

## **ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS**

**28 May 2025**

### **Contents**

|                                                              |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Opening of Meeting .....                                  | 2  |
| 2. Acknowledgment of Country.....                            | 2  |
| 3. Attendance, Apologies and Leave of Absence .....          | 2  |
| 4. Attendance of Electors .....                              | 2  |
| 5. Confirmation of Minutes .....                             | 2  |
| 6. Annual Report & Annual Financial Report .....             | 3  |
| 7. General Business Regarding the Financial Statements ..... | 3  |
| 8. General Business.....                                     | 14 |
| 9. Closure .....                                             | 14 |

## Minutes

For the Annual General Meeting of Electors, to be held in the Council Chambers on Thursday, 28 May 2025 commencing at 4.30pm

### **1. Opening of Meeting**

The Presiding Member opened the meeting at 4.31 pm.

### **2. Acknowledgment of Country**

We acknowledge the cultural custodians of the land, the Kaneang, Pibelmen and Wadandi people. We acknowledge and support their continuing connection to the land, waterways and community. We pay our respects to members of the Aboriginal communities and their culture; and to Elders past and present, their descendants still with us today, and those who will follow in their footsteps.

### **3. Attendance, Apologies and Leave of Absence**

President - Cr T Lansdell

Councillors - Cr J Boyle  
- Cr M Christensen  
- Cr M Fletcher  
- Cr L Pearce - Teams  
- Cr R Redman

Officers - A Kyron, Chief Executive Officer (Temp)  
- L Guthridge, A/Director Development and Regulation  
- M Gillham, A/ Director of Projects & Environment  
- M Morrell, A/ Manager Executive Services

Leave - Cr T Pratico

### **4. Attendance of Electors**

J Moore, B Moore, M Cable, B Bebbington, I Barker, L Gibson, L Roberts,  
D Roberts, J Steer, K McGuiness, A Wright

### **5. Confirmation of Minutes**

Attachment 1 Minutes of the AGM of Electors held 22 February 2024

*A Motion is required to confirm the Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held 22 February 2024.*

### **AEM 001/25**

#### **Amendments**

- ***Mr B Moore was the mover of the Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held 02 February 2023.***
- ***Mr Bruce Bebbington was the Mover and Seconder Cr Pratico of the Motion That Council is to investigate improved access and crossover of the railway line, specifically for access to the old railway station and from the car park to the CBD.***

**AEM 002/25**

**Moved Mr. B Moore, Seconded Mrs. I Barker**

***That the Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held 22 February 2024 be confirmed as a true and correct record.***

**For - 17**

**Against - 0**

**Carried 17/0**

**6. Annual Report & Annual Financial Report**

Attachment 2                      Annual Report and Annual Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2024

*A Motion is required to receive the Annual Report and Annual Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2024, as presented.*

**AEM 003/25**

**Moved Mr. B Bebbington, Seconded Mr. M Cable**

***That the Annual Report & Annual Financial Statements for the 2023/24 year be received as presented.***

**For - 17**

**Against - 0**

**Carried 17/0**

**7. General Business Regarding the Financial Statements**

Following receipt of the Annual Report & Annual Financial Report for the 2023/24 year the Shire President will call for questions or queries regarding the Report and Financial Statements.

**QUESTION 1**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

The minutes state that the motion to confirm the 2023 minutes was moved by Cr Moore. Who moved the motion to confirm the minutes, as both ex councillor's Moore were present?

**Answer**

To be changed to correct mover Mr. B Moore and Minutes were confirmed.

**QUESTION 2**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Regarding last year's Annual Electors Meeting Minutes. regarding developer contributions for the Highlands? Have they been paid?

**Answer**

**Acting Director of Development and Regulation**

The Highlanders Development has been going for 20 years; Acting Director of Development and Regulation has contacted the previous CEO Mr T Clynch to get general advice on this. He stated the developer provided 9000sqm that's the reserve that is up there that is undeveloped apart from a fire shed. The developer contributed to the getting scheme water to the reserve. That can be used for ongoing garden maintenance. He was clear the Developer has not contributed to any cash for any infrastructure for this site including playgrounds. I will go way and find a paper trail to confirm this.

### **QUESTION 3**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

In the minutes last year, it also referred from the CEO's comments that there's a review being done of the developer contributions for all the subdivisions in the shire. So, the question is, has that review been done and are there any other outstanding developed contributions what the amounts are and what's like the intended purpose? So, the Shire Can plan for any shortfall with any future commitments for things like parks.

**Answer**

**Acting Director of Development and Regulation**

The review has not been done.

### **QUESTION 4**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Re Steere Street, Stewart Lane, and Civic Lane redevelopment and parking

"Executive Manager, Economic & Community Development – We do have some plans to include another ACROD parking bay in front of Westpac – we do have 2 ACROD bays in the Railway Carparking there". What is the status of the ACROD parking bay in front of the old Westpac bank?

**Answer**

**Acting Director of Projects & Environment**

A proposed ACROD bay has been designed, and budget has been allocated for construction in 25/26 financial year.

**CEO**

So, you will be implementing the plan this calendar year.

**Acting Director of Projects & Environment**

Before Christmas 2025

### **QUESTION 5**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

How many ACROD bays are in the new carpark at the Visitor's centre, as presented to and approved by Council? Has the work been complete, including line marking and signage? What was the cost of the car park?

**Answer**

**Acting Director of Projects & Environment**

There is one ACROD bay in the visitor centre carpark. Line marking of the carpark is imminent and likely before end of August 2025.

Carpark kerbing and asphalt cost was \$22,000. Line marking and ACROD bollard will be a further \$5,000 to a total of approx. \$27,000.

#### **QUESTION 6**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Why wasn't this motion from the annual elector's meeting in February 2024 presented to the March 2024 council meeting? As the proposer and mover of this motions why is this not been put to council?

#### **Previous Motion**

**Moved Cr Mountford, Seconded Cr Pratico That Council is to investigate improved access and crossover of the railway line, specifically for access to the old railway station and from the car park to the CBD. Carried**

#### **Answer**

**CEO**

Having not been here during that time. I can't answer that question. Clearly, we have not fulfilled our obligations. If it is outstanding, I will find out why and if it still needs to go to Council, I will have it brought to the June meeting.

#### **QUESTION 7**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Page 42 Disclosure of Annual salaries

The report states "The number of employees of the local government entitled to an annual salary of \$130,000 or more was two." However, the table shows 5. Which is correct?

#### **Answer**

This was an administrative error and will be corrected in future Reports.

#### **QUESTION 8**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

The remuneration of the CEO(s) was \$365,004 and the compulsory 11% super contribution was \$19,681. This is only 5.44% of the CEO(s) remuneration. Why is it not the full 11%?

Why was the total salary's \$365,004 for CEO's when the outgoing CEO left August/October and then new CEO started in October. Other then Leave entitlements we only had one CEO for the Financial year?

#### **Answer**

The figure of \$365 004 is includes a termination payout of \$173,268 for the outgoing CEO. Hence the Salary less the Termination payout was \$191,736. This was a one-off event and does not reflect what the CEO Salary would normally be. When superannuation is calculated on the ordinary time earnings it equates to \$19,861 compulsory 11% and \$2,369 Employer 5%.

#### **QUESTION 9**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

During the year the CEO moved from the house in Hampton Street provided as part of her employment condition and leased a property. Did the shire contribute to the lease, rental, provide a bond or incur relocation expense and if so, what was the total cost to the shire in the 2023/24 and 2024/25 financial years? Would this form part of the CEO's remuneration?

**Answer**

**CEO**

What is included in the CEO package is Salary, Superannuation, Motor Vehicle. What's outside of the super package is Housing and other factors. I will provide that information to you.

**QUESTION 10**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Did the Shire forego any rental revenue from the property in Hampton Street as a result of the CEO vacating the property?

Were the Hampton Street properties occupied throughout the year and did the shire pay any staff accommodation (such as for the accountant for whom the house was bought) whilst the Hampton Street properties were vacant?

**Answer**

**CEO**

We know that forums are generally scheduled for either the first or second Wednesday of the month. If a month has a fifth Wednesday, a forum could also be held then

**QUESTION 11**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

On page 31 it refers to expenditure for 7.11 Provide a Local Planning Strategy, in consultation with the community, to plan thoughtfully, creatively and sustainably for population growth, affordable housing, and protection of environmental values. - status in progress. Did the shire commence the local planning strategy consultation and development, as indicated in the annual report, and how much was spent?

**Answer**

**Acting Director of Development and Regulation**

That perhaps is not completely correct because we have not commenced the Local Planning Strategy to a point where we are consulting and developing it. That will commence next financial year as planned, as per the stage 3 approach the Council resolved to do.

**Question 12**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

At the April 2025 Council Meeting this year. As announced by the shire president on 6 May. Council adopted the 26 recommendations of the organisation review undertaken by Temp CEO Arthur Kryon. As it is a confidential item no detail has been issued other than the announcement. The announcement did state a perception the shire has lost touch with the community, Loss of confidence in the Shire's administration. What can be divulged that is being done or proposed to be done to remedy the situation in relation to those two matters and when will the community be presented with information and policy changes to remedy these changes?

**Answer**

**CEO**

There are twenty-six recommendations in the report. A number of these refer to adopting a more authentic approach to community engagement—building stronger connections with our stakeholders, recognising their importance, improving our customer service, and rethinking how we interact with the public.

This includes establishing better processes—or in some cases, initiating them—so that we can more effectively manage the interactions between our staff, our councillors, and the community.

These are not just catchphrases, Mr Bebbington and members of the gallery. They are serious commitments outlined in the report. Central to this is the idea that we must view the public as partners. While governments often use that term, I use it here with genuine intent. We must see our community as co-creators in building the best version of the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes.

This means engaging in authentic, face-to-face interactions. Not expecting people to come to us—to the "castle," so to speak—but going out to them: to their workplaces, their homes, their activities—wherever they are.

This marks a philosophical shift in how this council's administration operates. In my view, the example set by our elected members—who are already out engaging with the community—is one the administration should follow. We need to value these interactions, not treat them as obligations, but as opportunities. This is something we should want to do, because it improves our connection with the community and enriches everyone's experience of living in this town.

You will be informed, and you will be involved. And those are not just words.

This is not about setting up more committees or bureaucracy. It's about practical, face-to-face participation—real involvement that helps reshape how the public perceives this council and its role in the community.

**Question 13**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

At the February Council meeting this year, Council adopted changes to the meeting schedule and format, including the introduction of Q&A sessions and the decision to open briefing forums to the public when items under discussion are intended for future Council decision.

How will the public be advised that a particular briefing forum is open to them? Will an agenda or reports be made available in advance so the community can review them beforehand? What level of participation will the public be allowed—can they ask questions or make presentations, particularly if they are an applicant or developer?

It's important to consider this considering last week's Q&A, where the fees and charges item was referred to a forum. That qualifies as an item requiring Council decision, and therefore, in my view, it should fall under the criteria for a public forum.

I believe it would be beneficial to establish some clear ground rules before we hold the first open forum.

**Answer**

I suppose it's never ideal to answer a question with another question—but I do want to ask you something, Mr Bebbington. How did you find out that you could come to a council meeting and participate in the Q&A?

You're an intelligent person—you found out that it was possible. We've advertised the changes to how we run council meetings, including through posts on Facebook and other platforms. But I agree—we could do more.

Councillor Fletcher moved a motion some time ago for the establishment of a digital noticeboard in town. That's coming to council soon, and it will provide one clear channel through which we can promote public participation in Q&A forums and encourage people to attend meetings.

Yes, if we are discussing an item that requires a council decision, then we are obligated to provide an open forum for public attendance and input. We will make sure that happens at the appropriate time.

Of course, some internal deliberations take place within the organisation that may not be suitable for a public meeting—frankly, they might bore you. But for items like fees and charges, or any other matter coming before council, our intention is to give the public the opportunity to comment through a dedicated forum.

There are many matters discussed in forums that don't make it to a formal council meeting, and those topics can change from week to week or month to month. Still, the goal is for this council to be open and accountable.

That, in part, responds to your earlier question—how the changes to the organisation will be implemented and how they contribute to a more open and transparent council.

#### **Question 14**

##### **Mr Bruce Bebbington**

As part of the process for locating meeting information, regular Council meetings are generally easier to find—especially if you're familiar with the meeting schedule. However, special Council meetings present a challenge because they follow different notification requirements. In some cases, there may be very little notice—sometimes only a few hours between the calling of a special meeting and its commencement—which makes timely communication difficult.

One concern I've raised for some time is the issue with Facebook. The Shire's Facebook page is no longer publicly accessible unless you're signed in as a member of Facebook. If you click on a Facebook link, you might see the first post—but then a login screen appears, preventing further access unless you're signed in. That makes Facebook an unsuitable option as the primary channel for quickly disseminating important information.

So, are there alternative methods that could be established for notifying the public—especially if an agenda is being prepared or a briefing is scheduled? I'm not sure what the standard notice period is for briefing meetings, but is there a system that could allow the community to be informed?

The core issue, I believe, is this: if there is a forum that should be open to the public, how will people be notified in a timely and accessible way?

#### **Answer**

##### **CEO**

We have begun looking into text messages for fire bans and restricted harvest bans. So, when there is a threat, a text message will go out, but again, it does rely on the community member signing up for it or opting out. I'm very much in agreeance with you that Facebook is limited. Our website is limited, but we are looking at options to combat that.

**Question 15**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

In relation to the previous question about the report and the changes about communicating better with the community, will the public consultation policy, which the last two versions of, have not been referred to the public for input on, will the public consultation policy be reviewed with a view to encouraging a level of consultation and communication between the Shire, the council, the shire and the public, bearing in mind effectively the current conversation policy chains under the last permanent CEO, effectively says it is entirely at Shire Officer discretion, the level of consultation.

**Answer**

**CEO**

Yes

**Question 16**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Regarding public question time—yes, the policy currently limits individuals to three questions per meeting unless the Shire President or Council gives permission otherwise. You've raised a concern that this limit may not reflect the intent of the Local Government Act and guidelines, which provide for a minimum of 15 minutes for public questions. Will you review the Public Question time Policy?

**Answer**

**CEO**

Let me clarify how it works. The 15 minutes is a minimum, not a maximum. Many councils, including ours, have adopted a limit of three questions per person to ensure fairness and allow others the opportunity to speak. However, once everyone has had a chance, you are welcome to ask more questions.

The process is: you ask your three questions, then take your seat. If no one else has questions, the Shire President can invite you to ask more. This can continue if time allows. You're not being silenced—there is a fair process in place to ensure everyone is heard.

You're also encouraged to submit questions in advance, so staff can prepare accurate responses. You can still ask them at the meeting to have them recorded for the public record.

If more time is needed, the Presiding Member can extend question time beyond 15 minutes at their discretion.

So, there's no need to change the policy—you already have the right to ask questions, and we are committed to making sure those questions are heard and answered.

**Question 17**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

That is different from what the model suggestion is. It specifically refers to whether the person can ask more questions, and what you've said is correct — but that's not how it's been applied. In previous Council meetings, we've been limited to three questions, full stop. Now, on the second page, the concern is this: I know the policy, so I can confidently say I'm asking a question. But for most people who don't know the policy — which is supposed to

be available at all Council meetings and posted outside, as was done only at the first meeting — they wouldn't know their rights.

The wording of the policy is quite specific: if you ask one question and sit down, you are allowed to ask one more question. That's what the policy says. That's my biggest concern and the issue I raised with the department — that the way it's being applied now is not in line with the intent of the policy.

I have no issue with the idea of allowing three questions at a time to give everyone a fair opportunity — that's what I've always supported. I've always made space for others to ask questions too. But this particular section of the policy needs to be reviewed and clarified, and I would like to see that happen.

**Answer**

**CEO**

I will review that part of the policy.

### **Question 18**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

Under the other issue is again regarding the issue of perception of the Shires lost contact with community. The Draft Local Planning Scheme which the councillors were not told of the extent they were only told it was administrative change to combine the two schemes, subject to doing the Draft Local Planning Strategy at the same time. This is the agreement with the department, was put to the council what council adopted. That was what was put to the council, and to use the model draft local Scheme. There are over 100 changes in the model Draft the Planning Scheme text. There are over 100 map discrepancies that may not be changes to sort out some of them and the local plan has not started. Currently, that Draft Local Planning Scheme has a significant number of changes affecting the zoning of a large number of properties within the shire. Will the shire be only pursuing the council resolution, which was limiting what could be done and very well was subject to Local Planning Strategy, which hasn't been started, or will it be pursuing the full changes that it has, which the public and council were not alerted to?

**Answer**

**Acting Director Development and Regulation**

The work that's being done, I believe, is in line with the Council resolution that passed to deal with this through a three-stage process. So, all I can say is that the finalisation of this through the next time the council addresses this, an upcoming workshop yet to be confirmed, and then it'll come through a formal agenda process for that consideration. With a project like this, it's inevitable that you find things, where you work through such a large document and as very salute to, here we found some things with mapping anomalies and there's plenty of them. So, everything that will be presented to council will be done in what I consider to be the best move forward to resolve in the local Planning Scheme and then importantly following that is then we'll embark on the big project, the important one, which is the Local Planning Strategy. So, back us in Council, that's what I would say.

**CEO**

Mr. Guthridge, what is the extent to which there will be community consultation in the next phase?

**Acting Director Development and Regulation**

Are you referring to the finalisation of the Local Planning Scheme?

**CEO**

yes, that and the Scheme and the Strategy.

**Acting Director Development and Regulation**

In terms of the Local Planning Scheme number 6, there won't be a separate public consultation process. That as it already occurred. It will simply be a presentation through a report to council, of the issues that came out of the public submission period with officers to recommend, dismiss or uphold and make mods that way and that is enshrine in a process as dictated by the Dean provision, so it's enshrined by law. But in terms of the public consultation of the strategy, when we go out to procurement for an appropriate person to develop that strategy, the intention is, is that will have a vigorous public consultation around that And so what we sometimes typically do is when we go to procurement, we ask the consultant to prepare what they think is an appropriate method of public consultation, because they can be formed in so many ways. But front and centre with the Local planning Strategy is a very important document. Public consultation will be a very important element that will be delivered upon that.

**CEO**

I can ask again, have we complied with the WA Planning Commission's process for establishing LPS6

**Acting Director Development and Regulation**

The answer to that is yes, and the backup to that is if we didn't, we would be advised by the Western Australian Planning Commission that we didn't, and we must do things again, so they provide the oversight. We work closely with the Western Australian Planning Commission and staff and they're watching us from afar. We seek advice on every step of the way, just about on a weekly basis with this. So, we rest assure that the process is a compliant process.

**Question 19**

**Mr Bruce Bebbington**

The Shire is doing a process that is not 100% to accordance with the Act. Shire applied for a concession that because it has never completed a Local Planning Strategy, it has started the process it never completed, it was negotiated that they could commence Local Planning 6 process of creating a new scheme subject to commencing and doing a Local Planning Strategy at the same time, and it was also subject that the Local Planning Strategy is what would drive, as is in the normal process, and very in mind, there are a number of significant amendments to the scheme, which are standard or whatever, which require specific processes in their own right, and the process also stated there would not be any amendment to the scheme. That was the agreement. That's the agreement with the Department of planning and WA Planning Commission. That is what has not been applied with. Similarly, regarding the issue of the connectivity and trust in the shire, this is the most important document the shire has, as far as the public can. It affects the development of the environment and buildings that are going to make permanent changes to this community and this environment, and where we live. The shire is not complying with the agreement. The concession is given by DPLH and WA Planning. It is not complying with the motion, and there is significant amendment. I don't particularly wish to have to go to the minister and use the provisions under the act to say the Shire has not complied. Simply because the shy

has now recognised, it is not communicating with the community. Here is the opportunity to say we have opposed significant changes to the scheme, we have not told the public, because the bottom line is the CEO, how does the community respond to the consultation on the change in the public on the Draft Local Scheme, when the Draft Local Planning Scheme did not tell them there was changes. How and how does that fit in with the change? That to me is the crux of the issue and why we need to stop the process or do a completely new consultation of the changes so the public are aware that they property zoning is changing, and they will never told about it.

**Answer**

**CEO**

But let me put this to you. In your statement, just then, you made the comment there. Council negotiated the LPS6 processes are 100% in accordance with the act. There was a negotiated process where the local planning strategy, and the LPS was to be done simultaneously. I'm not sure you're referring to the fact but referring to in your statement. I'm not sure if you're referring that the negotiated outcome hasn't been combined with, or because it was a negotiated process, it isn't 100% complied with the end. If it was negotiated with the WA Planning Commission, who are the ultimate body that has the regulatory role, then we would be complying with that negotiation process, because they have agreed to it. So, it's not if it's not 100% compliant, but it has been negotiated to be a special arrangement because of the situation in this Council, then I think we have complied with the process. You raised an important matter about transparency. And that is, if there are any changes to the Local Planning Scheme that are going to have, or Local Planning Strategy Scheme that are going to have an impact on property owned by people in this community, I think there is an obligation for us to inform the public. Old back. And I don't think that the WA Planning Commission would want us to not inform them. So, if the changes and you've identified numerous changes, are of such a significant nature, then my understanding of planning scheme is that those schemes would need to go out for public commenting again, if they are significantly. But that'll be a determination made by the WA Planning Commission on the advice of The Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes. So you make a number of statements, I'm not sure I can accurately answer them to your satisfaction, but clearly, my officers have heard and received information from you, and they will take them seriously, and will submit the town, the local planning scheme to the Planning Commission and the LPS Strategy outcomes to the Local Planning Commission as well, and they will review it.

**Ingrid Barker**

My name is Ingrid Barker. I just was able to come to the Annual Electors Meeting, but I need to leave shortly. Before I do, I just really, in light of everything that's happening there, is to thank existing committee here for the Shire, all the councillors. I do see in the last few months that changes have been made to improve communication with the Shire and the community, I mean, particularly with the question and answer, week or alternating with the actual meetings. I think everyone in our community knows what a huge upheaval is being for our shire over these last months and fantastic that that you've been able to step in, because I know from speaking with councillors what have wonderful job you've done in reuniting, not only the councillors, but also bringing the community on board. So, we've got more changes to come with the new CEO, as though Mr Kyron can't stay, because you just make so much sense. Just want to thank all the counsellors, because I know you do receive so many grumbles and rarely get the praises for the amount of huge hours that you put in,

as volunteers is phenomenal. So, I'd just like the people that are here to give everyone a round of applause and for everything you done. Thank you.

#### **Question 20**

##### **Mr Bruce Bebbington**

I would like to move a motion from this meeting if it can get the support of the meeting. That this meeting that this meeting calls on the Council to re advertise Draft Local Planning Scheme 6. Clearly advising to the community of the extent of the changes and impact upon the community and planning, which has not yet been undertaken.

##### **CEO**

Could you repeat that motion please.

##### **Acting Manager Executive Services**

Mr Bebbington has moved the motion that this meeting calls on Council to re advertise the DLP 6, advising community, the extent and impact of the planning on the community.

##### **AEM 004/25**

**Moved Mr. B Bebbington, Seconded Mrs. L Gibson**

***That Council to re advertise draft local planning Scheme 6. Clearly advising the community of the extent of the changes and impact upon the planning on the community.***

***For - 13***

***Against - 4***

***Carried 17/0***

##### **Speaking for**

##### **Bruce Bebbington**

I believe the community is facing significant, largely uncommunicated changes under this Draft Scheme. For example:

- Environmental protections are being removed, including the disappearance of the Blackwood Valley Zone 3, which currently requires special approval to build near the river.
- Land use changes will affect property rights. Some residents who currently keep livestock near town will no longer be able to—but they haven't been told.
- Even councillors and the EPA weren't made fully aware of the extent of changes. I have correspondence from the EPA indicating they were surprised by the draft and had not seen the final version.
- Subdivisions and building envelopes are being removed from the scheme without explanation. Many properties were sold based on protections such as building envelopes, and without them in the scheme text or maps, the Shire will struggle to give clear advice to prospective buyers or owners.

This scheme shapes the future of our community and environment. The process has lacked transparency—not just with the public, but also with councillors and state agencies. If the Shire has nothing to hide, then why not extend the advertising period to 60 days and clearly explain the proposed changes?

We need to be honest and open. People can't provide feedback if they don't know what's changing. I urge a proper review of the Draft Scheme and am happy to assist. This document will shape our town for decades to come—it must be done right.

**AEM 005/25**

**Mr Brian Moore**

**Procedural Motion**

***Moved Mr. B Moore, Seconded Mr. Cable***

***That Mr. Bebbington motion regarding public advertising be deferred to a later Ordinary Council Meeting, once the shire has provided to counsellors all the information regarding DLPS 6.***

***For 11***

***Against 6***

***Carried 17/0***

**Mr Brian Moore**

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Bebbington is wrong. But I feel together advertising, which may not be necessary. but you can't tell until you've got the information before you. Thank you

## **8. General Business**

*[Councillors and Electors to please note that any Items raised at this Meeting which require a Council decision will be presented to the Ordinary Council Meeting scheduled for June 2025].*

## **9. Closure**

*The Presiding Member thanked those in attendance and closed the meeting at 5.39 pm.*

**List of Attachments**

| Attachment | Item No. | Details                                                                 |
|------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1          | 3        | Minutes of the AGM of Electors held 22 February 2024                    |
| 2          | 4        | Annual Report & Annual Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2024 |