

COUNCIL AGENDA

TUESDAY, 13TH MARCH 2012



GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL

* *The General Manager certifies that the reports contained in this Agenda have been written by qualified persons under Section 65 of the Local Government Act 1993.*

Hour: 3.00 p.m.

Present:

In attendance:

Leave of Absence:

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date: Monday, 27th February 2012

Purpose: To discuss:

- GASP Stage 2
- Derwent Estuary Program Presentation
- Integrity Commission
- Graffiti Prevention and/or Removal Grant Program
- Tour of McKay Timber Yards
- General Business

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.	APOLOGIES	4
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	4
3.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	4

4.	PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION	4
5.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	4
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES).....	4
7.	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS.....	4
	COMMUNITY	5
8.	PROVISION OF CRIME STATISTICS BY TASMANIA POLICE	6
9.	APPLICATION TO THE PROCEEDS OF CRIME GRAFFITI PREVENTION AND REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAM	7
10.	AUSTRALIA DAY CELEBRATIONS IN GLENORCHY	10
	ECONOMIC	13
11.	HOBART CAPITAL CITY PLAN 2011-2040	14
12.	NEW REGIONAL TOURISM ORGANISATION - TOURISM SOUTHERN TASMANIA.....	24
	GOVERNANCE	28
13.	MEMBERSHIP OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA.....	29
14.	SOUTHERN WASTE STRATEGY AUTHORITY - QUARTERLY REPORT DECEMBER 2011	35
15.	NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE	36
	CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	36
16.	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	36
	COMMUNITY	36
17.	PUBLIC LAND DISPOSAL AND RATIONALISATION PROGRAM 2011/12 - 65-67 CHAPEL STREET AND 191-197 CHAPEL STREET, GLENORCHY.....	36
18.	DEVELOPMENT OF LAWN BOWLS FACILITIES STRATEGY FOR THE CITY OF GLENORCHY	36

19.	INTRODUCTION OF WEEKLY KERBSIDE & GREENWASTE COLLECTION.....	36
GOVERNANCE		37
20.	SOUTHERN WATER QUARTERLY REPORT TO THE OWNERS' REPRESENTATIVES	37
21.	NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)	37

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 14th February 2012 be confirmed.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

COMMUNITY

8. PROVISION OF CRIME STATISTICS BY TASMANIA POLICE

Author: Executive Manager - Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

Qualified Person: Executive Manager - Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

File Reference: Crime Statistics

Community Plan Reference:

A Safer Community

1.2.2 Ensure accurate and adequate provision of crime statistics.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

1.3.10 Partner with other stakeholders to implement crime prevention, community safety and fear of crime initiatives in consultation with the community.

Reporting Brief:

A presentation on crime trends will be given by Inspector Grant Twining of Glenorchy Police.

Proposal in Detail:

A presentation of crime trends will be given by Inspector Grant Twining of Glenorchy Police.

Consultations:

No consultations have been required to produce this report.

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

None envisaged.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

None envisaged.

Recommendation:

That Council receive the presentation by Inspector Grant Twining of Glenorchy Police on crime trends in the Glenorchy Local Government area.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

9. APPLICATION TO THE PROCEEDS OF CRIME GRAFFITI PREVENTION AND REDUCTION GRANT PROGRAM

Author: Executive Manager - Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

Qualified Person: Executive Manager - Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

ECM File Reference: Graffiti Management Group

Community Plan Reference:

3.1.2 Implement and evaluate initiatives that respond to crime and safety issues identified through police crime data and through community consultation.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

1.3.10 Partner with other stakeholders to implement crime prevention, community safety and fear of crime initiatives in consultation with the community.

Reporting Brief:

To seek approval from Council to submit an application for CCTV installation in the Glenorchy CBD under the Commonwealth Proceeds of Crime Graffiti Prevention, Reduction and /or removal Grant Program.

Proposal in Detail:

The Commonwealth Government recently announced the Proceeds of Crime Funding Round for 2012. The focus of this round is Graffiti Prevention, reduction and /or removal.

The guidelines for the 2012 funding round specifically cite the provision of CCTV in graffiti hotspots as an example of projects which this funding round will support.

Applications for the 2012 grants close on Friday March 16 2012.

Funding available through this round is \$50,000 - \$150,000 per application.

Graffiti is a significant issue for Glenorchy City Council and for the community. The presence of graffiti has an impact on the perception of safety that residents and visitors have of the city and is an issue that has repeatedly been identified as a concern by business owners in surveys conducted through Council's former Economic Development Unit.

Council has responded to the issue of graffiti through the development and adoption of a Graffiti Management Plan. This plan specifically deals with removal, education, prevention and enforcement. One of the specific principles documented in the Glenorchy Graffiti Management Plan in relation to prevention is the use of the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

One of the commonly used CPTED measures in graffiti management is CCTV.

In 2007-2009 the NSW Department of Justice and Attorney General undertook a review of graffiti reduction demonstration projects. Eight Councils with a high incidence of graffiti were funded to implement a graffiti reduction project using one of 3 strategies: CPTED including CCTV (3 councils), rapid removal (3 councils) and volunteer programs (2 councils). The review found that CPTED was the most effective as all 3 Councils reported a reduction in the incidence of graffiti at the intervention sites and improved “visual amenity” of locations. The review also found no displacement was observed and there was increased community ownership of sites.

The provision of fixed CCTV installations in the Glenorchy CBD and the availability of mobile units for other specific graffiti hotspots in the City would add to the overall suite of measures that Council has in place to manage, reduce and prevent graffiti.

The opportunity to obtain funding for fixed and mobile CCTV cameras as part of the City’s graffiti management strategy has the support of Tasmania Police. Meetings have been held with the Glenorchy Divisional Inspector and the Detective Inspector of Glenorchy CIB and also with the Senior Sergeant of the Counter Terrorism Unit of Tasmania Police. This unit has a coordination role in relation to CCTV installations across the state and through the unit provides advice to councils on crime assessments and technical specifications for CCTV.

The role of the Counter Terrorism Unit, Tasmania Police in relation to CCTV installations has addressed a number of issues which have previously been identified as impediments to the operation of CCTV. There are now 480 cameras across the State which are integrated into the Tasmania Police system and the Police Radio Dispatch Centre in Hobart has monitoring access to all the cameras thereby obviating the necessity for individual Councils to assume the responsibility and costs associated with monitoring. Tasmania Police also take responsibility for the intellectual property issues associated with the digital images.

The Senior Sergeant Counter Terrorism Unit has facilitated the provision of advice on the system requirements and costings for a funding application to the Proceeds of Crime Grant Fund 2012. The application will seek funding for 16 fixed cameras, 4 mobile cameras, associated installation and electrical costs and funding for monitoring equipment to be based at the Glenorchy Police station. This monitoring equipment will be in addition to the equipment already in place at the Police Radio Dispatch Centre in Hobart. The only cost to Council in relation to this application would be an annual budget allocation of approximately \$3,000 for routine maintenance of the CCTV equipment.

An application through this funding program for CCTV to prevent and reduce graffiti in the Glenorchy CBD and other graffiti hotspots is consistent with the intent of a resolution of Council at its meeting of July 18 2011 at which Council resolved to “commence to facilitate in conjunction with all tiers of government and local businesses, through grants, other financial assistance and in kind assistance, the installation of closed circuit TV (CCTV) in the Glenorchy CBD as a pilot project “.

Consultations:

ELT

Aldermen at the Council Workshop of February 27

Engineering Project staff

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The grant application does not require any cash contribution from Council.

All costs associated with the purchase and installation of equipment will be sought through the grant. The work will be done through specialist contractors.

Current Year \$3000

Next Year \$3000

Future Years \$3000 and any costs associated with equipment replacement/upgrade.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

engagement strategy will be implemented to inform the community of the initiative.

Recommendation:

That Council support the application to the Commonwealth Government Proceeds of Crime 2012 Funding Round for the installation of fixed and mobile CCTV units in the Glenorchy CBD and other identified graffiti hot spots and monitoring equipment to support Council's overall Graffiti Management Plan.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

10. AUSTRALIA DAY CELEBRATIONS IN GLENORCHY

Author: Executive Manager - Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

Qualified Person: Executive Manager - Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

ECM File Reference: Australia Day

Community Plan Reference:

1.1.20 Continue to foster and support community cultural activities and events that promote identity and civic pride at a local and city-wide level.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

1.31 Foster and support community cultural events and projects which celebrate Glenorchy's Cultural Diversity and build identify inclusion and city pride.

Reporting Brief:

To respond to a request from Aldermen for information on Australia Day celebrations in Glenorchy.

Proposal in Detail:

Prior to 2008, Glenorchy City Council did not hold any Australia Day events or celebrations on January 26.

The Council's recognition of Australia Day was in the form of a luncheon held on the day before Australia Day. Members of the community were invited to purchase tickets to attend the luncheon and the format of the luncheon was a guest speaker and the announcement of the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year. The last luncheon was held in 2010.

In 2008, Council initiated the celebration of Australia on January 26. The first such celebration was held on the front lawns of Council on January 26, 2008 and consisted of the announcement of the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year, a Citizenship Ceremony, community entertainment and a BBQ. Council allocated funding in the budget of \$5,500 to this event and a State Government Australia Day Grant of \$1,000 was also secured. Approximately 200 people attended the event.

In 2009, the Australia Day celebration was held at Tolosa Park. Again the event consisted of the announcement of the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year, a Citizenship Ceremony, a community BBQ and entertainment. Council allocated funding in the budget of \$9,900 for the Australia Day event and a \$500 grant was obtained through the State Government Australia Day Local Government Grants Program.

The grant acquittal report to the State Government indicated that approximately 150 people attended this event.

In 2010 the event was again held at Tolosa Park and consisted of the announcement of the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year, a Citizenship Ceremony, a BBQ provided at no cost by the Lions Club of the City of Glenorchy and a performance by the City of Glenorchy Concert Brass. Because of financial constraints, Council made the decision not to include any funding in the budget for Australia Day. The funding criteria for the State Government Australia Day Grants changed for events in 2010. Councils could only receive funding if they were proposing to hold a different form of celebration from that which they had previously held. This precluded Council from accessing this grant for the 2010 event which was the same as that held in the previous year. Estimated attendance numbers were 200 people.

In 2011, a larger scale community event was held at Tolosa Park on January 26 to celebrate Australia Day. The event was planned by a committee consisting of both Council and community representatives and was badged as "Australia Day in the Park". The key activities at the event were the announcement of the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year, a Citizenship Ceremony, a concert and family activities. The performers at the concert were young people who had participated in the Telstra sponsored "School of Rock".

Activities that were provided for children and families included an African Drumming Workshop, henna tattooing, flag making and painting, Life. Be In It, Tai Chi, the Mobile Activities Centre and Cheerleading. A BBQ was provided by the Northern Suburbs Athletics Club. The attendance estimate was around 300 people.

Because the 2011 event was a new model of event for Glenorchy, Council was able to access \$1,180.00 in funding from the State Government Australia Day Grants Program and also gained \$5000 in sponsorship from the Glenorchy Telstra Shop. Council had not included any funds for Australia Day in the 2010/11 Annual Budget.

In 2012 the Australia Day event was held at the Glenorchy Civic Centre and consisted of the announcement of the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year and a Citizenship Ceremony. Morning tea was provided for those in attendance and one of the rooms at the Civic Centre was set up with simple, no cost activities for children. Approximately 200 people attended the event. Again Council had made no allocation in the 2011/12 budget for Australia Day but \$1396.96 was expended on the event.

Consultations:

As this report is confined to the provision of factual information on Australia Day events which have been held in Glenorchy, no consultation was required.

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

If Council wishes to continue to conduct an event on Australia Day, there are human resource and financial implications that need to be considered by Council. The scale and nature of the event and the availability of external sponsorship will impact on

the level of financial contribution required by Council. The scale and nature of the event also impacts on the level and availability of staff resources required.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

As this report is confined to the provision of factual information on Australia Day events which have been held in Glenorchy, no community consultation has been undertaken in the preparation of this report.

implemented to gauge community opinion.

Recommendation:

1. That the information in this report be noted by Council.
2. That the terms of reference for the Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year Selection Committee be amended to include the review of Glenorchy City Council's Australia Day event with the committee preparing a report for consideration by Council prior to the commencement of planning for the 2013 event.
3. That Council consider the allocation of \$2,000 in the 2012/13 annual budget for the 2013 Australia Day event.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

ECONOMIC

11. HOBART CAPITAL CITY PLAN 2011-2040

Author: Manager City Strategy (Tony McMullen)

Qualified Person: Manager City Strategy (Tony McMullen)

ECM File Reference: Greater Hobart Capital City Project

Community Plan Reference:

4.2.5 Advocate for a regional and state strategic planning and policy framework within which economic growth in Glenorchy can develop.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

2.1.4 Partner with others to promote economic development in the City and the Region.

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's endorsement of a submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission on the draft Hobart Capital City Plan 2011-2040.

Proposal in Detail:

What is the Hobart Capital City Plan?

The Hobart Capital City Plan (the Plan) is a 30 year plan for Greater Hobart, the purpose of which is "to develop a coherent strategic approach to the future evolution of the City of Hobart".

Because of its size, the draft Plan is too large to attach to this report. The draft Plan may be downloaded from the Tasmanian Planning Commission's website at: http://www.planning.tas.gov.au/the_planning_system/national_planning#draft

The Plan was prepared as a result of a COAG directive that States prepare Capital City Plans by 1 January 2012.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission placed the Plan on public exhibition until 29 February 2012. Council officers sought and obtained an extension of time until 14th March 2012 to enable the Plan and a submission on it to be fully considered by Council.

The Plan's vision is:

"that Hobart will be a vibrant, dynamic and attractive City, a globally connected place that fosters cultural expression, innovation and growth, and which provides a liveable, sustainable and prosperous lifestyle." (p. 25).

The Plan draws together a range of existing strategic documents that have been prepared at State and regional level, including:

- Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2035;
- Southern Integrated Transport Plan;
- State Infrastructure Strategy;
- Tasmanian Economic Development Strategy;
- Tasmania Together 2020; and
- Tasmanian Framework for Action on Climate Change

“One of the key objectives of this Capital City Plan is to conceptually unify Greater Hobart and to integrate disparate State and Local Government strategies and policies into a coherent framework that will support strategically planned growth, improved infrastructure and enhanced community outcomes.

This Capital City Plan draws together a number of previously generated strategic plans and vision documents, including those of Councils and State Government agencies, to conceptualise a coherent vision for Greater Hobart as a whole.

It develops an integrated strategic framework of near, medium and long term actions and priorities to guide Councils, State Government agencies, utilities providers and the private sector in their investment and planning decisions and address the serious challenges which the city faces now and in the future.” (p. 3)

Background

The Plan responds to a directive from the COAG Reform Council, an independent body that supports the Council of Australian Governments’ reform agenda, that each State prepare a Capital City Plan by 1 January 2012.

This is part of broader work that the COAG Reform Council (CRC) is carrying out at the request of COAG to:

- review capital city strategic planning systems against agreed national criteria
- support continuous national improvement in capital city strategic planning
- and build and share knowledge of best practice planning approaches.

‘To ensure Australian cities are globally competitive, productive, sustainable, liveable and socially inclusive and are well placed to meet future challenges and growth.’

Capital City Planning Criteria

The CRC established nine criteria for future strategic planning of capital cities:

Capital city strategic planning systems should:

1. be integrated across functions and government agencies;
2. provide for a consistent hierarchy of future oriented and publicly available plans;

3. provide for nationally-significant economic infrastructure (both new and upgrade of existing);
4. address nationally-significant policy issues;
5. consider and strengthen the networks between capital cities and major regional centres, and other important domestic and international connections;
6. provide for planned, sequenced and evidence-based land release and an appropriate balance of infill and greenfields development;
7. clearly identify priorities for investment and policy effort by governments, and provide an effective framework for private sector investment and innovation;
8. encourage world-class urban design and architecture; and
9. provide effective implementation arrangements and supporting mechanisms,

The CRC has appointed an expert advisory panel, with a range of eminent persons, to assist it with its work.

The CRC's report on the review of capital city strategic planning systems against national criteria is now due for public release in April 2012 because the Queensland government elections has put that government into caretaker mode.

Process

A Project Steering Committee was set up, comprising State government department heads and Council General Managers as well as representation from Southern Water and the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority.

A Project Reference Group was also established comprising officers from State government, local government and the Commission.

After some initial workshops at the Commission, the carriage of the process was handed over to the State Architect who essentially prepared a draft Plan in house.

The draft Plan was circulated for officer-level comment in October.

Council officers provided the following comments on the draft Plan (in summary):

- Initiatives are identified with 2015, 2025 and 2040 timeframes. How does this sit with the H:30 label?
- A need to explain where the Plan fits into the larger planning context;
- No details have been provided on the governance and implementation of the plan – structure, KPIs, assignment of agency responsibility for initiatives;
- The document is difficult to navigate because of the unnecessary complexity of its structure, with 8 levels or pseudo-levels to navigate – vision, dimensions, key sectors, focus areas, catchwords, objectives, directions and initiatives;
- There is a lot of repetition of initiatives under the Plan – giving the impression of trying to pad out an insubstantial document e.g. one initiative was repeated 8 times and another 7 times;
- The direction of the Plan for Hobart's future is fundamentally sound but could be more clearly articulated;

- The document is fairly comprehensive. However, there are some obvious gaps – energy efficiency initiatives through building regulation, scarcity of land use planning initiatives relating to economic development, nothing about the grey economy, little about Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.

Structure

The Plan's structure is as follows:

- Why Hobart Needs a Plan
- Geographical Scope of the Plan
- Hobart in 2011 – Challenges, Constraints, Opportunities
- Local and regional strategies
- State and Commonwealth Policies
- Vision
- Objectives and Directions
- Implementation

Content

Why Hobart Needs a Plan (p. 3)

The thesis of the Plan is that Greater Hobart is essentially made up of a number of separate local government jurisdictions and there is a need to improve integration in order to improve planning outcomes for the Capital City as a whole.

The Plan would be strengthened and made more honest, by a statement in this section which recognises the State's role in planning for the capital city and its need to also lift its game to improve outcomes.

Geographical Scope of the Plan (p. 4)

The Plan essentially identifies the capital city according to the Regional Land Use Strategy's definition of Greater Hobart. However, it does not repeat the definition – so those who have not read the Regional Strategy will be none the wiser. It is suggested that the definition of the spatial scope of the Plan be explicitly stated in the Strategy – i.e. *Means the land contained within the Statistical Local Areas of Brighton, Clarence, Glenorchy, Hobart Inner, Hobart Outer, Kingborough Part A and Sorell Part A. It includes the metropolitan area and dormitory suburbs.* (Regional Land Use Strategy, p. 95).

Hobart in 2011 – The Challenges

Projected population growth over the next 35 years will increase pressure on housing availability and affordability, infrastructure and services.

Impacts of an ageing population will be greater in Tasmania than the mainland states, requiring greater investment in housing choice, health, infrastructure and ancillary services.

Currently, employment is highly centralised in the City of Hobart. As employment grows there will be a need to better match employment and residential location.

Greater Hobart is one of the least densely settled capital cities in Australia. Housing is still largely developed on the urban fringe. There is a lack of housing choice and affordability is declining.

There has been increasing conflict between residential uses and natural and agricultural resources due to a lack of proper growth management.

Climate change could significantly affect Hobart through e.g. sea level rise, more frequent and intense storm surge and greater bushfire risk.

There is a need to better integrate transport and land use planning to counter a high level of private car dependency, a small dispersed and ageing population and limited resources for major network changes.

Hobart in 2011 – The Constraints

Scale – Tasmania has a small population and limited resources and will increasingly need to maximise the potential of existing infrastructure networks and services;

Distance – Tasmania is geographically isolated, which creates a competitive disadvantage for export industries.

Governance – Greater Hobart lacks a unified governance body.

Social – Tasmania is the nation's poorest performing State in terms of health, school retention rates and household dependence upon income support.

Hobart in 2011 – The Opportunities

There are significant opportunities for expansion of Hobart's Antarctic and Southern Oceans gateway role given Hobart's geographical advantages. However, this will rely on improved facilities and services.

Increasingly, the re-occupation of the inner City by the University and by student housing will enliven the City and create opportunities.

While Tasmania will continue to rely upon its resource-based export industries, there is an opportunity to capitalise upon knowledge-based and creative industries, e.g. using the National Broadband Network.

There is an opportunity for Hobart to leverage off its cultural institutions (e.g. TMAG, MONA), cultural community and rich heritage.

Establishing a settlement boundary and changing the emphasis in housing on infill and inner-city development will support improved housing choice and affordability.

There is an opportunity to showcase Hobart as a sustainable City, with its renewable energy systems, walkability, proximity to food sources and environmental quality.

Hobart can be positioned as a desirable place to visit or live because of its quality of life.

Local and Regional Strategies

This section is essentially a graphic that shows the covers of a range of local and regional strategy documents. The selection of documents appears haphazard and a number of Council's documents are not represented, including Glenorchy.

Given these gaps, it is not clear what sort of systematic analysis of local and regional strategies has been undertaken in the development of the Plan, nor which of the documents has been drawn upon in the preparation of the Plan.

State and Commonwealth Policies

Again, this is a graphic. It is not clear what sort of systematic analysis of State and Commonwealth Policies has been undertaken in the development of the Plan, nor which of the documents has been drawn upon in the preparation of the Plan.

Vision

The Plan's vision for Hobart is:

"that Hobart will be a vibrant, dynamic and attractive City, a globally connected place that fosters cultural expression, innovation and growth, and which provides a liveable, sustainable and prosperous lifestyle."(p. 25)

Central to the vision are "three integrated and mutually-supportive concepts":

Liveability – the various attributes that make a city a place where people want to live;

Sustainability – a community's ability to meet its current needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs;

Productivity – an indicator of a community's level of; and capacity for, economic activity.

(These three themes attempt to demonstrate a tie-in to the National Urban Policy released in May 2011.)

Objectives and Directions

The Plan contains objectives and directions that translate the vision into a strategic framework "that will guide the direction and priorities for future public and private investment".

The framework is built around 6 key sectors:

For each key sector, there are three "high level focus areas". The key sectors and their high level focus areas are:

- Strategic land use – settlement planning, buffering, mixed use
- Transport networks – urban corridors, regional networks, national gateways
- Natural environment – climate change, natural resources, biodiversity
- Built environment – resource efficiency, design excellence, low maintenance
- Infrastructure integration – communications infrastructure, community infrastructure, utilities infrastructure
- Economic integration – skills, growth, exports

For each of the key sectors, a set of "high level" objectives and directions is given.

Implementation

The Implementation section contains a table for each key sector which sets out the various initiatives, timeframes, responsible agencies and which “directions” are advanced by each initiative.

This section adds some specificity to the high level objectives and directions.

General Comments

A Worthwhile Initiative

While it is acknowledged that the Capital City Plan is really a document that repackages a range of regional and State strategies on land, transport, economic development, infrastructure and the like, it is considered that there is a real benefit in bringing these together in one place with a focus on the Capital City.

It is also considered that the Capital City Plan has a distinct role that is complementary to the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy. The Regional Strategy has a statutory focus, largely to be implemented by local government through planning schemes (albeit there are some critical elements like settlement planning that fall into both).

The Capital City Plan identifies a range of initiatives, largely for State agencies, with potential to deliver improved planning outcomes. It has the potential to engage State agencies in big P strategic planning for Greater Hobart. That is a big plus.

Document Strengths

The document provides a concise and very good analysis of the challenges, constraints and opportunities facing the Capital City.

The document exhibits a high standard of graphic design.

The Plan presents a generally sound, high level strategy for the Capital City across a range of functional areas.

Lack of a Communicable Vision

Council’s officer-level comments on the earlier draft of the Plan indicated that the direction of the Plan for Hobart’s future is fundamentally sound but could be more clearly articulated.

It is considered that the best way to achieve this would be to strengthen the document’s vision statement.

The current vision statement is jargonistic and abstract – one that is unlikely to resonate with the community. There would be benefit in considering replacing or augmenting it with a “Hobart in 30 years” type statement. Consider, for example, a scaled down version of what is in the draft Auckland Plan (See: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz).

Gaps in Coverage

The Plan is, overall, quite comprehensive.

However, there are some obvious gaps.

There are few ,if any, references in the objectives, directions or initiatives to light rail, rail transport generally or river transport.

If these matters do not rate a mention in the Capital City Plan, there is little prospect of seeking federal funding for future capital projects.

There are no mentions of efficiency initiatives through building regulation, a scarcity of land use planning initiatives relating to economic development, nothing about the grey economy, no mention of the protection of aboriginal cultural heritage significance and little about Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.

Implementation Concerns

The major concern is with implementation of the Plan.

There are a myriad initiatives, but it is as if the effect is to distract from a sense of the real priorities in a mirage of frenetic activity.

There is a lack of clear prioritisation of initiatives. The existing implementation section runs the serious risk of withering on the vine, with no clear timeframes and with a plethora of equally weighted initiatives – a recipe for lack of accountability and lack of implementation.

The Implementation section of the Plan needs to identify those initiatives which are most important to the successful implementation of the Plan. Even a simply priority rating of “high, medium, low” would be beneficial.

There are no unique reference descriptors for initiatives. It is as if there was no ongoing desire or intention to monitor implementation and manage performance of the Plan.

There are no performance indicators identified. There is a note on p. 26 to the effect that potential indicators have been identified for several of the Directions and will be refined and added to in future iterations of the document. However no indicators are present in the document.

Lack of a Governance Model

It is not clear from the Plan how the agencies and councils will be held to account for initiatives allocated to them. This is a reflection of the lack of information on the governance of the Plan.

This reflects the lack of a clearly identified regional / capital city governance model. The STCA councils signed off on its criteria for a regional model last year and the silence has been deafening from the State since.

Need for Implementation to Coalesce Around a Series of Core Projects

There is no sense of what the priority projects are for improving outcomes for the capital city. There are just a series of equally weighted initiatives presumably lifted from the various existing regional and State strategies. To move the Plan from a half-hearted attempt to tick the box for the COAG Reform Council, it will be critical to identify those “must do” projects and throw some State government weight and resources behind them.

One of the critical core projects is to get growth management and settlement planning happening – and there would be a range of initiatives which coalesce around that goal – restraining fringe growth, getting inner city densification along transit corridors going. This could involve initiatives to improve public transport, getting a VicUrban or similar funding model up, bringing forward consistent headworks charges (alarmingly only seen as a medium term project) and urban design improvements to encourage people to reinhabit the inner areas. That is a series of mutually-reinforcing initiatives under a broader project. In short, a packaging of initiatives in a way that suggests that the State actually wants these things to happen, rather than just sit in a report which gathers dust on a shelf.

There are probably a series of projects like this that can be identified across the document – through creative packaging of the various initiatives. This would achieve on the COAG Reform Council principle of “integrated across functions” – as the current implementation section is formatted largely along Departmental functional silo lines.

Complex Structure

In terms of the structure, the document is quite complex – with a vision, three “mutually supportive concepts”, key sectors, focus areas, attributes, objectives, directions and initiatives – all serving to complicate. This point was made on the earlier draft, without response, and it is now quite late in the day to reformat it. However, there remains benefit in structurally mirroring the National Urban Policy’s quadruple bottom line approach under Productivity, Sustainability and Liveability (and Governance when this sees the light of day) headings.

When someone applies for a position, they need to address the selection criteria. It would seem to make sense that a Capital City Plan be prepared with the same structure as the National Urban Policy rather than along key sectors aligned to Departmental functions, particularly given that a major role of the Plan will be to justify funding submissions to the Commonwealth. This would assist to demonstrate compliance with the COAG Reform Council principle of “integrated across functions” on urban issues rather than continuing to work in Departmental silos.

Detailed Comments

A range of detailed comments have also been prepared at officer level and these may be found in the draft Council submission at **Attachment 1**.

Consultations:

Manager Infrastructure & Engineering Services, Natural Areas Co-ordinator, Social Planner

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The Capital City Plan does not oblige any direct funding from Council. Any future projects arising from the Plan would either be resourced operationally or be the subject of future budget bids.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

The public consultation process for the draft Hobart Capital City Plan has been run by the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

Recommendation:

That Council make a submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in relation to the draft *Hobart Capital City Plan 2011-2040* in the terms outlined in this report and more specifically detailed in **Attachment 1**.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1** Council Submission on Capital City Plan

12. NEW REGIONAL TOURISM ORGANISATION - TOURISM SOUTHERN TASMANIA

Author: Manager City Strategy (Tony McMullen)

Qualified Person: Manager City Strategy (Tony McMullen)

ECM File Reference: Tourism Southern Tasmania

Community Plan Reference:

4.1.1 Develop, promote and market Glenorchy as an icon tourism destination.

4.1.5 Develop relationships between Local, Regional and State tourism.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Objective 2.1 Attract, promote and support growth in the local business, industrial and residential sectors.

Strategy 2.1.4 Partner with others to promote economic development in the City and the Region.

Objective 2.3 Realise and grow the potential of tourism in the City.

Strategy 2.3.1 Increase visitation to the City.

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's support in principle to membership of a new regional tourism organisation, Tourism Southern Tasmania and to authorise a budget bid to support membership of the organisation.

Proposal in Detail:

The Mayor received a letter from Vincent Barron, Chairman of the Southern Tasmanian Regional Tourism Steering Committee, on 23rd February 2012 (Refer to **Attachment 1**).

New Regional Tourism Organisation

Since June 2011, industry representatives have worked with the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) representatives and Tourism Tasmania management, to develop a Tripartite Strategic Action Plan for tourism in Southern Tasmania, which includes establishment of a sustainable, industry-led regional tourism body.

A fourteen member Steering Committee, with representatives from a mix of tourism related businesses, Local Tourism Associations in Southern Tasmania and a Tourism Tasmania member, has developed a formal proposal for a new Regional Tourism Organisation (RTO).

Tourism Tasmania intends to consolidate all tourism related funding for regional and local tourism marketing and development programs into a regional tourism budget and allocate these funds through the RTO.

The RTO will also be the centre of regional tourism planning, coordinating the input from industry operators, Councils and other tourism related businesses and contributing to the tourism component of the State Economic development Plan.

Proposed Structure

The proposed structure would involve members drawn from:

- Southern tourism industry-related businesses through membership subscriptions and partnership marketing contributions;
- Southern Councils by way of membership subscriptions and individual partnership agreements;
- Tourism Tasmania by way of marketing agreements and grants made through its Industry Support Unit.

Objects

The objects of the RTO (refer to **Attachment 2**) would be:

- (a) To promote, encourage and support tourism in and encourage and generate visitation to Southern Tasmania;*
- (b) To coordinate the activities of government, local government, tourism operators and others in respect of tourism in Southern Tasmania;*
- (c) To develop effective marketing plans and strategies in cooperation with government, local government and industry with a view to positioning Southern Tasmania as the premier tourism destination in Tasmania;*
- (d) To encourage the dispersal of visitors throughout the region;*
- (e) To provide and encourage the development of new or innovative products and services in the tourism industry in Southern Tasmania;*
- (f) To encourage, develop and distribute information for visitors;*
- (g) To undertake public relations programmes to raise the profile and understanding of the tourism industry in Southern Tasmania;*
- (h) To encourage Southern Tasmanian businesses to participate in the Company's activities;*
- (i) To liaise with Tourism Tasmania and other government bodies in respect of the promotion of tourism in Southern Tasmania;*
- (j) Solely for the purpose of carrying out the aforesaid objects and not otherwise;*

The proposal has been well received at a series of council workshops and industry consultation meetings, including a workshop with this Council on 30th January 2012.

Timeframe

It is expected that the new organisation will be operational during April 2012, at which time a formal approach will be made to invite Council membership from 1st July 2012 and to seek participation in cooperative marketing or development projects under a Partnership Agreement. The membership subscription and other cooperative contributions will become due in the 2012-13 financial year.

Governance

It is intended to incorporate the RTO in March 2012 as Tourism Southern Tasmania Limited.

It is then intended to appoint an executive officer with the role of building the organisation and securing membership and partnership commitments from industry operators and Councils effective from 1st July 2012.

The 14 member Founding Subscribers will make up the first board of the company. The Founding Subscribers include 2 local government representatives, Mr Nick Heath, General Manager of Hobart City Council or his nominee and Ms Kate McCarthy from Tasman Council and 2 Local Tourism Association representatives – Mr Michael Higgins, President, Huon Valley Kingborough Tourism Association, and Mr Frank Pearce, President, Rivers Run Tourism Association.

The Founding subscribers are charged to hold a special general meeting within 3 months to elect a formal board of 11 directors.

The formal board will comprise:

Five (5) Directors elected by the members of the company in General Meeting; and six (6) Directors appointed by the Board as follows:

- (a) Two (2) Directors chosen by the Board from nominees sought from the Councils of Southern Tasmania;
- (b) Two (2) Directors chosen by the Board from nominees sought from Local Tourism Associations;
- (c) One (1) Director whom the Board considers to be an appropriate person to assist the Company in the attainment of the objects of the Company; and
- (d) One (1) Associate Director chosen by the Board from a nominee sought by the Board from Tourism Tasmania.

It is anticipated that the Director described in (c) above will be elected as Chairman of the Board.

The Articles also stipulate that those appointing or electing Directors should seek to elect or appoint persons who have one or more of the following attributes:

- (a) high level skills and extensive experience in commerce, accounting, finance or the law or a combination of one or more of these fields of expertise and preferably coupled with experience in or exposure to the tourism industry; and, skills and experience in the following:
- (b) marketing-related businesses;
- (c) travel, tourism or convention-related businesses;
- (d) Local Government
- (e) to enable the Company to meet its objectives.

To facilitate the process of transitioning from the Founding Board to the formal, elected/appointed Board, the Steering Committee has written to the STCA Board inviting nomination of two suitable persons from its member Councils to be appointed as members of the Board of the proposed new regional tourism association, 'Tourism Southern Tasmania Limited'.

Consultations:

Council workshop presented by Mr Malcolm Wells on 30th January 2012.

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The proposed membership subscription for each Council is \$5000 per annum to gain access to the base level services of the RTO. Councils will then be encouraged to enter partnership agreements and contribute to specific projects identified by them as being of benefit to their local area.

Current Year: Nil

Next Year: \$5,000

Future Years: \$5000

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Once Tourism Southern Tasmania is publicly launched, the following is proposed:

An article in the Glenorchy Gazette

Association.

Recommendation:

- (a) That Council, through the Mayor, advise the Chairman of the Southern Tasmanian Regional Tourism Steering Committee of its support in principle for the establishment of Tourism Southern Tasmania;
- (b) That a bid in the amount of \$5,000 be authorised and submitted to the 2012/13 budget process for membership of the new organisation.

Attachments/Annexures

1 Attachment 1

2 Attachment 2

GOVERNANCE

13. MEMBERSHIP OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: LGAT

Community Plan Reference:

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

Reporting Brief:

To enable Council to consider renewing its membership the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT).

Proposal in Detail:

Glenorchy City Council was a long standing member of LGAT whose objects are to:

1. promote the efficient administration and operation of Local Government in the State of Tasmania;
2. represent and protect the interests, rights and privileges of members of the Association;
3. foster and promote relationships between Local Government in the State of Tasmania with both the Government of Tasmania and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia;
4. Provide support services to members of the Association.

During 2009 Council decided to provide written notice to the Chief Executive Officer before 30th June 2010 of its intention to resign from LGAT from 1st July 2010 for reasons including budgetary.

Council's primary reason for announcing its intention to withdraw from LGAT was to have the option from 2010/11 of saving the approximately \$52,000 per year annual subscription in light of the major negative financial impacts on the Council from the State Government's water and sewerage reforms.

A letter reflecting the Council decision was sent to LGAT on 24 June 2009. Member councils wishing to withdraw from LGAT are required to give a year's notice, so the effect of the letter and the Council decision is that unless Council decides otherwise its membership of LGAT will cease from 1 July 2010.

Mayor Barry Easter and Allan Garcia, the President and CEO of LGAT attended the Aldermen's workshop on 12th April 2010 to put the case for the Council to remain a member of LGAT.

Issues of concern raised by Aldermen at the Workshop included:

- dissatisfaction with the level of support for Glenorchy during the water and sewerage reform process and the outcomes that were achieved for Glenorchy.
- Glenorchy has had to fight for itself and achieve our own outcomes, with little recognition from LGAT.
- concern about the future of local government and the capacity of LGAT to influence the outcomes sufficiently to meet Glenorchy's needs.
- LGAT seems to lack teeth and may not be assertive enough in pursuing local government agendas.
- LGAT should be more consultative and representatives should visit the Council more often.
- City council issues are different from smaller councils – is there an opportunity for support for particular groups of councils?

LGAT provides the primary mechanism by which the State Government consults with local government on legislative and other initiatives that affect local government and it may be difficult for Council to even know that an issue is coming up unless the State Government agrees to consult directly with Glenorchy in addition to LGAT. LGAT is also the primary mechanism for placing issues on the national agenda via the Australian Local Government Association.

The previous Mayor as well as Mayor Slade and the General Manager have met with Mayor Barry Easter and Allan Garcia, the President and CEO of LGAT to discuss Glenorchy becoming a member of LGAT again. Attachment A) is the latest letter received from LGAT.

The Association state that they have taken on board the issues previously raised by Council and is anxious to ensure that if Glenorchy becomes a member, the expectations of Council can be met. Since the departure of Council from the Association some significant matters have taken place.

The Association has established a Metropolitan Councils Group (MCG) which has as its members all major councils in the state. Chaired by Mayor Albert van Zetten of Launceston, the MCG has highlighted the need to focus on key strategic issues to progress. The MCG meets quarterly and has identified an enhanced gas rollout, rail operations in the state and infrastructure funding through the Federal Government's regional development avenues as priorities for action.

It has also listed a number of other matters including, among other things, the State economic development strategy from a metropolitan council perspective; bus services and public transport - presentations from Metro on future directions and issues such as intercity transport; planning for urban growth; matters associated with ports and developing a closer relationship with Tasports and engendering a strategic approach to port decisions and activities in consultation with councils; strategic responses to infrastructure gaps and anti-social behaviour and the sharing or working collaboratively on solutions to issues such as graffiti. These issues have been formulated into a strategic plan for the group.

The Association considers that there is a vital role for Glenorchy to play within this group.

LGAT also notes that while departure from the Association effectively meant losing access to a number of services and activities, it should be noted that significant latitude was given in a number of areas so as not to have a detrimental impact on Council and its employees.

The Association acknowledged the difficulty that Council may have had accessing public liability and fidelity insurance and agreed to allow Council continued access to both to ensure ongoing coverage and a competitive premium.

Significant funding was also attracted by the Association for asset and financial management on behalf of the Local Government sector with a comprehensive project continuing to run over the next 12 months. Glenorchy City Council has been included within this project.

Although initially disallowing access for Council employees, the Association reviewed its decision and agreed to allow Council employees ongoing opportunities for borrowings, hardship grants, funeral grants and scholarship funding opportunities for dependents of employees via LGAT Assist.

The Association has also embarked on a significant procurement drive developing closer relations with interstate counterpart Associations to deliver Tasmanian councils access to improved purchasing opportunities. Already member councils can obtain access to trucks, earth moving equipment, mowers, tyres, batteries and stationery at much reduced prices than would otherwise be available. Member councils are already enjoying these benefits and if Glenorchy renewed its membership, would enjoy instant access to these savings and benefits.

Training and development opportunities continue to be provided for newly elected and existing aldermen to assist in the understanding of their role and improving their capabilities to fulfil their functions as an elected member. The opportunity for newly elected members (and existing) to gain access to contemporary and authoritative training is an important and valuable induction to their council careers and it would be very beneficial to any new member elected to Glenorchy City Council.

Other significant areas of endeavour on the part of the Association from which it is considered Council could benefit include:

- Industrial relations - the Association has continued to assist members in relation to extensive advice on union negotiations and award modernization and the ongoing requirements for the future;
- Community Satisfaction Survey - the LGAT state-wide survey will be a key instrument in determining measures and indicators of councils sustainability;
- Climate change and community development forums - sharing of contemporary practice and development of policy frameworks;
- Workplace training and development successful brokerage of training opportunities and funding through aggregation of council employee numbers; and the successful advocacy of motions of councils.

LGAT states that Council was previously critical of the Association for its lack of direct interface with Council. If Aldermen remain of the view that they would like to meet with the President, CEO or any other Association representative on a regular basis that can be arranged or, alternatively, they can be available for attendance to discuss specific issues at Council workshops or meetings.

LGAT states that Glenorchy remains a highly significant council in Tasmania and its input to legislation and policy has been invaluable in the past. The officers and aldermen of Council are highly regarded among their peers and it would be preferable to the Association to be in a position of interacting with staff and elected members on matters of significance and to take into account not only views proffered but the expertise available on technical issues and political matters.

It should be noted that the Consultation and Communication protocol that the Association has with the State Government ensures that there is a dialogue on all matters relating to Local Government either at the policy or legislative levels. Timeframes and processes are included within these arrangements to allow for appropriate input and negotiation.

LGAT claims that Glenorchy is not party to this process and therefore has limited opportunity to influence policy and legislative agendas.

On matters of budget, it is likely that the contribution that would be payable by Glenorchy Council for membership of the Association would be approximately \$50,000. In recent years the Association has unbundled "extra" activities from its subscription base and offers these to councils on a separate approval basis. Generally, the funding contribution is linked to the subscription formula. The types of activities funded last year include the careers project, which would have cost Glenorchy an additional \$7,400, an environmental mediation trial (\$2,525), the state-wide survey (\$1,212) and a contribution to the constitutional recognition fighting fund of \$3,788.

Therefore, had Glenorchy participated as a member last year the all up cost would have been \$62,600. The separation of the fees has been based on the division of Association operating costs and "optional" projects that councils may seek to have progressed and are willing to fund. If all these matters were to be included in the upcoming financial year the likely cost to Council would be in the vicinity of \$65,000 based on some movement in the subscription level.

I trust that Council will consider the matters raised in this correspondence carefully and would hope that the Association could again embrace Council and present a truly sector wide approach on all matters Local Government.

Consultations:

Mayor
General Manager
ELT

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Glenorchy Council membership of the Association would be approximately \$50,000. plus "extra" activities from its subscription base. Generally, the funding contribution is linked to the subscription formula. The types of activities funded last year include the careers project, which would have cost Glenorchy an additional \$7,400, an environmental mediation trial (\$2,525), the state-wide survey (\$1,212) and a contribution to the constitutional recognition fighting fund of \$3,788. Therefore, had Glenorchy participated as a member last year the all up cost would have been \$62,600. The separation of the fees has been based on the division of Association operating costs and "optional" projects that councils may seek to have progressed and are willing to fund. If all these matters were to be included in the upcoming financial year the likely cost to Council would be in the vicinity of \$65,000 based on some movement in the subscription level.

Next Year	\$65,000
Future Years	\$65,000 plus CPI

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

None.

Recommendation:

That Council:

- (a) In principle agree to rejoin LGAT, the \$65,000 cost be considered as part of the 2012/2013 budget process; and
- (b) If the budget bid is successful, Council write to LGAT requesting to rejoin the Association effective 1st July 2012.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 LGAT Letter

14. SOUTHERN WASTE STRATEGY AUTHORITY - QUARTERLY REPORT DECEMBER 2011

Author: Executive Manager (David Reeve)
Qualified Person: Executive Manager (David Reeve)
File Reference: Southern Waste Strategy Authority

Community Plan Reference:

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

Reporting Brief:

To receive the Quarterly Report – December 2011 of the Southern Waste Strategy Authority.

Proposal in Detail:

The Southern Waste Strategy Authority (SWSA) is a “joint authority” formed under Section 36B of the Local Government Act 1993.

The Quarterly Report – December 2011 of the Southern Waste Strategy Authority has been provided and is attached.

Consultations:

None required.

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

None.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

None.

Recommendation:

That the Quarterly Report December 2011 of the Southern Waste Strategy Authority be received.

Attachments/Annexures

1 SWSA Quarterly Report - December 2011

15. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

16. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

COMMUNITY

**17. PUBLIC LAND DISPOSAL AND RATIONALISATION PROGRAM
2011/12 - 65-67 CHAPEL STREET AND 191-197 CHAPEL
STREET, GLENORCHY**

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(e).

**18. DEVELOPMENT OF LAWN BOWLS FACILITIES STRATEGY FOR
THE CITY OF GLENORCHY**

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(d).

**19. INTRODUCTION OF WEEKLY KERBSIDE & GREENWASTE
COLLECTION**

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(c).

GOVERNANCE

20. SOUTHERN WATER QUARTERLY REPORT TO THE OWNERS' REPRESENTATIVES

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(f).

21. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)