

## ADDENDUM

### Item 10.1 – Notice of Motion – Site Selection for new Aquatic Facility

Following the release of the December 2025 Council Agenda, advice was sought from the WA Local Government Association (WALGA) to determine if the proposed revocation motion affects Resolution 070225 in its entirety or only Point 1 of the Resolution.

WALGA's advice suggests it is more appropriate for consideration of the matter to occur via two separate motions, one for the revocation and another for any new decision. This approach ensures that Council first resolves the revocation and then (subject to the revocation motion being Carried by an Absolute Majority decision) Council considers any new proposal. Council cannot deliberate on any new proposal unless and until the previous decision has been revoked.

It should be noted that should the revocation motion be lost, Resolution 070225 from February 2025 remains valid as Council's established decision.

Councillors have submitted further questions on the matter. In the interests of transparency, these are answered below.

#### **CR ASHFORD**

1. *Can officers confirm whether any engineering assessments or vibration studies were undertaken to support the claim heavy-vehicle vibration risk at site A? If not, on what basis was this concern introduced?*

*Aside from the geotechnical study commissioned at the request of Council, no additional engineering studies have been completed. Soil movement is widely acknowledged within the construction industry as a potential risk to rigid structures, such as pool shells. This risk was identified as being relevant to this site particularly with its proximity to heavy haulage on Henrietta.*

*Other than geotechnical field investigations no extensive investigations have been taken to date. As Council have been considering multiple sites, the cost of conducting rigorous investigations at all three sites was cost prohibitive. While this does introduce a discovery risk, officers have allowed for this risk by including design contingency of 10% (where more rigorous testing will occur) and a construction contingency of 5% in the cost planning for this project along with approximately \$1M of escalation over the life of the project.*

2. *Have officers reviewed comparable facilities located on major roads, such as Bilgoman Pool, to understand whether heavy-vehicle vibration presents any structural risk?*

*No direct comparison has been conducted. The site in York is classified as having clay soil, whereas the general soil classification in the Greenmount area is gravelly loam. The site conditions are not comparable. As with Q1, further investigation will be conducted during the design phase of the project and risk has been addressed through contingency planning.*

3. *What assessment has been undertaken regarding the risk to the aging foundations of the existing recreation buildings, given the scale of major construction immediately adjacent to them?*

*No assessment has been undertaken. Infill construction is a well-known process, and engineering design steps will be implemented to safeguard existing buildings during the construction.*

4. *How has the Officers Assessment accounted for disruption to school PE programs, community sport, and precinct activity during construction?*

*The previous reports recognise that disruption is inevitable but in line with the Council resolution from February 2025 OCM there is a commitment to consult with impacted community groups. A likely option is to ensure access to the indoor stadium for court-based activity.*

5. *Can officers confirm precisely which areas contains asbestos?*

*Asbestos has been identified as part of the edging to the old bowling greens.*

6. *Has a detailed asbestos-management plan been prepared (or commissioned) for the project, outline how asbestos will be safely removed, disposed of, and which regulatory standards will be followed?*

*Asbestos management will be handled within the design specifications and overseen through a construction management plan which will meet relevant standards and be conducted by licenced contractors only.*

7. *Has the cost of asbestos remediation - including removal, transport, disposal, and testing been costed and included in the projected budget? If not, why not?*

*The proposed demolition costs incorporate provisions for asbestos abatement.*

8. *What risk has been assessed in terms of asbestos exposure to workers, nearby residents, or future users during construction?*

*This issue will be covered in both the Construction Management Plan and the Safety Plan and will be included as a mandatory part of the construction tender to be conducted only by licenced contractors. There are documented guidelines on the handling and disposal of asbestos and all works will comply.*

9. *Was any analysis done (or planned) to assess risk to adjacent existing buildings / structures from construction vibration, excavation, or heavy machinery?*

*Engineering specifications must incorporate a risk assessment along with strategies to mitigate potential effects on surrounding buildings. Additionally, the construction contract will mandate a Dilapidation Survey to evaluate any real impact caused.*

10. *Has the cost of site mediation (asbestos / ground preparations / demolition / reconstruction of displaced facilities) been separately and transparently estimated? And is this cost included in the project budget?*

*An order of cost estimate prepared by a quantity surveyor is presented in the feasibility study. These figures are for indicative budgeting purposes only. As the design process progresses the cost estimates become increasingly precise as more data comes in. Cost estimates include allowances for all work required to build on the site.*

11. Given the geotechnical investigation objective was to obtain information on the sub-surface conditions to classify the site and to provide recommendations on 'Storm water Drainage' for sites it did not include bearing capacity, compaction control, wind force calculations or classifications, slope stability or settlement calculations, how can council be confident sites 'A' or 'B' are structurally suitable for heavy load facility (pool, buildings, traffic, excavation)?

*An initial geotechnical investigation was carried out to identify the site classification in accordance with Australian Standard 2870-2011. This is not just for the purposes of stormwater management. The site classification is used by engineers to design the structural elements of a development including footings, suitability for onsite drainage and fill requirements. Groundwater presence was included due to previous data.*

12. Given that the geotechnical investigation also excluded environmental issues is their intent to commission an independent contamination / environmental audit (solid / groundwater testing, asbestos survey)?

*A comprehensive site investigation will be conducted at the chosen location during the design phase. The preliminary geotechnical study was intended to guide decision-making rather than support design activities, and it was planned to address the Council's question in a financially responsible way.*

13. For good governance, council needs a clear understanding of how the analysis evolved between the feasibility study and the officers report presented to council in February 2025, For example heavy vehicle vibration was introduced as a new concern, while reconstruction and relocation impacts has less emphasis. Can officers explain the decision-making process that led to these changes, including who provided advice and what evidence was used?

*As with any iterative process new information is always sought and added to the decision making process. The February 2025 report was responding to the Council resolution at the April 2024 OCM to reintroduce Site A as an option. The site was identified as unviable as early as November 2023. Once the site was reintroduced potential impacts were included in the information provided to Council for their decision making. At its February 2025 Council believed it had enough information to select a site and directed the Administration to proceed with Site B.*

14. Could officers clarify how assurances given to the Senior Netball and Basketball Clubs that their courts will be rebuilt prior to the aquatic centre works are being formalised for council and the community?

*Discussions have been had with both clubs and centred on the proposal to build new courts as part of the new facility. The staging of those works in relation to the facility construction has not been confirmed and no assurance given on the timing by Administration. The Council resolution at the February 2025 OCM included a direction to consult with impacted community groups to plan for relocation of uses. This consultation has not yet occurred and is scheduled to commence as the design phase progresses.*

15. For transparency, could all letters and submissions regarding the proposed sites be made available to council?

*In addition to any information presented via Council reports, an overview of community consultation was presented to Council at its February 2024 and November 2024 Concept Forums.*

*These summaries are attached. The Pool Project can be viewed from Slide 21 onwards for February and Slide 9 for November.*

*Since the selection on Site B there have been only two communications from community groups. One an email from the Playgroup which was emailed directly to all Councillors on the 2 November 2025 and the other a hand delivered letter from the York Bowling Club to re-present their original objection letter which was shared with you on the 9/12/2025.*

16. *The feasibility report states on page 60 (or page 339 in the shire agenda) that site 'A' is not integrated with other sport and recreation facilities, yet on page 61 (page 340 in the shire agenda) it highlights that a major benefit of site 'A' is its proximity to the York District High School and the York Sport and Recreation Precinct. Could officers clarify how these statements should be interpreted?*

*The feasibility study includes an options analysis. This table discusses opportunities and constraints for each site. Site A is adjacent to both those facilities but does not offer a high level of integration with Precinct facilities. The feasibility study identifies that Site B allows for better integration with the recreation facility that provides additional benefits, that in the assessment were considered more compelling.*

17. *The feasibility report of page 62 (page 341 in the shire agenda) notes that, after consultation with Council staff, Site 'A' was considered 'NOT Viable'. Could officers clarify on what basis a Council member formed this view? Which appears to have altered the tone of the remaining feasibility report in such as the descriptions of the sites became 'Main site' and 'Corner site'?*

*The view presented was not formulated by a Council member. The feasibility study was developed based on an extensive range of data, incorporating the expertise of the consultant, the professional judgment and experience of Shire staff, and feedback from both the community and the Council after the draft study was presented. Additionally, industry trends and relevant guidelines were also taken into account.*

18. *Could officers confirm whether any written communication, stakeholder briefings, or informal or formal advice were issued to community groups or key stakeholders stating that Site 'A' was considered 'Not Viable'? If so, can those documents be provided to council for review? Additionally, could officers clarify the supporting evidence or basis for the view that site 'A' is 'Not Viable' so council has a complete transparent understanding of both the advice given and the rationale behind it?*

*In August 2023, lead consultant Neil Tredwell conducted a workshop with community members to contribute to the feasibility study. Initially, every site was deemed viable. However, after the draft feasibility study was presented to the Council at the Concept Forum in November 2023, further engagement focused specifically on the sites highlighted in that report.*

19. *In relation to community consultation for the proposed aquatic centre site, the officers report references consultation with the York Swimming Club, YDHS, Senior Netball and Basketball, York Tennis Club, York Playgroup, Early Years Network, and York Bowling Club. Could officers clarify whether all clubs within the York Sporting Precinct were consulted, i.e. Junior Netball, York Cricket Club, York Football Club, York Hockey Club, York Agricultural Society, York Badminton, Keep Fit, GKR Karate, Prindy and York FM? If not, why were these groups not included in the consultation process?*

*Informal discussions have been held with many of those groups, there is also significant overlap in memberships between groups, however as the impact of the new facility on many groups is minimal the consultation was prioritised towards the impacted groups. There has also been a range of wider community consultation held including a workshop in August 2023 and the consultation program over the Summer of 2023/24. There is also the Community of Interest Group who signed up to be part of further conversations who receive regular updates.*

20. Are there existing Master Plans for the York Sport and Recreation Precinct? If so, can council please access for review?

*Attached is the 2008 Masterplan developed by consultants A Balanced View in October 2008 showing the intended positioning of the Swimming Pool at Site B, the demolition of the Netball Courts, and Old Bowling Clubhouse Radio Station and Skate Park. At its November 2008 Ordinary Meeting Council considered this document and resolved (021108) to*

- (1) Receive the Forrest Oval Precinct Sport and Recreation Facilities Master Plan as a guideline for development in this location.*

*The attachments are the Site Plans, and Draft Masterplan with Council resolution. The Final Masterplan can be found on OneDrive in the link attached as it is too large to email*

*Council also resolved to review this plan annually however no evidence of this has been found until 2019 where consultation commenced with community to update this Masterplan. This work does not appear to have concluded in a new Plan being presented to Council, so the 2008 plan is still the guiding document. A summary of community consultation for the 2019 period is also attached.*

21. Is the Shire confident that work to date is adequate to make a fully informed decision at the December 2025 Council Meeting on which site is preferred?

*Yes. Progress towards a Council decision was supported by Concept forum workshops and updates in November 2023, and February 2024 as well as through detailed reporting at the April 2024 OCM, November 2024 OCM and the February 2025 OCM. At points along this process Council requested Administration seek additional information to support its decision-making process. The decision on the preferred site was made by Council at the February 2025 OCM whereby Council concluded it had sufficient information to direct Administration to progress.*

*Monthly updates have been provided at the Concept Forum on the progress on the project and Administration has responded to every request for additional information. The administration is confident Council has been provided with adequate information.*

Thank you for the responses provided to my earlier questions. In reviewing the answers, I seek clarification arising directly from officer advice to ensure Council has a clear and balanced understanding of the relative risks, impacts, and feasibility of each site.

Below, I reference prior officer responses and request confirmation or further clarification as appropriate.

1. Asbestos (Officer response: Site B contains asbestos; Site A not addressed)

Can officers confirm that Site A contains no known asbestos and therefore avoids asbestos removal, handling, disposal, regulatory compliance, and associated construction or program risk entirely?

*No review of Site A for asbestos has been conducted so this cannot be confirmed.*

2. Impact on existing community facilities (Officer response: no assessment undertaken at Site B)

Can officers confirm that Site A, being undeveloped, avoids construction immediately adjacent to existing recreation buildings and therefore avoids risks of structural damage, vibration, or disruption to facilities?

This cannot be confirmed without further testing. The confirmed presence of a hard layer for example at Site A may result in the requirement for blasting to remove rock which may negatively impact other facilities.

3. Disruption to sporting clubs and community users (Officer response: disruption at Site B is inevitable; consultation to occur)

Can officers confirm that Site A development would not require displacement or temporary relocation of existing sporting clubs, school programs, or community groups during construction?

Some disruption to regular access may still be encountered if Site A is chosen. This may be negated using alternative access other than the Barker Street entry.

Selecting Site A does not remove the need to manage the demolition and relocation or renewal of the Old Bowling Club and Netball Courts, which remains a long term Council direction.

4. Construction risk profile (Officer response: Site B requires demolition, asbestos management, infill construction, and protection of adjacent facilities)

Can officers confirm that Site A presents a simpler and lower-risk construction environment because it is an undeveloped site?

Site A has different and less well investigated risks associated including:

- Borehole testing undertaken by Local Geotechnics indicates the presence of a hard layer at depths of approximately 1.1–1.5 metres. At this stage, the extent of this barrier and its potential impact on construction feasibility and overall project viability remains unclear.
- No sewer connection available at Site A. The Shire's Environmental Health Officer has undertaken preliminary calculations for effluent disposal based on the anticipated number of showers and toilets. Should a septic tank system be required, approximately 200 metres of leach drains would be necessary, together with appropriate separation from other facilities and services. It is unlikely that these requirements could be accommodated within the available site area.

Other lesser risks include the lack of power, water and the need to amalgamate the site.

5. Timelines – land tenure and utilities (Officer response: Site A may face delays for title consolidation and utility provision)

Can officers confirm whether any written advice from Landgate or utility providers identifies confirmed timeframes or constraints that would materially delay development at Site A, as opposed to these being assumed risks?

Landgate and utility providers have not been contacted to provide advice on timelines for Site A. However, over the last three years the Shire has made applications for similar work, with real timeline impacts. These are both recent and local and provide a good guide to the likely outcome. For example:



- The application to Western Power for the connection upgrade for Pioneer Memorial Lodge. The initial application fee was paid to Western Power on 14 January 2023. The design quote from Western Power was received in February 2025.
- An application for a new connection to Western Power for the Howick Street carpark was made in June 2024. We received the design quote from Western Power in November 2025.
- In regard to lot amalgamations, previously on this site an amalgamation was required for the development of the Ag Society Shed. The application was submitted to the WA Planning Commission in May 2022. The title was issued in August 2023.

6. Feasibility study – relocation and rebuild costs (Officer response: disruption recognised but no costed rebuild included)

Can officers clarify why the feasibility study did not explicitly include the cost of rebuilding or relocating outdoor netball and basketball courts or relocating the York Playgroup, given these are required for Site B but not for Site A?

Cost of the new courts has an initial estimate of \$200,000, based on actual costs the Town of Cambridge shared with us for new court construction at Lake Monger. This isn't in the initial cost estimate, however it is in scope for the design tender and as such forms part of ongoing cost plans.

Relocation of other uses is not a cost that would be included in the feasibility study, there is a range of other costs, such as demolition of the existing pool. that are not part of that cost estimate, however do form part of ongoing project planning.

7. Comparative decision context (Officer response: Council has sufficient information to decide)

Can officers confirm whether Council is effectively being asked to choose between a site with known construction complexity, disruption, asbestos, and relocation costs (Site B), and a site that avoids these impacts entirely (Site A)?

Both Sites A and B include their own complexity as already discussed. It is Council that has reintroduced the choice between Site A and B not Administration. When asked to choose previously Council in both 2008 and 2025 chose Site B knowing these complexities.

8. Site A “Unviable” conclusion (Feasibility Study basis and subsequent communications)  
The Feasibility Study (April 2024) states:

*“After consultation with Council staff it was considered this site was an unviable option for a new aquatic facility moving forward, primarily due to non-integration with the existing facilities at the York Sport and Recreation Precinct.” [York WA](#)*

This wording appears to have informed advice given throughout 2024 and into 2025 — including how Site A's viability has been described to community groups on occasions, which the CEO has referenced as dating back to 2023/early discussions.

Can officers clarify:

- What documented advice or assessment (e.g., internal reports, workshop minutes, consultant correspondence) supports the conclusion that Site A is “unviable option” as described in the feasibility study?
- Who within the organisation provided or endorsed this conclusion (e.g., consultant, officer group)?

- Whether this conclusion, or its evidence, was communicated *in writing* to community stakeholders when Site A was described as “Unviable Option”?
- Given that no formal technical assessments (e.g., vibration, contamination, detailed services analysis) have been completed since the April 2024 feasibility study, how this original conclusion has been maintained and applied in subsequent officer advice to Council?

All reports submitted to Council receive Officer and Executive review before progressing. The reason for consultant Tredwell’s decision is communicated above in the passage you have extracted. Non integration was a key component, but this was considered alongside the non-amalgamated site, and lack of services connection.

It would be negligent for Tredwell to have formed their opinion without consulting the considerable recreational and architectural expertise that sits within the Administration team. This experience is coupled with both local and site knowledge and is consistent with industry best practice and publications. It remains the opinion of Administration that Site B achieves Council’s vision of a connected and vibrant recreation precinct as well as long term financial and operational viability.

No formal technical assessments other than geo-technical assessments have been conducted on Site B. It is the expectation that these will be undertaken as part of the standard design process which Officers have been progressing as per Council’s direction. Associated risks have been addressed through contingency budgeting and planning. Site A has received no further assessments as it was discounted in April 2024 and again in February 2025 via a Council decision.

Council’s decision and the feasibility study are publicly available documents. The Major Projects page on the Shire’s website has been running since November 2024 contains links to all Council decisions relating to the Pool as well as all relevant documents. A group of 100+ registered stakeholders has been in place since the summer of 2023/24. This group receives regular email updates on the project.

### **CR HUTCHINSON**

I noted in the feasibility report it mentioned that income for usage did not include the general usage and that of the basketball courts inside the pool area. If people wish to access the basketball courts in the pool area, but do not wish to swim, is there a cost and if not, how will this be monitored, to those paying and not paying to swim?

The feasibility study for the proposed aquatic facility identified a "Desirable" option that includes additional activity areas, such as a playground and a half-court basketball court, within the pool site. Once the architect is engaged, one of the initial steps in the project will be to determine which elements are within scope and which are not. This process will clarify whether these additional features will be incorporated into the final design.

In evaluating the operating model, the projected income for the new facility did not account for individuals who may wish to use the amenities without engaging in swimming activities.

It is important to distinguish this proposal from the initiative to renovate the current outdoor courts at the Recreation Precinct. The architect's design brief specifies relocating these courts within the Recreation Precinct, adjacent to the pool facilities. The proposed courts will remain outside the fenced pool area and will continue to be freely accessible, consistent with the existing arrangements.

Entry fee details for the new facility are still to be determined and will be decided in later stages of the project.



If I understand correctly, that the consideration of not choosing site C, will prevent the pool closure for the time of rebuild. However, I also note that the basketball and netball clubs and the early years leaning centre group will all lose their ability to normal engagement due to site B. Is there a proposed early years group location and how long before they will be able to return to normal engagement? I note that they have conversation with the school.

Yes you are correct, choosing a site other than Site C allows for the current pool to remain fully operational until the new pool is opened. The Report submitted to the February 2025 OCM acknowledged how construction would affect current users of the site and emphasised the need for temporary solutions during the transition. The Council's resolution also specifically directs that community groups affected by these changes must be consulted.

Consultation with all community groups is scheduled to begin once the design contract has been awarded, as determined in the project plan. Since construction is not anticipated to start until April 2027, there remains ample opportunity to find a workable solution for all groups. We do not have an exact location for the Early Years group rather a number of options to work through with them at this stage. The Council's resolution from February 2025 stipulates that the Business Case will incorporate plans and cost estimates for rehabilitating the existing pool site, which may include consideration of the Early Years Network if another permanent site is not found prior. It is expected that temporary arrangements for the clubs using the outdoor courts can be accommodated by ensuring access to the indoor court.

Where are the new basketball proposal of location, as mentioned south of site B? Will the courts be as big as the courts now? How long before these courts are rebuilt?

The general specification in the design tender included the following: "The scope of works will also include the design of new outside sports courts to replace the existing courts that will be demolished as part of the new aquatic facility."

Initial thoughts have been that new courts could be constructed in the currently underutilised space directly south of the proposed pool location. They will fit there. The design architect will consider this as part of their brief and may identify a better option. This will be resolved as part of the Concept Design process. Any new courts will be regulation size, but the design process will look at whether two or three courts are required. Consultation with user groups will assist in informing the full scope.

Construction of new courts is expected to be part of the aquatic facility construction project, with specific timing is unknown at this stage.

If we pass SY146-12/25, how will this affect the opportunity at item 10.1, whereby we have chosen to now go ahead with the Site B plan tender.

The appointment of a consultant to carry out the design work may proceed independently of this current notice of motion. Although the tender has been prepared for the Council-selected site, adjustments can be made in consultation with the successful consultant. Such changes are anticipated to result in a cost variation, as the initial proposal was based on Site B but there is a mechanism in the contract to allow for this. Sub-consultants may incur additional work, especially with regard to hydraulic design with the lack of sewage connection.

It should be noted that postponing the design phase of this project is likely to lead to cost escalations, which would not only incur cost impacts for the design stage, but would significantly affect the construction stage.

Also why was a costing not done for site A when the feasibility report considered this site enough to report on it as far as comparison to site B?

The Feasibility Study, undertaken by Tredwell Management Consultants, commenced in 2023. At the November 2023 Concept Forum, the draft study was discussed with Council and a presentation given by lead consultant Neil Tredwell. This was timed for Council to review key considerations before the community consultation phase kicked off. At this time Site A on the Henrietta Street frontage was identified as an unviable option primarily due to non-integration with the existing facilities at the York Recreation Precinct. Council agreed for the feasibility work to progress on the two viable sites. The community consultation carried out over the summer of 2023/24 was based on these two sites only as were the subsequent and the cost estimates and concept plans developed as part of finalising the feasibility study.

Site A was reintroduced into the discussion after the completion and publication of the feasibility study following a Council amendment to the recommendation at the April 2024 OCM as follows:

“Directs the Chief Executive Officer to undertake site geotechnical investigations at sites as outlined in the feasibility study.”

Geotechnical investigations were undertaken and presented at the Council Meeting in February 2025 the Council resolved to choose Site B.

Would be possible to also receive more information on the question I asked in the Agenda briefing, as the follow up on to Cr Welsh’s question.

To remind, Cr Welsh asked a very important question as to site A, and the findings as to possible granite at a certain depth. I further questioned seeking if we could please have the same question answered for Site B? This was not able to be offered on the night.

This information was presented to Council at its November 2024 and February 2025 OCM to assist its decision making and is available on page 10 of the Geotechnical Report.

Scope was drill to 4.0m (the approximate depth required for pool excavation) or refusal

Bore Hole	Depth	Comment
A1	Full depth	
A2	Full depth	
A3	1.5m	Refusal on hard layer
A4	1.1 m	Refusal on hard layer
B1	2.5 m	Refusal on gravel
B2	2.2 m	Refusal on gravel
B3	2.8 m	Refusal on gravel
B4	Full depth	

I also have the following questions:

I now understand that since 2008, site B was already the proposed site as mentioned in the master plan. What was the reasoning for site B chosen? The site plan does not show any evidence of the reasoning behind site B as a chosen site nor any reference to community consultation for the pool. Was community consultation completed and what response was received in regard to site B?

The full report by A Balanced View Consultants (ABV) was provided to current Council on 11 December 2025 for its consideration. Public consultation is listed on Page 19-26 of ABV's draft report that was presented to the November 2008 OCM. The rationale behind the pool moving can be found on Pages 27. Other historical information that supports this decision may no longer be available. Records such as community consultation are only required to be kept for 7 years prior to disposal. Resourcing the retrieval of this information cannot occur prior to tomorrow night's meeting.

What are the biggest concerns of impact for the shire and the community if Site A is chosen?

Assessing this against the 8 Strategic Risks outlined in the Shire's Risk Management Framework the following would apply:

Strategic Risk	Comment
1. Failure/Loss of Infrastructure	The anticipated extended timeframe associated with the provision of services at Site A (including power, water, sewerage and lot amalgamations) increases the risk to the Shire and the community that the existing pool facility may fail prior to the completion and commissioning of the new pool.
2. Failure to Delivery Key Projects	<p>Borehole testing undertaken by Local Geotechnics indicates the presence of a hard layer at depths of approximately 1.1–1.5 metres. At this stage, the extent of this barrier and its potential impact on construction feasibility and overall project viability remains unclear.</p> <p>In addition, there is currently no sewer connection available at Site A. The Shire's Environmental Health Officer has undertaken preliminary calculations for effluent disposal based on the anticipated number of showers and toilets. Should a septic tank system be required, approximately 200 metres of leach drains would be necessary, together with appropriate separation from other facilities and services. It is unlikely that these requirements could be accommodated within the available site area.</p>
3. Reputational Damage	<p>Reversal of previous Council decisions may negatively impact perceptions of good governance and could adversely affect the Shire's ability to secure external funding for this project. Proceeding with Site A without community consultation may also present a reputational risk. Additionally, selecting Site A does not remove the need to manage the demolition and relocation or renewal of the Old Bowling Club and Netball Courts, which may create unrealistic expectations within the community regarding these facilities.</p> <p>If further community consultation is required, the Shire should not proceed at this time with the appointment of architectural consultancy services. Refusing all tenders and re-advertising may result in a negative perception of the Shire within the consulting profession and could reduce the level of response to future tenders.</p>

4. Loss of Financial Viability	The risks identified under Items 2 and 3 have the potential to result in significant cost escalations, which may adversely impact the overall financial viability of the project.
--------------------------------	---

What parts of the master plan have been achieved ? If so, was there anything that was changed to this proposed master plan design that was considered a better option, than following the plan as set in 2008?

Estimated timeline for major works on the site

Year	Works
2008-2010	Oval realigned
2008-2010	Ag Shed demolished and Hockey change rooms constructed
2010 (approx.)	Earthworks for YRCC Building
2010-2012	YRCC, bowling greens and tennis courts constructed
2010-2012	Dog Park constructed
2010-2012	Cricket Shed constructed
2010-2012	Earthworks – second hockey field
2012-2013	Hockey field installed
2013-2014	Dam installed
2014-2017	Solar Panels on YRCC roof installed
2014-2017	Main carpark constructed
2017-2019	Water tank replacement
2019-2021	Shade sails on playground installed
2022	New Ag Society building constructed

These appear to be largely in-line with the Master Plan intent.

If areas of the master plan have been achieved, how much of the shire's money was spent on these changes and how much funding was granted?

Resourcing the retrieval of this information cannot occur prior to tomorrow night's meeting. Some information that might be of assistance:

The estimate of costs prepared by the QS for the ABV 2008 Masterplan was \$4,819,600 but the final figure was significantly more than that (exact figures unavailable). The ABV report suggests that a total of \$1,880,000 of Shire funds would be made available including a municipal and reserve funds as well as a \$1,000,000 loan. At the time this represented 46% of the anticipated project costs. Three loans were taken out to serve this project:

- Loan 62 - \$1,330,500 @ 6.3% 20 years – Stage 1 – 25/05/2011
- Loan 63 - \$320,000 @ 5.15% 15 years – Stage 3 – 08/02/2012
- Loan 64 - \$499,155 @5.15% 15 years – New Facilities – 08/02/2012

At 1 July 2025 \$712,655 remains to be paid.

The master plan recommends that it should be reviewed annually to bring into account demographic, financial, social and environmental changes impacting on the community. Has this been done and if so what has been discussed over the last 15 years?

As per the answer to Q.20 asked by Cr Ashford (provided to all Councillors on the 11 December 2025), there is no evidence that regular review was undertaken. Information regarding the 2019 community consultation was provided in the email response to Cr Ashford mentioned earlier.

Has the water corporation upgraded the sewerage system to support the forest oval precinct being connected to a reticulated effluent system?

No upgrades have been completed to date. Access to the deep sewer system is available at the intersection of South Street and George Street, where the current facilities are connected.

The master plan states in the estimates of operation consider that in future times, as we are now, there will be more water available in the town dam, saving the shire \$12,900 each year. Has this come to fruition? If so, how much as the town dam increased and how much is the \$ savings?

The town dam was discontinued as of approximately 2023, owing to insufficient water return from the Water Corporation ponds and concerns regarding elevated salinity levels.

Restoring the dam as a reliable water source is timely, especially since building the pool can supply extra water from sources like stormwater and backwash. Technological improvements, such as on-site desalination, also enhance its viability.

## **CR SMYTHE**

Q: why are we not following the timeline? (For instance it says the establishment of project advisory group will happen before the contract for design consultancy? I also not that a business case has not yet been prepared are we at risk of committing to a major capital project without a robust business case?

### **Response:**

*The current timeline is shared through the Major Projects page on the Shire website. This timeline has the following schedule:*

- *Engagement with impacted user groups to plan for relocation - Progressing in 2025/26*
- *Establishment of Project Advisory Group - Progressing in 2025/26*
- *Contract for design consultancy—to be awarded December 2025*
- *Schematic and site investigations—March 2026*
- *Business Case—2025/26*

*The project is on track in relation to this timeline. It should be noted that project management is an agile process and the project timeline is continually refreshed. Timelines expressed in early reports may change due to delays, risk and other items.*

*The feasibility study has already addressed much of the business case requirements. What still needs to be completed are the funding plan and the associated methodologies. These elements will be coordinated with the design phase, since creating an effective funding plan requires more advanced design work to supply essential details.*

As the agenda has been distributed there is a requirement to update the Recommendation to Council. The new Recommendations are as follows:

**MOTION A**

**That, with regard to Notice of Motion - Site Selection for new Aquatic Facility, Council:**

1. **Revokes Point 1 of its decision 070225 of the OCM of 25 February 2025 which states:**

***“Resolves to select site B - Recreation Precinct North-west Corner Site, specifically 44 Forrest Street (Lot 292), York for the proposed new aquatic centre as presented in Appendix 4.”***

**MOTION B**

**That, with regard to Notice of Motion - Site Selection for new Aquatic Facility, Council:**

1. **Resolves to select Site A for the proposed new aquatic centre.**