



Minutes

Annual General Meeting of Electors

Monday 2 February 2026 6pm



Table of Contents

- 1. Official opening, welcome and acknowledgement 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 Report 11
- 4. Public question time: General 11
- 5. Acceptance of Motions 14
- 6. Closure 16



1. Official opening, welcome and acknowledgement

The Presiding Member Mayor, Ben Lawver declared the meeting open at 6:00pm and welcomed electors to the meeting.

2. Attendance

Mr Ben Lawver	Mayor / Presiding Member
Cr Andrew Sullivan	Coastal Ward / Elector
Cr Frank Mofflin	East Ward / Elector
Cr Pip Slaughter	East Ward / Elector
Cr Melanie Clark	North Ward / Elector
Mr Glen Dougall	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Matt Hammond	Director City Business
Mr Pete Stone	Director Creative Arts and Community
Ms Morgan Adams	A/Director Infrastructure
Mr Russell Kingdom	Director Planning, Place and Urban Development
Ms Melody Foster	Manager Governance
Mr David Settelmaier	Manager Strategic Communications and Stakeholder Relations
Mr Aaron Dolin	Governance and Risk Officer
Ms Donna Ross	Meeting Support Officer
Ms Gabrielle Woulfe	Meeting Support Officer
Ms Jordyn Harvey	Meeting Support Officer

There were approximately 70 members of the public and no members of the press present at the meeting.

3. Annual Report

3.1 Presentation of the Annual Report

A presentation on the Annual Report 2024-25 was presented by the Director City Business.

3.2 Public question time: Annual Report

Craig Ross made a statement and asked the following questions:

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?



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?

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?

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.

Response by the Chief Executive Officer:

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.

Response by the Director City Business:

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. 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, 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. The City's future investment into renewal programs is clearly outlined in the Long Term Financial Plan.



The RRG was still operational at the balance date, and we will be guided by the auditor on appropriate accounting treatments.

It is noted this has been raised previously on several occasions. While it is something other Local Governments do, 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.

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 query this with the auditor again as part of the 2026 audit process.

The South Fremantle Targeted Underground Power Project (TUPP) is being delivered and heavily subsidised by Western Power. 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. 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.

Commercial space 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. Fit out works are still currently underway so a total fit out cost has yet to be finalised.

Tenanted commercial spaces within the WCC are budgeted to generate approximately \$250,000 per annum in 2026/27 noting that some of the leases may not be 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 tenants who are on turnover rent arrangements.

Jenny Thomas – Friends of Cantonment Hill made a statement and asked the following question:

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?

Response by the A/Director Infrastructure:

The City has a team leader and two field staff in the area, who are supported by external contractors to undertake some of the specialist work. The natural areas team has a number of operational programs occurring on these sites, including weeding, revegetation, bush fire mitigation, and other routine servicing.

Response by the Mayor:

The City will consider the use of external contractors as part of future budget discussions.

Mark Woodcock made a statement and asked the following questions:

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?

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?

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?

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?

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 its co-users, and what is the estimated worst case financial exposure for the ratepayers should the site require soil or groundwater treatment?



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?

Response by the Chief Executive Officer:

The Resource Recovery Group (RRG) wound up on the 30th of November 2025. 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 is expected that it will be wound up prior to the 30th of June 2026.

There are many assets, there are cash reserves, and there are liabilities to work through. The proposal is that the Booragoon office will be sold. The City hope that the office will have zero liability once it's purchased.

The assets will be transferred to ReGroup. Part of the proposal over the 20-year term with ReGroup to continue using that facility is the assets are transferred to them and then they'll be liable to upgrade them and the City's of Fremantle, Melville and Canning will be able to access those facilities into the future.

The contract sum of \$20m 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 contract moving forward.

Ongoing costs of waste are still to be determined. The City are getting better gate fees for recycling, taking waste directly to the waste for energy supplier which has decreased the cost, and FOGO is still continuing with ReGroup which comes at a reduced cost.

The City of Canning has taken over responsibility of the RRG site which is within their Local Government area.

The remaining questions have been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Helen Cox made a statement and asked the following questions:

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?



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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

Question 7:

What is the \$20m valuation based on? Has the site and other properties been formally valued? By whom and when?

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?



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?

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.

Response:

These questions have been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Elisabeth Megroz made a statement and asked the following questions:

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?

Question 2:

If the City has structural operating deficits of this magnitude, what is the plan to achieve sustainable operating surpluses?

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?

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?

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?



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?

Question 7:

Can you provide a reconciliation showing how the City moves from the current structural operating deficit position to sustainable operating surpluses?

Response by the Director City Business:

The 1.5 to 1% rate increases is growth in rate base, not increase in rates.

The large amount of grants seen in years two to three are associated with major projects like Fremantle Oval and the Depot, and all of the operating costs associated with how the City are servicing these are captured in the Long Term Financial Statements included in the Annual Report.

The remaining questions have been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Marija Vujcic made a statement and asked the following question:

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?

Response by the Mayor:

Every year at the Annual General Meeting of Electors there is a vote to receive the Annual Report, as per the agenda set by the presiding member.

Kyle McGinn made a statement and asked the following question:

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?



Response:

This question has been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Bill Ody made a statement and asked the following question:

Question 1:

Where is the money collected for the South Fremantle underground power project shown in the accounts?

Response by the Director City Business:

This is collected through rates and 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 they have not yet been collected.

The following elector made a statement in relation to the Annual Report:

John Dowson

3.3 Receival of the Annual Report

ELECTORS MOTION

Moved: Barry Healy

Seconded: Olivia Stronach

That the City of Fremantle Annual Report 2024-25, provided in Attachment 1, be received.

Carried by Majority Vote

4. Public question time: General

Leonie Lundy made a statement in relation to AUKUS and asked the following question:

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?



Response:

This question has been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Mark Woodcock made a statement in relation to the use of Pindone and Glyphosate by the City and asked the following questions:

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?

Question 2:

Will the Council stop using Pindone and similar chemicals, or does it plan to continue such practices?

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?

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?

If no target date exists, what are the hurdles effecting the transition to not using Glyphosate?

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?

Response:

These questions have been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Elisabeth Megroz made a statement in relation to Victoria Hall and asked the following questions:

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?



Question 2:

Is the portion under this agreement for commercial or community use?

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?

Question 4:

Are the presently unused portions of the Victoria Hall available for hire/lease, licence or sub licence to other interested parties?

Question 5:

How many portions of VH are available by way of lease, licence or sub licence?

Response by the Director Creative Arts and Community:

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.

The rest of Victoria Hall is available for hire by community, cultural, commercial and arts hire.

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.

These remaining questions have been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Andrew Luobikis made a statement in relation to the welcome address at Council meetings and Victoria Hall and asked the following questions:

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?

Question 2:

Urban Winery has extended their alfresco area right out to the front of Victoria Hall. Are they paying a lease?

Response by the Mayor:

There are many different versions of Welcome to Country and Acknowledgement of Country.



Response by the Director Creative Arts and Community:

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.

Stephanie Jones made a statement in relation to the Tree Retention Council Policy and asked the following question:

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?

Response:

This question has been taken on notice and will be answered within the agenda of the 25 February 2026 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

5. Acceptance of Motions

ELECTORS MOTION 1

Moved: Marija Vujcic

Seconded: Sally McKay

That the Electors of the City of Fremantle submit the following to Council:

- 1. That the Council formally acknowledge, and record in the minutes of the next Ordinary Meeting of Council Meeting, that the process adopted following the 2025 Annual General Meeting of Electors – whereby all five elector motions were bundled into a single Council resolution (item C2502-14, carried 11-0) without separate debate or voting – did not provide transparent or accountable decision-making and was inconsistent with the intent of the AGME.**
- 2. That Council develop and adopt, no later than 1 May 2026, a formal policy requiring that each motion carried at the Annual General Meeting of Electors be:**
 - a. Listed separately – each motion to appear as a discrete agenda item;**
 - b. Debated separately – councillors to debate each motion on its merits;**
 - c. Voted separately – with each councillor’s vote recorded in the minutes;**
 - d. Clearly resolved – by Council either:**
 - a. adopting and implementing the motion;**



- b. referring it for further work with a defined scope and timeframe not exceeding six months; or
- c. rejecting it, with reasons recorded in the minutes; and
- e. Supported by neutral advice – officer reports to provide factual information and implementation options only, without predetermining or substituting Council’s decision on elector motions.

3. That this policy apply to this Annual Meeting of Electors and all future AGME’s, with annual reporting to Council on compliance.

Carried by Majority Vote

The following electors made a statement in relation to the motion:

Marija Vujcic
Elisabeth Megroz
Petr Pacak
Alex Buck

ELECTORS MOTION 2

Moved: Marija Vujcic

Seconded: Sally McKay

That the Electors of the City of Fremantle demand that Council:

- 1. Produce and publicly release by 1 May 2026:**
 - a. A business plan for the South Fremantle Underground Power Project, including a project cashflow analysis;**
 - b. Status of the co-funding and delivery agreement with Western Power; and**
 - c. An indicative delivery and staging timetable.**
- 2. Disclose the total amount of underground power service charges collected to-date in 2025/2026, including amounts paid to Western Power and the balance held.**
- 3. Provide a public written assurance from the Chief Executive Officer that all funds collected are quarantined solely for the South Fremantle Underground Power Project and not used for consolidated revenue, with any interest retained for the project.**
- 4. Make the continuation in collecting of underground power service charges conditional upon the production of the documents and assurance in paragraphs 1 and 3.**
- 5. Guarantee that, should the project not proceed or not reach construction commencement within a reasonable and publicly stated**



timeframe, all unspent funds will be refunded to affected ratepayers, including interest where applicable.

Carried by Majority Vote

The following electors made a statement in relation to the motion:

Marija Vujcic
Sally McKay
Bill Ody
Mark Woodcock

ELECTORS MOTION 3

Moved: Marija Vujcic

Seconded: Ian Caluert

That the Electors of the City of Fremantle request that Council:

- 1. Prepare and publicly release a total project cost post completion report for the South Beach Toilets project, including:**
 - a. The original timeline, approved budget, any revised budgets, and the final total project cost (including all elements, demotion, consultants, plumbing, landscaping, security, fencing, temporary toilet hire);**
 - b. A comparison of actual expenditure against budget, with explanations for any material variances;**
 - c. Confirmation of delivery against the approved scope of works, including any scope changes or omissions; and**
 - d. An assessment of whether the completed project represents value for money for ratepayers, having regard to cost, quality, durability, and functionality.**
- 2. Table the post completion report at a Council meeting and publish it publicly within 90 days of the 2026 Annual General Meeting of Electors.**

Carried by Majority Vote

The following electors made a statement in relation to the motion:

Marija Vujcic
Ian Caluert
Helen Cox



ELECTORS MOTION 4

Moved: Marija Vujcic

Seconded: Elisabeth Megroz

That the Electors of the City of Fremantle hereby express no confidence in the Mayor, the elected members, and the Chief Executive Officer in relation to their stewardship, oversight, and assurance of the City's financial management and long-term sustainability.

Carried by Majority Vote

The following electors made a statement in relation to the motion:

Marija Vujcic
Elisabeth Megroz
Freya Cheffers

ELECTORS MOTION 5

Moved: Andrew Luobikis

Seconded: Marija Vujcic

Council:

- 1. Implement a policy for the safety of the community and the homeless individuals, under the only remit available to the City of Fremantle given authority for City Rangers/Community Safety Officers, with the utmost compassion, move them on from public areas, and only after offering them assistance to access the available services.**
- 2. Lobby the State Government for Police and expert mental health assistance in relocation of the homeless to appropriate mental health facilities.**
- 3. To protect the integrity and avoid litigation, only registered charities to be listed on website or be promoted by the City to assist the homeless.**
- 4. Fremantle Electors give authority for the Chief Executive Officer to implement the homelessness policy as above.**

Carried by Majority Vote

The following electors made a statement in relation to the motion:

Andrew Luobikis
Marija Vujcic
Evalena Lowe

**Minutes – Annual General Meeting of Electors
2 February 2026**



Freya Cheffers
Mark Woodcock

1. Closure

The Presiding Member Mayor, Ben Lawver declared the meeting closed at 7:57pm.