ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

7:00pm, Wednesday, 21 October 2026
Council Chambers
6177 Great Northern Highway, Bindoon

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Time Permitted
A minimum of 15 minutes is permitted for Public Question Time at Council Meetings. If there are not sufficient questions to fill the allocated time, the Presiding Member will move to the next item. If there are more questions to be considered within 15 minutes, the Presiding Member will determine whether to extend Public Question Time. Each person seeking to ask questions during Public Question Time may address the Council for a maximum of two minutes each.

Protocol
No Member of the public may interrupt the Council Meeting proceedings or enter into conversation.
Members of the public wishing to participate in Public Question Time at the Council Meeting who wish to submit written questions, are requested to lodge them with the Chief Executive Officer the Tuesday by 5pm on the day before the meeting.

The Presiding Member will control Public Question time and ensure that each person wishing to ask a question is given a fair and equal opportunity to do so. Members of the public wishing to ask a question must state his or her name and address before asking a question. If the question relates to an item of the agenda, the item number and title should be stated.

General Rules
The following general rules apply to Public Question Time:

- Public Questions should only relate to the business of the local government and should not be a personal statement or opinion.
- Only questions relating to matters affecting the local government will be considered at a Council Meeting, and only questions that relate to the purpose of the meeting will be considered at a Special Council Meeting.
- Questions may be taken on notice and responded to after the meeting.
- Questions may not be directed to specific Elected members or a Shire Employee.
- Questions are not to be framed in such a way as to reflect adversely on a particular Elected Member or Shire employee.
- First priority will be given to persons who have submitted their questions in writing.
- Second priority will be given to persons who are asking questions relating to items on the current Council Meeting Agenda.

DEPUTATIONS

Time Permitted
A minimum of 10 minutes is permitted for Deputations.

Protocol
No member of the public may interrupt the Council Meeting proceedings or enter into conversation.
Members of the public who make a Deputation at the Council Meeting are requested to lodge them with the Chief Executive Officer the Tuesday by 5pm on the day before the meeting.

The Presiding Member will control Deputation time and ensure that each person wishing to ask a question is given a fair and equal opportunity to do so. Members of the public making a Deputation must state his or her name, company (if applicable) and address before commencing. Members must also state the item number and title on the agenda.

General Rules
The following rules apply when making a Deputation:
Deputation is not to exceed five persons, only two of whom may address the Council, although others may respond to specific questions from Members.
Deputations must not exceed 10 minutes without the agreement of the Council.
Additional members of the deputation may be allowed to speak with the agreement of the Presiding Member.
Council is unlikely to take any action on the matter discussed during the deputation without first considering an officer's report on that subject in a later Council Agenda.

RECORDING AND ACCESS TO RECORDINGS OF COUNCIL MEETINGS POLICY

Objective

To ensure that there is a process in place to outline access to the recorded proceedings of Council.

To emphasise that the reason for the recording of Council Meetings is to ensure the accuracy of Council Minutes and that nay reproduction is for the sole purpose of Council business

Recording of Proceedings

Proceedings for meetings of the Council, Electors, and Public Question Time during Council meetings shall be recorded by the Shire on sound recording equipment, except in the case of meetings of the Council where the Council closes the meeting to the public.

Notwithstanding clause 1, proceedings of a meeting of the Council which is closed to the public shall be recorded where the Council resolves to do so.

No member of the public is to use any electronic, visual or vocal recording device or instrument to record the proceedings of the Council or a committee without approval as per ***Local Government (Council Meetings) Local Law 2014***, c6.15.

Access to Recordings

- The record of proceedings is to be loaded on the Shire's website once the minutes have been made available.

Retention of Recordings

- Recordings pertaining to the proceedings of Council Meetings shall be retained in accordance with the ***State Records Act 2000***.

DURING THE MEETING, NO MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC MAY INTERRUPT THE MEETINGS PROCEEDINGS OR ENTER INTO CONVERSATION.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SHALL ENSURE THAT THEIR MOBILE TELEPHONE, AND/OR AUDIBLE PAGER IS NOT SWITCHED ON OR USED DURING ANY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ARE HEREBY ADVISED THAT USE OF ANY ELECTRONIC, VISUAL OR AUDIO RECORDING DEVICE, OR INSTRUMENT TO RECORD PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL IS NOT PERMITTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PRESIDING MEMBER.

PREFACE

When the Chief Executive Officer approves these minutes for distribution, they are in essence "Unconfirmed" until the following Ordinary Meeting of Council, where the minutes will be confirmed subject to any amendments.

The "Confirmed" minutes are then signed off by the Presiding Member.

Attachments that formed part of the Agenda, in addition to those tabled at the Ordinary Meeting of Council are put together as an addendum to these Minutes.

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

These minutes were approved for distribution on 23 October 2026.



Melinda Prinsloo
Chief Executive Officer

CONFIRMED MINUTES

These minutes were confirmed at a meeting held on

Signed: _____

NOTE: The Presiding Member at the meeting at which these minutes are confirmed is the person who signs above.

DISCLAIMER

The purpose of this Council meeting is to discuss and, where possible, make resolutions about items appearing on the agenda.

Whilst Council has the power to resolve such items and may in fact, appear to have done so at the meeting, no person should rely on or act on the basis of such decision or on any advice or information provided by a member or officer, or on the content of any discussion occurring, during the course of the meeting.

Persons should be aware that the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1995* (section 5.25 (e)) establish procedures for revocation or rescission of a Council decision. No person should rely on the decisions made by Council until formal advice of the Council decision is received by that person.

The Shire of Chittering expressly disclaims liability for any loss or damage suffered by any person as a result of relying on or acting on the basis of any resolution of Council, or any advice or information provided by a member or officer, or the content of any discussion occurring, during the course of the Council meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM 1. DECLARATION OF OPENING OF MEETING / ANNOUNCEMENTS OF VISITORS 7

ITEM 2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE 7

ITEM 3. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST 11

ITEM 4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME 11

Previous public questions taken on notice 15 September 2026 11

PQT11 – 09/26 Isobel Crowe, Lower Chittering 11

PQT12 – 09/26 Taylor Reeves, Muchea 12

PQT13 – 09/26 Mary, Muchea 12

Public question time 12

PQT01 – 10/26 Tara Maxwell, Lower Chittering 12

PQT02 – 10/26 Jacelyn Scadden, Lower Chittering 13

PQT03 – 10/26 Isobel Crowe, Lower Chittering 14

PQT04 – 10/26 Sabrina Davies, Lower Chittering 16

PQT05 – 10/26 Mark Penketh, Lower Chittering 17

PQT06 – 10/26 Mark Campbell, Lower Chittering 19

ITEM 5. PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS 25

DEP01 – 10/26 Sonia Cook, Lower Chittering (Protect Our Valley – Chittering) 25

ITEM 6. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE 25

ITEM 7. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES 25

Ordinary Meeting of Council: 15 September 2026 25

ITEM 8. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDING MEMBER 25

ITEM 9. REPORTS 25

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES 26

TECHNICAL SERVICES 27

CORPORATE SERVICES 28

CS01 – 10/26 List of Accounts Paid for the Period Ending 30 September 2026 28

CS02 – 10/26 Monthly Financial Report for the Period Ending 30 September 2026 30

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER 32

CEO01 – 10/26 Work Health and Safety Statistics Report – September 2026 32

CEO02 – 10/26 Dadour Provisions 35

CEO03 – 10/26 Economic Development Strategy 2026 – 2031 41

CEO04 – 10/26 Adopted Changes to Regional Road Group Funding 44

CEO05 – 10/26 Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Procurement 47

CEO06 – 10/26 Gonneville Project - Lower Chittering Community Information Session 51

ITEM 10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES 56

COM01 – 10/26 Local Emergency Management Committee - Unconfirmed Minutes from Wednesday, 9 September 2026 56

ITEM 11. MOTIONS, OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN 59

MWPN01 - 10/26 Cr Grayer – Chalice Mining Gonneville Project 59

ITEM 12. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITHOUT NOTICE 63

QMWN01 – /26 Cr Hughes – Bindoon Oval Following Events 63

ITEM 13. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF THE MEETING 63

ITEM 14. MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC 63

Matters of which the meeting may be closed 63

ITEM 15. CLOSURE 63

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, we wish to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land within the Shire of Chittering, the Yued and Whadjuk peoples. We would like to pay respect to the Elders of the Nyoongar nation, past and present, who have walked and cared for the land, we acknowledge and respect their continuing culture, and the contributions made to this region.

ITEM 1. DECLARATION OF OPENING OF MEETING / ANNOUNCEMENTS OF VISITORS

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 7.00pm.

ITEM 2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Attendance

The following members were in attendance:

Cr David Dewar	President
Cr Mary Angus	Deputy President
Cr Nicholas Grayer	
Cr Kylie Hughes	
Cr Rene van Eeden	

The following staff were in attendance:

Melinda Prinsloo	Chief Executive Officer
Scott Clayton	Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Leo Pudhota	Executive Manager Technical Services
Denaye Kerr	Executive Assistant

Members of the General Public: 43

Media: 0

Apologies

Jake Whistler	Executive Manager Development Services

Approved leave of absence

Cr John Curtis
Cr Beck Foulkes-Taylor

Announcements

Councillors to advise of their attendance in their role as an Elected Member at community activities and meetings. As the Chief Executive Officer's office looks after some (not all) appointments for the President and Deputy President; the Agenda includes only those meetings. Councillors are therefore requested to provide additional information at the Ordinary Meeting of Council for inclusion in the minutes.

Cr David Dewar			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
President & CEO Meeting	2 October 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	In attendance	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Rural Water Council	16 October 2026	Apology	
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	
WALGA Convention	16-18 September 2026	Nil	

Cr Mary Angus			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
President & CEO Meeting	2 October 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	In attendance	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	
WALGA Convention	16-18 September 2026	Nil	
Grants Commission Information Session	22 September 2026	Nil	

Cr John Curtis			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	Approved Leave of Absence	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	

Cr Beck Foulkes-Taylor			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	Apology	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Rural Water Council	16 October 2026	Apology	
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	
WALGA Convention	16-18 September 2026	Nil	
Grants Commission Information Session	22 September 2026	Nil	

Cr Nicholas Grayer			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	In attendance	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	
Grants Commission Information Session	22 September 2026	Nil	

Cr Kylie Hughes			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	In attendance	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	
WALGA Convention	16-18 September 2026	Nil	
Grants Commission Information Session	22 September 2026	Nil	

Cr Rene van Eeden			
Meeting / Event	Date	Attendance	
Councillor Information Session Ordinary Meeting of Council	15 September 2026	In attendance	
Councillor Information Session Agenda Forum	14 October 2026	In attendance	
Delegated Meeting Attendance	Date	Attendance	Written Feedback/Report
Other Attendances	Date	Written Feedback/Report	

ITEM 3. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil

ITEM 4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Previous public questions taken on notice 15 September 2026

PQT11 – 09/26 **Isobel Crowe, Lower Chittering**

Question 1: My question regards 539 Powderbark Road, Lower Chittering, the Transport Depot. Has the Shire already enforced the provisions of the Bushfire Act and have they commenced working with the Department of Water and Environment due to the breaches of multiple management plans?

Response: *The Shire applies the provisions of the Bushfires Act 1954 consistently across the Shire. Any compliance action taken against an individual property owner under the Bushfires Act 1954 is not information that can be provided publicly. The Shire has liaised with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) following previous community reports of environmental hazards at the subject site, and has invited comment from DWER on the pending development application for an amendment to the existing development approval for a transport depot and warehouse/storage at the subject site.*

Question 2: The Shire is aware that third party contactors and subtenants are actively operating and storing heavy transport equipment, given that the land use is agricultural resource class A, is the Shire actively logging daily non-compliance offences to pursue maximum financial penalties once the SAT process concludes?

Response: *The presence of third party contractors and/or subtenants is not a breach of the current development approval. The current development approval controls the land use activities occurring on the land, not by whom such activities are conducted. The approved land use is 'Transport Depot & Warehouse Storage'. Agricultural Resource is the underlying zone of the property pursuant to the Local Planning Scheme No. 6.*

Question 3: I just want to bring your attention to Lot 195 Wandena Road. In light of the local residents concern regarding unapproved land use and the lack of statutory advertising, is the Shire currently investigating claims of unapproved scrap metal and salvage operations? If so, what compliance action or site inspection timelines have been established? And if not, can Council formally request that planning compliance opens up an investigation into Lot 195 Wandena Road?

Response: *A compliance investigation has been undertaken by the Shire on the subject property. The details of any ongoing compliance investigation and State Administrative Tribunal appeal is not information that can be provided publicly.*

PQT12 – 09/26 **Taylor Reeves, Muchea**

Question 1: In relation to 298 Timaru Road and the effects that it has caused on our community. Section 181 of the health or miscellaneous provisions act 1911 appears to specifically address accumulations of manure and/or offensive matter that constitute a nuisance or injurious and/or dangerous to health, can the Shire please explain why this provision does not apply to the manure stockpiling that we are reporting?

Response: *This matter is subject to a current compliance investigation, and details of this investigation cannot be provided publicly. However, it can be advised that for any health compliance matter that relates to the creations of a nuisance, the Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911 can be applied by the Shire.*

PQT13 – 09/26 **Mary, Muchea**

Question 1: In regard to the same stockpiling on Timaru Road. Our Health Act is here to protect individuals and communities from public health risk and to provide to the extend reasonably practicably a healthy environment for all West Australians. Why is it since 2003, there still exists an accumulation or deposit of manure and slate lime, which is offensive, injurious and dangerous to health, why is it still occurring?

Response: *This matter is subject to a current compliance investigation, and details of this investigation cannot be provided publicly.*

Public question time

PQT01 – 10/26 **Tara Maxwell, Lower Chittering**

Question: The Shire of Chittering has been meeting directly with Chalice Mining regarding it's proposed mine and infrastructure corridor, yet as a directly affected landholder and ratepayer, I have received no communication from the Shire. We have previously been told at Shire meetings that the Shire has limited ability to act because the mine is outside its boundaries. However, the proposed corridor is within Chittering and directly affects local properties. Why has the Shire not proactively informed or consulted with affected landholders about these discussions, and what steps has it taken to represent our interests?

Response: *The Shire acknowledges the concern of affected landholders. The proposed infrastructure corridor is a matter of direct local significance, even though the proposed mine itself is outside the Shire of Chittering.*

The Shire is not the decision-making authority for the mine or the custodian of the project's current technical and property-specific information. Chalice and the relevant State and Commonwealth agencies hold that information. Affected landowners may therefore receive information directly from Chalice before it is provided to the Shire, and in some cases landowners have information available that the Shire does not yet have.

The Shire is reliant on engagements and updates from Chalice. When information is received, the Shire attempts to interpret it, clarify uncertainties and communicate confirmed information as accurately as possible. However, the Shire cannot speak

authoritatively on technical project matters, individual property negotiations, route decisions or approval processes for which it is neither responsible nor appropriately qualified. Providing speculative or incomplete information could create further confusion for affected landholders.

This does not mean the Shire has been inactive. Meetings with Chalice have been used to seek clearer and more timely information, communicate Council and community concerns, and press for clarity about the proposed corridor and its impacts. The actions undertaken are detailed in Council agenda item CEO06 – 10/26, Gonneville Project – Lower Chittering Community Information Session, including public updates, the community information session and advocacy concerning roads, road safety, rural amenity, landholder impacts and Chittering's rural character.

The consistent feedback received by the Shire has been that it should engage with Chalice and the relevant authorities to negotiate the best possible outcome for the Chittering community. That is what the Shire has been doing. Engagement with Chalice is not endorsement of the project or its preferred route; it is necessary to obtain information, represent community concerns and advocate for affected residents and landholders.

The Shire will continue to advocate for meaningful consultation with directly affected landholders. Where it receives sufficiently reliable and confirmed information about the corridor, assessment process or formal consultation opportunities, it will make that information available to the community.

Question: Section 4.5 of the Shire's Sponsorship Policy states that sponsorship must not create reputational risk or undermine public confidence. How would administration objectively determine whether accepting Chalice sponsorship complies with that policy, particularly when Council is considering formally opposing the company's proposed infrastructure?

Response: *Please see consolidated response.*

PQT02 – 10/26 **Jacelyn Scadden, Lower Chittering**

Question: Given that Councillor Grayer's original motion already permits Chalice to contribute towards costs arising from its proposed development, what public interest justification does administration have for recommending that the Shire also retain the ability to accept discretionary corporate sponsorship from Chalice?

Response: *Please see consolidated response.*

Question: Has administration considered the possibility that Chalice Mining could use its sponsorship of Shire activities as evidence of positive local government relationships and community engagement when presenting its Gonneville Project to State and Commonwealth decision-makers? If so, what safeguards would prevent those contributions from being presented in a way that suggests community acceptance or institutional support for the proposal?

Response: *Please see consolidated response.*

Consolidated Response:

A contribution towards costs arising from the proposed development and discretionary corporate sponsorship are different. A project contribution is intended to ensure that costs created by the proposal are not transferred to the Shire and its ratepayers. Sponsorship supports unrelated community events, activities or services.

The Shire relies on donations and sponsorships to deliver community events and services that may otherwise need to be reduced, funded entirely by ratepayers or not held. Through its community engagement and Integrated Planning and Reporting processes, the Shire consistently receives feedback that residents value local events, activities and services while also expecting Council to manage costs responsibly and minimise pressure on rates. Corporate sponsorship is often an important source of funding that assists the Shire to deliver those outcomes.

It is important to note that Council has not yet considered the proposal before it and no decision has been made to accept sponsorship from Chalice Mining. The officer recommendation relates only to whether Council should retain the ability to consider sponsorship proposals on their merits if such a proposal were ever made in the future. Whether any future sponsorship arrangement would be acceptable would depend on the circumstances at that time, the policy framework in place, community expectations and the decisions of the Council of the day.

The proposed mine is outside the Shire of Chittering and the Shire is not the decision-making authority. Accepting sponsorship cannot approve the project, alter the assessment process or change Council's formal position. The Shire has formally and vehemently opposed the proposed infrastructure and freight corridors, and any adverse impacts on the Chittering community, through direct advocacy to the relevant Ministers, opposition parties and decision-making bodies. There is no uncertainty about the Shire's position.

Any sponsorship would still be assessed transparently under the Sponsorship Policy and separately from the Shire's advocacy and regulatory functions. Any public acknowledgement would be limited to the factual contribution and would not amount to endorsement, community acceptance, social licence or support for the Gonneville Project or its proposed corridors.

The principal practical consequence of refusing sponsorship is that the Shire may be unable to deliver the relevant community event or service, may need to reduce it, or would need to fund it from another source. Retaining the ability to consider sponsorship preserves the Shire's capacity to weigh those practical considerations, alongside all other relevant considerations, and make a decision in the best interests of the community should the issue ever arise. It does not predetermine that any proposal from Chalice will be accepted.

PQT03 – 10/26 **Isobel Crowe, Lower Chittering**

Question: Ten years ago, when the original transport depot application was open for public comment, 33 local residents objected. The only reason it was approved was because the proposal appeared airtight on paper, every community and environmental concern was supposedly addressed through mandatory management plans, foundational to which was a fully sealed hot mix hard stand. Two years ago, when the land changed owners and was leased out, commercial operations began without fulfilling those mandatory conditions. At last month's meeting the Shire stated that the development approvals control the land activity not who conducts it. By that exact logic, if the approval attaches strictly to the land and that land is non-compliant because it lacks the mandatory hot mix hard stand, no operator, owner or sub tenant has a legal right

to operate on that site. My question to council is, since third-party sub tenants are actively operating on unsealed clay pad why has the Shire not issued individual section 214 direction notices directly to those third-party occupiers under Section 214 of the Planning and Development act?

Response: *The Shire does not agree that the legal position is as simple as suggested in the question.*

Section 214 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 provides an enforcement power where development is being undertaken contrary to a planning scheme, interim development order or relevant approval conditions. Importantly, the legislation provides that a direction may be given to the owner or another person undertaking the development. It does not require the Shire to issue a separate direction to every person or business operating from a property.

The Shire's statement that a development approval relates to the use and development of the land, rather than simply the identity of a particular operator, should not be interpreted as meaning that every person conducting an activity on the land automatically requires an individual section 214 notice before the Shire can pursue compliance.

Compliance and enforcement action must be directed at the actual planning breach, the applicable approval and conditions, and the person or persons against whom enforcement action can appropriately and lawfully be taken.

The Shire is actively dealing with the compliance matters associated with this property. Given the current proceedings and the need to preserve the Shire's legal and enforcement position, it would not be appropriate through public question time to provide detailed commentary on legal strategy or prospective enforcement action against particular parties.

Question: In light of the Shires written confirmation that the SAT appeal does not prevent or restrict the enforcement of the Bushfire Act 1954 and given that heavy transport and hot machinery are actively operating on dry, unsealed clay without the mandatory static firefighting water tank installed. Has the Chief Bush Fire Control Officer or Shire Ranger services issued a formal Bushfire Hazard Notice or Infringement under the Bushfires Act to compel the immediate installation of dedicated firefighting water storage on site before the upcoming Bushfire season? If not, Why?

Response: *The planning compliance issues and the Shire's powers under the Bush Fires Act 1954 are separate regulatory matters.*

The requirement for a static water supply is linked to the current development approval approved by Council in April 2017 under the Planning and Development Act 2005, and not linked to the requirements of the Bushfires Act 1954.

The Shire is actively dealing with the compliance matters associated with this property under the Planning and Development Act 2005. Given the current proceedings and the need to preserve the Shire's legal and enforcement position, it would not be appropriate through public question time to provide detailed commentary on legal strategy or prospective enforcement action against particular parties.

The Shire can and does consider bushfire risks independently of planning proceedings. Where requirements arise under the Bush Fires Act, they can be dealt with under that legislation irrespective of the separate planning compliance matters.

PQT04 – 10/26 **Sabrina Davies, Lower Chittering**

Question: How does Council justify acting on 80% community opposition to expanded pool barrier inspections, yet disregarding an overwhelming 92% community support for the Lower Chittering bridle trails, when both issues directly concern public safety?

Response: *The two matters are not directly comparable.*

Community consultation is an important part of Council's decision-making, but the result of consultation is one of the matters Council considers; it is not a referendum that automatically determines the outcome.

In relation to swimming pools, Council must also operate within specific requirements imposed by State legislation. Regulation 53 of the Building Regulations 2012 requires local governments to arrange inspections of private swimming-pool barriers, including subsequent inspections at prescribed intervals. Pool safety barriers are an important measure to reduce the risk of young children drowning.

The Lower Chittering bridle trail matter involves a quite different set of considerations. Council considered the community feedback alongside the suitability of the trail, landowner impacts, the rights and interests of adjoining properties, safety, risk and the practical implications of maintaining public access.

The 92% figure therefore cannot reasonably be interpreted as meaning that Council was obliged to retain a particular trail arrangement. Strong community support is important, but Council must ultimately make a decision having regard to all affected parties and all relevant considerations, including people who may be disproportionately affected by the outcome.

Council has also made it clear that the closure of the existing trail does not mean that it is ignoring the safety concerns of horse riders. The Shire is actively exploring alternative opportunities for safer equestrian access and riding infrastructure.

Question: How can Council expect residents to have any faith in the integrity of its community consultation process when overwhelming public support can apparently be ignored, and who is accountable when Council's decisions expose vulnerable road users to unnecessary safety risks?

Response: *Council does not accept the premise that the community consultation was ignored.*

The purpose of consultation is to ensure Council understands community views before making a decision. It does not transfer Council's decision-making responsibility to whichever position receives the greatest number of submissions.

In the case of the Lower Chittering bridle trail, Council considered the strong support expressed through consultation, but it also had to consider the impacts on affected landowners, safety and risk issues, the suitability of the existing arrangement, and the

Shire's broader responsibilities.

Importantly, Council has not treated closure of the existing trail as the end of the matter. The Shire continues to investigate alternative trail opportunities and ways of improving safety for equestrians.

Road safety has also been actively raised through the Shire's emergency-management processes, including by the CEO at the Local Emergency Management Committee meeting on 9 September 2026.

Ultimately, elected Council is accountable for the decisions it makes. Community consultation informs those decisions, but Council must balance the interests of the broader community with those of directly affected residents and landowners and make the decision it considers appropriate on all the information before it.

PQT05 – 10/26 **Mark Penketh, Lower Chittering**

Question: The Shire's 2024/25 Annual Report records 555 km of roads, comprising 340 km sealed and 215 km unsealed, compared with approximately 407 km in the contemporary 2024/2025 WALGA return and 406.7 km reported in 2023/24. Will Council provide a public reconciliation of this approximately 148 km discrepancy, identifying the correct Shire-controlled road network, the roads and classifications causing the difference, which figures were provided to WALGA, Main Roads WA and the WA Local Government Grants Commission, and whether the discrepancy has affected road funding, asset valuations, depreciation or renewal reporting; and, if an error is identified, will Council independently reconcile its asset register, ROMAN/ROMAN II and external road returns and correct the relevant records given the data in Table 1 provided to Council?

Response: *Both figures are correct, but they measure different things. The 555 km reported in the 2024/25 Annual Report represents all roads located within the Shire of Chittering, including 340 km sealed and 215 km unsealed. The approximately 407 km reported to WALGA represents roads managed by the Shire.*

The approximately 148 km difference therefore reflects different reporting scopes rather than an error or an unexplained increase in the Shire-managed network. Road grant funding has been based on the Shire-managed road inventory, not the broader 555 km figure. The difference has not caused a loss, over-allocation or under-allocation of road grant funding.

The Annual Report figure does not, of itself, indicate an error in asset valuations, depreciation or renewal reporting, which are based on the relevant asset and financial records.

The Shire is updating its road asset inventory to confirm the current managed network and include roads transferred through new subdivisions. The revised information will be entered into the Shire's systems and will automatically update the WALGA inventory used for relevant road grant allocations.

As the figures are correct for their respective purposes, an independent reconciliation is not warranted on this basis. Future reporting will distinguish more clearly between all roads within the district and roads managed by the Shire.

Question: Given that rateable properties increased from 2,677 in 2012/13 to 3,059 in 2024/25 while reported planning applications decreased from 417 to 147 and available workforce figures increased from 42 FTE in 2013/14 to 58 FTE in 2024/25 and as shown in the two organisation charts provided to Council for current and 2006/2007; will Council publish planning-performance and resourcing information showing statutory determination times, applications outside those periods, SAT/deemed-refusal matters and Development Services staffing; and explain whether the statutory timeframe, consultation and administrative treatment applied to the beekeeping application at 222 Holstein Loop was consistent with the treatment of comparable applications and approvals, including Targa West, and if consistency and compliance cannot be demonstrated, will Council commission and publish an independent review?

Response: *The comparison presented is not like-for-like. The approximate 2006/07 chart records positions, including casual employees, and notes that some services were externally contracted. The current workforce of approximately 70 employees represents about 58 FTE. Positions, headcount and FTE are different measures, and a reliable comparison would also need to account for contracted and outsourced services.*

The Shire's workforce supports all local government services, not only planning. Since 2006, responsibilities have expanded or become more prescriptive across integrated planning and reporting, asset and long-term financial planning, audit and risk, records, building, food and public health regulation, animal management, bushfire and emergency management, work health and safety, digital services, governance and transparency.

Digital communication and the increasing availability of artificial intelligence have also changed the administrative environment. Email, online channels and AI-assisted drafting make it easier to generate and submit larger volumes of correspondence, including lengthy or repetitive queries. Each enquiry must still be received, reviewed, recorded, allocated, researched and answered by staff. The resulting increase in correspondence and records-management activity adds to the Shire's administrative workload, even where the underlying subject matter is repeated.

Planning work has also become more structured and technically complex. Application numbers do not capture strategic planning, scheme amendments, structure plans, subdivision referrals, compliance, SAT and DAP matters, consultation, agency referrals, customer advice or bushfire planning requirements. Raw application numbers are therefore not a reliable measure of total planning workload or overall staffing need.

The Shire supports meaningful performance reporting, but historical information can only be published where it was consistently recorded and can now be verified. Some requested measures, including historical determination times, deemed refusals and Development Services FTE by function, may not be capable of reliable reconstruction. The Administration will continue to review prospective measures that can be reported consistently from current systems.

222 Holstein Loop

The dates cited do not, by themselves, establish the statutory commencement date or determination deadline. That calculation depends on the complete application record, including whether the application was complete, whether further information was

required, the date it was supplied, consultation or referral requirements, and any valid extension or excluded period. The elapsed time between selected dates does not establish non-compliance or inconsistent treatment.

Targa West and independent review

The beekeeping application and Targa West may involve different legislation, approval pathways, delegations, consultation requirements and risk controls. Different treatment is not inconsistent where it reflects the nature of each proposal and the applicable legal framework.

Shire decisions must be based on relevant statutory, policy, operational and risk considerations. An applicant's identity, criticism of the Shire, previous disagreement or earlier legal proceedings are not relevant unless a particular legal issue makes them directly relevant.

The information presented does not demonstrate statutory non-compliance, inconsistent treatment or a governance failure requiring an independent review. If a material error, statutory breach or significant control weakness is identified, the Shire will take corrective action and obtain independent advice or assurance where warranted.

PQT06 – 10/26 **Mark Campbell, Lower Chittering**

Question: I'm unable to attend in person to ask my questions as I am travelling interstate. Please provide a detailed breakdown of all costs incurred by the Shire and ultimately funded by ratepayers in relation to attendance by the CEO and Councillors at the 2026 Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) National General Assembly/Conference in Canberra and 2026 WALGA Convention in Perth, including: conference registration and attendance fees; airfares, airport transfers, parking and travel claims; accommodation costs; meals, refreshments and any alcohol purchased; costs associated with gala dinners and networking functions; any other expenses claimed, reimbursed or paid by the Shire in connection with attendance.

Further, for the conferences attended, can the President identify tangible deliverables, measurable outcomes, grants, successful funding allocations, projects or operational improvements, advocacy representing the interests of local communities in relation to the proposed Chalice Gonneville Project infrastructure corridor that can be directly attributed to attending these conferences?

Response: *The Shire is able to provide the actual costs associated with attendance at the 2026 ALGA National General Assembly and the 2026 WALGA Convention. As the question seeks a detailed transaction-level breakdown across a number of expenditure categories, the precise figures should be taken directly from the Shire's financial records rather than estimated during Public Question Time.*

Cost category	2026 ALGA National General Assembly	2026 WALGA Convention
Conference registration and attendance fees	$1,816.36	$6,500.00
Airfares	$3,050.25	$0.00
Airport transfers, parking and travel claims	$253.42	$679.01
Accommodation	$3,383.64	$3,855.91
Meals and refreshments	$449.34	$0.00
Alcohol purchased by the Shire	$0.00	$112.73 (Recoup costs via debtor invoice
Gala dinners and networking functions	$834.55	$3,560.00
Other expenses claimed, reimbursed or paid	$0.00	$17.37
TOTAL	**$9,787.55**	**$14,725.02**

National advocacy through the ALGA National General Assembly

The ALGA National General Assembly provides a national forum for local governments to engage on Commonwealth policy, legislation and funding matters affecting councils across Australia. This includes the adequacy and structure of Federal funding, national infrastructure priorities, emergency management, housing, regional development and other matters where Commonwealth decisions directly affect local government capacity and service delivery.

At the 2026 ALGA National General Assembly, the Shire specifically advocated directly for progression of the Bindoon Bypass. This provided an opportunity to advance a major infrastructure priority for Chittering in the national forum where Commonwealth infrastructure policy and funding are considered. The Bindoon Bypass has direct implications for regional freight movement, road safety, the future of Bindoon townsite and the Shire's long-term planning and economic development.

The ALGA National General Assembly and WALGA Local Government Convention serve different but complementary purposes. ALGA deals primarily with national policy and Commonwealth funding matters affecting local governments, while WALGA deals primarily with Western Australian policy, legislation, sector priorities and State funding matters affecting local governments. Participation in both forums enables the Shire to advocate at the level of government with responsibility for the relevant issue.

Within that State context, the 2026 WALGA Local Government Convention dealt with a number of matters directly relevant to the Shire of Chittering and to the decisions Council and Administration are currently required to make.

Of particular importance was the State Government's announcement of the next tranche of reforms to the Local Government Act 1995. The reform program covers matters including the respective roles and responsibilities of Council, the President,

Councillors and the CEO; complaints handling; council and committee meetings; compliance and reporting; financial management; integrated planning and community engagement; and the long-term sustainability of the local government sector.

Why the Act reforms matter to Chittering

These reforms are directly relevant to Chittering because they affect the governance framework within which Council operates and Administration implements Council decisions. They have practical implications for meeting procedures, the respective statutory roles of elected members and the CEO, complaints and unreasonable-customer conduct, transparency and reporting obligations, audit and financial management, community engagement, and the resources required to maintain compliance.

For a growing rural local government, early access to information about the timing, scope and likely implementation of these reforms is important. It allows the Shire to assess policy and procedural changes, prepare elected members and employees, plan for systems and resourcing impacts, and provide informed feedback before new requirements take effect.

The Convention also addressed other issues relevant to Chittering, including housing and planning pressures, shared-service delivery, artificial intelligence, increasing service and resource demands, renewable-energy transition and associated transmission infrastructure, resilience, and emerging risks affecting local government. These topics are especially relevant to a rapidly growing rural Shire that must manage substantial infrastructure and development pressures while continuing to deliver services across a large geographic area and protect its rural character.

Tangible advocacy outcomes from the WALGA Annual General Meeting

The WALGA Annual General Meeting, held in conjunction with the Convention, is the forum through which member local governments determine matters that become WALGA advocacy priorities. In 2026, two motions initiated by the Shire of Chittering were carried. This elevated positions developed and advanced by this Council from individual Shire advocacy to sector-wide WALGA advocacy.

1. Rural water security funding

The first motion called for WALGA to advocate to the Commonwealth and State Governments to renew, continue and expand rural water security funding from 2027–28 onwards, including the Community Water Supplies Partnership and Agricultural Area Dams programs and any successor funding program.

- *emergency and firefighting water infrastructure;*
- *farm and livestock emergency water and agricultural water resilience;*
- *agricultural area dams and townsite non-potable water supplies;*
- *reduced reliance on potable scheme water;*
- *continued eligibility for local governments and regional organisations;*
- *an increased funding pool and flexible cash and in-kind co-contributions so smaller councils can participate; and*
- *a forward funding pipeline so infrastructure can be planned and delivered before drought or bushfire conditions become emergencies.*

This is particularly relevant to Chittering as a rural and agricultural local government with significant bushfire risk and an ongoing need for reliable non-potable and emergency water infrastructure. The Shire's Sandown Park project, involving a bore, pump controls, a 100 kL firefighting tank, a 10 kL amenity and irrigation tank, and associated upgrades, is a practical example of the type of infrastructure supported through these programs. The motion being carried gives WALGA a sector mandate to advocate for continuation and expansion of this funding.

2. State Assistance Grants for Western Australian local governments

The second motion called for WALGA to advocate for the State Government to establish an annual, untied State Assistance Grant. The proposed grant would address the gap between the Western Australian Local Government Grants Commission's assessed equalisation need and the Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grants allocation, use the existing equalisation methodology, be indexed to changing costs and asset pressures, and particularly support regional, rural and remote local governments.

The supporting material identified an assessed State-wide equalisation need of approximately $334.1 million compared with Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grant funding of approximately $277.4 million, leaving an estimated gap of approximately $56.7 million. The proposal recognises the particular pressures on smaller rural councils arising from limited ratepayer bases, geographically dispersed communities, higher service-delivery and asset costs, cost shifting, and increasing expectations that local governments support services beyond the traditional local government remit.

The motion was moved by Shire President Cr David Dewar, seconded by Cr Lincoln Stewart of the Shire of Gingin, and carried by the WALGA Annual General Meeting. It is therefore now part of WALGA's advocacy mandate to the State Government for additional untied funding, with a particular focus on the needs of rural, regional and remote local governments.

Direct relevance and measurable value

These are tangible and measurable outcomes from the Shire's participation. Two priorities initiated by the Shire of Chittering were endorsed by WALGA's member local governments and now form part of WALGA's State-wide advocacy agenda. One seeks to secure and expand practical water-security funding for rural communities; the other seeks to address the structural funding gap that disproportionately affects rural, regional and remote councils.

Conference attendance is therefore one component of Council's broader professional-development and advocacy activities, but in this instance the Shire can identify specific outcomes directly connected with participation in the Convention and Annual General Meeting. The Shire's positions have progressed beyond advocacy by Chittering alone and now carry the collective backing of the Western Australian local government sector.

In relation specifically to the proposed Chalice Gonneville infrastructure corridor, this is a Shire-specific matter involving a particular project, route, affected communities and identified stakeholders. It is therefore best progressed through direct, issue-specific

advocacy with the government agencies, project proponent, elected representatives, affected landowners and other relevant stakeholders, rather than relying on a general national or State local government conference to resolve it.

The Shire has undertaken that direct advocacy, as detailed in the Council agenda item relating to the Gonneville public information session. That agenda item records the Shire's engagement, representations and advocacy on behalf of affected residents and the broader Chittering community. The absence of a conference-specific outcome on the Gonneville corridor should therefore not be interpreted as an absence of advocacy. It reflects that this local project is being pursued through the more appropriate direct channels.

Together, the two conferences provide access to the appropriate national and State advocacy forums. At ALGA, the Shire directly advocated for progression of the Bindoon Bypass in the context of Commonwealth infrastructure priorities and Federal funding. At WALGA, the Shire obtained current information on State reforms affecting Council operations and successfully elevated two Chittering motions into sector-wide WALGA advocacy priorities. Shire-specific matters such as the Gonneville infrastructure corridor continue to be advanced separately through direct engagement with the relevant stakeholders, as documented in the Council agenda item for the public information session.

Question: The electronic scoreboard at Muchea Rec Centre was funded through significant efforts of local volunteers and sporting clubs with the objective of enhancing grassroots sporting opportunities within the Shire.

Now that the scoreboard has been installed and is ready for use, local sporting groups have been advised they will be required to pay the electricity costs associated with its operation.

Can the Shire please explain:

1. If the signboard has been locked out so community sports groups cannot use the sign?
2. Why community sporting groups in Muchea are being required to pay electricity costs to operate the electronic scoreboard when other user groups throughout the Shire are not typically charged separately for power consumption?
3. What is the estimated annual cost to the Shire of supplying electricity to the scoreboard?
4. Has the Shire undertaken any assessment of the financial impact this additional charge may have on local volunteer-run sporting clubs?

Response: *The Shire acknowledges the significant contribution made by local sporting clubs and volunteers towards the electronic scoreboard at Muchea Recreation Centre. The facility is intended to support organised sport, recreation and community activity, including the sporting clubs that call the facility home.*

Access to the scoreboard

Yes. Council resolved at its September 2026 Ordinary Council Meeting that the electronic scoreboard was to remain locked and unavailable for use until the Memorandum of Understanding had been signed.

The restriction is therefore not an administrative decision to prevent community sport from using the scoreboard. It gives effect to Council's resolution and is an interim risk-

control measure until the parties formally agree to the arrangements governing access, operation and responsibility for the asset.

The MOU is needed to establish clear responsibilities for authorised use, access and controls, electricity consumption, maintenance and repairs, insurance, public liability, damage, operational safety and the respective obligations of the Shire and participating clubs. Allowing the scoreboard to be used before those matters are agreed would expose the Shire and the clubs to avoidable uncertainty and risk.

Once the MOU has been signed and the agreed operational requirements have been completed, access can be provided in accordance with that agreement.

Electricity costs

The proposed electricity arrangement forms part of the operating framework considered by Council. The scoreboard is a separately identifiable, club-initiated asset with operating costs that can be directly measured through a dedicated meter or sub-meter.

The MOU provides for the electricity used by the scoreboard to be charged on the basis of actual meter readings, or a reasonable estimate if meter information is unavailable. It also allocates responsibility for the scoreboard's operation, inspection, maintenance, repair and replacement. These matters were included so that the ongoing obligations are clear and are not unintentionally transferred to the Shire and the wider ratepayer base.

This is not a general policy of separately charging every sporting group for ordinary power use within a Shire recreation facility. It reflects the specific ownership, installation and operating arrangements for this scoreboard, as considered by Council.

Estimated annual electricity cost

The Shire does not yet have sufficient operating data to provide a reliable annual electricity cost because the scoreboard has not been available for normal use while the MOU remains unsigned. The separate meter or sub-meter will allow the actual consumption and cost to be identified once operation commences.

Any figure provided before meaningful usage data is available would depend on assumptions about frequency, duration and intensity of use and may not represent the actual cost.

Financial impact on volunteer sporting clubs

The Shire recognises the contribution of local volunteers and sporting clubs and the need to keep community sport affordable. The September Council decision was not made to impose an unnecessary financial burden or prevent use of the scoreboard. It was made to ensure that the MOU and the responsibilities identified in the Council report are settled before operation begins.

A reliable financial-impact assessment cannot be completed until actual electricity consumption is known. The metering arrangement will provide that information. If the actual cost proves material, the Shire and the participating clubs will then have an evidence base for considering the impact and any future options.

ITEM 5. PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS

Petitions

Nil

Deputations

DEP01 – 10/26 Sonia Cook, Lower Chittering (Protect Our Valley – Chittering)

Sonia spoke on the **Chalice Mining Gonneville Project**.

Presentations

Nil

ITEM 6. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

ITEM 7. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Ordinary Meeting of Council: 15 September 2026

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 011026
Moved Cr Angus, seconded Cr Hughes
That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday, 15 September 2026, as published on the Shire website, be confirmed.

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.39PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

ITEM 8. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDING MEMBER

I would like to congratulate the Bindoon Agricultural Society on hosting of another fantastic Bindoon Show and Rodeo. Thank you to all the organisers, volunteers and everyone involved in making this much-loved community event a success.

ITEM 9. REPORTS

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Nil

TECHNICAL SERVICES

Nil

CORPORATE SERVICES

CS01 – 10/26 List of Accounts Paid for the Period Ending 30 September 2026

Applicant Shire of Chittering
File ref SOCR-1845402348-122828
Author Finance Officer - Accounts
Authorising Officer Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments 1. List of Accounts Paid as at 30 September 2026 or other purchasing cards

	Authority / Discretion	***Definition***
☐	Advocacy	*When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.*
☐	Executive	*The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☒	**Information**	***Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)***

Executive Summary
To present the list of accounts paid by the Chief Executive Officer under delegated authority for the period ending 30 September 2026.

To present the List of Payments made by authorised employees using credit, debit and other purchasing cards for the period ending 30 September 2026.

Background
Pursuant to *Local Government Act 1995 Section 6.8 (2)(b),* where expenditure has been incurred by a local government, it is to be reported to the next ordinary meeting of Council.

Consultation/Communication Implications
State
Nil

Local
Nil

Legislative Implications
State
Local Government Act 1995
Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations

Local
Nil

Policy Implications
State
Nil

Local
Nil

Financial Implications
All expenditure has been approved via adoption of the 2026-2027 Annual Budget, or resulting from a Council resolution for a budget amendment.

Strategic Implications
State
Nil

Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*
  Outcome: *Thriving*
  Strategic Objective 4: *Ensure responsible stewardship of Shire resources and long-term financial sustainability.*

The presentation of the List of Accounts Paid supports transparent financial management and Council oversight of expenditure, contributing to the responsible stewardship of Shire resources and long-term financial sustainability.

Site Inspection
Not applicable

Environmental Consideration
Not applicable

Risk Assessment/Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Compliance	Low	Minor	Low	Quality Assurance prior to publishing
Opportunity: None				

Officer Comment/Details
The attached "List of Accounts Paid as at 30 September 2026" is presented to Council, inclusive of payments made using credit, debit or other purchasing cards.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 021026
Moved Cr Van Eeden, seconded Cr Grayer
That Council receive the List of Accounts Paid as per Attachment 1 totalling $1,381,820.81, inclusive of payments made using credit, debit or other purchasing cards for the period ending 30 September 2026:

1. **PR7227 & PR7231;**
2. **EFT30749 – EFT30906;**
3. **Direct Debits, Cheques as listed; and**
4. **Purchasing Card as listed**.

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.41PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CS02 – 10/26 Monthly Financial Report for the Period Ending 30 September 2026

File ref SOCR-1845402348-122827
Author Finance Manager
Authorised by Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments 1. Monthly Financial Report for the Period Ending 30 September 2026

	Authority / Discretion	***Definition***
☐	Advocacy	*When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.*
☐	Executive	*The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☒	**Information**	***Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)***

Executive Summary
Council is requested to consider the financial statement for the period ending 30 September 2026.

Background
In accordance with *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996*, the Financial Activity Statement has been prepared in compliance with the following:

> *"Regulation 34(1) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, which requires a local government to prepare a statement of financial activity each month, presented according to nature and type, by program, or by business unit. From the 2021/22 financial year the statement of financial activity will be presented by nature and type.*
>
> *Regulation 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, which requires a local government to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances. For the 2026/27 financial year 10% and a value greater than $100,000 will be used for the reporting of variances."*

Consultation Summary
This document has been prepared in consultation with Responsible Officers for review and analysis.

Legislative Implications
State
This monthly financial report complies with *Section 6.4 of* the Act and *Regulations 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.*

Local
Nil

Policy Implications
Local
Finance Policy 2.1 Investment of Funds

Financial Implications
Nil

Strategic Assessment / Implications
State
Nil

Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*
  Outcome: *Thriving*
  Strategic Objective 4: *Ensure responsible stewardship of Shire resources and long-term financial sustainability.*

The presentation of the Monthly Financial Report supports transparent financial management and Council oversight of expenditure, contributing to the responsible stewardship of Shire resources and long-term financial sustainability.

Site Inspection
Not applicable

Environmental Consideration
Not applicable

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Compliance	Rare	Minor	Low	Quality Assurance prior to publishing
Opportunity: None				

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Reputation: Providing transparent, accurate financial records.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	Adequate training for all Finance Officers, to ensure balanced reports each month.
Opportunity: None				

Officer Comment/Details
Council adopted the Annual Budget for the 2026/27 financial year on 17 June 2026 (Resolution 110626). The figures in this report are compared to the Adopted Budget.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 031026
Moved Cr Angus, seconded Cr Hughes
That Council receives the Monthly Financial Report for period ending 30 September 2026, as per Attachment 1.

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.42PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CEO01 – 10/26 Work Health and Safety Statistics Report – September 2026

Applicant N/A
File ref SOCR-1845402348-122379
Author Human Resource Coordinator
Authorising Officer Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments 1. WHS Statistics Report – Monthly September 2026

	Authority / Discretion	***Definition***
☐	Advocacy	*When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.*
☐	Executive	*The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☒	**Information**	***Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)***

Executive Summary
Council is requested to receive the Shire of Chittering's Work Health and Safety Statistics Report for the month ending September 2026.

Background
At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 17 November 2021, Council resolved (Resolution 231121) to adopt a safety commitment statement prioritising employee wellbeing and requiring all staff to work safely, led by Council. The resolution also required the CEO to provide quarterly reports on key safety metrics (such as safety activities, hours worked and trained, equipment issues, and overtime) and monthly reports on critical safety outcomes (including drug and alcohol testing, injuries, near misses, and workers' compensation claims).

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 20 May 2026, Council amended this resolution (Resolution 100526) to require monthly reporting only and to remove the reporting of working hours and training hours.

Consultation Summary
Local
Nil

State
Nil

Legislative Implications
State
- *Work Health and Safety Act 2020*

Local
Nil

Policy Implications
State
Nil

Local
- *Shire of Chittering Policy Work Health and Safety (WHS)*

Financial Implications
Nil

Strategic Assessment / Implications
Local
- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*

Outcome: *Thriving*

A thoughtfully planned Shire where our community is supported to grow and thrive through future-ready development that respects rural character.

Strategy Objective 4: *Ensure responsible stewardship of Shire resources and long-term financial sustainability*

The monthly Work Health and Safety Statistics Report supports the Council Plan by providing Council with oversight of workplace health and safety performance, promoting good governance and supporting informed decision-making. Regular reporting assists Council to monitor organisational performance, legislative compliance and workplace safety outcomes, contributing to the responsible stewardship of the Shire's workforce and resources.

Maintaining a strong focus on work health and safety supports the Shire's capacity to deliver services effectively, manage organisational risks and foster a safe and healthy workplace for employees, contractors and volunteers.

State
Nil

Site Inspection
Not applicable

Environmental Consideration
Not applicable

Risk Assessment / Implications
Nil

Officer Comment/Details
Nil

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 041026
Moved Cr Angus, seconded Cr Grayer
That Council receive the Shire of Chittering Work Health and Safety Statistics Report for the month ending September 2026 which includes:

a) Statistics
b) Near Miss, Incident and Damage Report
c) Minor Register
d) WHS Training
e) Site Inspections
f) Safety Observations

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.44PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CEO02 – 10/26 Dadour Provisions

Applicant Shire of Chittering
File ref SOCR-1845402348-170036
Author Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Authorising Officer Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments Nil

	Authority / Discretion	*Definition*
☒	**Advocacy**	***When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.***
☐	Executive	*The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☐	Information	*Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)*

Executive Summary
Council is requested to consider the State Government's announced intention to remove the "Dadour poll" provisions from the Local Government Act 1995. These provisions currently provide affected electors with a statutory mechanism to require a poll on certain recommended local government amalgamations and, where the prescribed participation and voting thresholds are achieved, require the Minister to reject the amalgamation recommendation.

The State Government has advised that removal of the provisions is intended to reduce barriers to voluntary local government amalgamations. However, the practical effect of the proposed change extends beyond voluntary amalgamations and would remove the only current statutory mechanism by which affected electors can obtain a binding outcome on a recommended amalgamation.

The issue is of particular significance to regional and rural local governments, where factors such as geographic scale, local representation, communities of interest, infrastructure responsibilities, service accessibility and financial sustainability differ markedly from metropolitan circumstances. While amalgamations are often promoted on the basis of administrative efficiencies and economies of scale, evidence from other Australian jurisdictions demonstrates that financial outcomes are mixed and should not be assumed. Of particular concern is the potential for ratepayers of financially sustainable local governments to inherit infrastructure backlogs, service deficits or financial pressures from neighbouring districts without having access to a binding mechanism through which they can determine whether an amalgamation should proceed.

The report recommends that Council oppose any amendment that removes or diminishes the intent and effect of the Dadour Provisions, seek support through the WALGA Avon-Midland Country Zone and WALGA, and advocate jointly through AMP-UP for the retention of this important democratic safeguard.

Background

On 17 September 2026, the Minister for Local Government, Hon Hannah Beazley MLA, announced a package of local government reforms that included the removal of the "Dadour poll" provisions from the Local Government Act 1995. The State Government stated that the proposed change is intended to remove barriers to voluntary local government boundary changes and amalgamations.

The Dadour Provisions are named after former City of Nedlands Mayor Dr John Dadour and are contained within Schedule 2.1 of the Local Government Act 1995. Under clause 8, electors of an affected district may require a poll to be conducted on a recommended amalgamation where sufficient elector support is obtained. Under clause 10, where at least 50 per cent of electors participate in the poll and a majority of those voting oppose the proposal, the Minister must reject the amalgamation recommendation.

The provisions gained prominence during the 2013-14 metropolitan local government reform process and have long been regarded by many local governments as an important safeguard of community self-determination. While often associated with metropolitan local government reform, the provisions apply more broadly to recommendations arising through the statutory local government boundary reform process.

Although the current reforms are described as facilitating voluntary amalgamations, the removal of the Dadour Provisions would have broader implications than voluntary proposals alone. The practical consequence would be the removal of the only existing mechanism through which affected electors can compel a poll and obtain a binding outcome on a recommended amalgamation. Final decision-making authority would instead reside with the State Government through the Advisory Board and Ministerial process.

The potential implications are particularly significant for regional and rural local governments. Unlike metropolitan councils, regional local governments often serve large geographic areas, multiple townships and dispersed communities with differing needs and priorities. Considerations such as communities of interest, local representation, infrastructure responsibilities, service accessibility and the tyranny of distance can have a substantial impact on the viability and effectiveness of any amalgamated structure.

There is also ongoing debate regarding the financial benefits commonly attributed to amalgamation. While proponents often point to reduced duplication and economies of scale, experience from other Australian jurisdictions demonstrates that amalgamations do not automatically improve financial sustainability and may result in increased organisational complexity, additional management layers and significant transition costs. Amalgamation may also result in financially sustainable local governments and their ratepayers assuming responsibility for inherited infrastructure backlogs, service deficits or financial pressures from neighbouring districts.

Given the significance of these issues and their potential long-term implications for local representation, community identity, service delivery and financial responsibility, Council is invited to consider whether retention of the Dadour Provisions remains an important safeguard for regional communities and local democratic decision-making.

Consultation Summary

Local

No community consultation has been undertaken in preparing this report. The recommendation proposes sector engagement through the WALGA Avon-Midland Country Zone and joint advocacy through AMP-UP.

State

State Government announced its proposed reforms on 17 September 2026. Council's adopted position would be communicated through the recommended advocacy channels.

Legislative Implications

State

- *Local Government Act 1995*

- Schedule 2.1, clause 8 provides the mechanism for affected electors to demand a poll on a recommended amalgamation.
- Schedule 2.1, clause 10 provides that the Minister must reject the recommendation where the statutory turnout and majority thresholds are met.

Local
Nil

Policy Implications
State
Nil

Local
Nil

Financial Implications
Nil. Any officer time associated with the proposed advocacy can be accommodated within existing operational resources.

Strategic Assessment / Implications
Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*
  Outcome: Communities Connected
  Strategic Objective 1: Work with the community on matters that are important to them.

  Retention of the Dadour Provisions supports direct community participation in decisions that may fundamentally change the identity, representation and governance of the district. The proposed advocacy is consistent with Council's role in representing its community on matters of strategic importance.

State
Nil

Site Inspection
Site inspection undertaken: Not applicable

Environmental Consideration
Environment consideration given: Not applicable

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Reputation / Governance: Loss of community confidence, local identity or self-determination if electors have no binding statutory poll mechanism for a future amalgamation proposal.	Possible	Major	High	Council adopts and communicates a clear position, seeks sector support through the Avon-Midland Country Zone and WALGA, and pursues joint advocacy through AMP-UP.
Opportunity: A coordinated regional and sector advocacy position may strengthen the case for retaining a statutory mechanism that enables electors to participate directly in decisions about local government amalgamation.				

Officer Comment/Details

The State Government's stated rationale for removing the Dadour Provisions is that the existing arrangements can enable a minority of electors within a district to prevent an amalgamation proposal from proceeding. However, the statutory threshold required before a poll result becomes binding is significant. A poll can only prevent an amalgamation recommendation where at least 50 per cent of electors participate and a majority of those voting oppose the proposal. The provisions therefore do not create an automatic barrier to local government reform. Rather, they operate as a democratic safeguard that only becomes effective where there is a high level of community participation and a clear expression of community opposition.

The proposal to remove the Dadour Provisions has been presented as a measure to facilitate voluntary amalgamations. However, the Dadour Provisions are not limited to voluntary amalgamation proposals. They apply to recommendations arising through the statutory boundary reform process and provide affected electors with the ability to require a poll on a recommended amalgamation. Their removal would therefore have a broader effect than simply making voluntary amalgamations easier.

Importantly, removal of the provisions would eliminate the only current statutory mechanism by which affected electors can compel a poll and obtain a binding outcome on a recommended amalgamation. While future governments may still choose to consult communities, undertake surveys or seek community feedback, those processes would not provide affected electors with the same determinative role currently available under the Act. The practical effect of the proposed change would be to transfer ultimate decision-making authority from affected electors to the State Government through the Advisory Board and Ministerial process.

This issue is particularly significant for regional and rural local governments. Much of the historic debate regarding local government reform has centred on metropolitan Perth, where local governments operate within a relatively compact urban environment. Regional Western Australia presents a fundamentally different set of circumstances. Local governments frequently cover large geographic areas, service multiple townships and localities, and provide services across substantial distances. These factors create challenges that cannot be resolved simply through administrative restructuring.

The tyranny of distance remains a defining characteristic of regional local government. Amalgamation does not reduce the distance that roads must be maintained across, the distance residents must travel to access services, or the distance staff and elected members must travel to engage with communities. In some cases, amalgamation may increase the size of the district being governed and create a larger organisation responsible for servicing a broader and more geographically dispersed area. This can reduce accessibility, increase complexity and place greater pressure on elected members and employees to effectively understand and respond to local issues.

Communities of interest are also a critical consideration in regional Western Australia. Regional communities are often shaped by longstanding agricultural, economic, educational, social and service relationships that have developed over generations. While neighbouring local governments may share a common boundary, this does not necessarily mean they function as a single community or have aligned priorities. The interests of a rapidly growing peri-urban district may differ significantly from those of a traditional agricultural area. Similarly, the needs of a service centre town may differ substantially from those of surrounding rural communities. The retention of a binding democratic safeguard recognises that local residents are best placed to determine whether a proposed amalgamation appropriately reflects their community of interest.

It should not be assumed that amalgamation will automatically improve financial sustainability. Proponents of amalgamation frequently point to potential economies of scale, reductions in duplication and savings associated with executive and corporate administration. However, evidence from other Australian jurisdictions demonstrates that the financial outcomes of amalgamation are mixed and frequently more complex than originally anticipated. While some efficiencies may be achieved in particular administrative functions, these savings can be offset by transition costs, increased organisational complexity and the additional governance, management and compliance requirements associated with larger organisations.

In practice, while an amalgamated local government may have a single Chief Executive Officer rather than

multiple Chief Executive Officers, larger organisations commonly require broader management structures to oversee expanded service delivery, larger workforces, increased asset portfolios and geographically dispersed operations. Consequently, reductions in executive positions do not necessarily translate into proportional reductions in overall management expenditure. Claims of long-term financial benefit should therefore be treated cautiously and assessed on a case-by-case basis rather than assumed as an inherent outcome of amalgamation.

Nor should amalgamation be viewed as a solution to underlying financial sustainability challenges. A financially sustainable local government with well-managed assets and responsible long-term planning may be amalgamated with a local government experiencing greater financial pressure, infrastructure renewal backlogs or asset management challenges. In such circumstances, amalgamation may redistribute existing obligations and liabilities across a larger area without addressing the underlying causes of those pressures. The result may be a larger organisation facing many of the same challenges that existed prior to amalgamation.

The existing Dadour Provisions establish a deliberately high threshold before a poll outcome becomes binding. They do not enable a small or disengaged minority to prevent reform. Rather, they require substantial community participation and majority opposition before a recommendation must be rejected. Retaining the provisions ensures that significant structural changes to local government boundaries cannot occur without affected communities having access to a meaningful and determinative role in the decision-making process. The importance of that safeguard extends beyond issues of governance and local identity. Amalgamation can have tangible financial consequences for individual ratepayers. Where a financially sustainable local government is merged with a local government carrying a significant infrastructure renewal backlog, asset management deficit or lower service standard, the cost of addressing those issues does not disappear. Instead, those costs may be spread across the broader rate base of the amalgamated local government. As a result, residents and ratepayers who have previously funded and maintained local assets and services at an appropriate standard may be required to contribute towards the uplift of infrastructure and service levels elsewhere within the new district. Given these potential long-term financial implications, affected electors should retain access to a binding mechanism that allows them to determine whether such a proposal should proceed.

While structural reform, shared services, regional cooperation and voluntary boundary adjustments may all have merit in appropriate circumstances, changes of this magnitude should continue to be supported by a robust democratic safeguard. For regional and rural local governments in particular, where issues of representation, local identity, communities of interest, service accessibility, geographic scale and financial responsibility are especially significant, the retention of the Dadour Provisions remains an important protection of local democratic decision-making and community self-determination.

Accordingly, it is considered appropriate that Council oppose any amendment that removes or diminishes the intent and effect of the Dadour Provisions and advocate for their retention through the WALGA Avon-Midland Country Zone, WALGA and AMP-UP.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 051026
Moved Cr Van Eeden, seconded Cr Hughes
That Council:

1. **oppose any amendment to the Local Government Act 1995 that removes, amends or otherwise diminishes the intent or effect of the Dadour Provisions contained in Schedule 2.1, clauses 8 and 10 of the Act;**
2. **support the retention of the Dadour Provisions as an important safeguard of local democratic decision-making and community self-determination;**
3. **request the Shire's representatives to the WALGA Avon-Midland Country Zone to present a motion to the next Zone meeting seeking support for retention of the Dadour Provisions and requesting that WALGA adopt this as a formal advocacy position;**
4. **present Council's position to AMP-UP and seek support for coordinated joint advocacy for retention of the Dadour Provisions; and**
5. **authorise the Chief Executive Officer to write to the Minister for Local Government, local Members of Parliament and WALGA advising of Council's position.**

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.46PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CEO03 – 10/26 Economic Development Strategy 2026 – 2031

Applicant	Shire of Chittering
File ref	SOCR-1845402348-110165
Author	Manager Economic and Community Development
Authorising Officer	Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest	Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	1. Draft Economic Development Strategy 2026-2031

	Authority / Discretion	***Definition***
☐	Advocacy	*When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.*
☒	**Executive**	***The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.***
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☐	Information	*Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)*

Executive Summary

Council is requested to adopt the Economic Development Strategy 2026–2031 (the Strategy), which will supersede the current Economic Development Strategy 2021–2031.

Background

The Shire of Chittering's Economic Development Strategy 2021–2031 has guided the Shire's approach to economic growth, business support, tourism and investment attraction since its adoption. Since that time, a range of local and regional factors have materially changed the operating environment for the Shire, warranting the development of a new, refreshed Strategy for the 2026–2031 period.

These factors include:

- Stronger than projected population growth across the Shire, exceeding the growth assumptions that underpinned the 2021–2031 Strategy;
- Changes in community and business priorities, reflecting evolving expectations around liveability, local employment, and diversification of the local economy;
- Completion of the Tonkin Highway extension and associated freight and transport improvements, which have improved connectivity to the Perth metropolitan area and are driving sustained population and investment growth; and
- Increasing demand for smaller residential block sizes and a more diverse range of housing options, particularly in and around Muchea and Bindoon, reflecting changing demographics and housing affordability pressures.

The Shire has prepared a new Economic Development Strategy 2026–2031 (Attachment 1) to ensure the Shire's economic development priorities remain current, evidence-based and responsive to emerging opportunities and risks.

Consultation Summary

Local

The development of the Shire of Chittering Economic Development Strategy was informed by a structured program of community and stakeholder consultation, undertaken to ensure the Strategy's objectives and actions are reflective of local business needs and community priorities. Consultation activities comprised the following:

- Two business-focused workshops, initially convened as part of the development of the Shire's Council Plan, provided a foundational understanding of local business sentiment and priorities, the outcomes of which were subsequently incorporated into the Strategy's development. This was supplemented by a series of face-to-face meetings with local businesses and key stakeholders, enabling the collection of direct, qualitative insight into the operational challenges and economic opportunities present within the Shire. Ongoing consultation was facilitated through Shire Officers participation on the Northern Valleys Business and Tourism Group, the regional industry representative body, ensuring alignment between the Strategy and the interests of the local business and tourism sector.

State

Nil

Legislative Implications

Nil

Policy Implications

Local

Adoption of the Strategy will establish the Shire's primary economic development policy framework for the 2026–2031 period, replacing the Economic Development Strategy 2021–2031.

Financial Implications

Implementation of individual actions identified in the Strategy will be subject to separate consideration through the Shire's annual budget and Long Term Financial Plan processes. Adoption of the Strategy itself does not commit Council to specific expenditure.

Strategic Assessment / Implications

Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*
  Outcome: Thriving
  Strategic Objective 1: Plan for future-ready growth that reflects the unique character of Chittering's communities.

The Strategy aligns with and supports delivery of the Shire's Council Plan by providing a coordinated framework for economic growth, business development, tourism, infrastructure and strategic partnerships over the next five years.

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Finance: Adoption creates community or stakeholder expectations that actions will be funded, placing pressure on future budgets and the Long Term Financial Plan.	Possible	Minor	Low	Adoption does not commit Council to expenditure. Each action is subject to separate consideration through the annual budget and Long Term Financial Plan processes.
Project Management: Delivery of actions that depend on external parties	Possible	Minor	Low	The Strategy has defined initiatives, measures of success and a delivery

or funding (e.g. Bindoon Road realignment, State-funded infrastructure) is delayed or not achieved.				schedule. Pillar 5 formalises partnerships with neighbouring local governments and State agencies, and the Strategy will be reviewed biennially.
Customer Service: Business and community expectations are not met if the Strategy does not reflect current priorities.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	The Strategy was informed by business workshops, face-to-face stakeholder meetings and Shire Officer participation in the Northern Valleys Business and Tourism Group.

Officer Comment/Details

The Strategy has been developed around five interconnected pillars, with defined measures of success and delivery schedule:

- Pillar 1 — Economic Growth & Investment Attraction: leveraging assets such as the Muchea Industrial Park (1,150 hectares of industrial land), advocating for the Bindoon Road realignment, improved availability of commercial and light industrial land, and identifying opportunities for multi-purpose residential housing to meet demand for smaller lots and diverse housing stock;
- Pillar 2 — Local Business Development & Workforce Capability: supporting local SMEs, partnering with training and education providers, and enhancing the night-time economy and service hubs in Bindoon;
- Pillar 3 — Visitor Economy and Tourism Development: growing agritourism, trails and events, and strengthening the Northern Valleys brand in partnership with the Shires of Gingin and Victoria Plains;
- Pillar 4 — Infrastructure, Connectivity & Liveability: addressing infrastructure gaps arising from population growth, advocating for funding of strategic projects, and enabling growth through updated local planning; and
- Pillar 5 — Strategic Partnerships: formalising alliances with neighbouring local governments, regional bodies and State agencies, and committing to biennial review of the Strategy to ensure it remains current and responsive.

The Strategy has been designed to directly respond to the population, transport, housing and community priority changes noted in the Background section above.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 061026
Moved Cr Van Eeden, seconded Cr Angus
That Council:

1. **Adopt the Economic Development Strategy 2026–2031, as provided in Attachment 1, noting that it supersedes the Economic Development Strategy 2021–2031; and**
2. **Note that the Economic Development Strategy 2021–2031 is superseded and of no further effect from the date of this resolution.**

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.48PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CEO04 – 10/26 Adopted Changes to Regional Road Group Funding

Applicant Shire of Chittering
File ref
Author Chief Executive Officer
Author Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that require disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments 1. 2027/28 Category 1 Regional Road Group Indicative Allocations Information Sheet

	Authority / Discretion	*Definition*
☒	**Advocacy**	***When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.***
☐	Executive	*The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☐	Information	*Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)*

Executive Summary
Council is requested to endorse an advocacy position supporting the retention of a strong, locally prioritised Regional Road Group funding model and advocating for ongoing review of the impacts of the Category 1 funding cap and redirection of growth funding to Category 2 State-managed programs. The report further recommends that the Shire seek meaningful consultation with regional local governments regarding future road funding arrangements.

Background
The State Government has advised of adopted changes to the State Road Funds to Local Government arrangements. Category 1 funding, which supports locally prioritised road projects through the Regional Road Group structure, is to be capped at 2025/26 levels. Future growth funding, estimated at approximately $34.22 million, would instead be directed to Category 2 programs administered through Main Roads Western Australia and other State initiatives.

The stated rationale is a history of under-expenditure and carryovers within Category 1 programs. However, regional local governments face genuine delivery constraints, including contractor availability, procurement lead times, material supply, weather, staged construction and the need to manage exposure to cost overruns. Carryovers do not necessarily indicate that a project is unnecessary or that funding should be removed.

The change would shift a greater share of local road funding away from locally determined priorities and towards State-controlled programs. This creates concern that smaller regional road projects may be displaced by larger or more prominent State priorities and that the change could become a permanent centralised funding model.

Consultation Summary
Local

The matter has been discussed internally by the Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer. Concerns have also been raised by regional local government representatives regarding the lack of consultation with the councils responsible for delivering Category 1 projects.

State
The matter has been discussed internally by the Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer. Concerns have also been raised by regional local government representatives regarding the lack of consultation with the councils responsible for delivering Category 1 projects.

Legislative Implications
State
- Local Government Act 1995
  Road Traffic (Administration) Act 2008

Local
Nil

Policy Implications
State
- Local Government Act 1995
  Road Traffic (Administration) Act 2008

Local
Nil

Financial Implications
There is no immediate budget amendment arising from this report. However, any long-term reduction in the real value or availability of Category 1 funding may reduce the Shire's capacity to deliver priority road renewal and improvement projects and may increase pressure on municipal funding.

Strategic Assessment / Implications
Local
- Council Plan 2026 - 2036
  Outcome: *Rural Way of Life*
  Strategic Objective 1: *Advocate for improved investment and maintenance in roads and paths.*

  This matter aligns with Council's objectives for responsible financial management, sustainable infrastructure and effective advocacy on behalf of the community. Retaining a strong, locally prioritised funding model supports the Shire's ability to plan and deliver road works according to local condition, safety, network and community priorities.

  State
  The matter has broader implications for regional road funding, local decision-making and the ability of regional local governments to maintain and improve their road networks.

State
- Local Government Act 1995
- Road Traffic (Administration) Act 2008

Site Inspection
Site inspection undertaken: Not applicable

Environmental Consideration
Environment consideration given: Not applicable

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Financial / Project Management: Reduced access to locally prioritised road funding	Possible	Moderate	Medium	Advocate collectively through regional local government networks and seek retention of Category 1 growth funding and meaningful consultation.
Opportunity: Strengthen regional collaboration and advocate for a funding model that improves delivery while retaining local priority-setting.				

The principal risk is that the adopted funding model reduces local influence over road priorities and limits future funding available for locally delivered regional road projects. Advocacy, collaboration with other regional local governments and engagement with the State Government are the available mitigation measures.

Officer Comment/Details

The Shire supports accountability, realistic project scheduling and improved delivery forecasting. However, capping Category 1 funding and redirecting growth funding does not address the underlying causes of project carryovers. Regional road projects are often delivered in stages and may be affected by factors outside a council's control. Councils also use conservative estimates to manage financial exposure where tender prices or construction costs exceed forecasts.

The Regional Road Group model provides an established process for local governments to assess road needs, agree regional priorities and direct funding to projects with strong local and regional benefit. Moving growth funding into State-managed programs reduces local decision-making and may result in priorities being determined at a State level without sufficient regard to smaller regional projects.

As the Category 1 funding cap has now been adopted and is scheduled to commence in 2027, it is recommended that Council advocate for ongoing monitoring and review of the impacts of the changes on regional local governments. Council should also support the continuation of strong local input into road funding priorities and request that the State Government work with regional local governments to address delivery and forecasting issues while preserving the benefits of the Regional Road Group model.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 071026
Moved Cr Angus, seconded Cr Van Eeden
That Council:

1. **reaffirm its opposition to the adopted cap on Category 1 Regional Road Group funding at 2025/26 levels, scheduled to commence in 2027, and the redirection of future growth funding to Category 2 State-managed programs;**
2. **support the continuation and growth of Category 1 funding through the Regional Road Group model, with road priorities determined through established local and regional processes;**
3. **request the State Government and Main Roads Western Australia to consult directly with regional local governments to identify and address the causes of project carryovers and under-expenditure as part of the implementation and ongoing review of the adopted funding changes; and**
4. **authorise the Shire President and Chief Executive Officer to undertake advocacy consistent with this resolution, including through WALGA, Regional Road Groups, local Members of Parliament and relevant State Ministers.**

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.52PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CEO05 – 10/26 Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Procurement

Applicant Shire of Chittering
File ref SOCR-1845402348-142651
Author Economic and Community Development Manager
Authorising Officer Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments Nil

	Authority / Discretion	*Definition*
☐	Advocacy	*When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.*
☒	**Executive**	***The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.***
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☐	Information	*Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)*

Executive Summary
Council is requested to authorise the Chief Executive Officer to execute the funding agreement for the Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Project and to release a Request for Quote (RFQ) through the WALGA Preferred Supplier Panel for the engagement of a suitably qualified consultant to undertake the co-design, planning and development stages of the precinct.

The consultant will be responsible for delivering community and stakeholder co-design, concept planning, technical investigations, business case development and the preparation of a comprehensive precinct masterplan to guide future investment and project delivery outcomes.

Background
The Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Project is a strategic place-making and economic development initiative designed to strengthen Bindoon as a regional centre, increase tourism visitation, support local business growth and improve community amenity.

Funding has been secured to undertake the planning and development phase of the project. In order to access the funding, the Shire is required to execute a funding agreement with the relevant funding body.

To deliver the project objectives, the Shire has prepared a detailed Scope of Works for the engagement of a multidisciplinary consultant team. The proposed procurement will be undertaken through the WALGA Preferred Supplier Panel, providing a compliant and streamlined procurement pathway while ensuring access to suitably qualified consultants with relevant expertise.

The project will culminate in the preparation of a coordinated masterplan and implementation framework to support future funding applications, investment attraction and project delivery.

Consultation Summary

Local

The Scope of Works has been developed through consultation with relevant Shire officers to identify strategic priorities, project requirements and delivery outcomes.

The consultant engagement will include comprehensive community and stakeholder consultation and co-design activities involving:

- Local residents;
- Businesses;
- Tourism operators;
- Community groups;
- Landowners;
- Traditional Owners; and
- Council Members.

State

The project has been developed through engagement with relevant State Government agencies during the funding application process.

Further consultation will occur with relevant approval authorities and government agencies during project delivery, including:

- Main Roads Western Australia;
- Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage;
- DevelopmentWA;
- Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions; and
- Other agencies as required.

Legislative Implications

State

- Local Government Act 1995
- Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996
- Planning and Development Act 2005
- Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2021
- State Heritage Act 2018

Local

- Shire of Chittering Local Planning Scheme No. 6
- Shire of Chittering Purchasing Policy

Policy Implications

State

- WALGA Preferred Supplier Program Procurement Framework

Local

- Shire of Chittering Purchasing Policy
- Shire of Chittering Community Engagement Policy

Financial Implications

Funding for the planning and development phase of the Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Project has been secured through external grant funding and associated budget allocations.

Execution of the funding agreement will enable the Shire to access grant funding and commence project activities in accordance with approved grant milestones.

Failure to execute the funding agreement and commence procurement activities may result in delays to project delivery and may place grant funding at risk.

Strategic Assessment / Implications

Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*
  Outcome: *Thriving*
  Strategic Objective 1: *Plan for future-ready growth that reflects the unique character of Chittering's communities.*

Prosperous Economy - The project supports local economic development, tourism growth, investment attraction and business expansion opportunities within the Shire.

Connected and Inclusive Communities - The co-design process will encourage community participation and ensure future development outcomes reflect community aspirations and needs.

Sustainable Infrastructure and Places - The project will establish a coordinated framework for future infrastructure investment, destination development and town centre activation.

State

Nil

Site Inspection

N/A

Environmental Consideration

Environment consideration given: Yes

Environmental considerations form part of the consultant scope and will be addressed through appropriate investigations and assessments during the planning and development process.

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Delay in project commencement	Possible	Major	High	Execute the funding agreement and commence procurement as soon as practicable following Council approval.
Loss of grant funding	Unlikely	Major	Medium	Ensure compliance with all grant conditions
Inability to secure suitable consultants within project budget	Unlikely	Moderate	Medium	Conduct procurement through the WALGA Preferred Supplier Panel to access suitably qualified and experienced suppliers.
Grant milestone timelines are unachievable	Possible	Moderate	Medium	Clearly outline the delivery timelines in the RFQ process. Inform funding bodies of any delays.

Opportunity: The project provides an opportunity to establish an investment-ready precinct plan that supports future grant funding applications, attracts private sector investment and delivers long-term economic, tourism and community development benefits.

Officer Comment/Details

The Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Project represents a significant strategic initiative for the Shire and supports Council's vision for economic growth, destination development and place activation within Bindoon.

Execution of the funding agreement is necessary to formalise the funding arrangement and facilitate project commencement.

The proposed procurement process will engage a suitably qualified consultant to undertake co-design and planning activities, prepare supporting business cases and technical investigations, and develop a comprehensive precinct masterplan to guide future implementation.

The use of the WALGA Preferred Supplier Panel will ensure the procurement process is compliant, efficient and capable of attracting consultants with demonstrated experience in strategic planning, economic development, tourism development and community engagement.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 081026
Moved Cr Van Eeden, seconded Cr Grayer
That Council:

1. **Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to execute the funding agreement for the Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct Project on behalf of the Shire of Chittering;**
2. **Approve the release of a Request for Quote through the WALGA Preferred Supplier Panel for the engagement of a suitably qualified consultant to undertake the co-design, planning and development stages of the Bindoon Town and Tourism Precinct and**
3. **Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to undertake all actions necessary to give effect to this resolution.**

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.55PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

CEO06 – 10/26 Gonneville Project - Lower Chittering Community Information Session

Applicant	Shire of Chittering
File ref	SOCR-1845402348-166919
Author	Chief Executive Officer
Authorising Officer	Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of interest	Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that require disclosure
Voting requirements	Simple Majority
Attachments	Nil

	Authority / Discretion	*Definition*
☒	**Advocacy**	***When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.***
☒	**Executive**	***The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.***
☐	Legislative	*When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law*
☐	Quasi-Judicial	*When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal*
☐	Information	*Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only)*

Executive Summary

Council is requested to endorse a public information session in Lower Chittering to provide the community with a clear and consolidated account of Council's work in relation to the proposed Gonneville Project infrastructure and transport corridors. The session is intended to address an evident information gap. Despite substantial advocacy, correspondence, meetings, submissions and ongoing engagement, sections of the community appear unaware of the work undertaken and, in some instances, regard the Shire as an adversary rather than an ally.

The proposed session will explain Council's adopted position, advocacy actions, statutory powers and limitations, current project status, outstanding concerns and next steps. Chalice Mining Limited will be invited to attend the same session to present current information, respond to community questions and hear concerns directly. Council endorsement is sought to proceed with the session and make the supporting information publicly available.

Background

The Gonneville Project mine site is located in the neighbouring Shire of Toodyay. However, associated infrastructure and the current preferred transport arrangements have potential direct impacts within the Shire of Chittering, including rural-residential areas, private properties, local roads and Chittering Road, the Shire's only formally branded tourist route.

Council's position has consistently distinguished between the mine itself and the impacts of associated infrastructure and transport corridors on Chittering. Council is not opposed to the project in principle and recognises that supporting infrastructure is required. Its advocacy has focused on avoiding or reducing impacts on Chittering residents, rural amenity, environmental values, community safety, private land and local infrastructure.

On 17 June 2026, Council resolved to actively advocate against proposed mining infrastructure through private properties in Rural Residential areas where it would create above-ground works, overhead powerlines, surface disturbance, easements or exclusion zones that restrict the reasonable use and enjoyment of land. Council supported use of existing transport or utility corridors wherever practicable, recognised affected landowners'

concerns, identified deep underground installation as preferable where impacts cannot otherwise be avoided, directed the Chief Executive Officer to communicate Council's position to relevant Ministers, agencies and proponents, and requested that Chalice meet with the community.

Since that resolution, the Shire has undertaken a coordinated advocacy program. This has included a 16-recipient letter campaign to State and Commonwealth Ministers, opposition representatives, regulators, agencies and the proponent; direct correspondence with Chalice; engagement with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation and other relevant agencies; representations concerning alternative alignments and lower-impact infrastructure solutions; advocacy regarding the proposed use of Chittering Road; and requests for broader assessment of construction, operational, contractor, fuel, chemical, oversize-load and other project-generated traffic.

The Shire has also advocated for genuine consideration of alternatives, including connections to Toodyay Road as an existing freight route near the project area, rather than defaulting to the Shire's highest-value tourist road to reach Great Northern Highway. It has raised road safety, emergency response, bushfire evacuation, cumulative traffic, infrastructure capacity, environmental, rural amenity, tourism and potential ratepayer cost impacts. The Shire has maintained regular engagement through meetings, briefings, emails, letters, submissions, public question responses and discussions with elected representatives, government agencies, Chalice and community members.

Recent community correspondence and public submissions indicate that this work is not fully understood. Some community members consider the Shire's response insufficient or believe the Shire is not acting alongside them. This perception risks undermining trust and weakening a shared advocacy position. A public information session provides a practical opportunity to place the full record before the community, explain what Council can and cannot control, hear community concerns and identify the matters on which Council and residents can continue to work together.

Consultation Summary

Local

Community views have been received through public question time, deputations, direct correspondence, submissions and discussions with affected landowners and residents. Key concerns include the infrastructure corridor, road safety, Chittering Road, broader mine-related traffic, bushfire evacuation, emergency response, rural amenity, environmental and water impacts, private property rights, transparency, and the financial burden of project impacts on the Shire and its ratepayers.

The proposed session is a further consultation and information-sharing measure. It will be held in Lower Chittering, where many directly affected and concerned residents are located. The format should include a Shire presentation, a consolidated advocacy chronology, an explanation of jurisdictional responsibilities, a facilitated question-and-answer component, and information on how residents can participate in relevant statutory processes.

State

The Shire has corresponded and engaged with relevant State Ministers, agencies, regulators, elected representatives and opposition representatives. Advocacy has addressed the infrastructure corridor, transport route, environmental assessment, cumulative traffic impacts, road safety, emergency access, bushfire evacuation, private property, rural amenity and the need to assess genuine lower-impact alternatives.

Chalice Mining Limited will be invited to attend the Lower Chittering session. Its attendance will provide an opportunity for the proponent to explain the current proposal and assessment processes, respond directly to questions and hear community concerns. The invitation does not indicate Council support for any route or corridor and does not diminish Council's adopted advocacy position.

Legislative Implications

State

- Local Government Act 1995 - Council may determine its advocacy and community engagement position. The Shire does not determine mining, environmental or State transport approvals.

Local
Nil

Policy Implications
State
Nil

Local
Nil

Financial Implications
The session can be delivered using existing staff resources and a Shire or community venue, with minor costs for venue setup, communications, printing and facilitation met from existing operational budgets. No additional budget allocation is proposed. Should specialist facilitation or a larger venue be required, expenditure will remain subject to available budget and applicable procurement requirements.

Strategic Assessment / Implications
Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*
  Outcome: Communities Connected
  Strategic Objective 1: Work with the community on matters that are important to them.

  A transparent public session will make Council's advocacy visible, clarify the respective roles of Council, the proponent and State and Commonwealth decisionmakers, and support informed community participation. It also strengthens Council's ability to advocate from a shared evidence base while protecting the rural lifestyle, amenity, safety and infrastructure values identified in the Council Plan.

State
- Relevant State environmental, mining, transport and land-access assessment and approval frameworks.

Site Inspection
Site inspection undertaken: Not applicable
The proposed decision relates to community engagement and advocacy rather than works at a specific site.

Environmental Consideration
Environmental consideration given: Yes
Environmental matters raised through Council's advocacy include vegetation, habitat, waterways and catchments, dust, water, surface disturbance, cumulative impacts and the comparative impacts of alternative infrastructure and transport corridors. The information session will explain that environmental assessment and approval decisions rest with the relevant State and Commonwealth authorities.

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Reputation / Community trust: community remains unaware of Council's advocacy or regards	Possible	Moderate	Medium	Publish a factual advocacy chronology; clearly explain Council's role and limitations; use a facilitated session;

the Shire as an adversary.				invite Chalice; publish follow-up information and actions.
Opportunity: Rebuild trust, demonstrate Council's advocacy, improve community understanding, obtain current information directly from Chalice, and strengthen a coordinated approach to protecting the Shire's interests.				

Officer Comment/Details

Council and Administration have undertaken substantial work to represent the interests of the Chittering community. The record demonstrates proactive advocacy, including Council resolutions, a broad ministerial and agency letter campaign, meetings and briefings, repeated engagement with Chalice, responses to community submissions and questions, and further correspondence seeking assessment of the full range of project-generated impacts.

However, advocacy is only effective when the community understands both what has been done and what remains possible. The current perception that the Shire is an adversary rather than an ally is inconsistent with Council's adopted position and actions. It also creates a risk that Council and the community pursue separate or conflicting messages when their underlying concerns substantially overlap.

A Lower Chittering information session is an immediate, low-cost response. The Shire can present a factual chronology of Council decisions and actions, explain its limited statutory role, identify the matters being pursued, distinguish between the mine and the infrastructure and transport impacts affecting Chittering, and outline the opportunities available to residents through environmental, mining and other approval processes.

Inviting Chalice to the same session is important. It gives the community direct access to current project information and allows questions to be put to the proponent in a transparent forum. The session should be independently or firmly facilitated, with speaking arrangements and questions managed to ensure respectful participation. The Shire should publish the presentation, advocacy chronology, questions and answers, and any commitments arising from the session on its website after the event.

The session will not replace formal statutory consultation and will not alter Council's adopted position. Its purpose is to improve transparency, rebuild trust, strengthen the relationship between Council and affected residents, and support a more informed and united approach to achieving the best available outcome for the Shire.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 091026
Moved Cr Angus, seconded Cr Hughes
That Council:

1. **Endorse the holding of a public information session in Lower Chittering regarding the proposed Gonneville Project infrastructure and transport corridors and Council's advocacy on behalf of the Chittering community.**
2. **Request the Chief Executive Officer to arrange the session as soon as practicable, using existing operational resources, and to include:**
   a. **a factual chronology of Council resolutions, advocacy correspondence, submissions, meetings, briefings and engagements undertaken to date;**
   b. **an explanation of Council's statutory role, powers and limitations in relation to the project and associated infrastructure and transport approvals;**
   c. **an update on the current known status of the infrastructure corridor, preferred transport arrangements and relevant State and Commonwealth assessment processes;**
   d. **the principal matters Council has raised, including rural amenity, private property, environmental impacts, road safety, cumulative traffic, emergency response, bushfire evacuation, infrastructure capacity, tourism and potential financial impacts on the Shire and its ratepayers; and**
   e. **a facilitated opportunity for community questions and feedback.**
3. **Invite Chalice Mining Limited to attend the same session to present current project information, respond to community questions and hear community concerns directly.**
4. **Note that inviting Chalice Mining Limited does not indicate Council support for any proposed infrastructure corridor or transport route and does not alter Council's existing advocacy position.**
5. **Request that the presentation, advocacy chronology, questions and answers, and any actions or commitments arising from the session be published on the Shire's website following the session, subject to confidentiality and privacy requirements.**
6. **Reaffirm Council's commitment to work alongside affected residents and the broader community to advocate for the best available outcome for the Shire of Chittering.**

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 7.59PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

ITEM 10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COM01 – 10/26 Local Emergency Management Committee - Unconfirmed Minutes from Wednesday, 9 September 2026

Applicant Shire of Chittering
File ref SOCR-1845402348-45254
Author Executive Assistant
Authorising Officer Chief Executive Officer
Disclosure of Interest Neither the Author nor Authorising Officer have any Impartiality, Financial or Proximity Interests that requires disclosure
Voting requirements Simple Majority
Attachments 1. "Unconfirmed" minutes from Local Emergency Management Committee meeting held on 9 September 2026

	Authority / Discretion	Definition
☐	Advocacy	When Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.
☐	Executive	The substantial direction setting and oversight role of Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.
☐	Legislative	When Council initiates or adopts a policy position, or a local law.
☐	Quasi-Judicial	When Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's rights and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include development applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (e.g. under *Health Act*, *Dog Act* or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.
☒	**Information**	**Includes items for information purposes only and do not require a decision of Council (to 'note' only).**

Executive Summary
Council is requested to receive the minutes from the Chittering Local Emergency Management Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 9 September 2026.

Background
The Chittering Local Emergency Management Committee meeting met on Wednesday, 27 August 2025. No motions were made at this meeting

Consultation Summary
Local
- Local Emergency Management Committee

State
Nil

Legislative Implications
Local
Nil

State
- *Local Government Act 1995, s5.12 and s5.13*

- *Emergency Management Act 2005*

38. Local emergency management committees

(1) A local government is to establish one or more local emergency management committees for the local government's district.

(2) If more than one local emergency management committee is established, the local government is to specify the area in respect of which the committee is to exercise its functions.

(3) A local emergency management committee consists of—

a) a chairman and other members appointed by the relevant local government in accordance with subsection (4); and

b) if the local emergency coordinator is not appointed as chairman of the committee, the local emergency coordinator for the local government district.

(4) Subject to this section, the constitution and procedures of a local emergency management committee, and the terms and conditions of appointment of members, are to be determined by the SEMC.

39. Functions of local emergency management committees

The functions of a local emergency management committee are, in relation to its district or the area for which it is established—

(a) to advise and assist the local government in ensuring that local emergency management arrangements are established for its district; and

(b) to liaise with public authorities and other persons in the development, review and testing of local emergency management arrangements; and

(c) to carry out other emergency management activities as directed by the SEMC or prescribed by the regulations.

Policy Implications

Local

Nil

State

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Assessment / Implications

Local

- *Council Plan 2026 - 2036*

Outcome:	Communities Connected
Strategic Objective 3:	Advocate for and support communities to prepare for emergencies and local risks.

State

Nil

Site Inspection

Site Inspection undertaken: Not applicable

Environmental Consideration

Environment consideration given: Not applicable

Risk Assessment / Implications

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Natural Environment: Making sure the natural environment of the Shire is	Possible	Minor	Moderate	Ensuring requirements are met through holding the scheduled meetings

protected as much as possible				
Opportunity: Nil				

Risk	Likelihood	Consequences	Risk Analysis	Mitigation
Reputational: The Shire's reputation in the community being impacted because we are not prioritising emergency management efforts	Possible	Minor	Moderate	More regular LEMC meetings with meaningful membership and valuable information shared at meetings.
Opportunity: Committee members building rapport with each other and understanding each other's specific needs should an emergency occur				

Officer Comment / Details

The next meeting of the Local Emergency Management Committee is on Wednesday, 25 November 2026.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL RESOLUTION 101026
Moved Cr Hughes, seconded Cr Van Eeden
That Council receive the 'unconfirmed' minutes from the Local Emergency Management Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 9 September 2026.

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 8.00PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

ITEM 11. MOTIONS, OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MWPN01 - 10/26 Cr Grayer – Chalice Mining Gonneville Project

COUNCILLOR MOTION / COUNCILLOR RESOLUTION 111026
Moved Cr Grayer, seconded Cr Hughes
That Council:

1. **Formally oppose the location of Gonneville Project associated infrastructure within the Shire of Chittering, including the use of roads within the Shire as a freight or transport corridor associated with the project.**
2. **Acknowledge the significant concerns raised by Chittering residents and landholders regarding the proposed Gonneville Project infrastructure corridor and the potential impacts on private property, rural lifestyle, environmental values, water resources, local roads and community amenity.**
3. **Reaffirm its commitment to protecting Chittering's rural character, natural environment, community amenity and the interests of affected residents and landholders, consistent with the strategic direction established in the *Council Plan 2026–2036 – Chittering 2036: Our Place, Our Future*.**
4. **Direct the Chief Executive Officer to continue advocating to Chalice Mining Limited, State Government agencies and relevant decisionmakers for alternative infrastructure and transport corridor solutions outside the Shire of Chittering.**
5. **Continue to advocate for and support affected Chittering residents and landholders through all relevant consultation, environmental assessment, licensing and approval processes associated with the project.**
6. **Continue to engage with Chalice Mining Limited, government agencies and other relevant stakeholders where that engagement assists the Shire to advocate for the Chittering community, explore alternative solutions, influence project outcomes and, if infrastructure is ultimately approved despite Council's opposition, secure the strongest possible protections and mitigation measures for affected residents and the wider community.**
7. **Resolve that, while Council maintains its formal opposition under Point 1, the Shire will not enter into direct corporate sponsorship arrangements with Chalice Mining Limited that provide promotional branding, recognition or association with the Shire, Shire-run events or activities. This does not prevent the Shire from seeking, negotiating or accepting funding or contributions associated with project impacts, including road and infrastructure works, maintenance, remediation, emergency management, mitigation measures, cost recovery or other community protections or obligations associated with the Gonneville Project.**

CARRIED: 5 / 0
TIME: 8.05PM
FOR: Cr Dewar, Cr Angus, Cr Hughes, Cr Grayer, Cr Van Eeden
AGAINST: Nil

Officer Comment
Administration understands the purpose of the motion is to provide a clear and unambiguous statement about Council's position on the proposed location of Gonneville-associated infrastructure and the use of roads within the Shire as a project freight or transport corridor.

The Shire does not determine whether the Gonneville mine proceeds, nor does it hold final approval authority over much of the associated infrastructure. Those decisions sit primarily with State and Commonwealth decision-makers through environmental, mining, infrastructure and other statutory approval processes.

That does not mean the Shire is powerless or should take a passive role. It does, however, mean that the Shire's influence is principally exercised through advocacy, submissions, consultation and direct engagement with the proponent, Ministers, government agencies and regulatory authorities.

Council and Administration have been actively using those opportunities to raise the concerns of affected residents and landholders and to seek outcomes that protect Chittering's rural character, landscape, environment, water resources, local roads, community amenity and private property.

This has included advocacy concerning:

- the location and design of proposed infrastructure;
- impacts on Rural Residential areas;
- the use of local roads as a freight or transport corridor, particularly roads that are important tourism, recreation and community access routes;
- road safety, road condition and infrastructure requirements;
- drainage, catchment and water-resource impacts;
- vegetation clearing, biodiversity and habitat fragmentation;
- cumulative environmental and amenity impacts;
- the interests and wellbeing of affected landholders; and
- the need for the costs and consequences of the project not to be transferred to the Chittering community.

Administration recognises that continued engagement with a mining proponent can sometimes be interpreted as support for the project. Similarly, where the Shire discusses infrastructure requirements, mitigation measures or alternative designs, this can be viewed as Council having accepted that the infrastructure will proceed.

That is not the purpose of the Shire's engagement.

Continued engagement does not mean Council or Administration supports the proposed location of the infrastructure. It means the Shire is using the avenues available to influence an outcome over which it does not have final control.

There is an important difference between accepting an impact and seeking to reduce an impact that may ultimately be approved by another level of government. Seeking a design change, alternative route or mitigation measure does not mean the original proposal was supported. It means the Shire has sought to achieve a better outcome for the community than may otherwise have occurred.

This distinction is not always visible publicly because the community usually sees the proposal that emerges from the discussions, rather than all of the earlier options considered or the changes secured along the way.

The proposed power infrastructure through Rural Residential areas is an example. Through ongoing advocacy, the Shire has moved the discussion from overhead infrastructure to underground infrastructure. That should not be interpreted as the Shire accepting a corridor through Rural Residential areas. Rather, it demonstrates the type of impact reduction that may be achieved by remaining engaged and continuing to advocate.

Without that engagement, the Shire may have had less opportunity to influence the design and a more intrusive option may have remained under consideration. The fact that a less harmful outcome may be achieved does not mean the original concern was overstated or that the Shire was working for the proponent. It means the Shire's advocacy had an effect.

This creates a difficult position for local government. If the Shire refuses to discuss mitigation because its preferred outcome is complete avoidance, it risks losing opportunities to protect the community if that preferred outcome is not accepted by the final decision-makers. If the Shire does discuss mitigation, those discussions can be portrayed as support for the proposal.

Administration considers that Council can strongly oppose the location of the infrastructure within Chittering while continuing to engage with those who can alter the proposal or determine its approval. Those positions are not inconsistent.

Much of the engagement currently occurring with Chalice Mining Limited is taking place before, or in addition to, the formal statutory consultation processes. The information being provided, discussions being held and opportunities for early input are valuable because they allow local concerns to be raised while aspects of the proposal may still be capable of change.

That engagement is not entirely within the Shire's control. If the proponent concludes that Council's position leaves no purpose for further discussion, the proponent may elect to limit future engagement to the minimum required through statutory approval processes.
In that situation, the Shire would not necessarily stop communicating with the proponent. Rather, the proponent may decide there is no longer sufficient value in continuing voluntary discussions with the Shire.

The Shire could then become more reliant on formal referrals, public documents, project updates and statutory consultation periods. Those processes remain important, but they may occur after options have been narrowed and substantial project development has already taken place.

The motion seeks to address that risk by clearly stating Council's opposition while expressly supporting continued engagement. This allows the Shire to advocate first for the infrastructure and freight routes to be located outside the district, while maintaining the ability to seek alternative alignments, design changes and protections if the State ultimately determines that some infrastructure will proceed despite Council's position.

Administration also acknowledges the community concern that Council may support the project because of potential financial benefits, sponsorship, contributions or its ongoing engagement with the proponent.

In considering this issue, Administration considers it important to distinguish between Council's position on the Gonneville Project and the Shire's ability to accept legitimate funding or contributions that provide a benefit to the Chittering community. Council's opposition to the proposed location of Gonneville-associated infrastructure within the Shire should not, of itself, prevent the Shire from seeking, negotiating or accepting contributions from Chalice Mining Limited. This includes contributions directly associated with project impacts as well as funding provided through the company's broader corporate citizenship, community investment or community support activities.

The important distinction is whether acceptance of that funding creates, or could reasonably be perceived as creating, an endorsement or promotion of Chalice Mining Limited or the Gonneville Project. While Council maintains its formal opposition to the proposed location of the infrastructure, funding may still be accepted where it provides a legitimate community benefit, but the arrangement should not include promotional branding, advertising, endorsement or other recognition that could reasonably suggest that the Shire supports or promotes the company or the project. This allows the Chittering community to benefit from legitimate corporate contributions without compromising the clarity or integrity of Council's position.

This is separate again from contributions associated directly with the impacts of the project. Negotiating road upgrades, environmental protections, emergency-management arrangements, infrastructure works, maintenance, remediation, cost recovery or mitigation measures is not seeking a financial benefit in exchange for support. It is seeking to ensure that the costs and consequences of a project are not transferred from the proponent to Chittering ratepayers and residents.

Similarly, securing a concession does not mean the Shire has agreed with the broader proposal. A concession is generally sought because the Shire has identified an impact and has advocated for that impact to be avoided or reduced.

Ultimately, there are two possible stages to Council's advocacy. The first is to advocate for the infrastructure and freight route not to be located within Chittering. The second, if that outcome is not accepted by State or Commonwealth decision-makers, is to ensure the impacts on affected residents, landholders and the wider community are reduced to the greatest extent possible.

The motion allows Council to pursue both. It does not weaken Council's opposition, but it avoids placing Administration in a position where pursuing protections or alternatives could be seen as inconsistent with Council's resolution.

The motion also confirms Council's opposition to the use of roads within the Shire as a freight or transport corridor associated with the project. This is particularly important where proposed freight movements could affect tourism routes, recreational routes, local community connections, road safety, road condition and the rural experience valued by residents and visitors.

Administration considers that the motion provides the community with a clear statement of Council's preferred outcome while preserving the practical ability to continue advocating, gathering information, challenging assumptions and seeking changes throughout the approval process.

The motion cannot guarantee that infrastructure will not be approved within the Shire because that decision is not Council's alone to make. It can, however, clearly state Council's position and direct the Shire to continue using every available opportunity to pursue that position and protect the community.

Administration therefore supports the intent of the motion and will continue to advocate for affected residents and landholders, oppose the use of Chittering roads as a Gonneville freight corridor, seek alternative infrastructure solutions outside the Shire and remain engaged wherever that engagement provides an opportunity to avoid or reduce impacts on the Chittering community. Administration does, however, caution against Point 7 as currently worded, as it may unnecessarily prevent the community from benefiting from legitimate corporate citizenship or community investment funding.

The proposed amendment would be for point 7 to be changed to read:
Resolve that, while Council maintains its formal opposition under Point 1, the Shire may seek, negotiate or accept sponsorship, funding or contributions from Chalice Mining Limited where these provide a legitimate benefit to the Chittering community, including through corporate citizenship, community investment or community support initiatives. The Shire may appropriately acknowledge such contributions publicly, provided that any acknowledgement does not imply Council endorsement or support for Chalice Mining Limited or the Gonneville Project. This does not limit the Shire from seeking, negotiating or accepting funding or contributions associated with project impacts, including road and infrastructure works, maintenance, remediation, emergency management, mitigation measures, cost recovery or other community protections or obligations associated with the Gonneville Project.

ITEM 12. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS WITHOUT NOTICE

QMWN01 – /26 Cr Hughes – Bindoon Oval Following Events

Question: Given the substantial amount of damage done to the Bindoon oval following the Show last year. Will there be an inspection and any necessary repairs undertaken prior to future users requiring the oval this year?

Response: *The Chief Executive Officer confirmed that the Shire constantly ensure that when we host events there that we attempt to do it with as little impact as possible on our infrastructure. Unfortunately, last year was a particularly wet year, and again this year there were two instances that led to the oval being extra wet again. We acknowledge that there has been some damage, not as extensive as last year, but we are encouraging more and more events to be hosted there. We are hosting the Taste of Chittering, and we will continue to look for better options than using a sporting oval for these functions.*

ITEM 13. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF THE MEETING

Nil

ITEM 14. MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Matters of which the meeting may be closed

Nil

ITEM 15. CLOSURE

The Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 8.07pm.