



# Annual Meeting of Electors

MINUTES

Tuesday 3 February 2026

## **INDEX**

<b>1. Official Opening .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Attendance, Apologies and Leave of Absence Previously Approved .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Presentation and Discussion of 2024/2025 Annual Report .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. General Business .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5. Closure.....</b>	<b>13</b>

**1. Official Opening**

The Presiding Member opened the meeting at 6:30pm and welcomed Councillors, Staff, Members of the Public Gallery and those watching via live stream. The Presiding Member also acknowledged the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet the Whadjuk Noongar people

**2. Announcement by the Member Presiding without Discussion**

Before we begin this evening's Annual Meeting of Electors, I'd like to take a moment to acknowledge the recent passing of two members of our community - David Sadler and Matthew Petch.

David served as a Shire of Kalamunda Councillor for many years and gave generously of his time to public service and community life, including through his work as a Board Member with Retirees WA, where he was a thoughtful and steady advocate for seniors. His contribution has left a lasting mark on our City.

We also acknowledge the passing of Matthew - a local teacher, husband and father who served with the Kalamunda Volunteer Bush Fire Brigade with great dedication and humility. He was respected not just for his skills and leadership, but for the calm, caring way he supported others.

While David and Matthew served our community in different ways, they shared the same spirit - generosity, quiet service, and a deep care for others. On behalf of Council and the City of Kalamunda, I extend our sincere condolences to their families, friends, colleagues and all who are grieving their loss. We thank them for what they gave to this community, and we honour their memory as we come together this evening.

**3. Attendance, Apologies and Leave of Absence Previously Approved**

**Members of Staff**

**Chief Executive Officer**

Anthony Vuleta - Chief Executive Officer

**Executive Team**

Nathan Ritchie – Director Development

Gary Ticehurst - Director Corporate

Sinead McGuire – Director Infrastructure

Darren Jones – Acting Director Community

Liah Ale – Acting Director Infrastructure

**Management Team**

Rhonda Bowman - Manager Governance

**Administration Support**

David Baker – Senior Governance Officer

Molly Rogers-Thomson - Executive Officer to the CEO

Margaret Thomas JP (Presiding Member)

David Modolo

Mary Cannon

Brooke O'Donnell

Sue Bilich

Lisa Cooper

Josh Clark

Kathy Ritchie

**Members of the Public.** 13

**Members of the Press** Nil.

**Apologies:** John Giardina

**4. Presentation and Discussion of 2024/2025 Annual Report**

4.1 The Presiding Member presented the Annual Report for 2024/25 to the meeting.

4.1.1 David Modolo, Kalamunda

Q1. Were there any material operating cost increases in 2024/2025 that were not foreseen in the budget? And what actions have been taken to control future escalation?

A1. There were no material variations on the expenditure side of the City's comprehensive income statement. If you look at our budget for the 2025 period was 82 million and the actual was 82.8 million, a variance of only \$600,000 against 82 million. In relation to what measures does the City take to mitigate and manage those varying number of activities. The first is the monthly financial reporting which comes to Council. Second is the midyear review and quarterly budget review processes which are monitored internally. Then of course the midterm budget review being a statutory review comes to Council as a public facing document.

Q2. Were there any material audit findings in the financial statements?

A2. There were no material adverse audit findings in the financial statements. Based upon that the auditors recommended an unqualified audit opinion.

Q3. How has the City measured community satisfaction for critical services like waste and parks and roads? How does this compare with previous years?

A3. We measure our community satisfaction levels through our community scorecard. Specifically in relation to waste, I know that our levels of satisfaction in relation to the industry are considered high. In relation to parks specifically, it's grouped in a broader sense on levels of service in and around community facilities and green spaces.

Every two years we do a community scorecard satisfaction survey. Not a cheap exercise to undertake. The next one is due around September this year and then we'll see if there's any major changes to levels of satisfaction. We will also be undertaking an engagement process for our new strategic plan, our council plan, and we are expecting to talk to community about expectations in regard to levels of service.

**5. General Business**

5.1 Hannah Lill, Kalamunda – read aloud by Presiding Member

Q1. While a critical element of the Urban Forest Strategy was negated when LPP33 was rescinded in February 2024 - when will we see the monitoring data referred to on page 27 - in particular updated canopy data in a comparable format to the 2020 baseline?

A1. As part of the CEO Key Performance Indicators for 2025/26, officers will be providing a progress report on the different environmental strategies' actions, including the Urban Forest Strategy by the end of this financial year. In terms of data availability, which is comparable to the 2020 baseline, the City currently utilises the Western Australian Planning Commission's Urban Forest Canopy Dashboard, with a link to be provided as part of the minutes of the meeting.

Link: [Urban greening data — Perth and Peel](#)

Q2. The Annual Report refers to an “Urban Forest Strategy refresh” which the community is noted to have had the opportunity to contribute to. Given the strategy was only adopted in 2023 - can you please confirm the rationale for and likely timeframe for this “refresh”? And how / when the community were invited to contribute?

A2. The specific environment program which underwent a 'refresh' was the Plants for Residents program. The refresh saw a review which provided a fairer and more inclusive approach to the distribution of native plants, through the pre-selected native plant packs, designed to boost biodiversity, support local flora and strengthen the Urban Forest canopy. The refresh was informed by community feedback on the previous 'first come first serve' online system, a survey was also undertaken post the event to evaluate and improve on the initiative for future financial years.

5.2 Michelle Bunn, Kalamunda

Q1. When can we expect to receive the revised draft Future Forest Policy, or will this two year vacuum continue?

A1. With response to the engagement, it has been significant with respect to the future forest policy. We've had over 150 formal submissions, and we've also had over 70 in-person engagements as we've gone out to the community to talk about this policy. There has been a lot of feedback in which to consider. Broadly the feedback that's been received is that the policy does not meet the expectations of the community. The broad sentiments are that that the policy is biased towards exemptions and doesn't focus enough on requiring tree retention.

Officers have been through the feedback and options are being prepared for Councillors.

Administration advised that a workshop with Council will be required to consider the policy direction and determine which elements may need adjustment or may be acceptable moving forward. Should a policy require redrafting, the extent of those changes will determine whether readvertising is necessary. Substantial amendments would require a further advertising process; however, if changes fall within Council's tolerance, the policy may be progressed for consideration.

It was noted that several options remain available to Council, including reintroducing the revoked LP33 Tree Retention Policy (subject to advertising requirements); adopting the WALGA Policy, should Council wish to do so; or resolving not to proceed with a policy at this time. Timeframes will depend on the pathway Council chooses.

Administration further advised that the intent is to hold workshops with Councillors over the coming months to refine the policy direction. This process will incorporate consideration of the approximately 150 community submissions received, with the aim of determining an appropriate future approach to tree retention within the City.

5.3 Donna Gahan, Kalamunda

Q1. I have some questions for council regarding tree protection. On the 30th of May 2025, a new standard for the protection of trees on development sites came into effect, the AS4970 2025. A City of Kalamunda planning staff member I spoke to some time ago confirmed that this new standard applies to all development proposals approved after the 30th of May 2025. I'd just like to ask is this correct?

A1. This question was taken on notice.

Q2. I'd like to know why the McDonald's car wash and dog wash development in Kalamunda doesn't require a new arborist assessment as it was approved 5 months after the publication of the AS4970 2025 and the original assessment was done using the old standard which didn't emphasise planning and development to ensure long-term viability of affected trees. As part of that question, why did the City of Kalamunda responsible authority report prepared for the 30th of October 2025 MODAP hearing reference the old 2009 standard rather than apply the current one of 2025?

A2. Part of this question was taken on notice.

The planning proposal relating to the McDonald's development involved consideration of a range of matters, including trees, traffic, community benefit and other relevant planning factors. These matters formed part of the decision-making framework considered by the Development Assessment Panel (DAP), with panel members weighing the relative importance of each element.

The DAP has the ability to impose new conditions, amend existing conditions, or include additional requirements as part of its determination. While certain matters were not progressed through the process as anticipated, approval for the development was ultimately granted and issued.

The relevant information and applicable standards would have been considered by the DAP as decision-makers when determining the appropriate pathway forward, including the application of conditions to the approval.

- Q3. I have done extensive research which confirms that concrete is not permeable. It's porous but not permeable and it starves tree roots of water, oxygen and nutrients. Contrary to what the arborist employed by McDonald's says. With 75.9% encroachment into its notional root zone, which is the old TPZ which is normally requires tree removal, and root zone coverage with impermeable surfaces.

The likelihood of the highly significant Mari Tree number two's long-term viability is poor unless pervious concrete is used according to the research I've done. They've made a modification to use reinforced concrete instead of tarmac. Pervious concrete and also permeable paving depending upon the circumstances are proven best practice materials for use in tree root zones.

- A3. The City will take on board the standard and research provided. There can be conditions that there is a level of ambiguity that still needs to be worked through with the detail and which is required in order to clear the condition and there is opportunity in which the City or the clearing authority of that condition can work with the developer to find the most appropriate pathway forward.

5.3.1 RESOLVED AGM 2026/1

I move that the City of Kalamunda research and mandate materials like pervious concrete for use in the Kalamunda McDonalds Development and all other developments where that are major incursions into trees'



notional root zones (NRZ – as defined in AS4971-2025) to help ensure longevity of existing and newly planted trees.

Moved: **Donna Gahan**  
Seconded: **Maryanne Hancock**  
Vote: **16/0**

The Presiding Member invited members of the public to speak to the motion or ask questions in relation to the motion.

5.3.2 Kathy Ritchie, Walliston

Q1 What is the status of the new standard Donna Gahan referred to? Is it mandatory or can it be left up to local governments?

A1. This question was taken on notice.

5.4 Peter Forrest, Kalamunda

Q1. The Grogan Road closure is impacting the commute of locals. Is it possible to build a tunnel concurrently to assist with this issue?

A1. When an analysis was done on providing a tunnel it was deemed not feasible by Perth Airport. The City does not have a say in this matter. Their preference is to have traffic use the major arterial roads and they have plans to upgrade the entrance to T1 and T2.

Q2. Brixton Street wetlands is a conservation and high value area. It has been wiped out completely following a bushfire. Can the City help restore the area?

A2. This question was taken on notice.

5.5 Meta Parker, Paulls Valley

Q1. Hazards for children in Stirk Park due to the skate park placement. Could there be some mitigation put there like a log to stop children scooting out onto Elizabeth Street traffic? Secondly, would it be possible to put some traffic calming devices down Elizabeth Street?

A1. A roundabout on Elizabeth Street and Railway Road is scheduled for completion by the end of this financial year which should address some safety issues at that intersection. Traffic calming further down on Elizabeth Street in the proximity of Stirk Park is underway including street lighting preliminary works.

The remainder of this question was taken on notice.

5.6 Rebecca Beverage, Kalamunda

Q1. Does the City of Kalamunda consider Tree Retention when they receive a development application? What factors might lead to recommendation to keep trees or incorporate them into a development plan? Would the City recommend on certain occasions reducing the number of lots available to development should it be deemed that the habitat is worth protecting? Is there such a thing as a protected tree in the City of Kalamunda?

A1. Any landowner or developer may submit a development application. Within most planning zones, the legislative and planning framework requires consideration of tree removal as part of the assessment process. The extent of supporting information provided forms part of the development proposal, and officers may request additional information where necessary to ensure a full and complete understanding of the application prior to recommending approval, approval with conditions, or refusal.

Depending on delegation, applications may be determined by officers, Council, or other decision-making bodies such as the Development Assessment Panel (DAP). These decision-makers consider whether the proposed removal or retention of trees is appropriate in the context of the development.

Many developers consider amenity and shade values when designing proposals and do not necessarily seek to completely clear a site; however, outcomes can vary depending on the developer and the nature of the proposal. Where developers seek to maximise development potential, they may justify tree removal and propose mitigation measures such as offsets or contributions or seek to retain trees where feasible.

Tree considerations form part of a two-part process: the developer's proposal and supporting documentation, and the assessment undertaken by officers. The level of protection afforded to trees remains a key policy question, with planning policy providing guidance to support a more consistent and transparent approach to assessing applications and making recommendations to decision-makers into the future.

5.7 Digby Johnston, Piesse Brook

Q1. Can you give me some advice on Amendment 118? It is a development application to develop industrial complex in a working orchard. Has this been approved?

A1. This question was taken on notice.

5.8 Mary Cannon, Wattle Grove

Q1. Asked by members of Forrestfield regarding the cross bridge that used to be off Hale Road. Is there any way that council could approach state government or anyone for any funding for that bridge?

A1. The City has undertaken some investigative work to see if there are any grant funding opportunities as well as liaison with third parties to see if there's any opportunities for joint funding. At this point there are still ongoing discussions. Regarding CSRFF, there's not a current funding round or cycle being advertised. That program is currently under review. There are potentially other opportunities which may align with the rebuilding of that bridge, but it is still under investigation.

5.9 Donna Gahan, Kalamunda

Q1. What is the status of the future of the Kalamunda Water Park? What is the long-term plan?

A1. Works have been undertaken to target fixing urgent maintenance issues. The City has undertaken some work which will be presented to the Council in coming months which will be presented to Council and will inform the long-term prospect.

Q2. Has the City applied to Lotterywest or the government for co-funding to assist the pool?

A2. Recent works undertaken at the pool were considered maintenance works and such works don't attract third party funding opportunities. Should any opportunities for co-funding present themselves officers will pursue them.

Usual funding rounds aren't sufficient for this kind of resource. There's only a couple of funding avenues that you can explore for this type of asset. Lottery West is one, but it only funds certain things like playgrounds and the like. In terms of the CSRFF funding, which was mentioned earlier, the state government's put that funding round on hold because it's under current review. So we can't currently lodge any new submissions for grants

for that pool. The only other options are generally through election periods. If there is anything that comes up, we will apply for it.

5.10 Rachel Davidson, Lesmurdie

Q1. Regarding the overflow house on Lindsay Street, in Kalamunda where the Kalamunda Community Garden is situated. What is the future of the building?

A1. The future of that facility is still under review. The City is currently reviewing the third party report received on the facility which did detail a level of remediation that was required to be done. The City is still working through those recommendations which will be brought back to council for a decision.

Q2. When will a decision be made?

A2. This question was taken on notice.

5.11 Mayor Margaret Thomas JP, Kalamunda

Q1. Our Director of Corporate mentioned that we had an Unqualified Audit. Could it be explained what that means?

A1. Independent auditors undertake a comprehensive review of controls, compliance, financial systems, risk management processes and financial reporting. Through this process, the auditors form an opinion on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the City's governance and financial controls.

It was noted that the preferred outcome is an Unqualified Audit opinion, which indicates that auditors have not identified any material misstatements, non-disclosures, or non-compliance with legislation, policy, or accounting standards. Administration confirmed that an Unqualified opinion was achieved.

While an unqualified audit opinion represents a clear and positive outcome, the audit process also identifies opportunities for continuous improvement. Audits support not only legislative compliance and effective control environments but also provide guidance to strengthen organisational practices over time.

5.12 Heidi Sanders, Kalamunda

Q1. Fierce advocate for trees and hopeful the Future Forrest Policy will be reviewed. Applaud recent actions by Councillors and the Mayor for their

efforts on social media to reach people. I hope people will continue to explore ways for locals to have their say and contribute.

A1. Thank you for your positive comments. The process will be continuing with nine educational videos due to launch shortly. These will act as an encyclopedia on what local governments are about and how to engage.

Q2. How will these videos be disseminated?

A2. Social media initially followed by hard copies. We will aim to make them available in a variety of resources.

**5. Closure**

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the Meeting closed at 7.34pm.