

Item No.	Subject	Councillor	Questions and Answers
CM/4.1/26.04	Confirmation of Minutes - Council Meeting - 24 March 2026	Cr Lewis	Item CM/7.1 Housing Development Authority 1.Can you provide an update as to when the webpage information explaining the Housing Development Authority and State Significant Development processes as they apply within the Waverley local government area will be operational and accessible by the public. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Completed https://www.waverley.nsw.gov.au/planning/design/housing_delivery_authority_hda_and_state_significant_development_ssd
CM/5.1/26.04	National Local Government Summit on Social Cohesion and Antisemitism	Cr Fabiano	1. What specific governance arrangements have already been agreed with partners, and what formal oversight will Waverley Council have over program content and speakers as a co-host? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> The current proposal is that Council will co-host the conference with the Combatting Antisemitism Movement group supported and in collaboration with the Australian and NSW Government. It is my understanding that a program has not yet been finalised, however, I would expect that Council as co-host will provide input on the final agenda. To date, preliminary discussions have been had around the proposed agenda and a request made for Council to present on our Anti-Semitism strategy, the model template, and to participate in a panel. 2. Has the Mayor or Waverley Council entered into any formal or informal commitments with CAM Australia or government partners prior to this Minute, and will those arrangements be documented and brought back to Council? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> No. It is my understanding that the mayor received a request regarding the conference and referred CAM to me as general manager. I have met with them to discuss the ideas behind the conference and who would be participating and sponsoring. Nothing has been finalised as yet, as we are awaiting formal endorsement by Council to co-host. 3. What advice has the Mayor received from the General Manager regarding staff resourcing, and can that be quantified before Council endorses the commitment? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> We have not discussed this in detail yet. However, as the request is regarding a presentation on an existing strategy and an existing template for NSW Councils, the resourcing would be limited to staff time preparing the presentation and participating in the conference. 4. How will Waverley Council ensure that, as co-host, the summit reflects a broad and inclusive social cohesion agenda and not a narrowly defined program? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Council staff will provide input into the final agenda prior to circulation. 5. What reporting or accountability mechanisms will be put in place to ensure Council sees the outcomes and value of its involvement post-summit? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> If Council requests this of Officers, we could do a post conference report back on outcomes and values.

CM/6.3/26.04	Pricing Policy, Fees and Charges 2026-27, Budget and Long Term Financial Plan 7.1 – Exhibition	Cr Fabiano	1.The LTFP states that the current revenue structure is insufficient to meet planned expenditure. Is it possible to quantify the underlying structural deficit excluding the use of reserves, borrowing and outline the pathway to genuinely closing that gap? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> The graph on page 71 of the Agenda details the income and expenses (excludes borrowing but includes loan repayments). The pathway to closing the gap is to either increase the revenue base or reduce expenditure. Income such as rates is set by IPART via the rate peg and user charges continue to fluctuate due to market conditions as does the availability of grants from State/Federal government. Expenditure includes personnel costs (based on an insourced model) and materials and contracts are also subject to market fluctuations e.g. impact of fuel crisis. The capital works program is designed to undertake asset renewals and that continues to be reviewed based on supply chain and construction costs and/or priorities. Reserves and borrowing are appropriate uses to fund the capital works program. Reserves are only used for their intended purpose (e.g. purchase of affordable housing) and loan funding is a strategic financial tool to accelerate the delivery of community assets to ensure distributing costs across current and future generations 2.Approximately \$82 million of the capital works program is contingent on external grants. What is Council’s prioritisation and fallback plan if a material portion of these grants does not eventuate? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> This total is forecast over 11 years. Council does not progress projects unless there is a clear funding strategy in place. If the grants do not eventuate, Officers come up with an alternative proposal that goes to ELT and / or Council for consideration. Council may look at alternatives of deferring the works, revising the scope or increasing the use of general funds. Council continues to report at quarterly budget reviews against the annual budget and yearly against the LTFP to seek endorsement of significant changes to funding strategies or prioritisations. 3. While current debt metrics are within benchmarks, how do those ratios change under the pessimistic scenario outlined in the sensitivity analysis, and what are the trigger points for limiting further borrowing? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> As per the sensitivity analysis as outlined in page 125 of the Agenda attachments should the pessimistic scenario eventuation then it “would require major changes to Council [our] expenditure and therefore operations and capital plans to rectify the situation. With respect to the triggering points for borrowing, as per page 112 of the Agenda attachments “pursuant to section 621 of the Local Government Act 1993, Council may borrow at any time for any purpose allowed under the Act. Council may not borrow from any source outside the Commonwealth of Australia nor in any currency other than Australian currency as prescribed in the Ministers Borrowing Order, section 624 of the Act.” i.e. Council by resolution makes decisions regarding borrowing. For example, work continues on the Bronte Beach Life Saving Club and Council’s agreed funding strategy to enter into a loan agreement. This has enabled delivery on a much-needed community asset and aligns with Council’s financial sustainability framework. 4. Given that over 70% of Council’s revenue is derived from non-rate sources that are sensitive to market conditions particularly parking, development, and property. What specific strategies are in place to reduce this volatility risk over the life of the LTFP? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> As outlined in sections 9 and 10 of the LTFP pages 122 and 123 of the Agenda attachment details the volatility risks for both income and expenditure and at its quarterly budget reviews and annual budget cycle Council responds to the market conditions and takes action to review its priorities based on adjusted income by revising its operational and capital expenditure program. 5. The LTFP assumes broadly stable service levels despite rising costs and constrained revenue. What service reductions, deferrals, or reprioritisations are realistically anticipated if efficiency gains and revenue assumptions are not achieved? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Council continually reviews its service offerings particularly non-core services e.g. Family Day care and also conducts an endorsed program of work undertaking service reviews of up to at least two per year as per OLG guidelines. If rising costs continue (particularly in light of fuel crisis or other unexpected external events) then expenditure on discretionary projects will be prioritised first and then frequency of services will also be reviewed noting community satisfaction and asset requirements. On an annual basis as part of the annual budget preparation and LTFP review, Council reviews the affordability of its services to ensure financial sustainability and resilience.
--------------	--	------------	--

CM/6.3/26.04	Pricing Policy, Fees and Charges 2026-27, Budget and Long Term Financial Plan 7.1 - Exhibition	Cr Lewis	1. Table 2 on page 67 of the Meeting papers refers to grants in the total amount of \$5,000,000 as one of the funding sources for the Council Chambers site redevelopment site being: \$2,550,000 in FY2028-29 \$2,450,000 in FY2029-30. a. What are the sources and programs for these grant applications? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Council bases its budgets for grant funding, particularly for community assets, on previous funding rounds, typical eligibility costs and conservative estimates. These forecasts are usually adjusted once programs and guidelines are released. Anticipated sources of grants include Office of Sport grant; CRIF grant (Crown Land Improvement Fund) and possible partnerships with key sporting clubs. b. The proposed grant funding comprises approximately 15.5% of the total funding for the project to be received in financial years 2028-29 and 2029-30. The Long-Term Financial Plan 7.1 (“LTFP”) forecasts total expenses to exceed total income in each of the financial years 2028-29 and 2029-30. (i) If some or all of the applications for grants are not successful, how will the shortfall be funded? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> If grant funding does not eventuate or falls short of the anticipated amount and Council has made the decision to proceed with the project, options to fund the shortfall include reprioritisation of expenditure program, review and enhance other income lines, and/or increase borrowing. These funding strategies are presented to Council for their endorsement. Council does not progress projects unless there is a clear funding strategy in place. (ii) What will be the impact on the LTFP if some or all of the applications for grants are not successful? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Impact varies depending on which option Council chooses – i.e. impact is minimal if the grant shortfall is funded through expenditure program trade-offs and reprioritisation, enhancement of other income lines; however if the shortfall is met through increased borrowing this will require formal Council approval and will increase operating expenses due to interest costs which in turn affects the cashflow. 2. Table 2 on page 67 of the Meeting papers refers to “Council fund” as a source of funding of the Council Chambers site in the amounts of \$7.037m in FY2028/29 and \$2.574m in FY2029/30 (total \$9.862m). a) Is this a reference to the funds being sourced from Council’s Capital Work Program (Appendix 1 to the LTFP on page 125 of the Attachments)? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Yes, “Council fund” referred to reserves and council general revenue on the Capital Work Program - Appendix 1 b) If the answer to (i) is yes, is it correct that in FY2028/29 the Council Chambers site project capital works costs will be 34.91% of the total building infrastructure budget and 13.82% of the total capital works program? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Yes, the Council fund component of the redevelopment of Council Chamber site project is equal to 34.91% of the total building infrastructure budget and 13.82% of the total capital works program. 3. Appendix 4 to the LTFP – Optimistic Scenario Forecasts – commencing on page 134 of the Attachment to the Council papers has been incorrectly headed as Appendix 3. This should be corrected before going on public exhibition. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i>
--------------	--	----------	---

			Noted and amended. 4. Appendix 5 to the LTFP – Pessimistic Scenario Forecasts – commencing on page 138 of the Attachment to the Council papers has been incorrectly headed as Appendix 3. This should be corrected before going on public exhibition. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Noted and amended. 5. The Reserve Balance forecast for each of Base Case (page 133) of the Attachments), Optimistic Scenario (page 137) and Pessimistic Scenario (page 141) sets out the External Restriction and the Interna; External Restriction amounts for the period of the LTFP but does not include the Unrestricted Balance for each year. a) What is the forecasted Unrestricted Balance for each year in the LTFP? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> The forecasted unrestricted balance for each year in the LTFP is available on the Balance Sheet statement under the heading “Total Cash, Cash Equivalents & Investment Securities attributable to:” (page 131- Base Case, page 135 – Optimistic Scenario, and page 139 – Pessimistic Scenario) of the Council agenda attachment. b) Can the table be amended to include the total unrestricted balance for each year? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Yes, we can add the unrestricted balance to the Reserve Balance statement. Given that Council is endorsing the papers to go on public exhibition suggest the following amendment: “That officers amend the table, prior to public exhibition, to include the total unrestricted balance for each year in the Reserve Balance Statement of the LTFP”
CM/6.3/26.04	Pricing Policy, Fees and Charges 2026-27, Budget and Long Term Financial Plan 7.1 - Exhibition	Cr Masselos	1. Increased revenue from parking meters. Is it anticipated that the increased revenue from parking meters will also include parking fines? If so how much is anticipated to be raised and what percentage of the increased revenue will this be? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> The increased revenue from parking meters is due to the pricing increase of the meters as per the pricing policy. We also anticipate an increase on the current budget as there was decreased activity due to the terrorist attack and aftermath at Bondi Beach so expecting activity to return to normal levels. Parking fines is outlined in other revenue. Again, we anticipate a return to normal levels after this year’s adjusted budget. 2. Increased staff costs. What has led to the continuous increase in staffing costs? The enterprise agreement is currently being negotiated. Has this increase been budgeted? If so, what is the anticipated increase and where will the funds come from? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Staffing costs include anticipated Local Government award increase (4.5% forecast) plus step increase, this is separate to the enterprise agreement negotiations. Staffing costs reflect the award increases, superannuation, and various oncosts. Staffing costs are funded from the income generated from the pricing policy and Council rates and levies including domestic waste. Council notes that it has an insourced staffing model. 3. Resident Parking permits – It seems there is a 26% increase in revenue from parking permits. However, given there is a review and no Council decision has yet been made, please explain rationale for this 26% increase. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director, Corporate Services:</i> Income from residential parking permits is anticipated to increase in line with the pricing policy and anticipated Residential Parking Scheme review outcomes.

CM/6.3/26.04	Pricing Policy, Fees and Charges 2026-27, Budget and Long Term Financial Plan 7.1 - Exhibition	Cr Masselos	<i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Q1. To confirm stage 2 value engineering achieved \$2,899,933 mill in savings. Is that correct? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> \$2,899,933 in cost savings were achieved have been achieved through: ▪ Stage 2 value engineering with minimal impact to quality and scope. The majority of which has been achieved through reduction in fire compartments to enable removal of the fire tank and pump; substitution of fixtures, fittings and equipment; and landscaping substitutes. These are all discretionary items and do not impact overall compliance / quality. ▪ Additional savings from allowances that are no longer required and savings from project costs that are to be paid for by Bronte Surf Lifesaving Club (for selected fixtures and fittings as identified in the Project Agreement). Q2 Stage 3 is expected to achieve only \$292,775 in savings from the list detailed in the report – including deleting under floor heating in the admin office. However, as the target is \$3,358,450, where is the other \$165,742 in savings expected to come from? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Stage 3 forecast cost savings of \$292,775 have been identified, subject to contractor costing. These are being achieved by: ▪ Reduction in plant sizes ▪ Substitution of materials for gates and doors to waste room and plant room. ▪ Substitution of swing gate to roller door for storage area. ▪ Replacement of tree grate with mulch. ▪ Provisional sum saving for underfloor heating in BSLSC administration office. ▪ Deferral of sandstone rooftop seating. The cost savings for the above are indicative and will be confirmed through detailed design and cost negotiation with the contractor. Further potential cost savings are also being investigated through detailed design such as the floor finish in the public amenities. Q3. Please confirm whether value engineering funds are to be transferred to the contingency. If so, please confirm the amount that will be transferred into the contingency. <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> All cost savings achieved have resulted in funds being redirected towards the contingency. Variations to date have mostly been associated with asbestos/latent condition management and have been paid from contingency. Q4. Please confirm that the net effect is that there are no real savings with this project as any savings found as a result of value engineering goes into the project and not back to council. <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> All cost savings achieved go into the project contingency, as originally planned. Q5. Please confirm that these savings from the value engineering process means we don't have to dip further into council funds to fund the contingency. <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> The project is currently within budget. Should the contingency need to be utilised and the project exceed budget, then details will be provided in a report to Council. Q6 Please confirm that the current remining \$436,393 continency, prior to any value engineering, will not be included as part of the target \$3.358 mil achieved through value engineering.
--------------	--	-------------	--

			<i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> There is \$436,393 remaining in contingency which takes into account the cost savings/value engineering achieved in Stage 2 and Stage 3 forecast cost savings/value engineering once the actual amounts are confirmed with the contractor. Q7. Please confirm that the total contingency including savings from value engineering and the remaining current contingency actually brings the total contingency to \$3,794,843. <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> There is \$436,393 remaining in contingency which takes into account the cost savings/value engineering achieved in Stage 2 and Stage 3 forecast cost savings/value engineering once the actual amounts are confirmed with the contractor. Q8. Given increasing cost of building supplies, labour, and diesel, as well as potential unforeseen circumstances and latent conditions, it is possible that the potential contingency will not be enough and pacing further imposts on the existing budget. What further strategies, including risk mitigation strategies, are in place to address potential cost blow outs and timeline slippages? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> The executed contract with the Head Contractor, Belmadar, is for a guaranteed maximum price for delivery of the design and construction of the project. This reduces risk to Council for any increasing costs associated with buildings supplies, labour and diesel. Latent condition costs for the remaining quantum of asbestos contaminated material and the rockwall undercut are being sought and should the contingency need to be utilised and the project exceed budget, then details will be provided in a report to Council. Q9. Has the 2nd drawdown of \$4mill, of the existing \$18 mill loan occurred yet? If not, when is this expected to occur? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> The loan drawdowns value schedule for the project has been revised to align with the revised project delivery schedule, as follows: 1st loan drawdown in June 2026 - \$8.2 million. 2nd and final loan drawdown expect in November/December 2026 - \$9.8 million. Q10. If it has not yet occurred, will this \$4 mill go into contingency? If not, please explain how this \$4 mill will be allocated. <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> The loan money is a funding source; it can be used to fund standard contract costs and contingency (cost variation). The loan does not go into contingency. Any unused loan will be held in the <u>unspent loan reserve</u> to meet upcoming project payment obligations. Q11. Please provide assurances that there will be no further loans taken out, beyond the existing \$18 mil loans, to fund any short fall in the budget during the build. <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Should the contingency need to be utilised and the project exceed budget, then details will be provided in a report to Council along with funding options including additional grant funding which continues to be sought throughout the construction of this project. Q12. Is there potential for any further cost savings for this project as costs continue to rise? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i>
--	--	--	---

			Further potential cost savings are also being investigated through detailed design such as floor finish in the public amenities.
CM/6.3/26.04	Pricing Policy, Fees and Charges 2026-27, Budget and Long Term Financial Plan 7.1 - Exhibition	Cr Merten	1. At last year budget briefing we were informed that in order to reach budget objectives for ongoing financial sustainability, Council 's capital works program investment should be around \$44m each year. The budget is forecasting a capital works budget of \$52.948 for FY26/27, \$54.108m for FY27/28, \$50.912 for FY28/29 and \$57.402m for FY29/30 (page 125 of the Attachments). How will Council meet its budget objectives if the capital works expenditure is expected to exceed the benchmark \$44m in 3 out of the next 4 years? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Our capital works program is both ambitious and targeted. It includes road and footpath renewals, upgrades to our open spaces including coastal protection and the renewal of community facilities including the Bronte Surf Lifesaving club and the redevelopment of our Council Chambers site. This program is designed to respond directly to asset conditions and community demands. The average cost per year over the LTFP is \$44.20m noting that most capital works projects are multiyear projects. 2. Has Council begun to incur the \$30k per month fines for not beginning the 7 Ways remedial flood works, and if so how much is owed by April 2026. Have these fines been included in the 2026/27 budget? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> The Seven ways project is anticipated to complete in the current year budget, namely 2025-26, so there is no penalty or costs provisioned for the 2026-27 budget for consideration tonight.
CM/6.7/26.04	Inbound Donations and Philanthropic Partnerships Policy - Exhibition	Cr Fabiano	1. On managing perceived influence. How will the policy ensure we're addressing not only actual conflicts of interest, but also situations where a reasonable member of the public could perceive that a donation is intended to influence Council decisions? <i>Response from Lucas Atkinson, Executive Officer:</i> Council will administer the Policy in accordance with the Code of Conduct. In addition, under the new Policy, Council will only consider philanthropic donations for public facilities or contributions towards public facilities on public land where it is in the best interest of the community in general. The Policy requires that philanthropic donations or partnerships must align with the strategic directions, including the Strategic Community Plan, Waverley Council Long Term Financial Plan, Section 94 Contributions Plan, Plan of Management or relevant Council work program or priority list, which have been adopted by Council. The Policy also includes a donation approval process, retraction process, and public disclosure measures for donations to further ensure conflicts of interest are managed. The Policy also requires incoming donations of over \$20,000, to be presented to Council for determination. 2. On donor due diligence. What level of due diligence is proposed to understand a donor's broader interests such as related entities, development activity, or commercial relationships with Council before a donation is accepted? <i>Response from Lucas Atkinson, Executive Officer:</i> The Policy includes provisions whereby proposed donation arrangements will be risk assessed for the possibility of a real or perceived conflict of interest. The assessment process will include parent companies or subsidiaries of donors. 3. On transparency and timing. Do you consider the current approach to publishing donations sufficient to maintain public confidence, or is there merit in more timely disclosure to ensure transparency ahead of any related Council decisions?" Transparency and reporting of donations and partnerships will align with existing arrangements in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993. Council's business papers will also publicly disclose the decision of Council in relation to the proposed donation. It would not be practical for Council to publish applications for donations or partnerships before they have been reviewed and assessed. 4. On the \$20,000 threshold. Can you explain the rationale for the \$20,000 threshold for Council determination, and whether there is flexibility to bring forward lower-value donations that may still carry reputational or community sensitivity? Thresholds set by councils can vary. However many NSW councils including those reviewed in the desktop analysis for the development of this Policy have set a threshold of \$20,000 for incoming donations requiring a Council resolution, while lesser amounts can be approved by the General Manager.

			Therefore the \$20,000 threshold which was included in the previous Inbound Donations Policy endorsed by Council at its meeting on 17 March 2020 has not been amended as part of this Policy update. 5. On long-term financial implications. How will Council assess and manage any ongoing maintenance or operational costs associated with in-kind or asset donations to ensure we're not creating unfunded future liabilities? Under the new Policy, philanthropic donations or partnerships must align with the strategic directions, including the Strategic Community Plan, Waverley Council Long Term Financial Plan, Plan of Management or relevant Council work program or priority list, which have been adopted by Council. Issues relating to ongoing maintenance or operational costs will be considered by the internal assessment panel in their determination on whether a donation meets the requirements and obligations as set out in the Policy. Budget for maintenance and repairs for any projects will be considered in the Long Term Financial Plan which is reviewed annually.
CM/6.14/26.04	Bronte House - Capital Works and Community Access	Cr Masselos	1. Pg 197 of the papers Council resolution requests a report to come back to council July 2025, addressing a number of items. The minutes of the July 2025 council meeting shows the amended unanimous resolution CM/7.21.25.07, clause 4, requesting 'Officers prepare a report to Council on the Council-operated community access model for both the house and the garden, including a detailed program and budget implications (akin to a business case). a) Have budget implications (akin to a business case) been undertaken and if so what is the summary of findings? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Council is working on this however there is no comparable information for what revenue could be expected from a tea room service. Council will still prepare a detailed program and budget implications (akin to a business case) once that information is available. b) If not why not? And why are we proceeding to tender if the business case has not been conducted? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Council is not proceeding to a tender. Council is undertaking an EOI process to test the market as to the level of interest in a team room, and what income might be expected. This will assist in further progressing a report for Council. 2. Are there any estimated costs as to the upgrade of the building to accommodate a tea house in compliance with codes? How much are the estimates? Will council be responsible for these? And where will the money come from within council's budget? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Apart from the works outlined in the report, no further works have been planned, scoped or budgeted. Once the outcome of the EOI is known any required upgrades can be costed and included in the report to Council. 3. The risks and issue include accessibility challenges as well as public safety. How will council meet these risks and issues now and on an ongoing basis? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> Council would undertake these risk and safety assessments and put measures in place to mitigate. This may include some areas not being accessible without supervision. 4. If Bronte house does not cover its costs, how will the shortfall be managed and where will the funds come from? <i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> As this is unknown until potential revenue opportunity is understood, this has not been planned or determined. This would be covered in a future report (if necessary). 5. If Bronte house continues not to cover its costs, can we be given assurances that Bronte House will not be leased out to other commercial entities, nor sold?

			<i>Response from Emily Scott, General Manager:</i> This is a decision of Council. There are no plans in current resolutions of Council for this to occur.
CM/6.16/26.04	Coastal Landslip Remediation	Cr Frazer	I would like to know the exact locations of any fence re alignments Would pedestrians still be able to walk along the newly aligned fence line up the hill or would the new fence force people to walk around mini forest <i>Response from Shane Smith, Acting Director, Assets and Operations:</i> The fence would be installed as close as safely practicable to the original location from Landslip A, in accordance with Geotechnical Engineer's advice. The fence alignment allows pedestrians to continue to freely walk along the fence line
CM/6.3/26.04	Pricing Policy, Fees and Charges 2026-27, Budget and Long Term Financial Plan 7.1 - Exhibition	Cr Masselos	Fees and Charges 1. It appears there is a universal increase of fees and charges of anywhere from 3.0% through to 7.5%+. During a cost of living crisis why have these fees and charges been increased universally? And why by so much? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> As Council operates with an insourced staffing model, the pricing policy generally aligns with the staffing costs to provide these services i.e. Award and step increases. Council also considers rate peg increase, CPI and cost recovery models as guided by the pricing methodologies and principles detailed in section 4 of the agenda paper. 2. The budget papers refer to \$9.5 mill Council's general funds that will go towards funding the Council Chambers site. Are these fees and charges increases, including the increase in parking meters, intended to contribute to this \$9.5mill allocated to the Council chambers? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Yes - all operational income is included in the general fund. 3. Page 17 of the attachments have section 6.1 Early Education Centre fees increasing by 7.5%. These increase sees fees increasing from as much as \$12.95 per day through to \$134.50 per bond. Why are we increasing these costs during the cost of living crisis and our commitment to provide childcare that is affordable? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council applies pricing methodology C - Full Cost recovery to Early Education centres. 4. Page 20 of the attachments section 9. Please provide commercial waste and recycling collection charges. What are these charges, and have they increased? And if so by how much? How much have charges increased over the last 2 years? How do these charges compare with market rates? Please provide answers under separate confidential briefing paper. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council undertook a confidential service review of its Commercial waste function to ensure that an appropriate commercial return is achieved in the delivery of commercial waste collection services. This should occur to ensure compliance with competitive neutrality principles under National Competition Policy, in addition to helping to support the general fund of Council. This was detailed in the November 2025 Council meeting in confidential session CM /11.1/25.11.

			5. Page 21 of the attachments shows sections 10 and 13, Community information and Education, and Cultural Activities have a range of fees from \$0 - \$300 per head. Have there been increases in fees for these activities, and if so by how much, in dollar terms and percentages. In a cost-of-living crisis, why have these fees been increased? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council applies pricing methodology B - Partial recovery, recognising the community benefit provides. There has been no change to Item 10 Community Information and Education in the Pricing Policy. There has been no change to Item 13 Cultural activities except for Items 13.3 Projects and Programs which details the % increase namely entry fees by 5.20% and Corporate volunteering by 5.43%. 6. Page 37 of the attachments Section 20 Parking sees beach parking rates increasing by over 5.3% which see increases anywhere from \$4.50 per permit to \$120 per permit. Why these increases? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council applies pricing methodology D- Full cost recovery plus an appropriate return. Each year officers review the service, market demand and assess the costs required to deliver the service and comparative pricing with similar and neighbouring councils. 7. Pp38-39 Similarly residential parking permits, section 20.3 have also significantly increased. Why? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council applies pricing methodology B - Partial recovery, recognising the community benefit provides. Each year officers review the service, market demand and assess the costs required to deliver the service and comparative pricing with similar and neighbouring councils. 8. Pp41 – 42 parking meters section 20.4 of the attachments sees a universal increase in parking meters fees from 5/4% through to 6.9%. For example, QED has increased from \$11.60oh to \$12.40 per hr, Bronte inner commercial core increased from \$6.90 to \$7.30 ph, and residential streets increased from \$9.20 per hr to \$9.70mper hour. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council applies pricing methodology E – market prices. Each year officers review the service, market demand and assess the costs required to deliver the service and comparative pricing with similar and neighbouring councils. 9. Page 65 of the papers also cites an increase of 8% income from car parks and on-street parking totally \$17.9 m (increase of \$1.28 m). This increase is way above CPI so please set out reasons why such a large increase when businesses are struggling and the cost of living is still very high. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council applies pricing methodology E – market prices. Each year officers review the service, market demand and assess the costs required to deliver the service and comparative pricing with similar and neighbouring councils. Council has also introduced a new fee for the first two hours of parking for non-library users (generally before the library opens). Council has also undertaken a confidential service review of its off-street parking. 10. At a time when businesses are struggling and cost of living is biting, why have parking meter fees increased? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council understands that the rising cost of living is placing pressure on households, including visitors, to our LGA but relies on these fees to provide essential services to the community. Officers aim to balance maintaining community services at the current service levels whilst minimising additional financial burden on its residents.
--	--	--	---

			Sources of income – council chambers (p 67 of council papers): a. What is the level of confidence that \$5 mill in grants will be secured for the Council Chambers site? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council bases its budgets for grant funding, particularly for community assets, on previous funding rounds, typical eligibility costs and conservative estimates. These forecasts are usually adjusted once programs and guidelines are released. b. Please confirm the amount that will be coming from the council fund. \$9.5 mill as per the recommendation on page 61 or \$9.863 m as per table 2 on pg 67 of the council papers? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Thank you Councillor that is a typo in the resolution. The shortfall and borrowing should read \$17,450 million and general fund should read \$9.86 million to align with the table 2 c. What projects will be cut / foregone from funding by the council general fund in order to find the \$9.863 m to fund the council chambers project? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> There is no proposed project cuts. This general fund is allocated to the project and is comprised of all operational income. d. Efficiencies and cost reductions (as per pg 64 of the papers) are a key strategy to helping fund projects. What strategies are being employed, other than ICT modernisation, to find these efficiencies, including cuts, and over what timeframe? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Council acknowledges volatility risks for both income and expenditure and at its quarterly budget reviews and annual budget cycle Council responds to the market conditions and takes action to review its priorities based on adjusted income by revising its operational and capital expenditure program. Council also undertakes service reviews and continuously refines its processes through management oversight and training and development to identify greater efficiencies and productivity. 11. Council Chambers Funding: a. The previous budget had an allocation of \$18.68 mill loan for the Council Chambers. It is now \$17.245 mil. Why has it been reduced given there has been no detailed costing and there is a reliance on unsecured grant funding of \$5 mill. <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> 12 months ago, Council had not determined its preferred options and associated grant funding opportunities as a result of those options. b. If the grants are not secured, will the loan be increased by that amount? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> If grant funding does not eventuate or falls short of the anticipated amount and Council has made the decision to proceed with the project, options to fund the shortfall include reprioritisation of expenditure program, review and enhance other income lines, and/or increase
--	--	--	--

			borrowing. These funding strategies are presented to Council for their endorsement. Council does not progress projects unless there is a clear funding strategy in place. c. What are the assumptions behind the \$32.31 mill price tag for the council chambers? What contingency has been provided for this top line costing? What provision has been made in this costing of \$32.3 mil given current global impacts on increases in costs of transport, labour and supply chains? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> Funding has been assigned from cost estimates prepared by external consultants on the high-level test fit design option. This is a high level cost estimate due to the concept / test fit nature of the current design progression. The estimate includes allowances for design, demolition, construction, authority approvals, project management and an approved % contingency. The contingency would contribute towards supply chain issues.
CM/6.11/26.04	Local Government Civic Program for Young People	Clr Masselos	\$20,000 is being spent in developing this program. How will this program be rolled out and will there be any budgetary implications? If so, what is the estimate? <i>Response from Tara Czinner, Director Corporate Services</i> There is currently no budget allocated for this proposal. The cost identified is in the development of the content and course. Funding strategies will be considered at a quarterly review as well as grant funding. Further assessment would be made at that time if further budget is required or could be delivered within current resourcing.