Town of Victoria Park

Special Council Meeting Agenda – Tuesday 14 July 2026

WE'RE OPEN VIC PARK

Please be advised that a **Special Council Meeting** will be held at **6:30 PM** on **Tuesday 14 July 2026** in the **Council Chambers**, Administration Centre at 99 Shepperton Road, Victoria Park.

Mr Carl Askew – Chief Executive Officer
9 July 2026

Table of contents

Item	Page no

1 Declaration of opening

Acknowledgement of the traditional owners

Ngany djerapiny Wadjak – Noongar boodja-k yaakiny, nidja bilya bardook.

I am honoured to be standing on Whadjuk - Nyungar country on the banks of the Swan River.

Ngany kaaditj Noongar moort keny kaadak nidja Wadjak Noongar boodja. Ngany kaaditj nidja Noongar birdiya – koora, ye-ye, boorda, baalapiny moorditj Noongar kaadijtin, moort, wer boodja ye-ye.

I acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land and respect past, present and emerging leaders, their continuing cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land, which continues to be important today.

Ngany youngka baalapiny Noongar birdiya wer moort nidja boodja.

I thank them for the contribution made to life in the Town of Victoria Park and to this region.

2 Announcements from the Presiding Member

2.1 Announcements from the Presiding Member

2.1 Recording and live streaming of proceedings

In accordance with regulation 14I of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, this meeting is being audio and video recorded and live streamed on the Town's website.

Under clause 39(1) of *the Meeting Procedure Local Law 2019* I do not give permission for any other person to record the proceedings of this meeting. By being present at this meeting, members of the public consent to the possibility that their image and voice may be live streamed to public. Recordings are also made available on the Town's website following the meeting.

2.2 Public question time and public statement time

As this is a Special Council Meeting, any public questions or statements must relate to the business of the agenda.

There are guidelines that need to be adhered to in our Council meetings and during question and statement time people speaking are not to personalise any questions, or statements about Elected Members, or staff or use any possible defamatory remarks.

In accordance with clause 40 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*, a person addressing the Council shall extend due courtesy and respect to the Council and the processes under which it operates and shall comply with any direction by the presiding member.

A person present at or observing a meeting shall not create a disturbance at a meeting, by interrupting or interfering with the proceedings, whether by expressing approval or dissent, by conversing or by any other means.

When the presiding member speaks during public question time or public statement time any person then speaking, is to immediately stop and every person present is to preserve strict silence so that the presiding member may be heard without interruption.

2.3 No adverse reflection

In accordance with clause 56 of the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019,* both Elected Members and the public when speaking are not to reflect adversely on the character or actions of Elected Members or employees.

2.4 *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*

All meetings of the Council, committees and the electors are to be conducted in accordance with the Act, the Regulations and the *Town of Victoria Park Meeting Procedures Local Law 2019*.

3 Attendance

Mayor	Mayor Karen Vernon
Banksia Ward	Cr Claire Anderson Cr Scott Ingram Cr Peter Melrosa Deputy Mayor Lindsay Miles
Jarrah Ward	Cr Andra Biondi Cr Sky Croeser Cr Jack Gordon-Manley Cr Daniel Minson
Chief Executive Officer	Mr Carl Askew
Chief Operations Officer	Ms Alison Luobikis
Chief Community Planner	Mr David Doy
Chief Financial Officer	Mr Duncan Olde
Manager Governance and Risk	Mr Brett Douglas
Manager Business Services	Mr Trent Prior
Manager Strategic Accounting	Ms Nana McIntosh
Manager Finance	Ms Grace Ursich
Manager Stakeholder Relations	Mr Paul Dunlop
Meeting Secretary	Ms Laine Cooke
Public Liaison	Ms Sarah Vader

3.1 Apologies

3.2 Approved leave of absence

4 Declarations of interest

4.1 Declarations of financial interest

A declaration under this section requires that the nature of the interest must be disclosed. Consequently, a member who has made a declaration must not preside, participate in, or be present during any discussion or decision-making procedure relating to the matter the subject of the declaration. An employee is required to disclose their financial interest and if required to do so by the Council must disclose the extent of the interest. Employees are required to disclose their financial interests where they are required to present verbal or written reports to the Council. Employees can continue to provide advice to the Council in the decision-making process if they have disclosed their interest.

4.2 Declarations of proximity interest

Elected members (in accordance with Regulation 11 of the Local Government [Rules of Conduct] Regulations 2007) and employees (in accordance with the Code of Conduct) are to declare an interest in a matter if the matter concerns: a) a proposed change to a planning scheme affecting land that adjoins the person's land; b) a proposed change to the zoning or use of land that adjoins the person's land; or c) a proposed development (as defined in section 5.63(5)) of land that adjoins the persons' land.

Land, the proposed land adjoins a person's land if: a) the proposal land, not being a thoroughfare, has a common boundary with the person's land; b) the proposal land, or any part of it, is directly across a thoroughfare from, the person's land; or c) the proposal land is that part of a thoroughfare that has a common boundary with the person's land. A person's land is a reference to any land owned by the person or in which the person has any estate or interest.

4.3 Declarations of interest affecting impartiality

Elected members (in accordance with Regulation 11 of the Local Government [Rules of Conduct] Regulations 2007) and employees (in accordance with the Code of Conduct) are required to declare any interest that may affect their impartiality in considering a matter. This declaration does not restrict any right to participate in or be present during the decision-making process. The Elected Member/employee is also encouraged to disclose the nature of the interest.

5 Public question time

6 Public statement time

7 Presentations

7.1 Petitions

7.2 Presentations

7.3 Deputations

8 Method of dealing with agenda business

9 Reports

9.1 Advocacy Program

Location	Town-wide
Reporting officer	Manager Stakeholder Relations
Responsible officer	Manager Stakeholder Relations
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	Nil

Summary

The Town's 2026–27 Advocacy Priorities focus on projects and initiatives requiring external funding, government support or broader policy engagement to progress key community and Council priorities.

Recommendation
That Council: 1. Endorses the following Advocacy Priorities for 2026-27 i. Rough sleeping and Homelessness in the Town ii. Burswood Station Precinct iii. Higgins Park and Playfield Reserve iv. Kent Street Sandpit Restoration v. Rutland Avenue Shared Path vi. Carlisle and Oats Street Station Precinct 2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to progress advocacy efforts in line with these priorities.

Background

1. The Town's Advocacy Policy outlines a structured approach to identifying and pursuing advocacy projects that address gaps in infrastructure, services, and legislative frameworks.
2. Advocacy priorities are reviewed annually to ensure they remain aligned with Council priorities, community expectations, project readiness, and emerging funding or policy opportunities. The annual review process also provides an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of current advocacy efforts, refine strategic objectives, and improve the Town's overall advocacy approach.
3. The Town's advocacy activities focus on:
   a. Building awareness.
   b. Strengthening partnerships.
   c. Positioning projects and initiatives for external support and investment.
   d. Improving the Town's influence in relation to strategic community outcomes.

Discussion

4. Following an administrative review and discussion at the 26 May 2026 Concept Forum, the following projects are recommended for adoption as Advocacy Priorities for 2026-27. These priorities are not listed in order of importance.
5. Rough Sleeping and homelessness

    a. Objective: Advance the Town's status as a recognised local government partner supporting the coordinated delivery of homelessness services and housing pathways across the Perth metro area.
    b. Key activities:
        i. Advocate for expansion of wrap-around support services for people at risk of – or experiencing – homelessness in the Town.
        ii. Strategic partnerships aligned with WALGA and Perth Inner City Group (PICG) activities and support agencies.
        iii. Act as a connector for local organisations and stakeholders.
6. Burswood Station Precinct
    a. Objective: Secure long-term State and Federal commitment to the redevelopment of Burswood Station as a high-density, transit-oriented precinct that supports housing growth and economic activation.
    b. Key activities:
        i. Strategic advocacy aligned with Metronet planning.
        ii. Promotion of housing growth and transport integration opportunities.
        iii. Ongoing precinct planning engagement.
7. Higgins Park and Playfield Reserve
    a. Objective: Obtain external funding to commence staged implementation of the endorsed masterplan, delivering modernised sporting and community recreation facilities.
    b. Key activities:
        i. Promotion of Council-endorsed masterplan.
        ii. Advocacy focused on recreation and community infrastructure outcomes.
        iii. Positioning as a regional recreational asset.
8. Kent Street Sandpit Restoration
    a. Objective: Advance the restoration of the Kent Street Sandpit into a best-practice Banksia Woodland site that strengthens the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct's ecological and cultural value.
    b. Key activities:
        i. Promotion of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct vision
        ii. Advocacy focused on biodiversity and cultural heritage outcomes.
        iii. Continued community interest and support, encouraging local pride in Town 'jewel'.
9. Rutland Avenue Shared Path
    a. Objective: Complete the final stage of the Rutland Avenue Shared Path to deliver a continuous, safe active transport corridor connecting the Armadale rail line to Great Eastern Highway.
    b. Key activities:
        i. Engagement with the Department of Transport and Water Corporation regarding design, funding and delivery pathways.
        ii. Continued community and stakeholder engagement regarding active transport and local access outcomes.
10. Carlisle and Oats Street Station Precinct
    a. Objective: Advocate for coordinated State Government investment and planning outcomes within the Carlisle and Oats Street Station Precincts, including positioning the redevelopment of Aqualife as critical community infrastructure supporting future medium and high-density population growth.
    b. Key activities:
        i. Advocate to the State Government for coordinated planning, funding and infrastructure investment across the Carlisle and Oats Street Station Precincts to support planned growth and transit-oriented development.

ii. Build and promote the strategic case for the redevelopment of Aqualife as essential community infrastructure, securing State Government support and funding aligned with future population growth.

Relevant documents

Policy – 103 – Communication-and-Engagement.pdf

Legal and policy compliance

Policy – 105 – Advocacy.pdf

Financial implications

Current budget impact	Sufficient funds exist within the annual budget to address this recommendation.
Future budget impact	Not applicable.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Risk rating	Risk appetite	Risk Mitigation
Financial	Not having a focused advocacy approach could result in the Town not being successful in accessing alternative funding streams.	Low	Low	TREAT risk by adopting an annual advocacy program that is aligned to Council priorities.
Environmental			Medium	
Health and safety			Low	
Data, Information Technology and Cyber			Medium	
Assets			Medium	
Compliance Breach	Conflicts of interest relating to advocacy	Med	Low	TREAT with effective systems managed closely
Reputation	Unfocussed approach to advocacy		Low	TREAT with clarification on expectations and focus projects, report accordingly
Service delivery interruption	Project delivery could be at risk without the support of external stakeholders	Med	Medium	TREAT with management of community expectations and transparent reporting on advocacy activities

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Stakeholder	**Comments**
Place Planning	Confirmation of project inclusions.
Community Development	Confirmation of homelessness and support service requirements.
Project Management Office	Confirmation of project inclusions.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Community Priority	**Intended public value outcome or impact**
CL1 – Effectively managing resources and performance.	The Town will seek to find opportunities to partner with State and Federal governments to deliver projects. The Town will seek ways to deliver projects in a that meet a high standard while reducing the short- and long-term financial impacts on residents.
CL2 - Communication and engagement with the community.	Communication and engagement with the community. Focussed efforts and an agreed approach that strengthen relationships with the State Government, enabling more effective collaboration
CL3 - Accountability and good governance.	Accountability and good governance. Establishing clear advocacy priorities and strategies, which allow for better tracking and evaluation of performance.

Further consideration

Not applicable.

9.2 Adoption of Annual Budget 2026/27

Location	**Town-wide**
Reporting officer	Chief Financial Officer
Responsible officer	Manager Strategic Accounting
Voting requirement	Absolute majority
Attachments	1. Statutory Annual Budget for year ended 30 June 2027 [**9.2.1** - 27 pages] 2. Schedule of Fees and Charges 2026/27 [**9.2.2** - 44 pages] 3. Capital Works Program 2026/27 [**9.2.3** - 3 pages] 4. Carry Forward Works Program 2026/27 [**9.2.4** - 3 pages] 5. Differential Rates Submissions [**9.2.5** - 4 pages] 6. Agenda Briefing Forum 7 July 2026 - Item 13.3 - Low Cost Urban Road Safety Program Grant [**9.2.6** - 11 pages]

Summary

The purpose of this report is to consider adoptions of the Annual Budget for 2026/27 financial year, including imposition of differential and minimum rates, adoption of fees and charges, and other consequential matters arising from the budget papers.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Annual Budget for 2026/27
   Pursuant to the provisions of Section 6.2(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 and Part 3 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, adopts the Town of Victoria Park Annual Budget for the year ended 30 June 2027, as detailed in Attachment 9.2.1, which includes the following:
   (a) Statement of Comprehensive Income
   (b) Statement of Cash Flows
   (c) Statement of Financial Activity
   (d) Notes to and forming part of the Budget

2. General Rates
   (a) Pursuant to Sections 6.32, 6.33, 6.34 and 6.35 of the Local Government Act 1995, impose the following differential general rates and minimum payments on Gross Rental Values (GRV);
      i. Residential – 6.459 cents in the dollar of GRV applicable to properties used primarily as a place of residence subject to a minimum rate of $1,482 per assessment.
      ii. Non-Residential – 10.879 cents in the dollar of GRV applicable to properties not used primarily as a place of residence subject to a minimum rate of $1,540 per assessment.
      iii. All Vacant Land – 12.272 cents in the dollar of GRV applicable to properties used primarily as vacant land subject to a minimum rate of $2,356 per assessment.

(b) Pursuant to Section 6.45 of the Local Government Act 1995 and regulation 64(2) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, adopts the following payment options and due dates for the payment of rates and service charges.

Option 1 (Full payment)

i. Full amount of rates and charges including arrears to be paid on or before 21 September 2026, or 35 days after the date of issue appearing on the rates notice, whichever is later.

Option 2 (Four instalments)

i. First instalment to be made on or before 21 September 2026 or 35 days after the date of issue appearing on the rates notice, whichever is later including all arrears and a quarter of the current rates and service charges.
ii. Second instalment to be made on or before 23 November 2026, or 2 months after the due date of the first instalment, whichever is later.
iii. Third instalment to be made on or before 25 January 2027, or 2 months after the due date of the second instalment, whichever is later.
iv. Fourth instalment to be made on or before 31 March 2027, or 2 months after the due date of the third instalment, whichever is later.

Option 3 (Flexible direct debit)

i. First instalment to be made on or before 21 September 2026 or 35 days after the date of issue appearing on the rates notice, whichever is later. Subsequent instalments to be made weekly, fortnightly or monthly on or before 20 June 2027.

(c) Pursuant to Section 6.45 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 68 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, adopts an interest rate of 5.5% where the owner has elected to pay rates and service charges through a four-instalment option or flexible direct debit option.

(d) Pursuant to Section 6.51(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 70 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, subject to Section 6.51(4) of the Local Government Act 1995, adopts an interest rate of 8.0% for rates and service charges, and costs of proceedings to recover such charges that remain unpaid after becoming due and payable.

3. Fees and Charges

Pursuant to Section 6.16 of the Local Government Act 1995, adopts the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2026/27 in Attachment 9.2.2.

4. Council Members' fees and allowances

(a) Pursuant to Section 5.98 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, adopts the following annual fees for payment of Elected Council Members in lieu of individual meeting attendance fees:

i. Mayor $36,112.
ii. Councillors $26,931.

(b) Pursuant to Section 5.98(5) of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 33 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, adopts the annual allowance of $73,435 for the Mayor.

(c) Pursuant to Section 5.98A of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 33A of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, adopts the annual allowance of $18,359 for the Deputy Mayor.
(d) Pursuant to Section 5.99A of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulations 34A and 34AA of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, adopts the Information and Communication Technology allowance of $3,500 for Elected Council Members.
(e) Pursuant to Section 5.100 of the Local Government Act 1995, and Regulation 30 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, adopts the meeting attendance fee of $1,215 per meeting for independent committee members of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARIC).

5. New loan
Pursuant to Section 6.20 of the Local Government Act 1995, authorises the following new loan:
(a) Elizabeth Baillie Site - $2,200,000.

6. Reporting material variance
Pursuant to Regulation 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, adopts the reporting variance for the 2026/27 Statements of Financial Activity, of (+) or (-) 10%, where that variance is also more than $50,000.

7. Change of reserves
Pursuant to Section 6.11 of the Local Government Act 1995, approves the closure and the change of purpose for the following reserves:
(a) Employee entitlements reserve – to be closed as of 1 July 2026 and its budgeted balance of $203,109 to be transferred to waste management reserve.
(b) Roads renewal reserve - to be used to assist in funding renewal initiatives associated with Council's roads, including to assist the Town contribution of State and Federal co-funded road renewal initiatives.
(c) Waste management reserve - to be used to assist in funding waste management, waste minimisation initiatives, and landfill site rehabilitation.

8. Notes community submissions were received in response to the notice published in accordance with section 6.36(1) of the Local Government Act 1995, detailed in Attachment 9.2.5.

Background

1. As required by Section 6.2 of the Local Government Act 1995, each local government is required to prepare and adopt by Absolute Majority an annual budget for the financial year.
2. In preparation for the annual budget 2026/27, the administration has collated and analysed relevant information, held a series of five budget workshops with Elected Council Members, and engaged with the community via "Money Matters" budget engagement survey from Thursday 29 January to 25 February 2026.
3. A critical part of the budget process is identifying the 'budget deficiency' to be supplemented by levying rates. The Town gave public notice of its intention to levy differential rates and minimum payments for

the 2026/27 financial year, representing a 5% increase in rates revenue to $58,115,901. This revenue contributes to a total operating revenue budget of $77,067,008.

4. The budget statements presented have been prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 and the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 and Australian Accounting Standards (to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the Act). The annual budget 2026/27 presents a balanced budget and is recommended for adoption by Council.

5. The Town continues to experience cost escalations across all areas of the organisation including costs of construction, maintenance, and employee. The Consumer Price Index (CPI), published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in March each year, has measured an annualised growth of 3.5% over the same three-year period. The increase in goods and services over the period is continuously impacting prices in our core operating and capital works contracts.

   (a) In March 2024, the CPI rose 3.6% over the past twelve months.

   (b) In March 2025, the CPI rose 2.4% over the past twelve months.

   (c) In March 2026, the CPI rose 4.6% over the past twelve months.

Discussion

6. The annual budget 2026/27 was developed over five workshops with Elected Council Members, which considered many facets of the budget with the input and advice of a range of Town officers. The workshops considered the following matters:

   (a) Corporate Business Plan and the Strategic Community Plan.

   (b) Long-Term Financial Plan, Asset Management Plan, and Workforce Plan.

   (c) Capital Works Program and Carry Forward Works Program Budget.

   (d) Fees & Charges.

   (e) Operating Budget.

7. Rates

   (a) As part of the 2026/27 rate-setting process, the Valuer General's Office (Landgate) has provided new revaluation data, effective from 1 July 2026 (based on a snapshot of property market as at 1 August 2024). At a category level, residential properties have on average increased in value by 55.5%, non-residential properties by 11.73%, and vacant land by 11.35%.

   (b) Landgate sets the Gross Rental Values (GRV) – the gross annual rental that a property might reasonably be expected to earn annually if it were rented – and Council determines the rate in the dollar to achieve the target rates revenue. The GRV is multiplied by the rate in the dollar to give the total rates payable. The rate in the dollar differs for each differential category, with Council having three differential categories, being Residential, Non-Residential and Vacant Land. These can be seen in Table 1. There are no recommended changes to the rate categories for 2026/27.

   Table 1: Proposed rates in the dollar and minimum payments

Rating Category	Rate in the Dollar	Minimum Rate
Residential	$ 0.064590	$ 1,482
Non-Residential	$ 0.108790	$ 1,540
Vacant Land	$ 0.122720	$ 2,356

   (c) Differential general rates can only be imposed based on certain characteristics. Any other characteristic, such as length of ownership, visual appearance of a lot or building, or length of vacancy or non-development, are not prescribed under the Act, and therefore not a characteristic for which a differential rate can be raised.

(d) The Town will rate 18,429 properties in the 2026/27 financial year, including 153 newly added rateable properties.

(e) The total budgeted revenue from rates for the 2026/27 financial year is $58,115,901 derived from the rate in the dollar and minimum rates outlined in this report.

(f) The differential rating model and the statement of objects and reasons for each differential rates category was advertised in accordance with statutory requirements for 21 days (between 28 May and 18 June 2026). There were thirty-five (35) public submissions received and have been included in the Attachment 9.2.5.

8. Fees & Charges

(a) The fees and charges for 2026/27 (Attachment 9.2.2) forecast an increase in revenue by $776,629 (7.0%) from $11,044,604 to $11,821,233, and include various statutory and regulatory fees, and discretionary fees associated with our community services and programs. For discretionary fees, consideration has been given to the level of fair cost recovery for a service, the ability of the community to pay, and the overall impact on the Town's budget.

(b) The Building Service, Parking, and Leisure Facilities are the main service areas of revenue growth due to; expected increases in demand for issuing building permits; increases in the fee structures for parking fees; and leisure facility memberships.

9. Capital Grants and Contributions

(a) The Town is anticipating receiving $8,436,257 (including carry forward of $4,750,414) in capital grants and contributions across a range of projects. Table 2 shows some of the projects receiving more than $250,000 in capital grants and contributions.

Table 2: Capital Grants and Contributions (more than $250,000)

Project	Grants & Contributions	Reserve	Municipal	Total Cost
Low-Cost Urban Road Safety Program	$1,515,000	-	$300,000	$1,815,000
Kent St Sandpit Bushland Management Project	$ 500,000	-	$ 172,000	$ 672,000
MRRG - Mint Street - Albany Hwy to Shepperton Road	$ 326,671	$ 163,336	-	$ 490,007
MRRG - Mint Street - Beatty Ave to Shepperton Road	$ 262,800	$ 131,401	-	$ 394,201

10. Capital Works Program

(a) In 2026/27, the total capital works expenditure budget is projected to be $9,659,948 (Attachment 9.2.3). The budget includes funding from capital grants and contributions, reserves, sale of assets, borrowings, and the residual of $4,948,355 from municipal funds. Some of the key projects for 2026/27 budget are:

i. Low Cost Urban Road Safety Program grant funded project – Main Roads WA Low Cost Urban Road Safety Program funds the delivery of road treatments which has been identified as priority sites based on risk and crash history. Following 15 locations are identified as priority:

a. Rutland Avenue – South of Howick Street
b. Rutland Avenue – North of Midgely Street

c. Rutland Avenue – South of Gallipoli Street
d. Rutland Avenue – West of Castle Way
e. Harvey Street – Howick Street to Shepperton Road
f. Gallipoli Street & Streatley Road
g. Baillie Avenue
h. Carson Street
i. Baillie Avenue & Albany Highway
j. Duncan Street & Teague Street
k. Sunbury Road & Azon Avenue
l. Sunbury Road & Gresham Street
m. Lichfield Street & Gresham Street
n. Lichfield Street & Sunbury Road
o. Lichenified Street & Axon Avenue

ii. Drainage upgrades along the streets of Armagh, Mercury, Sussex, Mackie and Taylor Reserve Swale.
iii. Public lighting upgrades along Briggs Street, Dovey Lane, and Lane 87 (Edmiston Lane).
iv. Sports lighting upgrades at Fletcher Park and McCallum Park.
v. Several road rehabilitation projects under the Metropolitan Regional Road Group Program (MRRG) and Black Spot Programs with general road renewal program.
vi. Installation of new pathways at Gascoyne Street.
vii. Renewal and upgrade work at Aqualife and Leisurelife.
viii. Sale of land associated with 6A McMaster St Victoria Park.

11. Carry Forward Works Program

(a) The Town plans to carry forward $14,041,636 (Attachment 9.2.4) from 2025/26 into the 2026/27 budget, which represents $239,000 for operating projects and $14,102,636 for capital works projects. The recommended budget includes several projects currently in progress and are expected to be completed during 2026/27. Some of the major projects include;

i. Several road rehabilitation projects under the MRRG, Black Spot Programs, and road renewal program.

ii. Elizabeth Baillie Park Masterplan: project commenced in March 2025. Majority of the works are completed. There are some follow-up works to be performed in 2026/27.

iii. Rutland Avenue Shared Path: cost escalation due to the associated design works, further advocacy efforts are underway to allocate additional fundings to deliver the preferred treatment.

iv. Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Project: The civil works component has been delayed due to the need for further investigation and potential redesign of some elements. Works have therefore been postponed to 2026/27. The August 2025 planting trial was assessed, with results informing the approach for the first formal planting stage in May 2026. The 2025/26 revegetation works are complete, with 8,500 tube stock planted in line with the project plan.

12. Operating Expenditure

(a) The Town continues to experience inflationary cost pressures due to rising construction costs, changes in legislative requirements, and renewal of various operational contracts.

(b) Material and contracts expenditure has increased by 2.22% compared to 2025/26 adopted budget due to increases in maintenance requirements, security services within community facilities, and the addition of Urban Forest Program projects being allocated to the operating expenditure due to the nature of works.

i. Higher landscaping and infrastructure maintenance costs, including additional specifications for McCallum Park, Higgins Park and Long Park, have increased the total cost of Parks and Reserves maintenance by $898,405 to $5,743,130.
ii. From 2026/27, all Urban Forest Program projects are allocated to operating expenditure due to the nature of works. The sub-programs of Urban Forest Green Basins, Leafy Streets, Urban Centre Greening, and Urban Ecosystem have increased operating expenditure by $483,000 to the total cost of $798,000.
iii. Security services expenses have increased across our Library, Aqualife and Leisurelife due to ongoing anti-social behaviour concerns of community and the safety of Town officers, totalling $172,200.

(c) Employee costs are projected to increase in 2026/27 due to higher casual salaries expenditure associated with increased participation in programs and expanded service delivery. Notwithstanding these increases, the majority of employee costs remain aligned with the provisions of the Town of Victoria Park Industrial Agreement. In addition, provision has been made for the establishment of five new positions to support the Town’s strategic and operational priorities. Those five new positions are;

i. Manager Asset Management;
ii. Arborist Tree Supervisor;
iii. Development Compliance Officer;
iv. Homelessness Officer; and
v. Planning Officer.

13. Reserve Accounts

(a) The proposed transfers detail a net increase of $6,440,255 to the Town’s reserve accounts. Some of these have been recommended to fund a portion of the capital works program.

(b) The Town continues to plan for the delivery of key infrastructure projects by transferring funds into key renewal reserves for drainage, other infrastructure and roads. The Town continues to receive the dividend distribution from the Catalina Reginal Council (1/12th of ownership interest), which is placed into the future funds reserve, however, this is anticipated to cease within a few years. Anticipated net sales proceeds of 6A McMaster Street will be placed into land asset optimisation reserve. An allocation will be placed into the underground power reserve for the anticipated Targeted Underground Power Program (TUPP) project planned for 2027/28 in Burswood. More generally, the Town is facing some significant infrastructure costs for sporting and recreation facilities for which it needs to plan for being;

i. Aqualife, which is an essential community facility for social and physical activities providing access to aquatic and recreational programs for all ages. Over the next financial year, the Town will be undertaking a detailed options analysis study to determine the feasibility of renovating and expanding core facilities and services. The Town has committed $70,000 towards the study and it is estimated that the construction costs will vary between $15 million to $70 million pending the completion of the study.

ii. Higgins Park, for which the Town is continuing work on an options analysis and concept design for the clubrooms at Higgins Park (Junior Football, Cricket and Tennis) which forms the key next stage of the implementation of the Higgins Park and Playfield Reserve Masterplan. While options analysis remains in the early stages and will be subject to ongoing club engagement and workshopping with Council construction costs are likely to vary between $2 million to $10 million.

(c) Following reserves to be closed or purpose changed or amended for their intended use.

(i) Employee Entitlement Reserve

Closure: as of 1 July 2026, and its budgeted balance of $203,109 to be transferred to waste management reserve.

Reason: AASB 119 Employee Benefit requires the recognition of a liability, and the total amount held as a liability is shown under Note 3 of the Budget. There is not requirement to holding hold matching cash or other asset against that liability.

(ii) Roads Renewal Reserve

Proposed new purpose: to be used to assist in funding renewal initiatives associated with Council's roads, including to assist the Town contribution of State and Federal co-funded road renewal initiatives.

Reason: to ensure the Town has an appropriate funding methodology in place to manage potential cost escalations for State and Federal co-funded road renewal initiatives between the application and project delivery stages. This will enable cost increases arising during that period to be appropriately accounted for and funded.

(iii) Waste Management Reserve

Proposed new purpose: to be used to assist in funding waste management, waste minimisation initiatives, and landfill site rehabilitation.

Reason: The Town holds a $1/12^{th}$ ownership interest in the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) and must recognise and plan for its share of any remediation liability associated with the Tamala Park Waste Management Facility operated by MRC. The reserve will support the Town's ability to contribute to future costs associated with estimating and undertaking remediation or rehabilitation works at the facility.

(d) Full detail on the proposed reserve transfers is included within the Attachment 9.2.1 under Note 9 Reserve Accounts, and Attachments 9.2.3 and 9.2.4, showing reserve allocations to projects and programs.

14. Loans

(a) The budget includes a loan to be raised for the Elizabeth Baillie project, valued at $2,200,000. Once works have concluded, this loan will be raised within the 2026/27 financial year. This loan has been included in previous budgets but not yet drawn down.

(b) Full detail on the movement in borrowings is included within the Attachment 9.2.1 under Note 8 Borrowings.

15. Materiality Reporting

(a) Each year Council is required to adopt a percentage or value for the purposes of reporting material variances in the monthly Financial Activity Statement.
(b) This value or percentage is then used throughout the financial year to identify potential areas in Council's actual revenues and expenditures that may not be in keeping with Council's budget. The early identification of these potential issues can assist in better utilisation and allocation of Council funds and resources.
(c) The values chosen should provide a good indication of variances that would not normally be able to be covered through Council's normal operations and should, therefore, be assessed to identify if a potential issue exists or not.
(d) To be compliant with 34 (3)(5) of Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, this is amended to a variance of (+) or (-) 10%, where that variance is also more than $50,000, for both revenue and expenditure to be included in the Statement of Financial Activity.

Relevant documents

[Strategic Community Plan]

[Corporate Business Plan]

Legal and policy compliance

Local Government Act 1995

Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996

Financial implications

Current budget impact	No impact on the current budget, however, an assessment has been made on likely carry forward budget allocations, and any likely carried forwards surplus or deficit.
Future budget impact	The adoption of the annual budget 2026/27 will enable the continuity of service delivery, maintenance and renewal of existing assets, and generation of new assets in line with Strategic Community Plan and Corporate Business Plan.

Risk management consideration

Risk impact category	Risk event description	Risk rating	Risk appetite	Risk Mitigation
Financial	Reduction in the quality of assets and services delivered if the proposed annual budget is not adopted.	Moderate	Low	Treat risk by ensuring Elected Members have been involved in the annual budget process to ensure understanding and collaboration for the budget to be understood and adopted.
Environmental	Potential reduction in the tree canopy if the initiative outlined within the Urban Forest Program is not adopted.	Moderate	Medium	Treat risk by ensuring stakeholders have been involved in the annual budget process to ensure understanding of the Urban Forest Program and initiatives.
Health and safety	Not applicable.		Low	
Data, Information Technology and Cyber	Potential reduction in the security of data and cyber security if the proposed ICT projects and services are not adopted.		Medium	Treat risk by ensuring elected members have been involved in the annual budget process to ensure understanding of critical ICT infrastructure and services.
Assets	Potential reduction in the quality of assets provided if the proposed	Moderate	Medium	Treat risk by ensuring elected members have been involved in the annual budget process including the setting of the capital works program projects are well understood.

	annual budget is not adopted.			
Compliance Breach	Legislative compliance will not be adhered to if the annual budget is not adopted and forwarded as appropriate within the required timeframes.	Moderate	Low	Treat risk by ensuring elected members have been involved in the annual budget process to ensure understanding and collaboration in order for the budget to be understood and adopted.
Reputation	Negative public perception if Council does not adopt the annual budget	Minor	Low	Treat risk by ensuring elected members have been involved in the annual budget process to ensure understanding and collaboration for the budget to be adopted. Community submission periods.
Service delivery interruption	Potential reduction in the quality of services delivered if the annual budget is not adopted or reduced.	Moderate	Medium	Treat risk by ensuring elected members have been involved in the annual budget process to ensure understanding and collaboration for the budget to be understood and adopted.

Engagement

Internal engagement	
Elected Members	Engagement was completed with Elected Members over five workshops with the Administration.
C-Suite	Engagement during the development of the Annual Budget process, including the approval of service area draft budgets, workforce request, and capital work projects. In addition, C-Suite was provided with regular updates on the budget process, its core informing documents, and workshop material.
Senior Management Group	The Town's Senior Management Group was engaged during the annual budget process to draft the required information to support the Capital Work Program, Workforce Plan, Operating Budgets, and Fees & Charges.

External engagement	
Stakeholders	Town of Victoria Park Community (residents, business owners, community groups)
Period of engagement	Survey Opened on Thursday 29 January 2026 Survey Closed on Thursday 26 February 2026

Level of engagement	2. Consult
Methods of engagement	Methods of engagement provided to the community was for them to participate in an optional survey, which was available either online or in paper, which could be collected from Town’s Administration Building.
Advertising	The “Money Matters” Community Engagement Survey was available via the Town website and was advertised to the community via various social media posts.
Submission summary	The survey had 487 interactions with 193 participants completing a survey. • What suburb of the Town do you live in? • If you do not live in the Town of Victoria Park, what is your primary interest in providing feedback on the Town's 2026/27 budget? • How satisfied are you with the Town's investment in your suburb? • What level of investment should the Town allocate to each of the following areas in the 2026/27 financial year? • Is there anything you would like to see considered in the budget for 2026/27? Why? • To what extent do you agree with the following statements? • The amount I pay in rates is: • Which of the following options best describes your household? • How long have you lived in the Town? • What is your age group? • Do you have any final comments to share?
Key findings	**Question 1:** The first question asked to members was what suburb of the Town do you live in? If members did not live within the Town, a follow up question was asked about what is your primary interest in providing feedback on the Town's 2026/27 budget? • 43.9% lived in East Victoria Park • 21.9% lived in Victoria Park • The remaining 34.2% of participants resided in either Lathlain (11.2%), Carlisle (10.8%), Burswood (5.4%), St James (5%), Bentley (0.7%) Kensington (0.4%) and I do not live in the Town (0.7%) **Question 2:** The second question focused on better understanding the participants' perception of how satisfied they are with the Town's investment within their suburbs. • 57.9% of participants were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the Town investment in their suburbs, which was an increase compared to previous year's results of 44.3%. • 16.9% of participants were neutral about the Town’s investment in their suburbs, which was a decrease compared to previous year's results of 20.6%.

- 24.5% of participants were either somewhat unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with the Town's investment in their suburbs, which was a decrease compared to previous year's results of 35.0%.

Question 3: The third question sought feedback about what level of investment should the Town allocate to each of the following areas in the 2026/27 financial year? This year we added a prompt for participants to keep in mind how your choices would impact on the Town's overall budget and rates for 2026/27. For example, selecting 'more' for most areas may require a rate increase. If you prefer not to see rates rise, consider balancing your responses and prioritising the area's most important to you. The key findings of this question include.

- Protecting and enhancing the natural environment remained the top priority with 62% (previously 74%) of the community wanting the Town to consider an increase in investment.
- Support for homelessness (55%), Upgrading our facilities (54%), Helping people feel safe (51%) all received strong support to increase investment within these areas.
- Strong support to see the same amount of investment spent towards maintaining Improving waste services (57%), Access to art, education, history and culture (54%), and supporting local businesses (51%)

Question 4: The fourth question in the survey empowered the participants to share their ideas and consideration for inclusion in the budget for 2026/27. The question asked is there anything you would like to see considered in the budget for 2026/2027? Why? The top themes have been summarised below.

- **1. Improving Streets, Roads and Footpaths Public** (Ranked #2 - Transport & Roads in 2025-26 survey): Residents frequently raised issues and concerns of deterioration of transport related infrastructure, such as greater investment in road resurfacing and maintenance, footpath upgrades and connectivity, safer pedestrian crossings, and traffic calming and safer streets.
- **2. Street Trees, Greening and Urban Canopy** (Ranked #1 - Parks & Green Spaces in 2025-26 survey): A strong theme across many submissions was the need to increase investment in urban greening initiatives, such as more street trees, improved tree maintenance, increased shade in streets and parks, and protection of existing mature trees.
- **3. Parks, Public Spaces and Community Amenity** (Ranked #1 - Parks & Green Spaces in 2025-26 survey): Residents expressed strong support for investing in local parks and recreational spaces, such as upgraded playgrounds, improvements to park maintenance, increased provision of seating and shade structures, and lighting and safety improvements.
- **4. Waste Management and Cleanliness** (Ranked #8 - Waste Management & Cleanliness in 2025-26 survey): Waste services were another recurring theme raised by residents that suggested improvements associated with waste collection services, additional public bins, better recycling options, and stronger action to address litter and illegal dumping.
- **5. Community Safety** (Ranked #3 - Crime Prevention in 2025-26 survey): Safety concerns continue to be a strong theme throughout the

engagement period where residents raised concerns in relation to improved lighting in streets and parks, anti-social behaviour in public areas, and traffic safety.

Question 5: The fifth question was new and focused on understanding the participants' perception of value for money associated with the Town's services and rates paid. This section asked participants to select from a range of choices from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The question my current rates feel fair for the services provided by the Town found.

- 6% - Strongly agree
- 36% - Somewhat agree
- 25% - Unsure/neutral
- 21% - Somewhat disagree
- 11% - Strongly disagree

The question rates in the Town are good value for money found.

- 7% - Strongly agree
- 27% - Somewhat agree
- 27% - Unsure/neutral
- 27% - Somewhat disagree
- 12% - Strongly disagree

Question 6: The sixth question asked participants to rate how they feel about the amount I pay in rates they pay.

- 3.4% - A little low
- 48.7% - About right
- 35.4% - A little high
- 12.5% - Much too high

Question 7: Which of the following options best describes your household?

- 3.2% - Share house
- 2.9% - Single with kids living at home
- 7.9% - Couple with kids, kids not living at home
- 43.7% - Couple with kids, kids living at home
- 28.2% - Couple, no kids
- 11.9% - Single, living alone
- 2.2% - Other

Question 8: How long have you lived in the Town?

- 49.3% - 10+ years
- 15.2% - 5-10 years
- 15.2% - 3-5 years
- 14.1% - 1-3 years

- 5.4% - 1 year or less
- 0.7% - I don’t live in the Town of Victoria Park

Question 9: What is your age group?

- 0.7% - 15-24 years
- 14.0% - 25-34 years
- 37.1% - 35-44 years
- 21.7% - 45-54 years
- 13.6% - 55-64 years
- 10.3% - 65-74 years
- 2.2% - 75-84 years
- 0.4% - 85 years or over

Question 10: The final question asked if the participant had any final comments to share? The top themes have been summarised below.

- **1. Strong Call for “Back to Basics” Governance:** A dominant overarching message that was received through this section was that residents consistently reinforced that the Town should focus on maintaining existing infrastructure and services, avoid overcommitting to new or ”nice-to-have” projects, and focus on delivery of core services well and consistently.
- **2. Concern About Rates and Cost of Living:** A significant number of comments referred to financial pressure that the community is facing, which found residents asked for a minimal rate increase, greater transparency on how funds are spent, clear justification for any major expenditure.
- **3. Desire for Transparency and Accountability:** Many respondents wanted clearer communication around how decisions are made, why certain projects are prioritized, how community feedback is used, underlying sentiment, residents want to feel heard and able to trust the decision-making process.
- **4. Mixed Sentiment Toward Current Performance:** The survey participants reflected a range of views about the Town’s performance including positive feedback about the appreciation for parks, amenities, and community feel but also sharing critical feedback about frustration with perceived underinvestment in infrastructure and spending decisions.
- **5. Continued Emphasis on Infrastructure and Amenity:** A repeated expectation that was raised within this section was the need to prioritise infrastructure such as roads and footpaths, trees and greening, cleanliness and maintenance, and parks and facilities.

External engagement

Stakeholders	Town of Victoria Park Community (residents, business owners, community groups)
Period of engagement	Survey Opened on Thursday 28 May 2026 Survey Closed on Thursday 18 June 2026
Level of engagement	2. Consult
Methods of engagement	Methods of engagement provided to the community was for them to participate in an optional survey, which was available either online or in paper, which could be collected from Town's Administration Building.
Advertising	The "Have your say on Differential Rates 2026/27" was available via the Town website and was advertised to the community via the Town's website, various social media posts and newspaper.
Submission summary	The survey had 95 interactions with 34 participants completing it, and one submission was received through email. This information was used to better understand the community's perceptions of the proposed differential rates and minimum payments for the 2026/27 financial year.
Key findings	The sentiment regarding the proposed split of the differential rating categories was generally supportive. Additional feedback highlighted the following: • Both support and opposition to the overall proposed rates increase of 5%; • Drawing down on reserves further to offset reliance on rates; • Request to separate waste charges and increase waste collection services; • Both positions to maintain and reduce current service levels.

Strategic alignment

Civic Leadership	
Community Priority	Intended public value outcome or impact
CL1 – Effectively managing resources and performance.	The annual budget 2026/27 complies with the relevant legislative regulations and adheres to the Town's own policies and practices to ensure the effective management of resources.
CL2 - Communication and engagement with the community.	Proposed differential rates advertised and public comment sought. In addition, the Town encouraged the community to engage in our "Money Matters" Community Engagement Survey to share ideas and themes for the Town to focus on as part of the setting of the annual budget 2026/27.
CL3 - Accountability and good governance.	The annual budget 2026/27 has been developed with Elected Members through a series of workshops to ensure it reflects the communities' current needs.

Economic	
Community Priority	Intended public value outcome or impact
EC1 - Facilitating a strong local economy.	The annual budget 2026/27 facilitates a strong local economy by investing in infrastructure projects, local events, and community services.

Further Consideration

At the Agenda Briefing Forum meeting held on 7 July 2026, the following consideration was requested:

Item 13.3 Low Cost Urban Road Safety Program (LCURSP) Grant, presented as part of 7 July 2026 ABF is now included in the 2026/27 Capital Works Program, agenda item listed as Attachment 9.3.6. Within this report, paragraph 10 has been added to the report presented at ABF, listing the proposed sites. Following the agenda briefing and consideration of the matter by the administration, the grant income and capital works have been added to the proposed budget, instead of listing as a separate item to amend the budget. This has changed the following figures:

- Carry Forward Works Program
  - Carried forward project amount: from $14,341,636 to $14,041,636
  - Grant and Contribution amount: from $5,050,414 to $4,750,414

  Reason: W910 Low Cost Urban Road Safety Program ($300,000) was restated as part of the 2026/27 Capital Works Program
- Capital Works Program
  - Project cost amount: from $8,144,948 to $9,659,948.
  - Grant and contribution amount: from $2,170,843 to $3,685,843.

  Reason: A $1,515,000 Urban Road Safety Program grant-funded project has been added. This program includes speed calming measures on Rutland Avenue. The $300,000 municipal funding from the separate Rutland Avenue project will be transferred to the LCURSP program to fund ancillary works, including drainage, lighting and landscaping, which are not covered by the grant program.

As described in the report submitted to the ABF – Item 13.3, ancillary costs are likely to be incurred, are not covered by the funding program. Therefore, it is recommended by Town Officers that the $300,000 of municipal funding is retained to enable timely delivery of the program. While not an exhaustive list, as some detailed design still needs to be completed, these costs could include:

- Road safety audits – estimated to be $60,000 ($4,000 per site).
- Relocation of services – site dependant, however, by way of example to relocate drainage at one site alone could be $50,000.
- Landscaping where appropriate – estimated to be $5,000 to $10,000 per site.
- Lighting – installation of single light pole is estimated to be $10,000.
- Restoration or rerouting of footpaths.

The Town does not have any other funds designated for possible ancillary works at these sites, other than the $300,000 attached to this program. If any of the above ancillary works are needed, budget amendments may be needed to progress with certain cells and locations.

1. Provide response to question taken on notice "*My next question is on the carry forwards program. The proposed budget has our actual capital spend for the preceding financial year at roughly $18.2 million. I would like to get an understanding of that estimate, what we'll land on as an actual, and whether it may change as we go back and do the accounts for the past month or so. I note in the Financial Statements for May that we are tracking at $17.9 million of actual expenditure on capital projects, but there is an additional $5.1 million of commitments. Can we expect that $5.1 million committed amount to end up being the actual for the past financial year? Similar to what happened in the previous budget, where we ended up with a re-evaluated budget for our actuals when we accounted for what carry forwards actually ended up occurring, can some commentary be provided on where we are planning to, what we think is the best estimate of where we will land, and, if we do not know, what the process will be going forward?" and "…if the actual expenditure shown is approximately $17.9 million, and there are commitments of $5.1 million. Would we expect those two figures together to form the final capital works expenditure for the past financial year, or will some of those commitments be carried forward?"*

The assumption that all of the $5.1 million of commitments outlined within the May 2026 Financial Statements will be completed by 30 June 2026 is incorrect. The Town has forecasted that $18.2 million of capital works will be completed by 30 June 2026, which would represent approx. $0.3m of these commitments to be completed by the end of 2025/26 financial year, so the bulk of the commitments shown will be part of the carry forward works.

***2.* Provide an update on the reported $50,000 election commitment for upgrades to the Scout Hall kitchen and bathrooms, including the status of any associated State Government funding, whether the commitment forms part of a Department of Sport and Recreation or other community facilities funding program, and any implications for the Scout Hall allocation contained within the Capital Works Program.**

On further investigation it was confirmed that the Scout Club has been the direct beneficiaries of a $50,000 election commitment. The funding has not been considered as part of the capital works program to renovate the Scout Hall bathroom and kitchen. Therefore, the 2026/27 Capital Works Program will remain unchanged, but Town Officers will engage further with the Scout Club to better understand the use of the $50,000 commitment.

3. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*What is the total value of all the Town's current building assets, either based on replacement value or depreciated value?*"

Based on the Town's 2024/25 Financial Statements, the current replacement cost and depreciated value of building assets are as follows.

	Current Replacement Cost	**Depreciated Value**
Buildings	$134,566,748	$76,470,144

4. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*What percentage of the Town's fleet vehicles, heavy and light, are currently electric?*

There are currently 45 vehicles in the light fleet. To date 16 have replaced with hybrids or dedicated electric. There are 29 remaining combustion engines.

There are still 7 vehicles that we should seek to change from combustion engines to achieve the 50% target by 2030 – we are currently sitting at 36%.

Currently, opportunities to transition away from diesel-powered engines within the heavy vehicle and mobile plant fleet are limited due to the performance requirements of these assets and the affordability of available alternative technologies. While lower-emission and zero-emission options continue to evolve, they are not yet able to consistently meet operational demands or provide a financially viable replacement across all heavy vehicle and plant applications

It is important to note that a number of factors must be considered when selecting operational vehicles. Under Work Health and Safety (WHS) legislation, consultation with workers is required whenever decisions are made regarding vehicles, mobile plant, machinery, or other equipment that may affect their health and safety. This consultation should focus on identifying hazards associated with the vehicles or plant, assessing the risks arising from their use, and considering appropriate control measures to minimise those risks.

5. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*What percentage of the Town's fleet vehicles, heavy and light, will be electric through adoption of this budget?*

There are currently 4 additional vehicles that are being considered for replacement with either hybrid or full electric technology. Should the electric vehicle be selected, we would have achieved 44% of the 2030 target.

There is no fit for purpose utility vehicles available in the market within the segment in which we purchase.

6. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*In relation to that, what percentage of the fleet electrification targets set out in the Climate Emergency Plan have been achieved to date, excluding any vehicles proposed for purchase under the budget currently being considered for adoption?*"

Please refer to the responses above in point 4 and 5.

7. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*My next question relates to Item 616 and, in part, picks up on a question raised by a member of the public during Public Question Time this evening. This relates to the Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Project. From the Carry Forward Works list, the total project cost is listed as $540,950, with funding comprising $241,350 from reserves and $299,600 from municipal funding, meaning that almost $300,000 was budgeted for the project in the 2025–26 financial year. However, in the 2026–27 Capital Works Program, a project with the same description appears with a total project cost of $672,000, comprising $500,000 in Commonwealth grant funding and $172,000 in municipal funding. My first question is: are these the same project or two different projects?*"

These projects are two separate projects and a breakdown of each stage and costs has been provided below.

Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Project – Stage One, total project cost of $540,950 (as part of the 2026/27 Carry Forward Program): This project is focused on the delivery of essential civil works components, which has been delayed due to the need for further investigation and potential redesign of some elements. Works have therefore been postponed to 2026/27. The August 2025 planting trial was assessed, with results informing the approach for the first formal planting stage in May 2026. The 2025/26 revegetation works are complete, with 8,500 tube stock planted in line with the project plan.

Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Project – Stage Two, total project cost of $672,000 (as part of the 2026/27 Capital Works Program: $172,000 municipal funding and $500,000 grant funding): This project restores Banksia woodland, once dominant on the Swan Coastal Plain but now a threatened ecological community due to extensive clearing. By reintroducing indicator species, restoration of the Kent Street Sand Pit extends Kensington Bushland and creates vital inner-city habitat for endangered Black Cockatoos, Quenda, reptiles, and smaller birds rarely found in urban areas. The objectives considered within this scope of works include:

- Installation of two universal access ramps
- Installation of three yarning circles
- Ground preparation and weed control
- Seedling propagation and Planting of 5,000m^2 Banksia Woodland tube stock.

8. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*If they are in fact the same project, are we now saying that the cost to undertake the same work is $1,212,950 rather than $540,950 or $672,000?*"

The Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Projects outlined within the 2026/27 Capital Works Program and the 2026/27 Carry Forward Program are two separate stages, which brings the total project cost to $1,212,950 (Stage 1: $540,950 and Stage 2: $672,000).

9. Provide a response to question taken on notice "*If that is the case and the total project cost is $1,212,950 for the same project, what is the total municipal funding component?*"

Total municipal funding for the Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Project is $472,000. The breakdown below outlines the funding commitments.

Stage One: Total project cost of $550,000

- Original: $300,000 municipal funding for the Kent Street Sandpit Bushland Management Project, included in the adopted 2023/24 Capital Works Program.
- Add: $250,000 reserve funding from the Other Infrastructure Reserve, approved under Item 13.3, Kent St Sand Pit – Approval to Change Proposed Pathway Materiality, Resolution 60/2024, OCM 16 May 2024.
- Carry forward to 2025/26: $541,350, comprising $300,000 municipal funding and $241,350 reserve funding.
- Carry forward to 2026/27: $540,950, comprising $299,600 municipal funding and $241,350 reserve funding.

Stage Two: Total project cost of $672,000

- $172,000 municipal funding and $500,000 grant funding.

10. Provide a response to question taken on notice *"My question relates to the Carry Forward Works under the Place Planning heading, of which there are a number of projects listed. These works appear to be what I would have considered operating expenditure rather than the usual capital works carry forwards. Could details please be provided as to why each of these projects has been identified as a carry forward? There are also some items in the descriptions that I do not recognise, such as a character study or a heritage study. Any information that can be provided about these projects and the reason they have been included as carry forwards would be appreciated."*

947. Bike Network - Horden Street $10,000

- This operating budget sits alongside a capital budget for Hordern St that is also requested to be carried forward. Due to competing priorities, these projects were not delivered in 25/26. Place Planning and Street Improvement are working cross functionally to develop a concept that improves this space for pedestrians and cyclists.

152. Decorative Lighting Proposal $15,000

- Originating from a notice of motion, and following the March 2026 Concept Forum, Town staff are continuing the design work for decorative lighting in the Town. It is intended for this to inform a budget request in the 27/28 budget process.

940. Micro Spaces $30,000

- This budget is being used for the design of an upgraded intersection at Albany Hwy and Dane St. The design is currently at 15%. The intention is to complete the design in preparedness for the 27/28 budget process.

157. Community Facilities Capacity and Equity Study - Stage 2 $20,000

- The lead role for this project (Place Leader – Social Infrastructure) was vacant for much of last financial year. This role is now filled, and the officer will be prioritising this study under the Social Infrastructure Program, working closely with the Assets team.

158. Aqualife Feasibility Study $70,000

- The lead role for this project (Place Leader – Social Infrastructure) was vacant for much of last financial year. This role is now filled, and the officer will be prioritising this feasibility study under the Social Infrastructure Program. This project is the next step in understanding the long term solution for the Aqualife facilities and also plays a critical role in identifying the path forwards for the Macmillan Precinct Masterplan.

165. UFS Communication, Engagement and Education (2E) $25,000

- This funding is requested to be carried forward to complete the review of the Urban Forest Strategy. This review was commenced in 25/26, however was temporarily paused due to staff resourcing. This is envisioned to be complete by the end of 2026.

167. Albany Highway Precinct Plan: Victoria Park Town Centre $24,000

- The Town have been awaiting a pending decision from the WAPC on this project. Originally anticipated Dec 2025, we have recently been informed that it will now extend beyond Sept 2026. Funding has been requested to complete the Stage 3 WAPC endorsement and PSP finalisation stage of the project.

173. Heritage and Character Study $30,000

- This funding is for the Town's Heritage Area and Residential Character Retention Study, which is an action outlined in the Town's Local Planning Strategy and therefore being delivered through the Vic Park Planning Program. An important piece of work to provide contemporary protection for some residential areas adjacent to the Albany Highway Precinct. This project is 75% complete but this funding is required to complete the work in Q1 of 2026/27.

11. Provide a response to question taken on notice *"Can I clarify the process here. If 12 Planet Street drainage project was previously listed in the budget as an investigation only, rather than construction works, how has it progressed to a project that is now being delivered? Other than the consolidation of the drainage budget that you referred to, where can we identify how that decision was made and what the final scope of works became? Given that the solution now under construction was not the project originally identified in the budget, and that the original allocation was for investigation works, how can we determine what the adopted solution has ultimately cost, whether it has been delivered within the budget originally allocated or subsequently revised, and where that information can be found?*

The original budget of $30,000 was allocated for investigation and design works. As part of the mid-year budget review (Resolution 40/2026, OCM 17 March 2026), an additional $50,000 was approved to progress the project to construction and purchase the required drainage infrastructure, including underground detention cells. These cells provide temporary stormwater storage during storm events, allowing water to gradually dissipate underground. The works were completed by 30 June 2026.

12. Provide a response to question taken on notice *"Can I please inquire why a column for the revised budget has not been included? It would seem that the more meaningful comparison is between the revised budget as it finally stood at the end of the financial year and the budget that Council is now being asked to adopt, rather than comparing the proposed budget only against the original budget adopted at the start of the previous financial year."*

The Local Government Act and Financial Regulations do not specify which budget should be used for the prior year comparative within the statutory budget report. However, it is best practice to use the prior year's adopted budget as the comparative rather than the revised budget as it provides a consistent and transparent point of comparison for elected members, the community and government departments. The adopted budget is the benchmark used to calculate the prior year's rates charges and therefore is a direct comparison to the changes to the budget required for rate revenue for the upcoming budget. The revised budget includes several post-adoption non-rates revenue adjustments, such as prior year surplus or deficit considerations, revised non-rates revenue, and reserve movements. These adjustments will also change the expenditure levels. In addition, the statutory budget report is publicised on the Town's website and is submitted to the Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety. Therefore, the revised budget is not the preferred comparative for the adopted budget.

13. Provide a response to statement taken on notice *"The Mayor clarified that the purpose of the question was to understand how Council, and the community, are expected to assess the proposed budget and the rationale for the proposed 5% rate increase when the comparison presented is against the original adopted 2025–26 budget rather than the revised budget position that existed following the mid-year budget review. The Mayor noted that the adopted budget had changed significantly during the financial year, resulting in considerable changes to expenditure, and queried how meaningful comparisons could be made where those revisions were not visible in the budget documentation. The Mayor further clarified that the question sought to understand how the key differences between the Town's actual budget position and the proposed 2026–27 budget could be identified and assessed."*

As noted above in point 12, the significant changes made after adoption of annual budget (adopted budget) are the reason that the revised budget is not preferred to be the comparative figure in the following year's adopted budget. The estimated actual income and expenditure (column 2025/26 Est. Actuals) is shown to provide an additional basis to assess the proposed budget.

10 Public question time

11 Public statement time

12 Meeting closed to the public

12.1 Matters for which the meeting may be closed

12.1.1 CEO KPI's 2026/2027

Reason for Confidentiality

This report and its attachment are confidential in accordance with Section 5.23(2) of *the Local Government Act 1995*, as the business to be considered relates to the following:

(b) A matter relating to the recruitment or employment of the Chief Executive Officer or a senior employee, including the following:

(ii) a review of performance under section 5.38.

Location	**Town-wide**
Reporting officer	Manager People & Culture
Responsible officer	Manager People & Culture
Voting requirement	Simple majority
Attachments	1. CONFIDENTIAL - KPI Workshop Presentation 2026-2027 [**12.1.1.1** – 27 pages]

Summary

Review and approve the draft Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) for the Chief Executive Officer for the financial year 2026/2027.

Recommendation from the CEO Recruitment and Performance Review Committee
That the CEO Recruitment and Performance Review Committee recommends that Council: 1. Endorses the 2026/2027 Key Performance Indicators for the Chief Executive Officer as determined by the Committee as set out in 12.1.1.1. 2. Resolves that this report, and its attachments remain confidential in accordance with section 5.23 (2)(b)(ii) of the Local Government Act 1995.

12.2 Public reading of resolutions which may be made public

13 Closure