



Minutes

Annual General Meeting of Electors

Monday 5 February 2024 6pm



Table of Contents

1. Official opening, welcome and acknowledgment 2

2. Attendance 2

3. Annual Report 2

3.1 Presentation of the Annual Report 2

3.2 Public question time: Annual Report..... 2

3.3 Receival of the Annual Report14

4. Public question time: General.....14

5. Acceptance of Motions.....19

6. Closure24



1. Official opening, welcome and acknowledgment

The Mayor, Hannah Fitzhardinge declared the meeting open at 6:05pm and welcomed members of the public to the meeting.

2. Attendance

Ms Hannah Fitzhardinge	Mayor / Presiding Member
Mr Glen Dougall	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Matt Hammond	Director City Business
Mr Pete Stone	Director Creative Arts and Community
Mr Graham Tattersall	Director Infrastructure
Mr Russell Kingdom	Director Planning, Place and Urban Development
Ms Alida Ferreira	Manager Financial Services
Ms Melody Foster	Manager Governance
Mr David Settelmaier	Manager Strategic Communications and Stakeholder Relations
Ms Emily Groves	Media and Community Relations Advisor
Ms Gabrielle Woulfe	Meeting Support Officer

There were approximately 36 electors present at the meeting and 1 member of the press.

3. Annual Report

3.1 Presentation of the Annual Report

A presentation on the Annual Report 2022-23 was presented by the Director City Business.

3.2 Public question time: Annual Report

Craig Ross asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Page 23 of the annual report misleadingly refers yet again to only selectively the construction contract portion of \$43m for the new civic centre and disregards the architect fees of \$7m, management fees, fit-outs, still unfinished fit-outs and other blow-out project costs. How is this not spinning ratepayers given total project costs currently exceeds \$65m?

Response:

As quoted on page 23 of the Annual Report "A fixed contract for construction of the Civic Centre was awarded at \$43.05 million and commenced in 2019."



This statement did not refer to the pre-construction costs. Additionally, this did not include the costs that resulted from the contractor entering administration and the resultant work to the Civic Centre to complete the project.

A full breakdown of costs associated with the Walyalup Koort/Walyalup Civic Centre Project is publicly available in the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 24 August 2022.

Question 2:

Page 36 of the annual report in the Finance section incorrectly refers to FY22 not FY23 and in other pages many figures quoted do not tie back correctly to the audited finance report. Has the annual report actually been properly proof-read by the finance department and when will the corrections be made?

Response:

The year ending shown as 2022 will be updated to 2023.

Question 3:

Year on year budgeted capital projects are consistently and inefficiently delayed and FY23 is no exception. Why is the actual capital expenditure of \$10m so low compared to the budget of \$28m?

Response:

The construction industry has been highly impacted with staff shortages, cost increases on materials and transportations costs. These increases are impacting all entities that go out to tender for materials and constructions related services. The city has been experiencing cost increases and delays to capital works projects as a result of market conditions that are beyond our control. The city is continually considering different options to how we manage the market conditions and the impact on the city and will adjust our procurement practised where possible as appropriate.

Noting that the funding related to underspend in capital works remains available to be spend in future years. Essentially, those capital items are budgeted for and would not impact budget setting decisions in a future year.

Question 4:

With the sell-off of numerous income producing properties and car parks over the years, is the council deliberately raising rates and postponing budgeted capital projects due to a dwindling financial buffer which is highlighted by many examples such as cutting the CAT bus, inability to absorb South Beach changeroom costs, lack of maintenance of the Town Hall...etc?



Response:

Rates increases are imposed in line with the operational/project requirements of the City for that year, as well as market conditions which have included rapid inflation and increasing cost pressures across most developed economies. Further information regarding the rate increase is available in the media release on the City's website below, as well as the budget report adopted by Council in June 2023.

[Fremantle budget focuses on the fundamentals | City of Fremantle](#)

Question 5:

For the current year ratepayers have been levied rate increases of 9% based on budgeted capital expenditure that will not eventuate and no benefit received. Will ratepayers receive a refund in the next rates cycle?

Response:

It is the intention that all projects will be completed. However, for any projects that experience unforeseen delays the related budgeted capital expenditure is carried forward to the following financial year.

Question 6:

In the council monthly financial update for the 5 months YTD FY24 capital expenditure is only a meagre \$2.7m. According to the council minutes response of 6 Dec 2023, 'for many of the capital projects the procurement strategy is to go out to tender early in the financial year and with action to occur later in the financial year'. Does the council still believe this is the best practice procurement strategy rather than a continuous rolling procurement program of capital projects?

Response:

Resource and capacity challenges has meant that there has been a tendency for Officers to design and deliver in one year; however there has been significant focus on better forward planning during this year's planning. Officers have lengthened project forecasting to 4 years as part of the annual business planning process, this will further improve project alignment, allow more time for scoping, tender documentation and cost estimating earlier in the project process.

Question 7:

How are project managers held accountable for project delivery failures and poor budgeting such as the South Beach changerooms to ensure adopted capital expenditure budgets and project timelines are realistic and actually met?

Response:

Officers work within the parameters of the City's Project Management Framework, this includes project reviews and monthly project monitoring.



Reasons for project delays and or budget challenges are reviewed and discussed as part of this process.

Question 8:

Note 19 in the financial report refers to contaminated sites for remediation. In addition to the South Fremantle landfill site and the scandalous Jones St property acquisition what other sites are contaminated?

Response:

There are a number of contaminated sites across Fremantle falling under both State & Local Government ownership as well as private ownership. A database of contaminated sites is made available online by the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation.

It is noted that Jones St Property is not a registered contaminated site.

Question 9:

In FY23 the council has belatedly acknowledged for the first time in an audited financial report a contingent liability. What event or circumstances triggered the now more forthcoming contingent liability disclosure on contaminated sites in Note 19?

Response:

The Annual Financial Statements were audited by Grant Thornton on behalf of the Office of the Auditor General (OAG).

Both Grant Thornton and OAG agreed that the city's Financial Statements accurately reflect the city's finances. The contaminated sites and revaluation of assets information included in the statements were reviewed in detail by both auditors and the financial statements and notes is an accurate reflection thereof.

The city is aware of the contaminated sites within its boundaries as declared by Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER). For city owned properties, there are management plans in place that requires monitoring of these sites. There are no contaminated sites that have been declared by DWER to be remediated at this stage, to that end note 19 accurately reflects that there are no contingent liabilities for the financial year.

Question 10:

What is the current preliminary best guess estimate of the remediation costs for these contaminated sites?

Response:

As per response to question 9.



Question 11:

What is the expected timeline for agreeing with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation the costs associated with remediation of the South Fremantle landfill contamination?

Response:

There are currently no plans to remediate the site and will continue to be monitored in line with the agreed management plan.

Question 12:

In which year will the remediation of the Jones St property contamination be undertaken, and how much is currently included in future budgets?

Response:

As per previous responses above, Jones Street is not listed as a contaminated site. The site does contain an asbestos building. The asbestos located within the buildings at Jones Street will be addressed appropriately as and when redevelopment of the site occurs. There is no fixed date set for the redevelopment of the site.

Question 13:

Note 17 of the financial report summaries a massive asset revaluation of \$241m containing multiple common-sense discrepancies, and given the paucity of public information, what were the valuation methodology/technique changes since the previous June 2020 valuation?

Response:

As part of the International Accounting Standards 16 Property, Plant and Equipment requires to be revalued at least every five years.

As part of the Local Government Act 1995 the city is required to adhere to the International Accounting standards. The infrastructure assets were required to be revalued in the financial year ending 30 June 2023.

The same methodology for revaluations was used, being replacement costs for infrastructure assets. The city engaged a registered valuer, Cushman & Wakefield, to undertake this work. The fair value increases are based on the City's infrastructure data.

As part of the audit for financial statements ending 30 June 2022, OAG noted that if the city is aware of an assets class that might have significant changes in fair value, it is not appropriate to wait for five years to undertake a formal revaluation of that asset class.



Accordingly, the city engaged with registered valuer to ascertain price per hectare for city owned land. Noting that the zoning for those land parcels was considered in deriving the price per hectare.

Question 14:

For what reasons did the revaluation of Park properties in Note 9 inexplicably change from an opening carrying value of \$10m to \$70m in FY23?

Response:

During the financial year there were new assets to the value of \$2.8M added and existing parks assets increased in value due to revaluations of \$54M. Along with capitalisation of new assets to the value of \$4.2M and depreciation of (\$1.6M) the value of parks assets on 30 June 2023 is \$69.8M.

Question 15:

Given the civic centre was specifically built for council purposes and will never have a ready commercial buyer now or in future years, why is this property valued purely at market approach?

Response:

It was valued based on building replacement cost in line with the Building Cost Index.

Question 16:

What is the revalued amount for the disastrous multimillion dollar loss making Jones St property which has been sitting idle since 2014, and does the valuation take into account the required contamination rehabilitation?

Response:

The total value of land and buildings is \$8.8 million.

Question 17:

In the absence of transparent information for the \$241m revaluation can a detailed property listing be made publicly available similar to three years ago (ARMC 2106-1 June 2021) for comparison?

Response:

While an extract of the list of building assets have been provided in the past, there is no requirement to make the list available as part of the annual financial statements.

Question 18:

If the detailed property listing is not to be made publicly available, why not?



Response:

As per response to question 17.

Question 19:

Given the Infrastructure carrying value doubled from \$158m in FY22 to \$339m in FY23, is the valuation technique wording actually correct in Notes 8 & 9 of the financial report?

Response:

Yes.

Question 20:

Who was the independent registered valuer performing the valuation?

Response:

The city engaged a registered valuer, Cushman & Wakefield, to undertake this work.

Question 21:

The majority of public sector restricted use land in Australia is valued taking into account the restricted use and for a better example refer to the City of Perth. For what reasons is Fremantle using a market approach valuation without properly taking into consideration the public sector restrictions?

Response:

Due to the changes experienced in the construction industry, buildings were also revalued by way of a management valuation. Based on the building construction cost index published by the Australian Institute of Quantity surveyor (AIQS) the city's building portfolio was updated to reflect the relevant replacement cost for the components of city buildings. The indices are based on projects for buildings procured by competitive tender. 12 Quantity Surveying firms in Perth contribute their advice and data to the AIQS in compilation of the index. Noting that the subcomponents of a building remains the same regardless of the purpose of a building, On that basis, the increase due to revaluation for buildings of \$ 55.1M is accurate.

Question 22:

Apart from Quarry St, what buildings, land, parks and carparks is the council intending to sell in the coming three to five years?

Response:

This is a decision that will require determination by council.



Question 23:

Is the council intending to sell the Leisure Centre carpark?

Response:

This is a decision that will require determination by council.

Question 24:

When will the incorrect YTD FY24 monthly accounts be updated for the increased multimillion dollar depreciation arising from the FY23 revaluation which significantly decreases operating results?

Response:

The Ordinary Council Meeting in February 2024 is the first opportunity to update the monthly financial statements following the adoption of the annual report and audited financial statements. Depreciation will be reflected in the January 2024 monthly financial statements provided in February.

Question 25:

Note 22 of the financial report refers to a total \$3m loss in FY23 for the Resource Recovery Group investment, and given the withdrawal by Fremantle from this agreement and associated liabilities, would it have not been more accurate to write-down to \$nil the remaining \$2.3m carrying value in FY23?

Response:

The OAG estimated that the financial impact of potential changes in the RRG financial statement to that of the city's financial statement were insignificant. On that basis, the auditors agreed that an emphasis of matter note in the audit opinion is sufficient to close out the city's 2023 financial statement. Along with the note 24 of events occurring after the end of the reporting period.

Question 26:

Given the auditor included an emphasis of matter paragraph in the audit report will the investment in the Resource Recovery Group carrying value now be written to \$nil in FY24?

Response:

As far as the city is aware the RRG financial matters are still to be resolved and the city will reflect future changes in the next years financial statements, once signed off by the OAG.

Question 27:

Why is the \$3m investment loss and secretive significant variance to budget in FY23 not properly described in the council monthly financial updates and kept confidential?



Response:

As far as the city is aware the RRG financial matters are still to be resolved and the city will reflect future changes in the next years financial statements, once signed off by the OAG.

Question 28:

As pointed out in prior years Fremantle fails to disclose Heritage Land and Heritage Buildings separately and loses meaningfulness to the readers of the financial report. So, asking yet again, why heritage assets are not shown separately and transparently in line with best practice in the Note 8 of the financial report to both highlight and showcase the heritage assets of Fremantle?

Response:

There is no statutory requirement to show heritage buildings separately and as such this has not been a priority, however the city is now considering this and will look at how it can be implemented in the future.

Mark Woodcock asked the following questions:

Question 1:

What is the latest cost of the Kings Square project?

Response:

A full breakdown of costs associated with the Walyalup Koort/Walyalup Civic Centre Project is publicly available in the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 24 August 2022.

Question 2:

How much of it is yet to be completed?

Response:

As per response to question 1.

Question 3:

What is the estimated cost of to complete the Kings Square Project?

Response:

As per response to question 1.

Question 4:

The Council's business plan was that the new civic centre was to make approximately \$900,000 annually, what is the actual revenue of the Kings Square business to date annually or year by year?



Response:

Two ground floor leases have been signed which generate 70K per annum in revenue. One of those leases is now open and operational the other will be open as at 1 July 2024 (fit out currently in process).

The remaining space which is available to lease and currently being marketed via an externally appointed leasing agent is estimated to generate an additional \$544,950 per annum in line with current market expectations.

Question 5:

What is the real total loss Resource Recovery Group to the city of Fremantle? Point 22 of the financial report refers to \$3 million loss in FY2023, given the withdrawal of East Fremantle this year, how much will this increase the operating loss for this facility and how much will this cost the rate payers?

Response:

The OAG estimated that the financial impact of potential changes in the RRG financial statement to that of the city's financial statement were insignificant. On that basis, the auditors agreed that an emphasis of matter note in the audit opinion is sufficient to close out the city's 2023 financial statement. Along with the note 24 of events occurring after the end of the reporting period.

As far as the city is aware the RRG financial matters are still to be resolved and the city will reflect future changes in the next years financial statements, once signed off by the OAG.

Question 6:

Why were the losses/next steps of the facility made confidential instead of opening discussing back in Mid 2023?

Response:

As per response to question 5.

Question 7:

What other council properties/land are listed for sale in the coming 5 years?

Response:

This is a decision that will require determination by council.

Question 8:

Is the Leisure Centre car park still for sale, and is the revenue for this sale listed in council documents or make up any part of future budgets?



Response:

This is a decision that will require determination by council.

Question 9:

When will the council properly establish the History library it promised to the rate payers?

Response:

An engagement process has just been concluded and options will be brought to council for consideration in the near future.

Ian Ker asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Referring to the statement on page 38 of the Annual Report being that 18,790 emails were received and responded to, 11,160 service requests were created for City business units to action, and the number of service requests was 2,740 fewer than the previous year; how many of the emails received were repeat emails, in response to problems or dissatisfaction with the 10-day delay, including the need for earlier responses?

Response:

The city does not have capacity to measure the amount of repeat emails or determine how many emails were regarding concerns about response times.

Question 2:

The Annual Report further states that satisfaction with the City's response to service requests was rated at 72%. How does this 28% level of non-satisfaction compare to previous years?

Response:

The average satisfaction level for service delivery over the last 5 financial years is 76%.

Question 3:

In relation to question 2, how does this 28% level of non-satisfaction compare to other local governments?

Response:

We are not aware of any other LGA's that measure satisfaction with regard to service requests. The standard measure for local governments is customer satisfaction with regard to customer service (front counter and phones).



Question 4:

In relation to question 2, does the City of Fremantle regard this level of non-satisfaction to be satisfactory?

Response:

City of Fremantle target is 70% satisfaction for service delivery and 90% satisfaction for customer service. City of Fremantle exceeds these targets.

Question 5:

In relation to question 2, to what extent is the reduction in the number of service requests a result of a high level of dissatisfaction with the City's response to previous requests, in other words, have people given up?

Response:

The city does not have capacity to measure this.

Will Ody asked the following questions:

Question 1:

In relation to parks infrastructure on page 82 of the Annual Report, can you explain how parks can go from a valuation of \$9.6m in 2021 and increase in value by \$54m? What caused that massive increase?

Response:

During the financial year there were new assets to the value of \$2.8M added and existing parks assets increased in value due to revaluations of \$54M. Along with capitalisation of new assets to the value of \$4.2M and depreciation of (\$1.6M) the value of parks assets on 30 June 2023 is \$69.8M. Current market conditions have contributed towards an increase in values.

Cathy Gavranich asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Did the City question the independent valuers valuation of the parks infrastructure and the massive increase?

Response:

As part of the process, the City assesses the reports and works closely with the consultant to verify the information. The City will continue to verify the information throughout the next year as well as in line with market conditions.



3.3 Receival of the Annual Report

ELECTORS DECISION **(Officers recommendation)**

Moved: Doug Thompson

Seconded: Jenny Archibald

That the City of Fremantle Annual Report 2022-23, provided in Attachment 1, be received.

Motion LOST

4. Public question time: General

Alan David Greenwood asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Why was the decision to change the Australia Day Citizenship Ceremony date made by a non-elected "City administration" and to which executive body does this title refer?

Response:

In December 2022, the Department of Home Affairs announced an update to the Australian Citizenship Ceremonies Code, removing the requirement for councils to hold Australia Day citizenship ceremonies on 26 January.

The Australian Citizenship Ceremonies Code sets out the requirements for conducting citizenship ceremonies in accordance with the Australian Citizenship Act 2007.

Whilst the dates upon which to which schedule civic and community events does not require a council decision, Elected Members were informed of the scheduled date and no objections were raised.

John Dowson (Fremantle Society) asked the following questions:

Question 1:

The Department of Local Government, Sports and Cultural Industries has recently undertaken a review, the Financial Better Practice review. Has the Council volunteered for an assessment and is there a report available from the department?

Response:

No.



Question 2:

As a result of simplified financial reporting to commence from 1 July 2022, has the City implemented the changes as recommended by the Office of the Auditor General (OAG)?

Response:

Yes.

Question 3:

Has the City adopted a Rates and Revenue Policy to link the costs of service and maintenance of assets to the setting of Rates?

Response:

Rates increases are imposed in line with the operational/project requirements of the City for that year, as well as market conditions. Further information regarding the imposition of rates for the year ending June 30 2023 is available in the media release on the City's website below, as well as the budget report adopted by Council in June 2023.

[Fremantle budget focuses on the fundamentals | City of Fremantle](#)

Question 4:

Are the financial metrics reported on MyCouncil adjusted to reflect the underlying position of the City?

Response:

The My Council website is managed by the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries.

Question 5:

As some of the matters that form the review will be passed in regulation, what is the City doing to prepare for this?

Response:

The City plans for and implements all legislative changes as per timelines required by the State Government.

Question 6:

Has the City prepared for the new Model Financial Statements?

Response:

The City already utilises the model financial statement and implements any recommended changes to that model on an annual basis.



Question 7:

Is the City preparing for the separation of waste rates from the general rate as will be required by 1 July 2024?

Response:

Yes.

Question 8:

With regard to waste services, does the City have a plan for the future delivery of services, in-house or contracted services?

Response:

The City has recently concluded a review of its waste (collection and disposal) arrangements. It is anticipated that a report will be presented to Council with proposals in respect to services moving forward.

Question 9:

As can be observed, the City trucks are old and possibly no longer fit of service. What system does the City have to determine if these trucks are no longer assets?

Response:

The city's fleet is included in the City's asset management plan and there is a fleet replacement strategy; funding requirements are included in the City's 10-year financial plan.

Question 10:

What is the City doing to ensure that the waste services delivered are efficient and the City waste rates will be competitive?

Response:

This has been addressed in question 8.

Question 11:

What is the City doing to facilitate and manage fixed-interest loans to building owners undertaking environmental or heritage upgrades to their buildings?

Response:

The City does not currently have any programs it provides to financially support upgrades to heritage properties.



Craig Ross asked the following questions:

Question 1:

If we are asked to vote on Annual and Financial Reports, and we are asking legitimate questions, we expect a professional response. Will you answer my questions and other rate payers' questions much more seriously?

Response:

Yes.

Andrew Luobikis asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Why can't the costs for the South Beach toilet and showers be consistent with other WALGA Councils, when recent examples are a third of that cost?

Response:

The City has undertaken an extensive engagement process with the community in respect to the place plan and the facilities required at South beach. The scope and quality of the change / toilet facilities tendered reflect those requirements.

Question 2:

In relation to the South Beach toilet and changerooms, why such expenditure on consultants and architects?

Response:

Consultant expenditure and commitments for the project are in line with industry and officer expectations.

Question 3:

In relation to question 2, who are these consultants and are there conflicts of interest reported?

Response:

The consultants include an architect, inc sub-consultant services and a quantity surveyor.

There are no reported conflicts of interest.

Cathy Gavranich asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Am I correct in my understanding that the former Committee meeting structure gave the community the opportunity to discuss and debate critical issues before they went to a full Council meeting?



If so, what benefit is it to the community to no longer have this platform to engage with Council decision making?

Response:

The ability for the community to engage in Council decision-making is essentially the same. Members of the community can raise questions and speak on items for the same amount of time – whether it was at a Committee or full Council. When there were Committees, there was only one Council meeting per month. Now there are two per month (to replace Committees).

Helen Cox asked the following questions:

Question 1:

Can you please inform the citizens of our city what new regulations you (the Mayor) have implemented to improve the hygiene and cleanliness of our streets and public amenities; in particular sidewalks/walkways located in the West End, used by patrons of cafes and bars?

Response:

The City has adopted precinct approach to cleansing across the city; service levels for the CBD have been developed to provide a fast response to incidents whilst also maintaining a regular (daily) cleaning regime across the CBD area.

Higher use / busy areas have a higher level of service (more intensive cleaning approach).

Question 2:

Which regulations and policy guidelines are business owners required to meet to sustain the use of public street amenities?

Response:

Al fresco licenses are regulated through a Local Law and Al Fresco Policy. These include a requirement on the business to keep al fresco areas clean. All complaints about specific al fresco areas should be reported to the City so that appropriate action can be taken.

Question 3:

How often are business owners required to undertake the cleaning of City sidewalks outside their premises?

Response:

The regularity of cleaning is not specified.



Question 4:

How often do Council employees or contractors conduct maintenance in the CBD area to ensure the highest of hygiene and safety is completed for the benefit of all residents, visitors, and tourists?

Response:

See response 1 above.

Planned and responsive works and maintenance services are provided through the appropriate teams.

5. Acceptance of Motions

1. Motion proposed by Mark Woodcock

Moved: Mark Woodcock

Seconded: Andrew Luobikis

That Electors form a small group to write to the Auditor General Office of WA and ask for a full investigation of the finances of the Resource Recovery Group (RRG), investigate the management, operations and reporting of the entity that has lost so many millions of rate payers funds.

Motion Carried

2. Motion proposed by Dominique Mimmagh

Moved: Dominique Mimmagh

Seconded: Mark Woodcock

- 1. The City of Fremantle is to immediately commission an independent investigation into the south beach toilet and changeroom project outlining specifically the expenditure on architects and consultants, along with why this projects budget is 3 times the cost of comparable projects, such as Mandurah eastern foreshore toilet block. This report is to be made available to ratepayers and residents.**
- 2. Authorises the CEO to immediately implement this resolution.**
- 3. Justification for the pre-mature demolition of the old toilet/change facility was that the building had concrete cancer. Considering the café was made from the same concrete and is still standing, we the ratepayers would like to see evidence of this so-called concrete cancer. We ask the City of Fremantle to make the building reports public.**

Motion Carried



3. Motion proposed by Dominique Mimmagh

Moved: Dominique Mimmagh

Seconded: Cathy Gavranich

1. Request that Council instructs the City to:

- a. Publish a weekly pesticide schedule;
- b. Leave glyphosate and other pesticides caution signs up for 24 hours; and
- c. Use glyphosate and other pesticides with marker dye so sprayed area is visible.

2. Request the City of Fremantle investigate safer alternatives to the use of pindone/glyphosate.

3. The City of Fremantle provide a response to part 1 and 2 above by 30 June 2024.

Motion Carried

4. Motion proposed by Dominique Mimmagh

Moved: Dominique Mimmagh

Seconded: Sally Price

Request that Council instructs that from now on the City is to:

- 1. Disclose any negotiation between telecommunication providers seeking to use any local government resources for 5G network infrastructure.**
- 2. Have a local law to restrict small cells from residential areas.**

Motion Carried

5. Motion proposed by Dominique Mimmagh

Moved: Dominique Mimmagh

Seconded: Daniel Mimmagh

Request that Council instructs the City to make available bicycle parking at the Bruce Lee Oval. At the moment cyclist have to find posts or trees to lock their bicycles to while shopping at the Sunday Farmer's Market.

Motion Carried



6. Motion proposed by Dominique Mimmagh

Moved: Dominique Mimmagh

Seconded: Daniel Mimmagh

Request that Council instructs the City to maintain cash payment options in City's venues.

Motion Carried

7. Motion proposed by John Dowson (Fremantle Society)

Moved: John Dowson

Seconded: Mark Woodcock

The Fremantle Society seeks the reinstatement of the following:

- a. The 1.25% of rates that used to go to the Heritage Fund.**
- b. The annual heritage awards**
- c. The annual Local History awards**
- d. The annual heritage festival**
- e. The annual \$100,000 grants program to owners of heritage properties.**

Motion Carried

8. Motion proposed by John Dowson (Fremantle Society)

Moved: John Dowson

Seconded: Mark Woodcock

The Fremantle society, in lodging a formal complaint about council processes, seeks a report which assesses the handling of this application, and to know why:

- a. Council did not choose the author to the heritage impact statement to be paid for by the developer, instead of allowing the developer to choose the author. The result was a deeply flawed report, contradictory, shallow, and unconvincing.**
- b. Why the council's heritage office report was contradictory, shallow and totally failing to protect the long-held policies for protection of the West End which includes that new works to heritage listed properties cannot be seen from the street?**
- c. Council's planning department again has not stood up for Fremantle's heritage, and the future for Fremantle's heritage is dire.**
- d. The planning application was taken offline before the council meeting and was unavailable for some days.**



- e. The Fremantle Society were not notified as is customary when the matter was going to JDAP.
- f. The Fremantle Society is also concerned at the shallow and simplistic attitudes evident to heritage assessments, especially relating to context, from the Mayor and some councillors. In particular, relating to 49 Phillimore street, the Mayor and Crs Lang, Williamson-Wong, Archibald, and van Dorssen. We congratulate the 4 councillors who agreed with the community experts on heritage and voted against this proposal (Crs Lawver, Thompson, Camarda, and Sullivan)

Motion Carried

9. Motion proposed by Petr Pacak

Moved: Petr Pacak

Seconded: Elisabeth Megroz

1. To ensure democratic, fair and transparent elections are carried out in the City of Fremantle, ensuring all eligible voters can participate, and the business owners and non-residents are fully informed with enrolment eligibility claims on the basis of occupations of rateable property within the electorate. This will be in the form of sending notification to those eligible occupants via Rates Notices, City of Fremantle social media and website posts, plus other City Publications such as FRE-OH! Magazine and local newspaper advertising. Modification to Council Policy to ensure this notification is to happen again at 30 days prior to the period of 56 days before the election day for ordinary elections of the local government as per section 4.33 (2B) (a) of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
2. By giving ample written notice (30 days minimum) of eligible persons occupying rateable property within the electorate and give information on how to re-enrol when their claim expires on the day 6 months after the holding of the second ordinary elections of the local government after the claim is accepted.
In reference to section 4.34 of the *Local Government Act 1995*:
 - a. The CEO is to ensure that the information about electors, that is recorded from enrolment eligibility claims, is maintained in an up-to-date and accurate form.
 - b. In consideration of this with section 4.35 (2) the CEO is to give written notice to the person before making a decision under subsection (1)(c) and is to allow 28 days for the person to make submission on the matter.



- c. If the CEO make decision under subsection (1)(c) the CEO is to give written notice of it to the person.**

- 3. The voter registration form to be straight forward and easy to follow. Simple mistakes in the form must not be reason for the application rejection and must be corrected by a Council officer in communication with the applicant. Voting right refusal notice to ratepayers (2)(c) (as above) to be legally justifiable if challenged before court.**

Motion Carried

10. Motion proposed by Marija Vujcic (on behalf of Susan Allwood)

Moved: Marija Vujcic

Seconded: Mark Woodcock

- 1. That the Council reinstate the disability wheelchair facility at South Beach and to construct a shed like the two new change sheds to lock up the disability wheelchair. Please do this immediately.**
- 2. Request the City of Fremantle to investigate extending the wheelchair access closer to the water line at South Beach, reporting back to Council by 31 March 2024.**

Motion Carried

11. Motion proposed by Marija Vujcic

Moved: Marija Vujcic

Seconded: Elisabeth Megroz

Motion of no confidence in Mayor Fitzhardinge handling of the City finances and in particular the South Beach Toilets and Changeroom Project.

Motion Carried

12. Motion proposed by Lyn Wicks

Moved: Lyn Wicks

Seconded: Marija Vujcic

That all events, indoor and outdoor, organised, supported and/or approved and funded by the Fremantle Council, where children under the age of 18 years are involved in, or have access to, be adherent to a Policy made by the Fremantle Council where, and which includes:



- 1. All organising and presenting staff (paid or voluntary) have current Working with Children clearances.**
- 2. There are no sexualised, inferred sexualised, or politicised content in the activities, presentations, and/or in the materials (including books) to be used.**
- 3. Presenters are of good character and have three professional references to support this.**
- 4. Authorise the CEO to implement this.**

Motion Carried

6. Closure

The Mayor, Hannah Fitzhardinge declared the meeting closed at 7:56pm.