

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Name	Question	Response
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Craig Ross	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	Jenny Thomas - Friends of Cantonment Hill	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	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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.

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Name	Question	Response
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Helen Cox	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Marija Vujcic	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.
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	Kyle McGinn	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 Tydemar road).
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	Bill Ody	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	Leonie Lundy	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	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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).

Meeting Date of Question	Meeting Date of Response	Meeting	Name	Question	Response
2 February 2026	2 February 2026	Annual General Meeting of Electors	Mark Woodcock	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	Mark Woodcock	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Elisabeth Megroz	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	Andrew Luobikis	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	Andrew Luobikis	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	Stephanie Jones	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.