

# MINUTES

## Special Council Meeting

31 March 2026

Mayor and Councillors

Here within are the Minutes of the Special Council Meeting of the City of South Perth Council held Tuesday 31 March 2026 in the City of South Perth Council Chamber, corner Sandgate Street and South Terrace, South Perth.



ANITA AMPRIMO  
ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

9 APRIL 2026

# Acknowledgement of Country

Kaartdjinin Nidja Nyungar Whadjuk Boodjar Koora Nidja Djining Noonakoort kaartdijin wangkiny, maam, gnarnk and boordier Nidja Whadjuk kura kura.

We acknowledge and pay our respects to the traditional custodians of this land, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation and their Elders past and present.

## Our Guiding Values



## Disclaimer

Members of the public are cautioned against taking any action as a result of a Council decision until such time as they have seen a copy of the Minutes or been advised, in writing, by the Council's Administration with regard to any particular decision.

# Contents

- 1. DECLARATION OF OPENING 4
- 2. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDING MEMBER 4
- 3. ATTENDANCE 4
  - 3.1 APOLOGIES 5
  - 3.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE 5
- 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST 5
- 5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME 5
  - 5.1 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME: 31 MARCH 2026 5
- 6. REPORTS 6
  - 6.0 STRATEGIC DIRECTION 4: LEADERSHIP 6
    - 6.0.1 Revocation - Councillor Tim Houweling - Item 14 - New Business of an Urgent Nature 6
- 7. CLOSURE 16
- APPENDIX 17
- DISCLAIMER 24

# Special Council Meeting - Minutes

Minutes of the Special Council Meeting held in the City of South Perth Council Chamber, corner Sandgate Street and South Terrace, South Perth at 6.00pm on Tuesday 31 March 2026.

## 1. DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Presiding Member opened the meeting at 6.00pm and welcomed everyone in attendance.

## 2. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDING MEMBER

The Presiding Member read aloud the following statement:

*'Councillors, tonight is Morgan Hindle's first Council Meeting since returning to the City of South Perth on a temporary basis as Acting Manager Governance. Morgan, on behalf of Council, we are delighted for your return, welcome back.'*

*Toni Fry (Manager Governance) is currently reporting directly to the Acting Chief Executive Officer and is working on key governance projects, recognising her skills, capabilities, and knowledge in this area.'*

*I would also like to welcome James McGovern, the General Manager of Governance and Compliance at the Local Government Inspectorate. Mr McGovern will observe tonight's meeting and can perform the Monitor's functions, if required.'*

## 3. ATTENDANCE

Mayor Greg Milner (Presiding Member)

### Councillors

Como Ward  
Como Ward  
Manning Ward  
Manning Ward  
Mill Point Ward  
Mill Point Ward  
Moresby Ward  
Moresby Ward

Councillor Kathy Lees  
Councillor Bronwyn Waugh  
Councillor André Brender-A-Brandis  
Councillor Blake D'Souza (Arrived at 6.07pm)  
Councillor Jacqueline Raison  
Councillor Tim Houweling  
Councillor Stephen Russell  
Councillor Hayley Prendiville

### Officers

Acting Chief Executive Officer  
Acting Director Corporate Services  
Director Development and Community Services  
Acting Director Infrastructure Services  
Acting Manager Governance  
Legal and Governance Coordinator  
Governance Officer

Ms Anita Amprimo  
Ms Danielle Cattalini  
Ms Donna Shaw  
Ms Olaya Lope  
Mr Morgan Hindle  
Ms Jessica Guy  
Ms Jane Robinson

## Guests

Local Government Inspectorate (General Manager Governance and Compliance) Mr James McGovern

## Gallery

There were 14 members of the public present.

### **3.1 APOLOGIES**

Nil.

### **3.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

## **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Nil.

*Councillor Blake D'Souza arrived at the meeting at 6.07pm during consideration of Item 5.*

## **5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

### **5.1 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME: 31 MARCH 2026**

In accordance with Regulation 7(4)(b) of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 all questions asked at this meeting must relate to the purpose of this meeting.

The Presiding Member opened Public Question Time at 6.02pm.

Written questions were received prior to the meeting from:

- Mr Max Szmekura of South Perth.
- Mr Aidan Carlsson of Karawara.
- Ms Joanne Ord of Como.
- Dr Sue Gillieatt of Salter Point.

At 6.20pm, in accordance with Clause 6.7 of the City of South Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2007, the Presiding Member extended Public Question Time by an additional 15 minutes to hear those questions not yet heard.

- Dr Louise Johnston of Como.
- Ms Bronwyn David of South Perth.

A table of questions received and answers provided can be found in the **Appendix** of these Minutes.

The Presiding Member closed Public Question Time at 6.24pm.

## 6. REPORTS

### 6.0 STRATEGIC DIRECTION 4: LEADERSHIP

#### 6.0.1 Revocation - Councillor Tim Houweling - Item 14 - New Business of an Urgent Nature

File Ref: D-26-7548

Reporting Officer(s): Anita Amprimo, Acting Chief Executive Officer

#### Summary

This report is to consider a motion submitted by Councillor Tim Houweling (and supported by two additional Councillors) to revoke Council Resolution Number 0326/061 considered by Council at its meeting held 24 March 2026.

The motion to revoke Council Resolution 0326/061 was dealt with as the first item of business, prior to the consideration of the substantive motions for its replacement.

**Moved:** Councillor Tim Houweling  
**Seconded:** Councillor Bronwyn Waugh

That the motion resolved at the Ordinary Council Meeting held 24 March 2026 which reads:

#### ***"COUNCIL DECISION 0326/061***

***Moved:*** Mayor Greg Milner

***Seconded:*** Councillor Stephen Russell

*That Council requests the Chief Executive Officer to:*

1. *Discontinue all work on the Psychosocial Risk Assessment described in the email from the Chief Executive Officer to Councillors dated 23 March 2026.*
2. *Convene a workshop inviting:*
  - (a) *the Chief Executive Officer;*
  - (b) *Councillors;*
  - (c) *the two external expert members of the City's Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee; and*
  - (d) *the Local Government Monitor (**Monitor**),*

*to discuss:*

    - (e) *the proper scope of works for a formal assessment of workplace conditions, culture and psychological health and safety (**Workplace Assessment**); and*
    - (f) *the appropriate timing of the Workplace Assessment, given that the Monitor is currently anticipated to:*
      - (i) *assist in the development of an Action Plan setting out any necessary governance and/or relationship improvements (**Action Plan**); and*
      - (ii) *provide a report (**Monitor Report**) to the Local Government Inspector by 29 April 2026.*

3. *Following the above workshop, present a confidential Item at the next Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (ARI Committee) meeting, proposing the scope of works for the Workplace Assessment and outlining the process by which Council will appoint the external body that performs the Workplace Assessment (External Body).*
4. *Following the above ARI Committee meeting, present the ARI Committee's recommendation to Council as a confidential Item for decision.*

**CARRIED (5/3)**

**For:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Kathy Lees, Jacqueline Raison and Stephen Russell.

**Against:** Councillors Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling and Hayley Prendiville.

Be revoked.

**Absolute Majority Required.**

### COUNCIL DECISION

**0326/062**

**Moved:** Mayor Greg Milner

**Seconded:** Councillor Hayley Prendiville

In accordance with Clause 8.10 of the City of South Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2007 Councillor Tim Houweling be granted an additional five minutes to speak.

**CARRIED (8/1)**

**For:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling, Kathy Lees, Hayley Prendiville, Jacqueline Raison and Bronwyn Waugh.

**Against:** Councillor Stephen Russell.

### Revocation Motion AND COUNCIL DECISION

**0326/063**

**Moved:** Councillor Tim Houweling

**Seconded:** Councillor Bronwyn Waugh

That the motion resolved at the Ordinary Council Meeting held 24 March 2026 which reads:

***"COUNCIL DECISION 0326/061***

***Moved:*** Mayor Greg Milner

***Seconded:*** Councillor Stephen Russell

*That Council requests the Chief Executive Officer to:*

1. *Discontinue all work on the Psychosocial Risk Assessment described in the email from the Chief Executive Officer to Councillors dated 23 March 2026.*

2. *Convene a workshop inviting:*
  - (a) *the Chief Executive Officer;*
  - (b) *Councillors;*
  - (c) *the two external expert members of the City's Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee; and*
  - (d) *the Local Government Monitor (**Monitor**),*  
*to discuss:*
    - (e) *the proper scope of works for a formal assessment of workplace conditions, culture and psychological health and safety (**Workplace Assessment**); and*
    - (f) *the appropriate timing of the Workplace Assessment, given that the Monitor is currently anticipated to:*
      - (i) *assist in the development of an Action Plan setting out any necessary governance and/or relationship improvements (**Action Plan**); and*
      - (ii) *provide a report (**Monitor Report**) to the Local Government Inspector by 29 April 2026.*
3. *Following the above workshop, present a confidential Item at the next Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee (**ARI Committee**) meeting, proposing the scope of works for the Workplace Assessment and outlining the process by which Council will appoint the external body that performs the Workplace Assessment (**External Body**).*
4. *Following the above ARI Committee meeting, present the ARI Committee's recommendation to Council as a confidential Item for decision.*

**CARRIED (5/3)**

**For:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Kathy Lees, Jacqueline Raison and Stephen Russell.

**Against:** Councillors Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling and Hayley Prendiville.

Be revoked.

**CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (8/1)**

**For:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling, Kathy Lees, Hayley Prendiville, Stephen Russell and Bronwyn Waugh.

**Against:** Councillor Jacqueline Raison.

**Moved:** Councillor Tim Houweling

**Seconded:** Councillor Blake D'Souza

That Council:

1. Accept that the matters raised and within its knowledge are of sufficient seriousness to warrant independent consideration.
2. Request the Acting Chief Executive Officer to progress the report on psychosocial affects on the Local Government by the suitably qualified expert, and obtain and present to Council, as soon as practicable a report in respect to:
  - a) The intra-council work environment (how elected members function together);
  - b) The Council-Leadership work environment (interactions between elected members and City leaders); and
  - c) The Council-Administration work environment (interactions between elected members and non-leadership) employees in Council-facing roles.
3. Ensure that any such review is progressed with urgency, with an interim advice on progress to provided within 28 days.
4. Ensure that no Officer or Council member affect, impact, interfere with the independence of the consultant, or the terms of reference and instructions, and that the consultant do make a declaration to the effect;
5. That no Council member at any time contact or speak to the Consultant, except at the request of the Consultant for the purpose of undertaking the report, but only if asked by the Consultant; and
6. That the Acting CEO do instruct the suitably qualified expert in writing, and that all such communication with the Consultant be appended to any report.
7. That the Report be presented for Council and identify any proposed response to any action items identified by the suitably qualified expert.

#### COUNCIL DECISION

**0326/064**

**Moved:** Councillor André Brender-A-Brandis

**Seconded:** Councillor Kathy Lees

In accordance with Clause 8.10 of the City of South Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2007 Mayor Greg Milner be granted an additional five minutes to speak.

**CARRIED (9/0)**

**For:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling, Kathy Lees, Hayley Prendiville, Jacqueline Raison, Stephen Russell and Bronwyn Waugh.

**Against:** Nil.

6.0.1 Revocation - Councillor Tim Houweling - Item 14 - New Business of an Urgent Nature

During debate on the Item, it was suggested to replace the word 'report' with 'advice' in paragraph 3.

With the agreement of the mover and seconder, the motion was amended as follows:

**Moved:** Councillor Tim Houweling

**Seconded:** Councillor Blake D'Souza

That Council:

1. Accept that the matters raised and within its knowledge are of sufficient seriousness to warrant independent consideration.
2. Request the Acting Chief Executive Officer to progress the report on psychosocial affects on the Local Government by a suitably qualified expert, and obtain and present to Council, as soon as practicable a report in respect to:
  - a) The intra-council work environment (how elected members function together);
  - b) The Council-Leadership work environment (interactions between elected members and City leaders); and
  - c) The Council-Administration work environment (interactions between elected members and non-leadership) employees in Council-facing roles.
3. Ensure that any such review is progressed with urgency, with interim advice on progress to provided within 28 days.
4. Ensure that no Officer or Council member affect, impact, interfere with the independence of the consultant, or the terms of reference and instructions, and that the consultant do make a declaration to the effect;
5. That no Council member at any time contact or speak to the Consultant, except at the request of the Consultant for the purpose of undertaking the report, but only if asked by the Consultant; and
6. That the Acting CEO do instruct the suitably qualified expert in writing, and that all such communication with the Consultant be appended to any report.
7. That the Report be presented for Council and identify any proposed response to any action items identified by the suitably qualified expert.

**LOST (4/5)**

**For:** Councillors Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling, Hayley Prendiville and Bronwyn Waugh.

**Against:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Kathy Lees, Jacqueline Raison and Stephen Russell.

During debate on Councillor Tim Houweling's motion, Mayor Greg Milner foreshadowed the following motion:

### COUNCIL DECISION

0326/065

**Moved:** Mayor Greg Milner

**Seconded:** Councillor André Brender-A-Brandis

1. That Council notes that the Acting Chief Executive Officer is undertaking a psychosocial risk assessment in accordance with the City's responsibility as the Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking (PCBU).
2. That Council requests the Acting Chief Executive Officer report back to Council on the findings of the psychosocial risk assessment.
3. That Council requests the Acting Chief Executive Officer to consider:
  - (a) whether the issue of psychosocial risk should be added to the Agenda for the next Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee; and
  - (b) whether a special meeting of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee should be convened prior to 16 June 2026, and advise Council of the outcome.

### Reasons For Change

1. The City's Audit, Risk and Improvement (ARI) Committee met on 10 March 2026.
2. The Agenda and the Minutes for the ARI Committee's meeting on 10 March 2026 do not mention psychosocial risks (or similar risks).
3. CEO Liz Ledger's email announcing her intention to commission a Psychosocial Risk Assessment was sent to Councillors at 4:10pm on 23 March 2026.
4. On 25 March 2026, Anita Amprimo was appointed Acting CEO.
5. On 26 March 2026, Acting CEO Anita Amprimo sent an email to Councillors and selected City staff members advising that:

*"Following Council's Resolution on Tuesday night under item 14, I sought to ascertain the status of the work to implement a psychosocial risk assessment by Azuhr. Azuhr declined to provide information on any communications with the City previously on this matter but confirmed that they had not been contracted to undertake any services for the City (see email below)."*

and

*"In view of the above and the current circumstances of which Elected Members are aware, and the City's duties as the person conducting a business or undertaking (PCBU), I have instructed staff to commence the relevant process to engage a consultant to undertake an appropriately scoped Psychosocial Hazard Risk Assessment to meet the obligations of the PCBU."*

6. The Officer Comment appearing in the Agenda to the Special Council Meeting scheduled for 31 March 2026 states that:
- “Notwithstanding part 1 of Council Decision 0326/061 which sought to request the Chief Executive Officer discontinue all work on the Psychosocial Risk Assessment described in the email from the Chief Executive Officer to Councillors dated 23 March 2026, the CEO has the ability to so far as is reasonably practicable, ensure health and safety for its workers by eliminating risks to health and safety. This can include monitoring the health of workers and the condition of the workplace to prevent injury or illness, including psychosocial hazards.”*
7. On reflection, it is appropriate to revoke Council Decision 0326/061 and replace it with this Alternative Motion.

**CARRIED (6/3)**

**For:** Mayor Greg Milner, Councillors André Brender-A-Brandis, Kathy Lees, Jacqueline Raison, Stephen Russell and Bronwyn Waugh.

**Against:** Councillors Blake D'Souza, Tim Houweling and Hayley Prendiville.

### Background

At its meeting held 24 March 2026, Council considered an Item 14 – New Business of an Urgent Nature received from Mayor Greg Milner. The revocation motion submitted by Councillor Tim Houweling (in accordance with City of South Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2007) is supported by Councillor Bronwyn Waugh and Councillor Hayley Prendiville.

### Reason for Revocation (provided by Councillor Tim Houweling)

*‘The direction to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is inappropriate and extends to operational matters. Not to proceed with the appointment of Azuhr in the present circumstances is not appropriate given we are aware of the circumstances raised by the CEO relating to workplace environment, governance, and organisational culture, and to determine whether further action, including an organisational review, ought to be undertaken.*

### URGENCY AND JUSTIFICATION

*The requisition is made on the basis that:*

- *Serious allegations have been raised which engage Council's obligations to ensure a safe working environment and proper governance oversight;*
- *Council must act reasonably, in good faith, and in the best interests of the local government as a whole; and*
- *Delay in reconsidering the relevant resolution risks undermining both staff welfare and public confidence in the governance of the organisation.*

*It could also adversely reflect on any claim or prosecution by Work Safe brought against the City in pro-active steps are not taken.*

*Under Work Health and Safety (WHS) legislation, neither the local government council nor individual elected members are considered a "Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking" (PCBU), and councillors are explicitly excluded from the definition of an "officer".*

*The Strategic Role of the Council*

*The Council's role in health and safety is strategic rather than operational. However, because Council decisions can have WHS implications for workers and others at the workplace, the Council must have an understanding of the risks within the local government's control and how their decisions impact health and safety.*

*Elected members play an important role in supporting the officers of the PCBU, such as the CEO and directors, to comply with their WHS responsibilities, but can never assume responsibility for those roles, the reality is if they do they act in the position as if they are responsible, this exceeds authority and could place persons so acting as taking upon themselves the responsibility.*

*Individual Responsibilities of Councillors*

*Individually, Councillors are classified as "other persons at the workplace" under Section 29 of the WHS Act. Under this classification, their legal obligations include:*

- *Taking reasonable care for their own health and safety.*
- *Taking reasonable care that their acts or omissions do not adversely affect the health and safety of other persons.*
- *Complying, so far as they are reasonably able, with any reasonable instruction provided by the local government (the PCBU) to enable its compliance with the WHS Act and regulations.*

*Councillors must comply with these duties while at the workplace, which includes participating in decision-making (such as debating and voting), attending Council meetings, and interacting with the administration.*

*WORKPLACE CULTURE AND PSYCHOSOCIAL HAZARDS*

*A Councillor's WHS duties intersect with their obligations under the Local Government Act 1995, which requires them to facilitate good working relationships and support a workplace culture that promotes fair and respectful treatment. Psychosocial health and safety issues where persons are going on leave citing circumstances relevant to psychosocial safety has expressly been brought to the Council's Notice.*

*On 25 March, the monitor informed Council that there were various staff on leave who have cited psychosocial risks. Psychosocial risks concern all members of Council, and we are aware in one instance of psychosocial harm being cited in an email to all Council Members.'*

**Comment**

Following the resolution passed by Council at its meeting held 24 March 2026, the City received a revocation motion from Councillor Tim Houweling on the 25 March 2026.

A person conducting a business or undertaking (PCBU) is the term given to a person conducting a business or undertaking, alone or with others, whether for not for profit or gain. PCBUs have a primary duty of care to ensure the health and safety of their workers while they are at work. In this context, workers are people engaged by the PCBU and whose activities in carrying out the work are influenced or directed by the PCBU.

The local government (City of South Perth) has the duties of a PCBU. The local government Council are not the PCBU under the *Work Health and Safety Act 2020*, and the local government Chief Executive Officer (CEO) has the duties of a worker and an officer for the purposes of the legislation.

6.0.1 Revocation - Councillor Tim Houweling - Item 14 - New Business of an Urgent Nature

Local government Councillors must comply, so far as they are reasonably able, with any reasonable instruction provided by the local government (the PCBU) to enable its compliance with the WHS Act and *Work Health and Safety (General) Regulations 2022*.

As a PCBU, the local government has a duty to eliminate psychosocial risks so far as is reasonably practicable. If it is not reasonably practicable to eliminate psychosocial risks, the local government must minimise the risks so far as is reasonably practicable.

Notwithstanding part 1 of Council Decision 0326/061 which sought to request the Chief Executive Officer discontinue all work on the Psychosocial Risk Assessment described in the email from the Chief Executive Officer to Councillors dated 23 March 2026, the CEO has the ability to so far as is reasonably practicable, ensure health and safety for its workers by eliminating risks to health and safety. This can include monitoring the health of workers and the condition of the workplace to prevent injury or illness, including psychosocial hazards.

The City considers that it is the role of the CEO to determine if any risk assessment is required and the relevant scope. The CEO intends to undertake this body of work and can present any advice or recommendation to Council.

**Consultation**

Nil.

**Policy and Legislative Implications**

Revoking or changing decisions made at Council Meetings is dealt with under Section 5.25(1)(e) of the *Local Government Act 1995*, Regulation 10 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 and Part 16 of the City of South Perth Standing Orders Local Law 2007.

**Financial Implications**

Nil.

**Key Risks and Considerations**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Risk Event Outcome</b>     | <b>Reputational Damage</b><br>Deals with adverse impact upon the professional reputation and integrity of the City and its representatives whether those persons be appointed or elected to represent the City. The outcome can range from a letter of complaint through to a sustained and co-ordinated representation against the City and or sustained adverse comment in the media. |
| <b>Risk rating</b>            | Medium  |
| <b>Mitigation and actions</b> | Ensure the City appropriately responds to public and media enquires and adheres to WHS obligations.   |

### Strategic Implications

This matter relates to the following Strategic Direction identified within Council's [Strategic Community Plan 2021-2031](#):

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Strategic Direction: | Leadership   |
| Aspiration:          | A local government that is receptive and proactive in meeting the needs of our community                                 |
| Outcome:             | 4.3 Good governance  |
| Strategy:            | 4.3.1 Foster effective governance with honesty and integrity and quality decision making to deliver community priorities |

### Attachments

Nil.

## 7. CLOSURE

The Presiding Member thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 8.07pm.

## APPENDIX

### 5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME: 31 March 2026

| 1 Mr Max Szmekura, South Perth<br>Received: 29 March 2026  | Responses provided by Anita Amprimo – Acting Chief Executive Officer  |
|--|---|
| <p><i>[Preamble]</i></p> <p><i>I understand that the City makes available to its employees an Employee Assistance Program that was recognised in 2023 for its excellence in workplace wellbeing. This program includes an external provider who delivers professional confidential counselling to help staff manage personal or work-related challenges. The City also maintains Mental Health First Aid Officers on-site to provide immediate assistance.</i></p> |   |
| <p>1. Doesn't this show that the City of South Perth aims to comply with Work Safety and Health regulations?</p>   | <p>Yes it does.</p>   |
| <p>2. As Allegedly, there are workplace issues within the City of South Perth workplace at present, have any employees availed themselves of this Employee Assistance Program believing that their mental health and wellbeing are under threat?</p>   | <p>EAP access is private and confidential therefore the City doesn't receive any information about who accesses these services.</p>   |
| <p>3. If an employee of the Council has a grievance with an officer or a Councillor, why would they not submit a Code of Conduct complaint, which is available for this purpose, to deal with a grievance?</p>   | <p>Employees can submit a grievance in accordance with the relevant policies and processes. It is not possible for the City to comment on why a complaint would not be submitted.</p> |

| <p>2 Mr Aidan Carlsson, Karawara<br/>Received: 30 March 2026</p>   | <p>Responses provided by Anita Amprimo – Acting Chief Executive Officer</p>  |
|--|--|
| <p><i>[Preamble]</i><br/><i>My questions seek to clarify whether there is sufficient new information that would justify the risks that come with revocation motions that is: they could provide an opportunity for Councillors to reflect poorly on other Councillors and the Council and gives a very public indication of dysfunction within the City.</i></p>   |  |
| <p>1. The West Australian newspaper reported on Thursday 26 March in an article entitled 'It's heading south for chaotic council' that CEO Liz Ledger has gone off on long term stress leave, Corporate Services Director Bree Websdale and Toni Fry have walked off the job on extended leave. Will the City please confirm whether these three senior staff have in fact "walked off the job on extended leave" as stated and will you confirm how many City staff are currently on extended leave citing "psycho-social risks" as the primary reason for leave as of 5pm 30 March 2026?</p> | <p>The CEO, Liz Ledger and Director Corporate Services, Bree Websdale are currently on personal leave. Contrary to recent media reports the Manager Governance, Toni Fry is not on personal leave and is currently reporting directly to the Acting CEO, working on key governance projects recognising her skills, capabilities and knowledge in this area.</p> <p>In respect to the second part of your question, it would not be appropriate for me to answer that.</p> |
| <p>2. This revocation motion cites communication on 25 March from the Monitor, Ms McGowan, to the Council citing various staff on leave who have cited psycho-social risks. Will the City please confirm whether this information was already known to the Council via the email from the CEO on 23 March and what significant new information became available to the City in the hours between the motion passing on the evening of 24 March 2026 and the revocation motion being lodged on 25 March?</p>  | <p>The City is unclear as to what correspondence the question is referencing.</p>  |
| <p>3. Given the likelihood of this revocation not meeting the requirements to succeed at this Council Meeting, does the City consider that this revocation motion itself risks further damage to the City's reputation through Councillors reflecting poorly on other Councillors, the Council as well as indicating further dysfunction on Council?</p>   | <p>The City cannot comment on what Council may or may not resolve in considering this item.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>3 Ms Joanne Ord, Como</b><br/>Received: 30 March 2026</p>   | <p><b>Responses provided by Anita Amprimo – Acting Chief Executive Officer</b></p>  |
| <p><i>[Preamble]</i><br/><i>There are differing opinions about the efficiency of psychosocial assessments – some say the only people who benefit are the consultants. At the Audit and Risk meeting on 10 March there was no mention of psychosocial hazards or impending assessment. There is a real possibility we may end up with two reports coming in only weeks or even days apart, meaning it is incredibly important to get this process right, not least for the ratepayers.</i></p> |   |
| <p>1. The Reason for Revocation asserts ‘not to proceed with the appointment of Azuhr in the present circumstances is not appropriate.’ This confirms that Azuhr has not yet been appointed and there appears to be an oversight in the proposed scope of assessment. Can the scope be revised to include working relations between all Executive staff and Managers as a minimum?</p>  | <p>The CEO has the ability to determine a scope for any required assessment under the obligations as the person conducting a business or undertaking.</p> |
| <p>2. Given that there are other providers in Perth who conduct these assessments, and the City must strive for efficient, effective and proper expenditure of public monies based on achieving value for money, will the City consider alternative consultants in this instance?</p>   | <p>Yes, the City will follow Policy P605 in requesting written quotations.</p>  |
| <p>3. The EpiGroup report refers to data sources used to inform their analysis. For example: hazard report and incidents notifications; reporting, escalation and decision-making records; exit interview themes and employee surveys. This data can reveal trends over time, say two or three years for example, but can also highlight timeframes of concern. Can the City advise if all the aforementioned documents will be made available to the consultant?</p>                         | <p>The consultant will be requested to undertaken to works to meet the scope and requirements of the relevant Code of Practice.</p>                       |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>4 Dr Sue Gillieatt, Salter Point<br/>Received: 30 March 2026</p> | <p>Responses provided by Anita Amprimo – Acting Chief Executive Officer</p> |
|---|---|

*[Preamble] Psychosocial harms/hazards are a recent workplace phenomenon in Australian industrial relations. Having worked in social work management and leadership roles, I am the first to say that psychosocial harms/hazards are real and legitimate. Given such harms/hazards are mostly perception based and often involve power differences, when people claim workplace harms, responders are sometimes timid about processes to systematically and justly address the issue. Given harms are in the eyes of the beholder, I think we all know they can be prone to creative interpretation. At the very least, we would expect that any incident to have met the criteria of a notifiable concern under the Work Health and Safety Act.*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Assuming the psychosocial harms/hazards raised for the City are so serious as to warrant independent, urgent consideration (point 1 of tonight’s motion), and the <i>Work Health and Safety Act</i> was cited as a reason to move forward with an independent assessment, can the City confirm that concerns have reached the threshold for notification and indeed formal reports setting out complaints with relevant evidence have been compiled and submitted?</p> | <p>Undertaking of a psychosocial risk assessment are part of managing risks for a PCBU.<br/><br/>The level of any risks will be determined by the independent report.</p> |
|--|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>2. Although no harms or hazards were reported at the Audit, Risk and Improvement Meeting on 10 March, this suggests matters have deteriorated in the last three weeks. Even so, there is still reason to tread slowly, in a measured way. In the first instance, an anonymous independent cultural safety audit could have been helpful to understand the nature and depth of any problem. Rushing in and demanding an urgent Psychosocial Risk Assessment on what appears to be an absence of documented or recorded evidence may cause more harm. Not only that, we have a rate-payer-funded local government Monitor already addressing some of these issues. These are not matters for political grandstanding. Given point 3 of the revocation motion about urgency, why must a Psychosocial Risk Assessment be completed rapidly, in 28 days - when the Monitor is already undertaking a similar, related scope of work to be ready at the end of April?</p> | <p>The Revocation Motion includes a request for an interim report on progress within 28 days. The scope and execution of the Monitor’s work does not replace the obligations of the PCBU.</p> |
|---|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>3. Given the relentless coverage which appears to be a sustained and co-ordinated representation against the City and Council described as reputational damage and given a risk rating of 'medium', which City Officers and Councillors are authorised to speak to the media about anything, including psychosocial harms and hazards in the intra-Council work and Council-administrator work environments?</p> | <p>In accordance with section 2.8(1)(a) of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> the Mayor is the principal spokesperson for the City.</p> <p>The City also follows Policy P624 Media Communications.</p> |
|---|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>5 Dr Louise Johnston, Como<br/>Received: 30 March 2026</p>   | <p>Responses provided by Anita Amprimo – Acting Chief Executive Officer</p>   |
| <p><i>[Preamble]</i></p> <p><i>As a community member who is observing developments at the Council from the exterior, I note that there does not seem to be a policy or standard methodology for managing relationships between members of the Council and/or Administration, where these have broken down. In contrast, most private sector corporations deal with grievances or disharmony or harassment within their organisation by arranging for the parties directly involved to meet individually together with an independent and unbiased mediator. That any matters of disagreement can be resolved in a calm, open and frank manner. This is always highly confidential and held behind closed doors, due to the sensitivity of relationships and associated behaviour. It is conducted without participation by any other parties, except where they might be asked to give evidence or corroboration.</i></p> |   |
| <p>1. Please could you clarify if there are any formal grievance processes available to Elected Members or the City’s administrators or members of the Community all of whom participate in the business of the Council, and whether these work consistently, in an effective and efficient way?</p>  | <p>Yes, the City does have formal processes and endeavours to ensure that they are dealt with in an efficient and effective way.</p>  |
| <p>2. Where it is observed that Elected Members of the Council appear to be attempting to subvert or undermine the business (either processes or matters of the moment) of the City, by threatening and intimidating colleagues or community members, or wasting the time and resources of the Council and ratepayers via inappropriate actions and debate, or deviating from factual information to influence an outcome, should there not be a facility for the Mayor or other senior individuals to step in and deal with this behaviour in a punitive form, thereby causing it to cease?</p>  | <p>The <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> outlines the role of the Mayor, including providing leadership and guidance to the Council and Council Members, including guidance as to the roles of the Council and Council Members.</p> <p>The Code of Conduct for Council Members, Committee Members and Candidates includes mechanisms for dealing with alleged breaches of the requirements of the Code and potential penalties that apply.</p> <p>The Local Government Inspector can investigate and take action on specified breaches of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> and general complaints.</p> |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>3. In the event that a decision is taken to dissolve the current Council membership due to the perception that the Council is irreversibly dysfunctional; what would be the process followed to re-establish the leadership and Elected Membership body?</p> | <p>This process would be undertaken in accordance with the relevant legislation.</p> <p>If a Council is dismissed, the Governor will generally appoint a commissioner or joint commissioners to exercise the powers and discharge the duties of the Council. An order dismissing a council is to fix a day for a full election of Council.</p> |
|---|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>6 Ms Bronwyn David, South Perth</b><br/>Received: 30 March 2026</p> | <p><b>Responses provided by Anita Amprimo – Acting Chief Executive Officer</b></p> |
|---|--|

*[Preamble]*  
*As other presenters have already indicated, we have a process underway, as illustrated by the presence of the Acting Monitor. This motion is to enable a different process to take place and it is all paid for by the ratepayers.*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1. What is the cost to ratepayers of the Monitor presently appointed to look into the City of South Perth Council?</p> | <p>The Presiding Member declared that the question was out of order, in accordance with Clause 6.7 (7)(d) of the Standing Orders Local Law 2007.</p>  |
| <p>2. Do we have an estimate of the cost of engaging Azuhr?</p>   | <p>Azuhr have not been engaged to undertake the psychosocial risk assessment therefore is not possible to confirm what the estimated cost may be.</p> |
| <p>3. What is this meeting costing ratepayers?</p>  | <p>It is officer and Elected Member time.</p>   |

## DISCLAIMER

The City advises that comments recorded represent the views of the person making them and should not in any way be interpreted as representing the views of Council. The minutes are a confirmation as to the nature of comments made and provide no endorsement of such comments. Most importantly, the comments included as dot points are not purported to be a complete record of all comments made during the course of debate. Persons relying on the minutes are expressly advised that the summary of comments provided in those minutes do not reflect and should not be taken to reflect the view of the Council. The City makes no warranty as to the veracity or accuracy of the individual opinions expressed and recorded therein.

These Minutes were confirmed at the Ordinary Council Meeting on: Tuesday 28 April 2026.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Presiding Member at the meeting at which the Minutes were confirmed