

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Monday, 28 October 2019 at 6.00 p.m.**



Present: Aldermen Kristie Johnston (Mayor), Matt Stevenson (Deputy Mayor), Peter Bull, Melissa Carlton, Jan Dunsby, Steven King, Gaye Richardson, Kelly Sims and Bec Thomas.

In attendance: Tony McMullen (General Manager), Jenny Self (Director Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Director Community and Customer Services), Samantha Fox (Director Strategy and Development), Ted Ross (Director Infrastructure and Works), Bryn Hannan (Executive Officer), Alex Woodward (Manager Property, Environment and Waste), Tina House (Manager Finance and ICT), Merv Graham (Property Sales and Acquisitions Officer), June King (Mayoral and Executive Support Officer) and Janina Gauden (Executive Support Officer).

**Workshops held since
last Council Meeting**

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date: | Monday, 7 October 2019 |
| Purpose: | To discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communications Plan / Strategy• Wilkinsons Point Update |
| Date: | Monday, 14 October 2019 |
| Purpose: | To discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Yarns Preparation |
| Date: | Monday, 21 October 2019 |
| Purpose: | To discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leasing and Licensing• Insurance Update |

Nineteen (19) members of the public attended the open part of the Council Meeting.

The meeting was opened with a prayer by Deacon Michael Hangan, St Therese's, Moonah.

The Chair acknowledged and paid respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the traditional and original owners and continuing custodians of the land.

The Chair read the following two statements:

Statement 1:

In relation to work health and safety at the Council meeting.

Statement 2:

In relation to the Audio Recording of the Council Meeting under regulation 33 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* and Council's 'Audio Recording of Council Meetings' policy.

1. APOLOGIES

Alderman Simon Fraser

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/BULL

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday, 30 September 2019 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Keep Australia Beautiful Awards

The Mayor announced that Council received 14 awards at the Keep Australia Beautiful Awards for Tasmania which were held at Oatlands on 18 October 2019. Council staff and the General Manager attended the awards ceremony. Categories in which Council received awards included:

- Health and Wellbeing
- Environmental Sustainability
- Heritage and Culture
- Litter Prevention
- Waste Management Resource and Recovery, and
- Community Actions and Partnerships.

The Mayor noted that the awards were a great achievement for Council, but also a reflection of our community as it recognised the work of community members which contributed to Council's success.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

The Chair asked if any Aldermen had, or were likely to have, a pecuniary interest in any items on the Agenda.

Aldermen King, Stevenson and Carlton declared an interest in Item 23 (Sale of Wilkinsons Point and the DEC).

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Shane Alderton, 296 Main Road, Austins Ferry

On page 47 of tonight's Council meeting agenda in reference to the response given to the FOGO Petitions, the agenda states consultations were undertaken with the Waste Wise Advisory Group. I am a member of the Waste Wise Advisory Group and this statement is incorrect. The only meeting held so far was basically an introduction meeting and it was only explained to the group what the exemption criteria would consist of, no consultation was undertaken, and the petition was not even discussed.

Q. Can the reference to consultation being undertaken with the Waste Wise Advisory Group be removed from the agenda?

A. The Waste Wise Advisory Group was consulted about the exemptions at its initial workshop. This included discussion on the exemption criteria including a review of home composting scenarios. The list of consultations in Council reports is intended to be exhaustive and to capture all people or groups who have had input. The Waste Wise Advisory Group's inclusion was appropriate and it will not be removed.

Q. If Council passes the Climate Change Emergency motion put forward by Alderman Sims:

- **will Council be legally liable for damage caused to any developments or infrastructure on land potentially effected by climate change that are approved by Council after this motion has been passed?**
- **will it have an impact on the sale of the DEC and Wilkinsons Point as these areas have been identified potentially as being impacted by climate change?**
- **will it have an impact on the proposed developments at the former Claremont Primary School site and Whitestone Point as these areas have been identified as being impacted by climate change?**
- **would Council be legally liable to build infrastructure (sea walls etc.) to protect low lying areas that have been identified potentially as being impacted by climate change?**
- **what would be the legal ramifications for Council?**
- **can Council defer this motion instead of passing or defeating this motion so legal advice on this matter can be obtained.**

A. The questions are superfluous given that the motion was not passed.

Rowan Meyers, Norman Circle, Glenorchy

Q. In relation to the proposed Climate Change Motion before Council, given the level of potential terror that anyone under the age of 40 feels regarding the climate change and the ongoing impacts not necessarily in the next 4 to 5 years but the next 10 to 20 years, and the level of real intensity fear and emotion that the public are feeling and given the fact that, as a planning body and as a local council you are responsible for the day to day wellbeing of a lot of aspects of life for people that live in your Council area, what competing priorities will Council identify as anything that could outrank the existential threat of climate change? What other issues would council see as taking precedence over this or as a justification for deferring or voting down this motion?

- A. Council approved an alternative motion at the September Council meeting, part of which was that Council confirmed its commitment to future generations through ongoing collaborative action to collectively reduce, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change, through:
- participation in the Regional Climate Change Initiative to develop a Climate Change Adaptation Plan
 - partnering with UTAS to develop a regional climate strategy and climate change action plan
 - engaging in LGAT climate change activities, and
 - other partnership opportunities that arise.

Kaye Smith, Constance Avenue, Glenorchy

Q. Several paragraphs in the report to Council around FOGO exemption give ratepayers the impression that their general waste is going to Jackson Street when in fact it is going to Copping. Why has this not been made public on the GCC website or announcement in the Glenorchy Gazette?

A. It is not clear which paragraphs are being referred to. Council made the decision in late 2018 to commence diverting general waste from Jackson Street landfill in response to actively extending the close out. This included diversion of Council's kerbside general waste to the Copping landfill via the Derwent Park waste transfer station. This was reported at the December 2018 Council meeting.

Q. Why is Council waiting until February before ratepayers who are wishing to apply for an exemption to FOGO for them to complete the relevant form? Why can't this process be ready and in place before the bin rollout therefore saving Council time and effort delivering bins to those that have applied and accepted for opting out of this service?

A. Council is continuing to work on implementing its exemption criteria to ensure that the process is as simple and easy as possible. Council has not had to implement something like this previously meaning there is considerable work involved (for example, developing the necessary website pages and forms to allow the process to be completed online). This will be completed by February and assessment of applications will occur after that.

Q. Why should those that will be applying to opt have to 'trial' these bins if they have no intention of using them?

A. As noted above, Council is continuing to work on implementing its exemption criteria to ensure that the process is as simple and easy as possible. Council has not had to implement something like this previously meaning there is considerable work involved (for example, developing the necessary website pages and forms to allow the process to be completed online). In the meantime, bins will be rolled out universally. We are hopeful that some people who had intended to apply for an exemption will change their minds after trialing the bins.

Q. Is it so that Council can then say the \$35 we have paid for a bin we haven't got has now been delivered and therefore will not have to refund our \$35?

A. No, the reasons are as set out above.

Q. How much is all this obstacle course for ratepayers to jump through to apply for an opt out costing the Council and inevitably the ratepayer? Is it not a fact all that is required is for the forms to be made available now, ratepayers fill them in, Council approve or not approve, Council need not deliver bins that are unwanted and the \$35 already paid be subtracted from their next rates bill?

A. Establishing the systems and internal processes to implement the exemption criteria is not as simple as just creating a form. It is also not, and has never been, Council's intention to allow unconditional opting out of the FOGO service (it is a universal service), meaning that all applications need to be assessed against the relevant criteria, which takes time to set up and then carry out.

Jenni McLeod, spokesperson for the Glenorchy Skatepark

Q. In relation to Council's proposed the construction of a skate park in Glenorchy:

- **Could the Council please stop referring to the \$250,000 from DHHS as a grant?**
- **Can the Council please confirm what the DHHS stipulations were for the use of the \$250,000?**
- **Was the \$250,000 an aspect earmarked specially for the skatepark in the agreement between DHHS and the Council?**
- **Can the Council please acknowledge publicly that at the time of the closure of Skate Central, the skate, BMX, Scooter and Roller communities were very supportive of the noble cause of which Skate Central was laid to rest (health clinic) and actively quelled initial user community resistance while creating positive events that said 'goodbye' in style.**
- **Community has noticed the language around the skatepark has changed to 'Glenorchy Community Park' and 'skate pump ramp'. Is there a reason for this?**
- **Does the Council have a Manager Community, Coordinator Community Planning and Inclusion, Community Engagement Officer and a Community Development Coordinator?**
- **How much do ratepayers pay for these positions collectively, each year?**
- **What is the role of Enlocus Landscape Architects on this project?**
- **What process of selection was undertaken to determine Enlocus Landscape Architects?**
- **How will Council pay for their services, i.e. where is the funding coming from?**

- What is the estimated cost of Enlocus Landscape Architects?
- Can Council provide a copy of the quotation received from Enlocus Landscape Architects or confirm their costs to perform the consultant?
- Are these the same architects engaged for the re-development of the Montrose Bay playground?
- Why has Council ignored the knowledge and expertise of local Tasmanian skate park specialists in favour of outsourcing to an expensive interstate consultant?
- Why has Council employed expensive interstate consultants to do their work before consulting with skatepark specialists here?
- Design phase and community consultation are separate workloads. If the Clarence City Council and the Hobart City Council can use its community development staff to undertake community consultation on similar projects, without impacting on money set aside for the project build (e.g. South Arm Skatepark and the Wellington Foothills Mountain Bike project), why is Glenorchy City Council engaging consultants to do this job? Please note: 'In kind' assistance paid for by Council to do Council work is NOT in kind, it is actually just work.
- Surveys are not a suitable form of consultation on any matters. They can be supplementary but not replace a normal consultation process – community is expecting to be met by council as a start point, will the council commit to rolling back on its 'preferred' solutions and start again with the community?
- Could the Council please provide data collected from the 2016-17 consultation process?
- Can the Council please explain what happened to the process between 2017 and now?
- Does the Council plan to do a push poll?
- Is the Council planning to poll our communities with only Montrose, Abbotsfield and Tolosa on the poll? Will Council reconsider this approach?
- Can Council please provide a definition of a push poll?
- Can the Council please explain why a central location has not been considered?
- Can the Council please say definitively whether or not it will fulfill its obligations and vow to build a park to replace Skate Central 'like for like'?
- Community understands there was previously a KGV Working Group – can Council please explain what happened to this group? Can Council please provide meeting notes and follow ups from previous meetings with the KGV Working Group?
-

- **Has Glenorchy City Council followed up on concerns raised by stakeholders when the KGV Working Group was operational? If so, what action has been taken?**
 - **Excluding funding, what are Council's 5 primary objections to the KGV recreation precinct site being a preferred site?**
 - **Users are seeking an intermediate to advanced skating experience and replacing 'like with like' infrastructure, will Council commit to this if this is reflected in community consultation, especially as easier options already exist (i.e. Tolosa Park)?**
 - **Will Council commit to seeking and obtaining additional funding (such as a Sport and Recreation Grant, which is currently open) to match the existing funding to deliver a quality facility to suit Olympic standard design requirements to give our young people their best chance at developing their skating to a high standard?**
- A. Council received \$250,000 from the Department of Health and Human Services to compensate for the removal of Glenorchy Skate Central in 2015. This money was received by Council in the form of a grant deed titled 'Glenorchy Skate Facility' which Council is required to report on and acquit. The purpose of the grant deed is to assist Council to facilitate the replacement of the skatepark.
- Council has engaged Enlocus (formally CONVIC) as leading experts in skate park design and community engagement. Enlocus is assisting Council with several community workshops and drop-in sessions specifically around the future of skating in Glenorchy. Enlocus will prepare a concept design from the outcomes of the workshops and community survey. They have been selected in accordance with Council's purchasing policy. The engagement of Enlocus is part of Council's in-kind contribution to the project.
- Council wants to hear from the whole community about what they would like improved at existing facilities or at a new facility. The engagement process will seek input on the community's preferred location for the grant funds to be spent and also what type of features they would like. The engagement period will allow Council to also collect information about who's out there in the Glenorchy municipal area, how they interact with our existing facilities and how they get to these facilities.
- Following community consultation into the future of skating in Glenorchy an open tender process will be advertised to engage consultants to undertake the detailed design. Local and interstate skate designers will be invited to submit. Council has made no commitment to replace Glenorchy Skate Central with a 'like for like' facility, nor is the expectation that a park will be able to be constructed in the Glenorchy CBD (due to the lack of a suitable site). Many of the stakeholders who were part of the original engagement have moved on and are no longer involved. Council has gone back out to the whole community as well as inviting new and previously involved stakeholders to provide Council with a current picture of what they all see as the future of skating in Glenorchy.

Angelique Payne, Tolosa Street, Glenorchy

Q. Regarding the Public Space Enhancement Grant for \$500,000 that was provided to Glenorchy City Council by the State Government in August 2015 for the specific purpose of a Children's Playground to be constructed in the front of the Glenorchy Council building, and subsequent report dated February 2018 provided after much positive community consultation:

- **Is the Playground to proceed and when can the community expect construction to commence?**
- **If the playground is not to proceed, what is the reason?**
- **Will the playground proceed at some point in the future, if so when?**
- **What is the timeframe in the Grant Deed to expend the funds on construction of the Children's Playground, and if expired has Council sought an extension, if so until when?**
- **Is the \$500,000 specific purpose funding for Children's Playground still held by Council or has it been returned to the State Government?**
- **Has the \$500,000 specific purpose funding for Children's Playground been utilised for any other purpose, if so what?**
- **Has the State Government been notified by Council that the funding has not yet been expended for its specific purpose?**

A. Unfortunately there are no longer any plans for a CBD playground.

In June 2018, Council made the decision to redirect funds from the Public Enhancement Grant from a playground and kiosk in front of Council Chambers to its CBD Revitalisation Project. The decision was made for various reasons, but primarily because of the un-suitability of the site, community concerns and the fact that the business case for the playground was not able to be justified. While alternative options were considered for spending the funds, the CBD project was selected as being the most suitable, given that it directed the funds into the surrounding area.

A formal request to the Tasmanian Government was made to divert the funds and was subsequently approved. The funds have subsequently been spent as part of the CBD Revitalisation Project, and a final acquittal report has also been provided in accordance with the requirements of the grant.

Council has recently secured approximately \$3m in in-principle funding for 2 significant playgrounds, one at the Montrose Foreshore and one at Giblins Reserve. These will be state-of-the-art facilities that will give Glenorchy residents access to playgrounds that are on par with other destination playgrounds in Greater Hobart.

Jenny Gibson, Grove Road, Glenorchy

Q. Regarding Council's proposed FOGO service:

- **Where are people who live in units going to place their bins as we are all fully aware the planning and development schemes have allowed for two bins, if we are going to bring in a third bin where are all these bins going to go in these closed housing developments?**
- **Can the council provide me with a service that has to be paid for without the service existing?**

A. An extensive audit of all existing unit developments has been undertaken to understand the individual bin storage requirements. From this audit Council, will issue a combination of 140 litre, 240 litre or in some instances 360 litre bins to meet the storage needs of each unit development.

Council will be providing ratepayers with a FOGO service commencing in February 2020. The \$35 fee will cover the cost of rolling out the bins across the municipality, and for bin collection from February to June 2020. Levying the \$35 charge with rates allows people to spread payments out across the four rates instalments, rather than in a single lump-sum payment later in the year after the service has commenced.

Patrick Berry, representing the Southern City BMX Club, Berriedale

Q. The Southern City BMX Club would like the Glenorchy City Council and its Aldermen to provide answers to the following questions in regard to the current location of our club along with other concerns we currently have as to the future of our club and the sport within our community:

- **Does the Council support providing public space for healthy activities?**
- **In regard to 671 Main Road, Berriedale and the potential disposal of the land, will our Club be a part of the consultation process? We ask, as to this point, we feel like we have been left out of the conversation to date.**
- **Our Club has been located at 671 Main Road, Berriedale for over 20 years and have spent a lot of time building a community of passionate BMX riders. Should the Council decide to sell off the land our club currently leases, what is your vision for the future of our sport within the Glenorchy community?**
- **There has been a lot of talk/rumours over the past 10 years that the Council has the opinion that Southern City BMX Club would be moving to the top of Tolosa Street. Is this still part of the Council's plan to include us within the MTB Park?**

- Over the past 12 months our club has spent approximately \$105,000 at our current location, these funds have been obtained through hard work and government grants. If we were to move, we would struggle to raise the required funds to relocate. Is the Council prepared to help source funding to move our club?
 - In moving locations Southern City BMX Club would be required to build a BMX Australia Standard race track which could potentially cost between \$550,000 to \$600,000 to meet the new current standards. Is Council aware of the costs involved in building a BMX track?
 - If this has been on the Council's radar in recent months, why have the Council been happy to take our money in regard to planning permits for the installation of our lights at the track? Are you prepared to refund these funds or allow us to transfer the approvals over to a new location at no cost?
 - If Southern City BMX Club were asked to relocate, is the Council prepared to ensure the new track was complete prior to requiring the club to leave its current location? If the club was forced to leave prior, we would lose too many members in the downtime which would be detrimental to our club.
 - Finally, what are your expectations regarding time frames? We ask as we are currently in negotiations with BMX Australia regarding hosting another national event in 2021 and we need to ensure we have a track to host the event on.
- A. Council provides open space and facilities for a broad range of both formal and informal sport and recreation activities. The Southern City BMX Club is an important and valued club within the Glenorchy community providing opportunities for the community to engage in healthy active sport.
- The investigation into the possible disposal of 671 Main Road, Berriedale is a staged process. The first stage is to engage with the community including the BMX club to better understand the views, concerns, opportunities, issues that may result of any potential disposal. The feedback from the community will be considered by Council before continuing. As part of any disposal process stakeholders will be provided with an additional opportunity to object.
- If a decision was made to sell or lease the land, on which the BMX track is currently located, then Council would need to work through with the club what this would mean and how Council would be able to provide assistance to ensure the ongoing success of the club.
- No decision has been made in respect to relocating the BMX club. Council is currently undertaking a master planning exercise looking at the Mountain Bike Park adjoining Tolosa Park. Southern City BMX club is a key stakeholder in this project along with other bike users and clubs and has been invited onto the Project Expert Panel for it.

Consideration for co-location of cycling clubs has been mentioned previously and is an alternative that might be considered. For this to happen, the project would need to demonstrate that it was in the best interest of all clubs involved.

If the club moved to Tolosa Park or another location, Council would assist with relocation costs, including sourcing funding. Any requirements that the club would have would form part of the conversation about funding including any funds that have been recently spent and the timing of relocation. This would ensure that disruption was minimised and did not impact on national titles and other important events.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

**Questions on Notice - Russell Tatlow, 6/124 Mary Hope Road, Rosetta
(received on 23 October 2019)**

- **DHHS has confirmed an extension of the grant and has also indicated further extensions could be applied for to ensure appropriate consultation etc. To what date is the present extension granted, and, will the Council apply for an extension to allow more time to a) ensure appropriate consultation (not a push poll) and b) apply for additional funding to ensure a suitable skate park facility? If so, to what date will Council request an extension?**
- **Why is the council rushing this after 5 years of no activity?**
- **How does GCC plan to support the growth of Olympic skate park action sports over the next 5 years without relying on the support of sports infrastructure provided by Hobart City Council and Clarence City Council?**
- **Given the number of residents in the Glenorchy and surrounding suburbs, what does GCC recommend as the ideal size (in square metres) for a skate park that would meet the regional needs of its residents?**
- **What is GCC's 5 year plan to engage, activate and mentally stimulate hundreds if not thousands of non-driving aged young people in Glenorchy who enjoy skate park action sports but do not engage in competitive ball sports?**
- **Can GCC provide a date contractors were booked to plant the 12 commemorative trees in front of the KGV area, why this area was specifically selected and how was the community consulted?**
- **What are the future plans of the land that runs alongside the 12 commemorative trees?**
- **Would GCC commit to support the rezoning of a small car park to provide a space dedicated to enriching the lives and engaging thousands of children, families and young people in our community in a healthy outdoor sport that is easy to participate in?**

- **Will the GCC work with the community to support them in developing a master plan to apply for additional funding for a new public skate park located in Glenorchy CBD to significantly benefit the community, GCC and all businesses in the CBD area?**
- **Has the Council considered how a suitable skatepark will enhance the council's recently ratified economic strategy?**
- **Has council made the link between a centrally located skatepark, the Glenorchy mtb Masterplan, the BMX track, existing local sporting facilities such as KGV and the potential economic benefits for Glenorchy?**
- **Has the council spoken with local business about the benefits of a centrally located skatepark, i.e. Northgate?**
- **Is council aware of the south arm skatepark and the objections that led to RMPAT appeals from residents backing on to the park?**
- **Is council aware of the impact wind has on skateparks sports, especially the northerlies and south easterlies frequently experienced at Montrose Bay?**

A. The questions were taken on notice.

**Mr. James Bryan, 14 England Ave, Montrose
(the following was provided in writing by Mr. Bryan at the meeting)**

The Local Government Act states the following in section 20, Functions and powers,

- (1) In addition to any functions of a council in this or any other Act, a council has the following functions:
 - (a) to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the community;
 - (b) to represent and promote the interests of the community;

I have serious concerns as a ratepayer that decisions regarding the sale of Wilkinsons Point and the D.E.C. may create considerable financial burdens on Glenorchy ratepayers and not be in their best interests, rather than a financial bonanza some are expecting. I have even seen it written on a website that it may lead to a rates remission for residents in the future.

Indeed, an examination of the agenda of the Glenorchy Planning Authority Meeting for last Wednesday, 23 October, 2019 raises so many unresolved issues that I am convinced that without thorough due diligence and sound legal advice when entering into a sales agreement the Glenorchy community could face a legal and financial nightmare in the future.

One issue stands out. On page 19 the following is stated:

“National Environmental Protection Measures

National Environment Protection Measures (NEPM) are automatically adopted as State Policies under section 12A of the State Policies and Projects Act 1993 and are administered by the Environment Protection Authority.

Principle 5 of the NEPM states that planning authorities 'that consent to developments, or changes in land use, should ensure a site that is being considered for development or a change in land use, and that the authorities ought reasonably know if it has a history of use that is indicative of potential contamination, ***is suitable for its intended use.***'

Part of the Wilkinsons Point site (601A Brooker Avenue) is identified as potentially contaminated as is the adjoining land at Dowsing Point. The Assessment of Site Contamination NEPM therefore applies to the proposed amendment.

The applicant has ***not*** provided in their submission any information or response relating to this potential contamination. The notes on Council GIS system indicates that in this area the property may have soil metal concentrations ***exceeding residential health investigation levels.***

Given that the proposed Wilkinsons Point Specific Area Plan includes introducing the Residential use class onto the land, this is a matter that requires further information and resolution - potentially through revisions to the specific area plan – prior to certification."

What is not stated here is that it is common knowledge within the Glenorchy community that the site while being reclaimed was like a tip site and that rubble from demolished buildings was dumped there. Whether the Council has records of what was dumped there or not, one can be certain that it can be considered to be contaminated. Contaminants include asbestos and hydrocarbons as well as heavy metals which would be in the original bay sediments underlying the fill. Contamination that originated at industrial sites such as Boyer and Risdon. Contamination of this type has recently prevented residents moving into apartments in NSW.

Any agreement entered into must protect ratepayers from future liabilities that this may cause.

The following is an extract from the **Sale Agreement for the Derwent Entertainment Centre between the D E C Management Authority and Glenorchy, dated 30th April, 1997.**

Page 3

"13: The Purchaser (GCC) acknowledges that the Purchaser has made its own independent enquiries investigations and inspections regarding the Property and has not relied on any information representation letter document or arrangement or other conduct and that the Purchaser ***will accept the Property in the form existing*** as at the date hereof.

14: The Purchaser shall not be entitled to make any claim demand or requisition other than those already identified and agreed to against the Vendor its servants or agents in respect of:-

(a) The state of repair and condition of the Property; or

- (b) The water supply electricity lines gas pipes drains or sewers or other services connected to or serving the Property or any adjoining land; or
- (c) Any encroachment upon the Property by any other property or any encroachments by the Property upon any other property or street or the lack of any easement or other right in relation to such encroachments if any; or
- (d) **Any latent defect which may exist** upon or in relation to the Property; whether caused by the Vendor its servants or agents or by previous owners of the Property.

15: The Purchaser shall indemnify and keep indemnified the Vendor against any costs with respect to the Property from the date hereof. “

This agreement should provide a starting point for any future negotiations regarding the pending sale.

Does this Council agree that the following are important principles?

- Q1:** That the legal doctrine, “*caveat emptor*”, meaning “*let the buyer beware*”, and/or the clause “*as is where is*” be clearly stated in any sale agreement to protect ratepayers.
- Q2:** That ratepayers will NOT be financially liable for any repairs or refurbishment to the D.E.C. building, surrounding property and the greater Wilkinsons Point site. (Council will be only responsible for the public access to the point, GASP property and the pavilion)
- Q3:** That ratepayers will NOT be financially liable for the excavation and disposal of contaminated soil/rubble that will be required for any future developments, including infrastructure provisions. This would include any remediation works required following such excavation.
- Q4:** That ratepayers will NOT be financially liable for the state of repair or provision of any infrastructure such as water supply, electricity lines, gas pipes, drains or sewers, or other services connected to the property now or in the future. This is the developer’s responsibility as is the case with subdivisions.
- Q5:** That ratepayers will NOT be financially liable for any future problems caused by sea level rise. The site comprises reclaimed land, is flat and relatively low lying. As this is obvious there can be no expectation that Glenorchy ratepayers will meet the cost of any mitigation solutions if required. There is requirements for building setbacks from high water mark, minimum floor levels and appropriate engineering and construction assessments and techniques and the developer should be aware of these.

Additionally, the following is a clause in the 1997 Sale Agreement:

“12: It is hereby acknowledged that the Property is being transferred to the Purchaser so that the Property can be ***used for the purpose of an entertainment centre*** and that the Purchaser will be required to ***seek written permission of the Crown*** in Right of the State of Tasmania prior to implementing any proposed change in use of the Property from that of an entertainment centre.

The Purchaser shall be required to act in good faith at all times. The provisions of this clause shall not merge on transfer of the Property to the Purchaser.”

The Act of Parliament creating the Derwent Entertainment Management Authority required that the D.E.C. be available for community use, in particular religious, educational and not for profit organisations. For 30 years community use has been probably the main source of patronage and the D E C is the only facility suitable for some of these. Since 1997 this has continued and there have been special community hire costs to support this.

Q6: Does the Council recognise that the welfare and best interests of the Glenorchy community should be paramount in any agreement and that the availability of the Derwent Entertainment Centre for community groups with not for profit hire rates should continue as it does now?

How will that be incorporated in the sale agreement?

Q7: As a promised major development of the site (\$100m to \$200m has been stated) seems to be a major driver for the sale of the property what guarantees will be established in the sale agreement to achieve this?

Will there be penalty clauses if major development does not occur in a reasonable time frame, say 10 years?

The Chair provided some comments and took the question on notice.

Erik Van Beest - 3 Garden Grove, West Moonah

Q. In relation to the free tip weekend in October (which was postponed due to the weather), would Council instead consider providing free tip entry vouchers to residents that could be used at any time during the year?

The Chair provided some comments and took the question on notice.

Russell Tatlow - 6/124 Mary Hope Road, Rosetta

Q. Council records show a spend of \$1M to sell \$1M of public land in 2019/20 Annual Plan, why couldn't this money be invested in the future of the community by the provision of appropriate infrastructure to make people feel connected, involved, valued and including servicing the community into the future by providing quality park facility.

A. (Director Infrastructure and Works) the \$1M in the budget accounts for the sale of the land, but there is a corresponding negative adjustment of \$1M in that asset being removed from our registered assets. It's an accounting adjustment. Council still receives \$1M in revenue from the sale.

Council has not committed on how we will spend any funds from land sales. Any money that will come from the sale of open space will go back into the community and we will engage with the community as part that process to decide where those funds will be distributed. There is not currently any proposal to put those funds into a skatepark or any other specific infrastructure.

Q. What is the Council's position on developer contributions?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Stephen Curtis - 32 Macrobertson Terrace, Claremont

Q. I did not receive a letter or any other type of consultation about Council's proposed disposal of 1 Bournville Crescent, Claremont. Can Council consider delaying the vote on the disposal of 1 Bournville Crescent?

A. (Director Infrastructure and Works) We will investigate why you did not receive a letter advising of consultation around the sale of this property. However, this is not the last opportunity that members of the public will have to comment on the potential disposal. Council is conducting initial community consultation to determine whether there are any serious concerns about the disposals. If Council does vote to dispose of the land, a further consultation process will take place under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, during which there will be an opportunity to provide written submissions.

Cartia Leeson - 13 Bournville Crescent, Claremont

Q. I live at 13 Bournville Crescent, Claremont and also did not received a letter about the proposed disposal of 1 Bournville Crescent, Claremont. How are properties contacted or selected for contact for this very initial stage (recognising that there are further opportunities for public consultation and for people to object more formally)?

A. (Manager, Property Environment and Waste) The first step is for us to send a survey to affected properties. We select all properties within a 100m radius of the property proposed for sale and provide them with a survey. We will find out why Ms Leeson did not receive a letter given that she lives next door.

James Loxton - 31a Marys Hope Road, Berriedale

Q. In relation to the consultation process around the proposed sale of 9 Barclay Crescent, Rosetta, residents in Barclay Crescent which don't border the land for sale received a letter but no one else did (including residents of Mary's Hope Road, Walker Street). Another resident notified Council and we received a letter 10 days later. Who is responsible for making sure that staff consult with the community.

- A. (Mayor) This Council, the elected body is responsible for the actions of our officers. We have 100% faith in our officers that they are doing their jobs. The process for disposing of land that is proposed is above and beyond the required statutory process. We decided to have a conversation with our community before the formal process commences, which starts with seeking feedback from the community to get context about why that land might be significant. That report then comes back to Council. If Council decides that there are concerns but the disposal may warrant further investigation, Council will go back to the community through the statutory (section 178) process to consult more broadly through public notification. Members of the public can then formally object to any proposal.

John Davie - 1 Brodie Street, Claremont

In relation to the proposed disposal of 14a Colston Street, Claremont:

- Q. Has the current use of the space or its community value been assessed, as it's already been activated organically by all ages and community groups? This doesn't appear to be mentioned in the report.**
- A. (Mayor) The current zoning of that area is not for public open space. It has been zoned and earmarked for utilities. It is used as a thoroughfare for students and the officers have recommended that the access be retained as a condition of any sale. We have also sent a request for feedback to the Department of Education and would be keen to engage with them as important stakeholders for the future of this site.
- Q. Why was there such a low response rate when the local community was engaged.**
- A. (Mayor) I can't speak for why individual people didn't respond. There have been some issues identified tonight with consultation which will be investigated, but low response rates like this are not unique in this type of consultation.
- Q. What is currently being done or planned to address parking and road safety issues on the street? Why wasn't this or several other existing issues referenced in this process?**
- A. (Mayor) This initial process is very early in the final process for disposing of the site. No decision to sell the site has been made, we are merely seeking community feedback. If we decide to pursue a sale further these types of issues would be looked at in detail. We are aware of the parking and traffic issues around Austins Ferry Primary School and have sent traffic engineers and parking officers out there to look at safety issues.
- Q. Why was the land reported as not being able to be used for a diverse range of activities?**
- A. (Mayor) the land is currently zoned as Utilities which is quite restrictive in its permitted uses. This is outlined in the report.

Q. Are there other opportunities for open space in the area?

A. The question was taken on notice to provide further information

Q. Can the vote on this property be delayed until there can be further discussions?

A. Aldermen can decide that when we debate the issue, but, again, this is the very first step in this process and there will be further opportunities to make formal submissions if we decide tonight to proceed further.

Julie Van Beest, 3 Garden Grove, West Moonah

Q. Is anything ever going to happen on the former Claremont Primary School site?

A. (Mayor) Yes, the site was recently purchased. The developers have recently conducted community consultation and held sessions at the Claremont RSL. They have plans for a 320 apartment medium density development on that site.

Their proposal would retain the old school building which has a lot of heritage significance and they are hoping to have that as a community space for community groups to use as an exhibition space and open space at the front for markets and the like.

The developers haven't yet lodged their development application, because they wanted to seek community input first. They are very keen to hear public feedback, but the key aspect for them is the retention of the old school building and making sure that there is community space and being mindful of the heritage significance of that site given the school and also the army camp. When the development application does come forward, I would encourage any member of the public to make submissions. The public will be notified on our website, Facebook page and through Public Notices in The Mercury.

Cartia Leeson - 13 Bournville Crescent, Claremont

Q. Is the developer for the Claremont Primary School site proposing public housing on that site?

A. (Mayor) the proposed development is being undertaken by a private developer, so that it a matter for them, however as far as I am aware there are no plans for public or affordable housing as part of it.

John Jessup - 29 Marys Hope Road, Rosetta

Q. In relation to the sale of unused Council land, are you prepared to release comments and recommendations made from the consultation you've already undertaken on what alternative uses that land may be put to?

A. (Mayor) It is really important that the public knows that if Council adopts the recommendations on the agenda, this is not a decision to sell or dispose of the land, only to start the process to consider selling the land which involves community consultation.

It is essentially a decision to advertise our intent to potentially sell the land. The public would have 28 days to make representations, and Council is then required to formally consider those representations before it makes any decision to sell the land.

There is information about the kind of objections and issues in the Council report. There are also zoning issues for the site, so part of any future decision to sell the site may involve consideration of re-zoning it.

We have released some details of the responses to public consultation in the Council report. We don't release the actual letters because they contain personal information.

(Director Infrastructure and Works) As part of the Council report there is a summary of the responses, but we have not released the specific responses. There is the opportunity at any point for the community to provide us with any ideas or suggestions for the use of the property. If there are any ideas or concerns we want to make sure we can address them.

Q. Will Council review its process for consulting with the public, as it appears not to have worked as intended this time?

- A. (Mayor) We are happy to take feedback on board. We have carried out this for other properties (at the September meeting we reported on the process for another 11 properties) and had good feedback. We will investigate the concerns that have been raised tonight. We are satisfied with the process but will double-check why the problems raised tonight occurred.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

Council received a petition from Janiece Bryan, 14 England Avenue, Montrose regarding the proposed sale of the Derwent Entertainment Centre and Wilkinsons Point containing 369 signatures.

KING/BULL

That Council receive the petition.

Alderman Sims left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson and Carlton.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

COMMUNITY

Community Goal: "Making Lives Better"

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

Reporting Brief:

To receive the announcement of events and engagements attended by the Mayor for the period from 24 September to 21 October 2019.

Resolution:

THOMAS/KING

That Council:

RECEIVE the announcements about the activities of the Mayor's office during the period from 24 September to 21 October 2019.

Alderman Sims returned to the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

Alderman Stevenson left the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

Alderman Stevenson returned to the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. AMENDMENTS TO 2019-20 SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES

File Reference: Annual Budget 2019/2020

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council approves minor amendments to the 2019-20 Schedule of Fees and Charges which was approved by Council on 27 May 2019.

Resolution:

BULL/KING

That Council:

APPROVE the following amendments to the Glenorchy City Council 2019-20 Schedule of Fees and Charges:

- (a) standardising refundable key deposits for hall hire and adding of St Matthews Church to the list of halls, as set out in Attachment 1, and
- (b) include a new fee of \$20 (inc. GST) for the disposal of mattresses at the Jackson Street Landfill, as set out in Attachment 3.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: “Valuing our Environment”

10. PUBLIC TOILET STRATEGY - RESULTS OF COMMUNITY SURVEY

File Reference: Public Toilet Strategy

Reporting Brief:

To brief Council on the results of a community survey exploring public perceptions of the municipality’s public toilets which will guide the development of Council’s Public Toilet Strategy.

Resolution:

THOMAS/RICHARDSON

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the report and the *Public Toilet Survey Results – August 2019* in the form of Attachment 1.
2. NOTE that the intended time frames for progression and completion of the strategy are to:
 - (a) release a draft Public Toilet Strategy for public feedback in November/December 2019, and
 - (b) present the final Public Toilet Strategy to Council for consideration by early 2020.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

11. QUARTERLY REPORT

File Reference: Corporate Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the Quarterly Report for the quarter ending 30 September 2019.

Resolution:

THOMAS/SIMS

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE Council’s Quarterly Report and the Quarterly Annual Plan Progress Report for the quarter ending 30 September 2019.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

12. 2018-19 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

File Reference: General Purpose Financial Report

Reporting Brief:

To present Council’s audited financial statements for the 2018-19 Financial Year to Council.

Resolution:

BULL/DUNSBY

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Glenorchy City Council Financial Statements for the financial year ended 30 June 2019 in the form of Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

13. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS - MONTHLY REPORT

File Reference: Procurement

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to the procurement requirements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts for the period 18 September 2019 to 17 October 2019 and provide updates on other relevant procurement matters.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/STEVENSON

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Monthly Report for the period from 18 September to 17 October 2019, and
2. APPROVE the monitoring of Sugden and Gee project management expenses and moving to exception reporting on this matter.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

File Reference: Council Policies by Directorate

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council reviews and adopts updated versions of its Audio Recordings of Meetings of Council Policy and Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property Policy.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/SIMS

That Council:

1. ADOPT the updated Audio Recording of Council Meetings policy in the form of Attachment 1
2. ADOPT the updated Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property Policy (**Helicopter Policy**) in the form of Attachment 3, and
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to exercise the discretion under the Helicopter Policy to permit aircraft operations on Council property in the circumstances set out in the policy, and to further delegate that authority to Council officers.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

15. INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LAND

File Reference: Council Land - Disposal and Sale

Reporting Brief:

To report back to Council on the outcomes of the community engagement processes around the potential disposal of 7 Council properties in accordance with Council's resolution of 26 August 2019 and recommend that Council proceeds with the public land disposal process under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993 (the Act)*.

Resolution:

SIMS/KING

That Council:

1. FORM an intention under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* to dispose of the following parcels of public land (**the Land**):
 - (a) 3 Edgar Street, Claremont
 - (b) 9 Barclay Crescent, Rosetta
 - (c) 5a Taree Street, Chigwell
 - (d) 14a Colston Street, Claremont
 - (e) 15 Hestercombe Road, Granton
 - (f) 345 Main Road, Glenorchy, and
 - (g) 1 Bournville Crescent, Claremont
2. AUTHORISE the General Manager to take all actions necessary to complete public notification of Council's intent to sell the land in accordance with section 178 of the Act and Council's *Disposal of Council Land Policy*, and
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to consider and acknowledge any objection received pursuant to section 178(6) of the Act and report to a future Council meeting.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST: Alderman Richardson.

The motion was CARRIED.

16. DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LAND - MILL LANE (CARPARK) - EXTENSION OF TIMEFRAME

File Reference: Disposal of Public Land

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council extends an exclusive dealing period with Marigold (Tas) Pty Ltd to exchange or purchase land situated at Mill Lane, Glenorchy.

Resolution:

THOMAS/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. NOTE that negotiations with Marigold (Tas) Pty Ltd to exchange or purchase the property at Mill Lane, Glenorchy, situated on the corner of Barry Street and Regina Street, CT29803/5 (**the Land**) during the initial 90-day exclusive dealing period have been constructive, and that a resolution is close, and
2. EXTEND the exclusive dealing period with Marigold (Tas) Pty Ltd for a further six (6) months, to allow time for Marigold to progress a planning permit application in respect of the Land and for a satisfactory outcome to be reached.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Question without notice - Alderman Dunsby

- Q. At the Royal Hobart Show on Friday night, a steer with a badly broken leg was allowed in the ring of the arena as part of rodeo activities, until eventually herded into a holding pen. The animal was in obvious distress and created alarm and concerns for the many members of the public who witnessed it.**

What processes does Council have in place to call to account the rodeo operators, the Royal Agricultural Society of Tasmania and individuals who obviously did not make the welfare of the animal a priority?

- A.** Although the footage of the incident was distressing, Council does not have any relevant powers to investigate or prosecute animal welfare or cruelty matters.

Animal cruelty in Tasmania is regulated under the *Animal Welfare Act 1993*. The RSPCA is the only extra-governmental organisation that has been given the power to investigate and prosecute offences under that Act, however DPIPWE, not the RSPCA, is the authoritative body which usually oversees animal welfare at rodeo events.

Council's animal management officers have no powers under that Act and there are also no relevant powers under our Animal Management By-law. If our animal management officers come across any instances of animal cruelty in the course of their duties their usual response is to call the RSPCA to investigate, and assist the RSPCA in its investigation where necessary.

As a result, despite the incident being very concerning, Council will not (and is unable to) take any regulatory action in response to it.

Q. When will electric vehicle charging points be installed in the City of Glenorchy?

- A. There are currently 3 electric vehicle charging stations in the centre of Hobart, and several others around the southern region. These are generally located near tourist attractions or heavily frequented venues, including Mood Food north of Kempton, Eaglehawk Neck, Willie Smiths Apple Shed near Huonville, Kettering, Dover, Adventure Bay and McHenry Distillery near Port Arthur.

Council does not currently have any plans to install electric vehicle charging stations and is not aware of any specific demand. The majority of charging is done at peoples homes.

Council would generally work with developers to install electric vehicle stations as part of significant developments in the City (for example at MONA or Wilkinsons Point).

KING/CARLTON

That the agenda be reordered so that Item 23 is dealt with as the last item.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Resolution:

KING/THOMAS

That the meeting be closed to the public to allow discussion of matters that are described in Regulation 15 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 8:34 p.m. for a short comfort break.

The meeting resumed at 8:46 p.m.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Alderman Sims was absent from the meeting when it resumed at 8.46 p.m.

18. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

STEVENSON/KING

That the minutes of the Council Meeting (Closed Meeting) held on Monday, 30 September 2019 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson and Carlton.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

19. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

None.

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: "Valuing our Environment"

17. PROCUREMENT OF FOOD AND GREEN WASTE (FOGO) SERVICES

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(b) (Information that, if disclosed, is likely to confer a commercial advantage or impose a commercial disadvantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposes to conduct, business) and (2)(c) (Commercial information of a confidential nature that, if disclosed, is likely to: prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it; confer a commercial advantage on a competitor of the Council; or reveal a trade secret) and (2)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal).

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: "Leading our Community"

21. AUDIT PANEL MINUTES

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

22. 2019 -20 THREE YEAR INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

24. SKM RECYCLING UPDATE

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(c) (Commercial information of a confidential nature that, if disclosed, is likely to: prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it; confer a commercial advantage on a competitor of the Council; or reveal a trade secret) and (2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

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

Aldermen King, Stevenson and Carlton declared an interest in the following Item and left the meeting at 9:06 p.m.

23. SALE OF WILKINSONS POINT AND THE DEC

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(b) (Information that, if disclosed, is likely to confer a commercial advantage or impose a commercial disadvantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposes to conduct, business) and (2)(c) (Commercial information of a confidential nature that, if disclosed, is likely to: prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it; confer a commercial advantage on a competitor of the Council; or reveal a trade secret) and (2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

Resolution:

DUNSBY/BULL

That the meeting be re-opened to the public.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, Johnston, Richardson and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting closed at 9:32 p.m.

Confirmed,

CHAIR