some club-provided operational and contact information not intended for general publication. In addition to working group meetings, the City conducted extensive community consultation from August 2023 until May 2024. This included four rounds of engagement, which involved existing users, surrounding community, sporting and community organisations, and Aboriginal Elders in progressively defining the precinct's values, priorities, vision and future physical layout.
23 September 2026	28 October 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.Can you explain how there can be a reduction of turf if you add a junior oval size 96 x 76? Where is that turf going to be taken away from? 2.Regarding the Electors meeting, on your website it says Electors narrowly voted in favour of the original motion. There was a show of hands. There was no counting needing. Why is this referred to as a narrow win?	There will be a reduction in amount of general grass areas, which will be replaced with mulch and understory planting. The City's Communications Team published a summary of the Special Electors Meeting on the City's website on 16 September 2026: Special Electors' Meeting summary - City of Fremantle. The purpose of this statement was to provide the public with a summary and outcomes of the meeting. The motion moved by Mark Woodcock and seconded by Marija Vujcic at the Special Electors meeting was carried by a show of hands. The Presiding Person was satisfied that a majority of electors voted to adopt the motion.
23 September 2026	28 October 2026	Ordinary Meeting of Council	1.Will the Council supply us, or make it available, the Hilton Park asbestos removal health and safety plan and a detailed risk assessment that is proposed for the project?	Any works that the City engages with in respect to asbestos will be done with a licensed contractor and everything would be done in accordance with the health and safety requirements. The City will present more information on this matter in the report presented to Council at the upcoming Special Council Meeting.
29 September 2026	28 October 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.When this report repeatedly describes the engagement as extensive, by what measure? 2.What of this statement given to A Current Affair that 70% supported some tree removal. I'd appreciated an explanation on precisely how that statement was arrived at?	The City conducted extensive community consultation from August 2023 until May 2024. This included four rounds of engagement, which involved existing users, surrounding community, sporting and community organisations, and Aboriginal Elders in progressively defining the precinct's values, priorities, vision and future physical layout. The information is contained in the community engagement report presented to council in September, 2024, as part of the report seeking council endorsement of the Hilton Park Masterplan. The engagement report is a public report provided on the City's website. As previously advised, the City provided a short comment when requested by the program. This short comment did not include the reference you describe.
29 September 2026	28 October 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.In relation to the total $7.35m stage one budget, could the City please provide a comprehensive itemised breakdown? Specifically, what funding amounts have been allocated to supporting the following deliverables for which the thriving suburbs grant is actually awarded. These include AFL, cricket, basketball, biking, scootering, pump track, walking, pedestrian infrastructure, park lands and environment, culture and community. 2.Of the $7.35m grant, what exact $ amount is being allocated specifically to AFL infrastructure? 3.Can the City please provide projected costs for upgrades and maintenance to the existing oval, the construction and turfing of the entire new junior oval, the delivery of associated spectator shelters, and the hazard mitigation specifically regarding asbestos and asbestos containing material identification, management and removal on site? 4.Could the City please provide a clear breakdown showing how ratepayer funds are being portioned across the stage one works? 5.Would the City please provide a full copy of its August 2024 application submitted to the Australian government's thriving suburbs program for the Hilton Park stage one Northern Zone project, including any subsequent formal variations to the project scope, variables, budget, and itemised breakdown?	The total project budget is $8.622m. A breakdown of the funding sources is provided within the report. Regarding the remaining costs, the City has a tender item within this agenda. Whilst the City know what the key elements of the scope of works are, a precise break down of these costs cannot be provided until the Council have a decision and have appointed the contractor. The financial information is provided within the report provided in the council agenda. The City does not publish its applications for various grant funds.
29 September 2026	28 October 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.When voting tonight, how will Councillors distinguish between considering the motions actually passed by the Electors and voting on the officer's recommendations, where those recommendations materially differ from what the Electors requested?	The Council considers the information provided in the reports by officers and their understanding of the issues in making their decisions.
29 September 2026	29 September 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.Have you drafted conceptual design which consider and avoid known areas visited by the endangered black cockatoos?	The environmental management report does address the ecological considerations against the current proposed design. An ecologist will be in attendance to inspect and manage any fauna prior to and during any tree removal works. They will assist with any relocation, protection, or management as and when required.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Question	Response
29 September 2026	28 October 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.How did the definition of a district facility come about, and does that definition encompass local areas beyond the Fremantle area? 2.If its a local area, why have we allowed both clubs to grow beyond their supply chain, in order for us now to be considering an amenity that is growing also? 3.Is the adequacy of the small oval going to be adequate enough into the future if we allow unfitted growth of both of these clubs? 4.Has the Council made any determination of the demographics of these clubs to understand whether we're talking about local Fremantle families, or are we talking about non-Fremantle families due to the definition of "district"?	The definition of a District Facility (District Open Space) is based on the Western Australian Government's Classification Framework for Public Open Space (2012). Under both the State framework and the City of Fremantle's Public Open Space Strategy, a District Open Space is defined as an area principally designed to provide for organised formal sport, while also accommodating recreation and, in some cases, nature space. Users are expected to travel from surrounding suburbs or districts to access these facilities. The City does not cap club membership or participation growth. Growth at Hilton Park has tracked broader population and participation trends identified in the Public Open Space Strategy 2024-2034. As demand has increased, the City's response has been to invest in the site's capacity. The current and planned oval provision, including the new junior oval, is designed to meet identified demand based on current participation data. However, the City acknowledges that if club growth continues at current rates, further capacity constraints may emerge over time, including for the junior oval. Future adequacy will continue to be monitored through the City's ongoing sporting facility planning. The City has not undertaken a formal demographic or catchment analysis of club membership. Both clubs have informally provided residential information for their members, which indicates the majority reside in Fremantle and surrounding suburbs, consistent with Hilton Park's role as a district-level facility.
29 September 2026	28 October 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.Is there any information regarding the consultation process that took place in regards to the school ovals around the district? 2.How strong was this consultation?	The City has participated in the State Government process in relation to use of school facilities.
29 September 2026	28 October 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.If the masterplan goes ahead, can you confirm when works on that community area will begin? Will it happen alongside the oval development, or will we have to wait?	Stage 1 of the project includes sporting areas and passive areas on the north end of Hilton Park – as per the information and signage provided.
29 September 2026	29 September 2026	Special Meeting of Council	1.Is it possible to create some walking entries into the fences from the East and North sides within Hilton Park, and on the premier oval within the three sides of that, for dog walkers and to open up the space and increase flow?	At the current design stage, the City hasn't defined where any gaps or access points in a fence would be. That will be developed through detailed design. We'll take your feedback and pass it on to the design team in the final stages.