



Ray Walsh House Community Information Session

14 May 2026

Most common questions

<p>1) Q: Why was the interior of Ray Walsh House gutted, including tiles that were not affected by asbestos?</p>	<p>Per the advice from the asbestos specialist, a contractor was engaged to do soft demolition. The contractor had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after.</p>
<p>2) Q: Why have other projects such as the sky walk and aquatics centre been prioritised over Ray Walsh House</p>	<p>The Skywalk project received state government funding. Similarly, The Tamworth Aquatics Centre project has received State and Federal government grants, therefore the projects need to meet certain deadlines to obtain the funding. Additional funding from TRC has been invested into these community infrastructure project to serve and benefit the entire community and boost visitation. RWH only houses and benefits Council staff.</p>
<p>3) Q: Why didn't Council spend the money to remove the asbestos and remediate RWH 4 years ago?</p>	<p>Early cost estimates only took into consideration initial removal of asbestos in the ceiling. The original costs were prepared in 2023 and would be even higher now, in 2026. Council couldn't afford the removal of the asbestos nor felt that the community should have to pay for this via an SRV. Council has sought funding from both the State and Federal Government with no result.</p> <p>The estimated cost to remediate and reoccupy Ray Walsh House is more than \$50 million and potentially as much as \$70 million. The cost to construct a completely new administrative office is likely to be in the similar range.</p> <p>Council is not currently in a financial position to pursue either of the above options and will require significant time to establish a financial reserve with an appropriate balance along with the financial capacity to contribute towards the long-term solution for office accommodation.</p>

4) Where is the picture of the queen and the opening plaque?	Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive. There is a framed photograph of the Queen opening Ray Walsh House with Alderman Ray Walsh in 1977.
5) What have been the costs since the asbestos was found?	Approximately \$900,000 for the first stage of demolition. Since vacating RWH the total rental cost up to and including June 30, 2026, is \$1,557,341.20.
6) What is the extent and treatment of the asbestos to date?	Note that we have received extensive questions regarding asbestos which we feel have been answered with the video. The priority has been the safety of the staff members and community who use RWH.
7) Why has priority been given to RHW over a new Performing Arts Centre?	There has been no decision to prioritise RWH over a Performing Arts Centre. Council is consulting with the Community on the future of RWH to determine if this is a priority. Early works have already been undertaken to prepare concepts and estimates for other integrated facilities, such as a Performing Arts Centre, however it is currently considered unaffordable in the foreseeable future without adequate grant funding.

Questions ordered based on theme:

Financial position

Why has nothing been done over so many years to get RWH repaired when costs were cheaper and when can staff be back in the building?	The original costs were prepared in 2023 and would be even higher now, in 2026. Council couldn't afford the removal of the asbestos nor felt that the community should have to pay for this via an SRV. Council has sought funding from both the State and Federal Government with no result. Council recently resolved to base staff at the Hub for 10 years, it will be a Council decision on what happens after this.
Can an itemised list of the \$70 million repairs to RWH be published on TRC website?	This was published in the cost report prepared by Blackett Maguire + Goldsmith in April 2023 which can be viewed on the TRC website and by Public Works.
This is a question for Cr Rodda. I noticed you are very vocal about moving back into Ray Walsh however I am keen to know how you think this is sustainable based on the estimated cost of refurbishment vs a new building, especially given the financial position of council. Is this just grand standing?	As per Cr Rodda's answer: Response provided from Cr Rodda - I refer to the anonymous question pertaining to my position regarding Ray Walsh House. I reject the suggestion that my position is "grandstanding." My views on Ray Walsh House have been consistent from the beginning, and they are based on the information available, the concerns raised by the community and the long-term financial interests of ratepayers.

	<p>What residents are entitled to ask is how Council arrived at a situation where, four years after vacating Ray Walsh House, there is still significant uncertainty surrounding the future costs, timelines, and decision-making process. Those are legitimate questions of governance, financial responsibility, transparency, and accountability.</p> <p>As a councillor, I also have a responsibility to ensure decisions are properly scrutinised and that all relevant information is made available to elected representatives and the public. There remain important questions that, in my view, have either not been fully answered or require greater clarity.</p> <p>In relation to Council's financial position, the community is rightly concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple major projects and the level of debt exposure facing Council. It is reasonable to question whether a more measured and staged approach to infrastructure and capital expenditure may have placed Council in a stronger financial position today.</p> <p>My focus remains on ensuring decisions are made transparently, responsibly, and in the best interests of the community — not on political point-scoring. The people of Tamworth deserve open discussion, proper scrutiny of costs and options, and accountability for the decisions that have led us to this point.</p>
<p>What has been the cost of remediation of the Ray Walsh building to Tamworth taxpayers since 2024?</p>	<p>Approximately \$900,000 for the first stage of demolition.</p>
<p>What is the cost of Council staff renting other premises around Tamworth (monthly rental) since Ray Walsh House was vacated?</p>	<p>Since vacating RWH the total rental cost up to and including June 30, 2026, is \$1,557,341.20.</p> <p>We cannot provide monthly rental costs as this is commercial in confidence. Further information is closed to the public pursuant to Section 10A(2) (c)&(d) of the Local Government Act 1993 on the grounds that the matter and information is information that would, if disclosed, confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom Council is conducting (or proposes to conduct) business and commercial information of a confidential position of the person who supplied it.</p>
<p>Council has publicly stated that it would cost \$9 million to fix the asbestos problem in RWH. Council has now leased a West Tamworth property that will cost Council in excess of \$15 million over the next 10 years. Why didn't Council spend \$9 million 4 years ago to fix the asbestos problem in RWH?</p>	<p>Council has resolved to base Council at the Hub for 10 years. The estimated cost to remediate and reoccupy Ray Walsh House is more than \$50 million and potentially as much as \$70 million. The cost to construct a completely new administrative office is likely to be in the similar range. Asbestos removal is only the first step to reoccupy RWH. It would then need to be redeveloped to meet modern</p>

	standards and refurbished. Council cannot afford this.
In the 2023 Consultants report by Concept 2 Reality Consulting the cost comparison for internal refurbishment vs new rebuild is \$49 790 000 Vs new build \$98 400 000. Why have these two figure not been used in discussion of options moving Forward. Clearly refurbishment is the cheaper option. ?	Yes, it is cheaper, but Council cannot afford either option.
Why wasn't the asbestos in the roof cavities removed at the estimated cost of \$9 million?	Council approached the State Government for assistance to undergo this work, given the building was purchased from them. However, no funding was granted. Council was not in a position to fund this, nor saw it as a good use of ratepayers' money. \$9 million was a high level quote provided 3 years ago only for asbestos removal. Full remediation to reoccupy is estimated to cost upwards of \$50 million. The work cannot be done properly in isolation.
On a cost basis, isn't removal of the asbestos for a cost of \$9 million and staying Ray Walsh House less than the ongoing rents Council will now incur at the Old Workman's Club of approximately \$17.5 million and how was the decision to do an internal demolition made?	\$9 million was a high level quote provided 3 years ago only for asbestos removal. Full remediation to reoccupy is estimated to cost upwards of \$50 million.

Staff Relocation

If the cost to build a new building is \$104 million and the cost of repairs to RWH \$70 million and over next 5 years this will increase does this mean the workies club will be the home of TRC staff forever at \$1.3 million a year rent Sounds absurd?	<p>Council has resolved to base Council at the Hub for 10 years. The estimated cost to remediate and reoccupy Ray Walsh House is more than \$50 million and potentially as much as \$70 million. The cost to construct a completely new administrative office is likely to be in the similar range.</p> <p>Council is not currently in a financial position to pursue either of the above options and will require significant time to establish a financial reserve with an appropriate balance along with the financial capacity to contribute towards the long-term solution for office accommodation. Assuming a \$50 million loan at 6% over the next 30 years, the Principal and interest repayments would be \$4.5-\$5 million within the first 5 years.</p>
---	---

Asbestos

<p>Hi, I'm wondering if you can explain the extend of the asbestos in the building and why it had to be gutted of everything?</p>	<p>The key concern is the presence of friable asbestos within the vermiculite fireproofing applied to every structural steel beam within the building. Friable asbestos can be easily disturbed, releasing microscopic fibres into the air. The extent of the asbestos has been published in several EnviroScience Reports available on the TRC website.</p>
<p>Can a third party independent inspection be made to determine the exact amount of asbestos that needs to be removed from RWH?</p>	<p>Yes. That is one of the options being considered by Council. However, even if TRC spends this additional money to cannot afford the estimated costs to remediate. All inspections and valuations to date have been conducted by independent third parties. Reports on these inspections can be viewed on the TRC website.</p>
<p>What was the proportion of asbestos measured in the samples of vermiculite taken from Ray Walsh House for analysis?</p>	<p>The key concern is the presence of friable asbestos within the vermiculite fireproofing applied to every structural steel beam within the building. Friable asbestos can be easily disturbed, releasing microscopic fibres into the air. The extent of the asbestos has been published in several EnviroScience Reports available on the TRC website.</p>
<p>What was the commercial contractor's quote for: a. Sealing-in-place the contaminated vermiculite insulation? b. Removing the contaminated vermiculite insulation?</p>	<p>Council obtained a high level estimate from Public Works in 2023. Council would need to spend more of ratepayers' money to get a more comprehensive quote. Based on feedback provided by occupational hygienists, it is likely asbestos is in additional sources. The encapsulation measures applied in some accessible areas - such as spray sealing or installing steel coverings can reduce immediate risk. However, these are temporary control measures, not permanent solutions. Over time, building movement, aging materials and ongoing maintenance activities can compromise these controls.</p>
<p>Fixing the asbestos problem in RWH is by far the cheapest and most sensible option. It is also the option favoured by most in the community. Why has Council over the last 4 years focused its resources on building a new Council building instead of fixing the asbestos problem?</p>	<p>Council hasn't focused it's resources on building a new Council building. The estimated cost to remediate and reoccupy Ray Walsh House is more than \$50 million and potentially as much as \$70 million. The cost to construct a completely new administrative office is likely to be in the similar range. Asbestos removal is only the first step to reoccupy RWH. It would then need to be redeveloped to meet modern standards and refurbished. Council cannot afford this.</p>
<p>Where exactly is the location of the asbestos contaminant that is to be removed?</p>	<p>Friable asbestos is present within the vermiculite fireproofing applied to every structural steel beam within the building across the 5 floors. The encapsulation measures applied in some accessible areas - such as spray sealing or</p>

	<p>installing steel coverings can reduce immediate risk. However, these are temporary control measures, not permanent solutions. Over time, building movement, aging materials and ongoing maintenance activities can compromise these controls.</p>
<p>What year was the last asbestos register and management plan done for Ray Walsh House identifying where asbestos contaminated materials were eg in air conditioning system and since staff vacated RWH in 2022 has a health assessment of all staff been done re Work Health and Safety Regulation 2017?</p>	<p>An Asbestos Register and Management Plan was completed for Ray Walsh House in 2020.</p>
<p>Premise: There are thousands of buildings of similar age, size and construction-type to RWH, located in towns right across Australia, which have successfully addressed the same issue of aging air conditioning systems in proximity to vermiculite fire proofing without needing to be abandoned; FACT.</p>	<p>Friable asbestos is present within the vermiculite fireproofing applied to every structural steel beam within the building. In RWH the detection of asbestos in plant rooms during maintenance activities shows that disturbance of materials during routine work can create exposure pathways. Even tasks as simple as servicing air conditioning systems or replacing light fittings can pose a risk if asbestos containing materials are present nearby. The encapsulation measures applied in some accessible areas - such as spray sealing or installing steel coverings can reduce immediate risk. However, these are temporary control measures, not permanent solutions. Over time, building movement, aging materials and ongoing maintenance activities can compromise these controls. While some other buildings may have been able to afford full remediation or short term solutions such as encapsulation, TRC is not in a position to do so. Additionally, it has been seen in other buildings like Sydney's RBA building (\$260m to \$1.2b renovation cost) that remediation costs can increase as the extent of asbestos becomes clearer.</p>
<p>Q. What is it about the installation or decommissioning of the air conditioning system that uniquely necessitated the abandonment of the building, rather than proceed with remedial work routinely carried out under such circumstances elsewhere, to enable its safe inhabitation?</p>	<p>Staff were ordered to vacate RWH in 2022 after the failure of the air conditioning system servicing three of the five floors of the building. The presence of friable asbestos was found in Vermiculite fire protection sprayed on all structural steel floor members. This meant that the replacement of the air conditioning system was not possible without first removing the asbestos-containing material. As an employer, Council's key responsibility under the law is to provide a safe workplace. With the safety and wellbeing of staff foremost, there was a staged relocation of workers from the premises. The priority was determined according to the level of known potential risk to the health of staff. Council could not afford the estimated costs to remediate RWH.</p>

<p>OK there is asbestos in the building, But there is asbestos in probably 1/3 of the houses in Tamworth. If you have asbestos in your house that Failed you would not sell it cheaply to someone who would fix it up cheaply and benefit from it would you???.</p>	<p>Friable asbestos is present within the vermiculite fireproofing applied to every structural steel beam within the building and is different to bonded asbestos generally found in houses. In RWH the detection of asbestos in plant rooms during maintenance activities shows that disturbance of materials during routine work can create exposure pathways. Even tasks as simple as servicing air conditioning systems or replacing light fittings can pose a risk if asbestos containing materials are present nearby. The encapsulation measures applied in some accessible areas - such as spray sealing or installing steel coverings can reduce immediate risk. However, these are temporary control measures, not permanent solutions. Over time, building movement, aging materials and ongoing maintenance activities can compromise these controls. Councillors will consider the options at hand on behalf of the community.</p>
<p>Would Council please clarify the current status of the asbestos remediation works above ceiling height and why extensive internal stripping and demolition below ceiling height commenced prior to completion of those works?</p>	<p>The asbestos has not yet been remediated from Ray Walsh House. Internal stripping and demolition took place prior to this to ensure that the asbestos could be more easily removed and not contaminate more material in the process, leading to more contaminated material to dispose of.</p>
<p>When was the last asbestos register done for Ray Walsh House designating where exactly the asbestos was ?</p>	<p>An Asbestos Register and Management Plan was completed for Ray Walsh House in 2020.</p>

Memorabilia

<p>When RWH house was gutted where were the marble tiles, custom made lectern desk and podium, and the autographed framed photo of the queen removed to and where are they now?</p>	<p>Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive. There is a framed photograph of the Queen opening Ray Walsh House with Alderman Ray Walsh in 1977 but it is not autographed on the front or the back. A lot of furniture was relocated or donated. Any furniture not relocated was destroyed and put in landfill. A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. However, the cost to do so prevented this.</p>
<p>Where is the picture of the queen?</p>	<p>Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive. There is a framed photograph of the Queen opening Ray Walsh House with Alderman Ray Walsh in 1977.</p>
<p>Whilst it's too late now, why were the marble floor tiles removed given that the Romans first laid marble in the 1st century BC and they are still in place with millions of tourists walking over them.</p>	<p>A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to</p>

What did these hard surface tiles have to do with overhead asbestos?	move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after.
In 2023 RWH interior was stripped removing all below ceiling level including the "Sicilian marble tiles" and original wall plaque when Queen Elizabeth 11 opened the building in 1977. Was a register compiled of these VIP cultural, historic items and where are they now or have they been destroyed?	Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive. There is a framed photograph of the Queen opening Ray Walsh House with Alderman Ray Walsh in 1977 but it is not autographed on the front or the back.
Was the opening plaque for RWH unveiled by Queen Elizabeth 11 in 1977 destroyed when interior of building was stripped in 2023?	No, the opening plaque for Ray Walsh House was not destroyed when the building work was undertaken in 2023. The Plaque is currently stored in Council's archives.
Was the opening plaque for Ray Walsh House unveiled by Queen Elizabeth 11 in 1977 destroyed when the interior of the building was stripped in 2023?	No, the opening plaque for Ray Walsh House was not destroyed when the building work was undertaken in 2023. The Plaque is currently stored in Council's archives.
Where now is the opening wall plaque for RWH that Queen Elizabeth 11 unveiled in 1977 which originally was in the entry foyer with the Sicilian marble tiles?	Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive.

Oakburn Park

Can Tamworth Regional Council sell Oakburn Park to the Tamworth Sporting Car Club to cover the costs of asbestos removal from Ray Walsh House?	Council is not considering selling Oakburn Park at the present time and the proceeds from such sale would not cover the cost of the asbestos removal. Council does not feel the community would wish to see community assets sold in order to provide staff accommodation.
--	--

Performing Arts Centre / Civic Precinct

Instead of sinking millions into remediating an obsolete building, why isn't Council investing in an integrated civic precinct that eliminates external lease costs and serves as a high-yield 'economic engine' to drive tourism and regional growth?	Tamworth Regional Council does not have the funds within the next ten years to refurbish RWH or build a new admin building. At present we need to deal with the issue of the future of RWH, however, if a new, integrated facility is a priority for the community and funding can be identified, then that could potentially be part of the 10 year plan from 2036.
Asbestos aside, with Ray Walsh House failing modern service standards and Council paying high rent for an unsuitable theatre, why are we subsidising a 'sick' building and private leases instead of building a modern consolidated, Council-owned asset?	Tamworth Regional Council does not have the funds within the next ten years to refurbish RWH or build a new admin building. At present we need to deal with the issue of the future of RWH, however, if a new, integrated facility is a priority for the community and funding can be identified, then that could potentially be part of the 10 year plan from

	2036. Early works have already been undertaken to prepare concepts and estimates for other integrated facilities, such as a Performing Arts Centre, however it is currently considered unaffordable in the foreseeable future without adequate grant funding.
Why is Tamworth Regional Council prioritising the proposed Ray Walsh House redevelopment over the long-discussed Performing Arts Centre and Precinct, despite the major economic, tourism and cultural benefits a contemporary Performing Arts Centre could deliver for the region?	There has been no decision to prioritise RWH over a Performing Arts Centre. Council is consulting with the Community on the future of RWH to determine if this is a priority. Early works have already been undertaken to prepare concepts and estimates for other integrated facilities, such as a Performing Arts Centre, however it is currently considered unaffordable in the foreseeable future without adequate grant funding.
Has Council considered incorporating Council office space above a new Performing Arts Centre to create a multi-purpose civic and cultural	Yes, It is an option under consideration, however funding may be harder to get once administration offices are combined with either a Performing Arts Centre or Visitor Experience Centre. Grants do not fund Council Offices.
I'm just wondering why Council is planning to spend so much money upgrading office space at Ray Walsh House when Tamworth still doesn't have a proper Performing Arts Centre?	There has been no decision to prioritise RWH over a Performing Arts Centre. Council is consulting with the Community on the future of RWH to determine if this is a priority. Early works have already been undertaken to prepare concepts and estimates for other integrated facilities, such as a Performing Arts Centre, however it is currently considered unaffordable in the foreseeable future without adequate grant funding.
Has there been any thought about combining the projects so the community gets more value for the money being spent? For example, having Council offices included as part of a new arts and entertainment precinct?	Yes, It is an option under consideration, however funding may be harder to get once administration offices are combined with either a Performing Arts Centre or Visitor Experience Centre. Grants do not fund Council Offices.

Other Projects including Skywalk and Aquatics Centre

Who in their right mind would spend \$4mil plus to build a skywalk when they don't have a home.	The Skywalk project received state government funding. Additional funding from TRC has been invested in this community infrastructure project to serve and benefit the entire community and boost visitation. RWH only houses and benefits Council staff.
Why aim at the Taj Mahal of swimming pools when money is so tight	Similarly, The Tamworth Aquatics Centre project has received State and Federal government grants, therefore the project need to meet certain deadlines to obtain the funding. Additional funding from TRC has been invested in this community infrastructure project to serve and benefit the entire community and boost visitation. RWH only houses and benefits Council staff.

Soft demolition works to date

<p>When RWH house was gutted where were the marble tiles, custom made lectern desk and podium, and the autographed framed photo of the queen removed to and where are they now?</p>	<p>Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive. There is a framed photograph of the Queen opening Ray Walsh House with Alderman Ray Walsh in 1977 but it is not autographed on the front or the back. A lot of furniture was relocated or donated. Any furniture not relocated was destroyed and put in landfill. A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. However, the cost to do so prevented this.</p>
<p>Who was responsible for the decision to totally demolish the interior of ray Walsh house down to marble floor tiles that would not have been affected by asbestos?</p>	<p>The Councillors were advised by Public Works which had experience with other government buildings to undergo a soft demolition. Councillors were advised it would be more cost effective to strip the floors and walls, ready for reoccupation renovations before the asbestos was removed.</p>
<p>Why were the tiles removed, and where are they now?</p>	<p>The tiles were put in landfill. A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. However, the cost to do so prevented this.</p>
<p>Did the cicilian pearl marble tiles have asbestos in them</p>	<p>No, the tiles did not have asbestos in them. A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after.</p>
<p>Was Furniture sold prior to the decision to abandon remediation of Ray Walsh House? Was this furniture decontaminated from asbestos for public sale</p>	<p>Yes, some furniture was sold, some donated and some re-homed for Council staff. However, no decision to abandon remediation of RWH has been made.</p>
<p>What was the reason for removal of the terrazzo floor tiles in the foyer area?</p>	<p>A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it</p>

	would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after.
Why was it completely gutted in over kill but the asbestos remains and where did all the furnishing's and valuable fittings go, were they considered rubbish or were they sold.	The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after. Any memorabilia from the building such as plaques and pictures are held in Council's archive. A lot of furniture was relocated, sold or donated. Any furniture not relocated was destroyed and put in landfill.
Would Council please clarify whether this level of internal stripping and demolition was necessary as part of the asbestos remediation process and who approved the adoption of this approach?	A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Council received advice from the contractor that it would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after.
The substantial amount of demolition that was done throughout Ray Walsh House, even in the foyer where no asbestos was present. If refurbishment was required and that was Councils direction, then why was such a project even commenced without any Government funding in place?	A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after. The intention was for Council to fund the remediation and refurbishment however when the costs started to escalate higher than original projected estimates the project was scope was reviewed with the Council on whether we can proceed without Government funding.
Why was it necessary to destroy everything on ground floor when no asbestos was there ?	A contractor was engaged to do soft demolition and had salvage rights over all other materials. The tiles were stripped, as the intention was to modernise and reoccupy the building once remediated. If Council was to reoccupy RWH the concept was to move Customer Service to the front of the building and therefore the flooring and fixtures would have been removed anyway. Advice was received that it

	would be more economical if this was done before the asbestos removal rather than after.
--	--

Access to evidence

Did TRC open Tender for the remediation of RWH and if so how many companies were given the opportunity to physically respond?	TRC did not go to tender for remediation of Ray Walsh House. The process of the soft demolition works was run independently by Public Works.
Given that Councils own Asbestos Report described the asbestos issues as minor, why weren't options properly discussed at Council Meetings for the remedying of the asbestos issues. Why was there no Consultancy report or costings done so Councillors could discuss this option?	Without referencing the particular report, Council cannot respond to this question.
Can TRC provide documentary evidence of any applications made for funding prior to the internal gutting works, formal refurbishment plans being considered prior to gutting & written advice/recommendation or approval from Public Works to gut it prior to such funding being secured?	Every document relating to Ray Walsh House is available publicly on the TRC website.
Can TRC provide evidence for public viewing regarding the repair/replacement costs for a/c failure. If not, why not because otherwise the key decision makers require independent accountability for the financial & strategic mismanagement that has led to the position we are in today?	Every document relating to Ray Walsh House is available publicly on the TRC website.

Health

Have staff had baseline health test for asbestos contamination and continuing health monitoring	Yes and any further information is private between Council and its affected staff.
Is Council aware of any person who has suffered an asbestos-related injury whilst working at Ray Walsh House?	No, Council is not aware of any asbestos related injuries. However there are staff at Council whose health is being monitored in relation to asbestos. Health effects do not occur immediately and will present many years later.

Options

How will Tamworth Regional Council incorporate feedback received through the Ray Walsh House community information sessions into its decision-making process, particularly given its statutory obligations regarding the management and disposal of public assets?	Councillors have been listening and gathering extensive feedback from the community, including questions and concerns noted at the Community Information Session. An online form for feedback will be open for submission until May 29, 2026. Council will take this into consideration, with a final report to be presented to Council on June 16, 2026 and a decision made at a public Council Meeting. In the event, Council votes to investigate selling
--	--

	options, a public auction process will be considered.
The infrastructure there of the building telecommunication and the outer and car parking arrangements for staff there are impressive. Why can't we just improvise and rejuvenate what we have to make use of this magnificent building and revitalise the shops used by staff in the main centre.	Council does not have adequate funds to undertake this option.
Looking to the future and given modern day communications and ways of doing business, is it necessary to have a council headquarters in the CBD if it may cost less to have a building with 21st century technology in it built elsewhere?	No, it is not necessary for Council to have a building in the CBD.
Could fund raising amongst ratepayers and businesses in some way be an option considering the love for the place. A loan serviced by a rate rise if public agree. It is central, it has heritage value, it is a unique design it appears plenty big enough plus other values I'm sure	Financial estimates suggest a 10-15% rate rise would need to occur, for Council to consider covering the costs to remediate and reoccupy RWH.
Why has there not been a simple like for like comparison provide for options considered? Internal refurbishment to a green 5 star standard depreciation over 50 yrs vs newbuild at a green 5 star standard depreciation over 50 yrs?	A like for like for RWH and a new build cannot be done accurately. There are complexities with making RWH energy efficient given the concrete and glass construction. A new build would be designed to be energy efficient from the start. However, Council cannot afford this option. Some preliminary work has already been completed, but more detailed work will cost more money at the expense of the community.
Can the councillors be held accountable for their actions in this instance for the selling of RWH?, especially when it will be repaired at a fraction of the cost quoted by the Mayor,... If not why not?	Councillors will be making the best decision for the community on next steps with all available information at hand. Councillors have been listening and gathering extensive feedback from the community, including questions and concerns noted at the Community Information Session. An online form for feedback will be open for submission until May 29, 2026. Council will take this into consideration, with a final report to be presented to Council on June 16, 2026 and a decision made at a public Council Meeting. In the event, Council votes to investigate selling options, a public auction process will be considered.