

Guy Weirich's Interventions at the Municipal Council Meeting of 5 June 2026

During this council meeting, which was largely dominated by “technical-administrative” matters, Guy Weirich mainly sought to obtain a number of clarifications, also in the interest of the public.

06 B: He wanted to know whether renovation work would be carried out at the “d’Rackett” premises before the new tenant takes over the restaurant and wondered whether this might explain the substantial increase in rent (63% compared with 2024). He learned that the increase was primarily due to index adjustments that have taken place in this sector over recent years.

06 C: He welcomed the work being carried out in the garden of the house rented by the municipality in order to provide young people with housing at affordable rates. He learned that this work is being carried out and financed by the owner.

08 B: Among the numerous revenue items, he highlighted three points. First, he put the substantial state allocation from the *Fonds de dotation globale des communes* (€39,870,909.31) into perspective by comparing it with the corresponding allocation received in 2016. At that time, the allocation amounted to €10,748,519. The revenue of the ordinary budget then stood at €36,067,360. Guy Weirich pointed out that the current state allocation alone exceeds the entire budget of that period. His objective was to illustrate the evolution of municipal finances over the past ten years and to provide a concrete sense of the magnitude of today’s allocation.

His second point concerned the budget item of €240,993.13 entitled “Reimbursement by private individuals for damage caused to public roads.” He obtained confirmation that such damage is caused during construction works — primarily as a result of the necessary utility connections — and that the costs must be borne by the developers or property owners concerned.

Finally, he suggested a minor improvement by ensuring that the correct designation of the relevant revenue item is indicated in a particular place.

11 B: Regarding the PAP Pourpelt, Guy Weirich expressed regret that a proposal put forward by the Evaluation Committee (*Cellule d’évaluation*) can no longer be implemented. According to this proposal, one of the houses should have been oriented differently in order to enhance the attractiveness of the future public square. The committee’s arguments were as follows:

“This orientation would create an additional main façade facing the square, thereby strengthening its visibility and attractiveness. It would also contribute to a livelier public space by generating more openings, entrances and daily movement flows associated with residents travelling to and from their homes.”

Nevertheless, Weirich understands the technical reasons that now prevent such a modification from being made.

He also obtained confirmation that the remarkable hedge located on the embankment, which separates this neighbourhood from the road network in its lower section, will be preserved, both for its function as a noise barrier and for its ecological importance.