

**Minutes of the Meeting  
of the Glenorchy City Council  
held at the Council Chambers  
on Monday, 27 March 2023 at 3.30pm**



**Present (in Chambers):** Alderman Bec Thomas (Mayor), Alderman Sue Hickey (Deputy Mayor), Aldermen Josh Cockshutt, Jan Dunsby, Steven King, Stuart Slade and Russell Yaxley and Councillor Molly Kendall

**In attendance (in Chambers):** Tony McMullen (General Manager), Emilio Reale (Director Infrastructure and Works), Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Executive Manager Stakeholder Engagement), Allan Wise (Manager Finance), Tracey Ehrlich (Manager People and Governance) and Andy Clark (Coordinator Creative Communities).

**In attendance (by video link):** Marian Maclachlan (Executive Assistant to the General Manager) and Andy Watson (Executive Assistant to the Mayor).

**Leave of Absence:**

**Workshops held since last Council Meeting**

**Date:** Monday 6 March 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Briefing on anti-social behaviour
- Derwent Estuary 2023 program
- Budget process – feedback on community survey
- Giblyns Reserve Playspace update
- Social media

**Date:** Tuesday, 14 March 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Waste Strategy
- CAPEX Budget process

**Date:** Monday, 20 March 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Glenorchy Jobs Hub

The meeting was live streamed on Council’s website, Facebook page and YouTube channel. The peak number of viewers watching the live stream was 24 viewers and 22 members of the public attended in person.

The Chair opened the meeting at 3.32pm.

The Chair acknowledged and paid respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the original and traditional owners and continuing custodians of the land and their elders, past, present and emerging.

The Chair read a statement noting that the meeting would be recorded and live streamed to members of the public, and about work health and safety at the Council meeting.

---

## 1. APOLOGIES

---

Councillor Harry Quick

---

## 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

---

### **Resolution:**

SLADE/KING

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday, 27 February 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

---

None.

**Resolution:**

KING/KENDALL

That the Council agenda be reordered so that Item 14 (Elected Member Training request) be dealt with after Item 12 (Nominations for General Management Committee of Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT)).

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

**4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION**

---

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

Mayor Bec Thomas declared a pecuniary interest in Item 12 – Nominations for General Management Committee of Local Government Association of Tasmanian (LGAT) and Item 14 – Elected Member Training request.

Alderman Slade declared a pecuniary interest in Item 9 – Investigations into property disposal at 12 Rothesay Circle, Goodwood.

---

## **5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

---

**Janette Good, Collinsvale**

**(received 27 February 2023)**

**Q: On behalf of my parents, Phil and Margaret Powe, our question relates to the amount of mud that comes down, my parents couldn't even get in through any of the doorways. Their whole house was a metre high in mud, and the insurance companies don't deal with this. So we had to do it ourselves but they are in their 80s.**

**My question is, it has happened again and we believe that the cause is due to the new addition to the drain at the top that is causing the blocking. We can't physically remove this mud and gravel ourselves. Can my parents get any help from the Council to remove this mud?**

**A: Residents that have been affected by the recent floods in the Berriedale Chigwell areas have been contacted and updated on what actions Council is progressing and the investigations into reducing the likelihood of this occurring so frequently. All residents who have been affected by flooding have been advised to seek advice from their insurers on assistance available to assist with clean-up and any other damages.**

---

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)**

---

**Question on Notice – Morris Malone, West Moonah**

**(received 13 March 2023)**

**Q1. What ownership does Council have over the land comprising Humphreys Rivulet?**

**A: Council has ownership of some, but not all of the land that comprises Humphreys Rivulet.**

**Q2. Because the land is publicly accessible, what responsibility does Council take for private property which is damaged or vandalised as a result of this availability of access?**

**A: Council, or other adjacent property owners, are not responsible for illegal activities of unrelated persons. Council does however have an interest in reducing and preventing such behaviour where practical.**

**Q3. If none; for the length between Constance Avenue & Grove Road would Council consider installing sufficient fencing at either end respectively to deter access, not just for safety but to mitigate further potential damage and vandalism?**

A: The rivulet section between Constance Avenue and Grove Road (Barossa Creek) is in Council ownership and is currently fenced. This fence has recently been repaired and No Access signs have been installed. Unfortunately, these signs are regularly vandalised and they are replaced periodically. Whilst the area is fenced to deter public access, it is very difficult to fully prevent it. Police have been made aware of reports of antisocial behaviour in this area and any instances of property damage or vandalism should be reported directly to the police.

**Question on Notice – Lynn Martin, Berriedale**  
(received 19 March 2023)

**There are many houses in Berriedale that have experienced multiple floods over the last two years. Currently, construction to stop the flooding is scheduled after 1st July 2023.**

**Q1: My question is why can't money be reallocated from funding from current fy local roads and community infrastructure projects to fixing Berriedale flooding? Solar panels for Council buildings and playground/ sports field upgrades are frivolous compared to flooding. The storm water infrastructure needs upgrading.**

A: Council has diverted funding from this financial year's capital works budget and have deployed additional resources to complete necessary analysis and network design upgrades to reduce the flooding events recently experienced in this catchment.

Some work has already commenced, with the upgrading of stormwater pits and pipes at various locations.

In the coming months, Council will continue to plan and implement upgrades to the stormwater network to reduce the frequency and severity of flooding in the area. Council has prioritised these works and, subject to budget approval, plans to spend 70% of its 2023-2024 stormwater capital budget on flood mitigation projects.

Projects to be completed in the area include:

- upgrades to the stormwater inlet and reshaping drains at the top of Dooleys Avenue (to be completed this financial year)
- upgrading the pits and pipes at the corner of Kilander Crescent and Chandos Drive (to be completed in 2023-2024 financial year)

- stormwater network upgrades from Michelle Court through to Chandos Drive (to be designed in 2023-2024 and constructed in 2024-2025 financial year)
- sedimentation basin at the top of Redlands Drive (to be constructed in 2024-2025 financial year).

Council has also undertaken detailed flood mapping for all its urban catchments, and we are currently finalising the Stormwater System Management Plan.

Council will continue to keep the community informed as these projects progress.

### **Question on Notice – Paul Campton, Claremont (received 22 March 2023)**

**Q1. Giving the current housing crisis does Council support the Planning Scheme (Local provisions Schedule) being amended to permit a 24 hour drive-thru on an Inner Residential zoned site?**

**A:** As at 22 March 2023, Council has not received an application requesting changes to the Glenorchy planning scheme to allow a drive thru in an Inner Residential Zone.

Should an application be made, it must be assessed against the requirements of the planning legislation and considered by the Glenorchy Planning Authority (GPA). If the Planning Authority thinks it meets these requirements, it is then tested through a public exhibition process where all neighbouring property owners are written to and invited to have their say. All feedback would then be considered by the GPA at another meeting and a decision made on whether to continue to support the proposal or make changes. The Tasmanian Planning Commission must then consider the proposal and hold public hearings on the representations received. The Commission would then decide whether to approve the proposal or not.

### **Question on Notice – Unknown author (received 23 March 2023)**

**Q1. Claremont area is already well served by fast food, takeaway and food delivery services. Given the current housing crisis, does the Council prioritise housing for inner residential zones over 24 hour food drive throughs?**

**A:** As at 23 March 2023, Council has not received an application requesting changes to the Glenorchy planning scheme to allow a drive thru in an Inner Residential Zone.

Should an application be made, it must be assessed against the requirements of the planning legislation and considered by the Glenorchy Planning Authority (GPA). If the Planning Authority thinks it meets these requirements, it is then tested through a public exhibition process where all neighbouring property owners are written to and invited to have their say. All feedback would then be considered by the GPA at another meeting and a decision made on whether to continue to support the proposal or make changes. The Tasmanian Planning Commission must then consider the proposal and hold public hearings on the representations received. The Commission would then decide whether to approve the proposal or not.

### **Question without notice – Wendy Ladaniwskyj, Berriedale**

**Q: As you are aware in January 2023, Berriedale was subject to another flash flooding event. I am aware several residents have written to Andrew Wilkie MP for his support which he did and Mayor Thomas has also responded and we are very happy with the plans being implemented.**

**However, given the officer statement that the existing infrastructure is not coping with the recent rainfall events for the houses which are currently located in this area, why has Council approved further housing development up on the hill at Berriedale?**

A: [Mayor] Planning development applications which come to Council go through a rigorous process of assessment, which includes looking at whether local infrastructure can accommodate increased development. This is a key component and a really important consideration of the planning authority in determining whether to approve applications.

Councils engineers provide advice on applications, but we also get advice from TasWater and any other relevant authorities. So we certainly do take this information into consideration when deciding development applications.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] Council does assess the capacity of our stormwater systems and there are numerous systems. If we determine that there is not adequate capacity to facilitate that development, then the developer has to either upgrade the system or put in a system that puts a net zero increase into the system during a rain event, which means they have to detain the water on their site and release it slowly after the event.

Therefore, there are other ways of dealing with it without overloading the system, but those processes and stipulations are in place at the moment.



**Q: That system did not work in January, apparently those systems failed?**

A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] The infrastructure systems worked, but the rain event was overland. The flooding brought a lot of landscaping and other matter downhill which blocked the inlets and this issue is also being addressed.

The particular property you are referring too has been investigated and recommendations have been made on how the matter can be dealt with, which is currently underway and the property owners have been communicated too.

As an update, there is some additional work going on at the top of Dooleys Avenue, Berridale where we have identified a couple of other flow paths that have contributed to this issue. This work is currently being scoped and designed, it will commence this financial year, with the aim to have it updated and working to a much better capacity.

### **Question without notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose**

**Q1: In December 2021, the Council stated work on the Montrose Skatepark would begin in May or June 2022. The Council later stated construction is set to commence on 27 March 2023 (today). Could you please provide an update of the current status of the Montrose Skatepark Project and expected date of completion.**

A: [Mayor] I am pleased to advise work on the Montrose Skatepark will commence this week and in fact they have started today.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] I can confirm preliminary works have commenced today with excavation work commencing this week.

**Q2: In October 2022, the Council stated the long-anticipated works to upgrade the North Chigwell Soccer Hub had commenced and will be completed by the end of the financial year. Could you please provide an update on the progress of the North Chigwell Soccer Hub and expected date of completion?**

A: [Mayor] I am pleased to confirm that work is well underway. In relation to the new pitches, the turf at North Chigwell has been sown and work is commencing on the lighting and it is expected to be completed in June this year.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] It is possible the work will be completed before June for both the pitches and lighting.

[Mayor] In relation to new club room facility, design works are well under way and we expect that work to commence in the next financial year.

**Q3: Do you have an estimated cost of the upgrade?**

A: [Mayor] The budget is \$8.3 million for the Federal Government funding.

**Question without notice – Paul Campton, Claremont****Q1: Can you please clarify that housing is a priority in residential areas?**

A: [Mayor] Housing is definitely a priority for inner residential areas and general residential areas. Council has undertaken quite a significant amount of work over recent years in an effort to rezone land to generate more housing. We know that we are running out of land in the municipality of Glenorchy and we need to see a greater density in housing and that is what we have been working towards. As an example last week, the Planning Authority approved putting forward some amendments to our local provision schedules to create new specific area plans to enable higher density housing through our commercial zone along the Northern Suburbs Apartments Corridor and also in our principal activity centre. Housing is absolutely a priority for this Council.

**Q2: I commend the General Manager on his letter dated 5 August 2022 to CBOS about McGill Rise where he says *'the system fails when there is not a private certifiers professional and strong licencing'*, further on he says *'problems arose primarily because of the apparent low standard of professionalism and independence displayed by the private certifiers by the developer'*.**

**In relation to consultants reports, be it traffic or acoustic reports which are paid for by the developers. What processes does the Council have in place given the highly technical nature of the reports to ensure that accuracy and adherence to technical standards are met, for example, does Council require the raw traffic and acoustic data sets to be submitted so they can be analysed independently if concerns are raised?**

A: [General Manager] It does depends on the nature of the speciality. As a Council we do retain some specialist expertise in-house, for example in relation to a traffic engineering report, we do have a traffic engineer who is a specialist in this area who can review that information. However, when it comes to something that is more highly specialised, like acoustic engineering we do rely on the professional ethics and the expertise of that acoustic engineer.

Some time back in the past with an acoustic engineering report, we did seek some advice from within the State government from an acoustic engineer. But generally if we have the expertise in-house, we rely on that expertise to review the specialist engineers report, but if we don't have the expertise in-house then we need to rely on the professional expertise of the expert or alternatively if

necessary seek our own advice in relation to that, as an example we might seek a peer review.

**Q3: Do you ever ask for their data sets to double check their calculations?**

A: [General Manager] In the case of a traffic engineering report, the traffic engineer will look at the reasonableness of the assumptions that have been made and if there are questions that arise from the report, then we would go back to that specialist and seek further advice.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] In relation to development applications that Council receive and the information provided, there are certain aspects that we would check the data on, as an example stormwater, as we have storm water modelling which we can run some checks and balances on to make sure that the systems can manage, as per the recommendation by the consultant.

For specialist areas like acoustics we would rely on the expert and they will have to certify their advice to Council. If there were areas we were skeptical of, we can ask for an independent review of that information, but we do analyse the information that we receive from development applications.

**Q4: Do you have software that analyses traffic?**

A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] We do have software, as well as a traffic engineer who is specially qualified in that area to check it against the relevant codes and our other engineers also have special software that they use.

**Question without notice – Shane Alderton, Austins Ferry**

**Q1: I applaud Council for the cost saving you've made in the last financial year. My question relates to Item 11, 'Review of Council Services, update – Arts and Culture (MAC) section'. On page 35 of the report the business forecast comparisons state expenditure is around \$600,000 a year, revenues are around \$100,000 and the salaries \$450,000.**

**Does our Arts sector and the MAC facility operate at a considerable loss every year and what would that loss be?**

A: [General Manager] The reference you make to page 35 in the report, is a piece of modelling done by the consultant who has looked at the 2021/22 actuals against what would be expected under the 2015 business case.

It is showing the Council has been operating the Centre in a way that is consistent with the business plan and in fact, you can see that both revenue and expenditure are, broadly speaking, close to the assumptions within that plan.

On page 38 of the report is has more definitive information. To clarify, the arts and culture program operates throughout the city, not just out of the Moonah Arts Centre (MAC), but there is more expenditure than revenue. This is a grassroots community arts program and facility. It doesn't operate at a profit which would not be expected from an arts facility such as the MAC. The figures do indicate both the annual budget and the forecast in the report does show that this year there is expected to be significantly more revenue, but also additional expenditure which reflects the fact that the facility is operating at a greater level and therefore if you're holding more events, it incurs more costs.

**Q: The deficit appears to be growing year on year. As a Council that prides itself on reducing costs, wouldn't part of this process when reviewing this report be for Council to look ways to cut back the deficit and minimise costs?**

A: [General Manager] Whilst Council has been operating consistently with the 2015 Business plan, the consultant working with Council staff has identified a range of refinements we can make and Council will be looking to a develop new business plan to look at making further gains in that regard. But, the reality is we are not turning this into a profit making venture because it is a grassroots community Arts Centre.

Many of Council operations do not operate at a profit because they're operating for the community, as an example, a range of our community halls are leased out to the community under market rates, as they are there to foster community activity which is part of governments role to grow community.

**Q: With the MAC, does Council look at leasing it out or offering the facility for use to the private sector, so it generates income rather than it sit idle?**

A: [General Manager] The MAC does have a range of spaces within its facility, such as the performance area, gallery spaces, meeting rooms and the Makers Workshop. The facility is highly utilised and is booked by both community and private organisations.

Council is looking at how we can improve this further as per the report. At present we are working with an arts organisation to see if we can lease out a meeting room to them. We are looking at options to bring in other organisations to assist with sharing the cost of running the facility.

**Q: If comparing this facility to the private sector, the private sector would not operate it at a loss?**

A: [General Manager] Council is responsible for a whole range of activities that the private sector wouldn't run, which we do as it is the province and the role of government and it isn't about making a profit. If it was about profit, Council could increase its rates but that is not its role.

**Q: I can't understand why you'd lease something out at say \$18.00 an hour, but it cost \$20.00 an hour to run, why would you not at least run it at a cost neutral basis?**

A: [General Manager] That is why we are looking at the review of the business plan. We will be looking closely at our fees and charges. But the reality is that this is about promoting arts and cultural activity within our city. It's not purely about making a profit. Its expenditure is roughly 1% of Council's overall expenditure budgets.

[Mayor] It should be noted the amount of revenue Council puts towards sport and recreation facilities and if we were to try and recover costs on sporting club rooms and sports ground hire at a cost recovery level, then it would be totally cost prohibitive for people to engage in sport and recreation. The same goes with the arts and culture sector within our community, we are trying to provide opportunities for everyone to be able to participate in sport and recreation and in arts and culture activities. We are not talking about rich artists who are coming along to use the MAC at a cheap rate at the ratepayers expense. This is about a community art facility where we are trying to support developing artists, whether that be through music, poetry, painting or other forms of art. So, yes Council does provide a number of subsidised community facilities and services and activities that are deemed appropriate for local government to do so in support of our communities.

**Q: Does Council take into consideration the rezoning of land i.e., whether you go from commercial to residential or residential back to commercial, do you factor into that decision the impact that decision would have on neighbouring properties in regards to devaluation of neighbouring properties and maybe the potential for neighbouring properties to seek compensation from Council if neighbouring properties were devalued as a result of a Council's zoning decision?**

A: [General Manager] In relation to the first part of the question, yes, we do take into account the impact on neighbouring properties. One of the fundamental underlying principles of our planning system is to try and minimise conflict between different land uses. Eg. a facility that's operating which may cause problems for adjoining residents, that is definitely front and centre of planning and one which would be taken into account along with a whole range of other checks and balances that Council has to consider. The legislation stipulates that Council has to look at a whole wide range of things.

In relation to the question of loss of value around properties. Generally that's not something that the planning system takes into account, but if Council is looking at impacts on surrounding land uses and whether something is going to be unreasonable from a land use impact point of view, then it is kind of a proxy

for value as well. But the planning system doesn't deal with value because otherwise everyone would need to get a valuation to resolve all of these things and it's not practical. So the planning system doesn't do that per se, but it does look at those residential impacts along with other things.

As the Mayor said if you are referring to a specific proposal in Claremont, Council is yet to receive a proposal, but elected members are aware of the proposal from correspondence which has been received, which I think is similar to what neighbours have received. Council can't form a view on an application before it has been received.

Council has to look at applications on their merits which is done through our planning authority, which is an another forum from the full council. But the process required in that instance would also pick up the Tasmanian Planning Commission. Therefore, the community will have two bites of the cherry in relation to this process. One is an opportunity to comment to Council and the second is an opportunity to comment to the Tasmanian Planning Commission, this is just a general idea of the process.

**Q: From a legal viewpoint, though, I guess there is a third process, which is litigation against any organisation or council who has impacted on the value of somebody else's property through a decision they make?**

**A:** No, not under the land Use Planning Act.

---

## **7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS**

---

None.

## COMMUNITY

### *Community Goal: "Making Lives Better"*

---

#### **8. ACTIVITIES OF THE MAYOR**

---

File Reference:                      Mayoral Announcements

**Reporting Brief:**

To receive an update on the recent activities of the Mayor.

**Resolution:**

KING/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 20 February to Sunday, 19 March 2023.

The motion was put.

**FOR:**                      Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Slade left the meeting at 4:13 pm.

---

## **9. INVESTIGATIONS INTO PROPERTY DISPOSAL AT 12 ROTHESAY CIRCLE, GOODWOOD**

---

File Reference: 12 Rothesay Circle

### **Reporting Brief:**

To recommend Council begins preliminary investigations into the disposal of 12 Rothesay Circle Reserve, Goodwood (the Land) by way of donation.

### **Resolution:**

KING/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. ENDORSE the commencement of investigations into the potential disposal of 12 Rothesay Circle, Goodwood (CT 156505/1) by donation to Karadi Aboriginal Corporation
2. AUTHORISE Council staff to undertake a community engagement process to identify any concerns about the potential disposal of the Land, and
3. REQUIRE a further report to Council summarising the feedback received (and identifying any concerns) and seeking approval to proceed or not proceed with the statutory processes for public land disposal.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, and Councillor Kendall.

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Slade returned to the meeting at 4:22 pm.



## GOVERNANCE

### *Community Goal: "Leading our Community"*

---

#### 10. GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN 2023-2032 COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

---

File Reference: GCC Strategic Plan Review 2023-2032

##### **Reporting Brief:**

To present the feedback from public exhibition of the draft Glenorchy City Council Strategic Plan 2023-2032 between 28 February and 19 March 2023 and recommend Council's adoption of the Plan with amendments.

##### **Resolution:**

KING/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. NOTE the feedback invited from the community, other stakeholders and Council staff during the public consultation period between 28 February and 19 March 2023 on the draft Strategic Plan and the changes to the notified draft Strategic Plan in response to that feedback.
2. ADOPT the Glenorchy City Council Strategic Plan 2023 – 2032 set out in **Attachment 4**.
3. REQUIRE the General Manager to further review the performance measures required to monitor Council's performance against the Strategic Plan, with a report to be brought back to Council before 30 June 2023 setting out the recommended measures.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 11. REVIEW OF COUNCIL SERVICES UPDATE - ARTS AND CULTURE (MAC) SECTION

---

File Reference: Review of Council Services

### Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with an update on the independent review of the Arts and Culture/Moonah Arts Centre Section.

### Resolution:

HICKEY/SLADE

That Council:

1. NOTE this review of Council services update, concluding the review of the Arts and Culture/MAC section.
2. AUTHORISE review of the MAC Business Plan with a report to be brought back to Council within 6 months.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

### AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Thomas left the meeting at 4:48 pm.

---

## **12. NOMINATIONS FOR GENERAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA (LGAT)**

---

File Reference: LGAT

### **Reporting Brief:**

To seek Council's nomination of an eligible Alderman to a position on the General Management Committee of the Local Government Association of Tasmania (**LGAT**) and Council's consideration of whether to make a nomination for position of President of LGAT.

### **Resolution:**

KING/KENDALL

That Council:

1. NOMINATE Mayor Thomas for a position on the General Management Committee of the Local Government Association of Tasmania (**LGAT**).
2. NOMINATE Mayor Thomas for President of LGAT.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 14. ELECTED MEMBER TRAINING REQUEST

---

File Reference: Aldermen administration

### Reporting Brief:

To enable Council to consider an elected member training request.

### Motion:

KING/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. APPROVE the Mayor's request to undertake the Company Directors course at a cost of \$8 449 as an Aldermanic expense.
2. ALLOW a one-off exemption to clause 8 of the Aldermen Expenses Policy to enable the Mayor to join the Institute of Company Directors for the current membership year to take advantage of the \$3,400 discount in course fees that is available to members.
3. AUTHORISE the Mayor's attendance at the Australian Local Government Association National General Assembly 2023 in Canberra from 14 - 16 June 2023 at an estimated cost for registration, flights, accommodation and taxi transfers of \$3,235.

### Resolution:

KING

That Items 1 and 2 are considered by Council as a separate item from Item 3.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Slade foreshadowed the following motion:

That Council:

1. DENY the Mayor's request to undertake the Company Directors course at a cost of \$8,449 as an Aldermanic expense, for the following reasons:
  - a. would exceed the annual elected members training budget
  - b. would not provide equitable access for all elected members
  - c. membership fees should be individual expenses

**Resolution:**

That Council:

1. APPROVE the Mayor's request to undertake the Company Directors course at a cost of \$8 449 as an Aldermanic expense.
2. ALLOW a one-off exemption to clause 8 of the Aldermen Expenses Policy to enable the Mayor to join the Institute of Company Directors for the current membership year to take advantage of the \$3,400 discount in course fees that is available to members.

Items 1 and 2 of the original motion were put

**FOR:**

The Acting Chair declared Items 1 and 2 of the original motion LOST due to lack of support.

The foreshadowed motion became the motion.

**Resolution:**

SLADE/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. DENY the Mayor's request to undertake the Company Directors course at a cost of \$8,449 as an Aldermanic expense, for the following reasons:
  - a. would exceed the annual elected members training budget
  - b. would not provide equitable access for all elected members
  - c. membership fees should be individual expenses.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Item 3 of the original motion was now considered.

Alderman Slade requested an amendment to Item 3 of the original motion, to reduce the authorised amount from an estimated cost of \$3, 235 to “up to a balance of \$2,940”.

The mover and seconder accepted the amendment to Item 3 of the original motion as follows:

**Resolution:**

KING/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

3. AUTHORISE the Mayor’s attendance at the Australian Local Government Association National General Assembly 2023 in Canberra from 14 - 16 June 2023 at an estimated cost for registration, flights, accommodation and taxi transfers up to a balance of \$2,940.

Item 3 of the original motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Thomas returned to the meeting at 5:46 pm.

The Chair adjourned the meeting for a 10-minute break at 5.46pm.

The Chair resumed the meeting at 5.58pm.

---

### **13. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 28 FEBRUARY 2023**

---

File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

**Reporting Brief:**

To provide the monthly Financial Performance Report to Council for the period ending 28 February 2023.

**Resolution:**

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 28 February 2023 as set out in Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 15. UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

---

File Reference: Council Policies

### Reporting Brief:

To present the Recording of Council Meeting Policy for review and adoption.

### Resolution:

SLADE/KENDALL

That Council:

1. ADOPT the Recording of Council meetings Policy 2023 in Attachment 2.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.



---

## 16. PROCUREMENT EXEMPTION REPORT

---

File Reference: Procurement

### Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to procurements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts.

### Resolution:

DUNSBY/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. APPROVE an exemption to the Code for Tenders and Contracts to directly appoint Tenderlink and Illion for the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2026 at an estimated cost over the three (3) year appointment is \$31,883 excluding GST.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 17. NOTICES OF MOTION – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE

---

### Question without Notice - Alderman Russell Yaxley

**Q:** Can Council assist in the updating of the Glenorchy Community Fund's "Faces of 2014" publication?

**A:** Question was taken on notice.

### **Resolution:**

KING/SLADE

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 Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 6.08pm.

# CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Closed session commenced at 6.10 pm.

---

## 18. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

---

### **Resolution:**

SLADE/KING

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Monday, 27 February 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 19. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

---

None.

## GOVERNANCE

### *Community Goal: "Leading our Community"*

---

#### 20. REVIEW OF GLENORCHY JOBS HUB

---

*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).*

---

#### 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. APPROVAL OF LEGAL EXPENDITURE

---

*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)(i) (Matters relating to actual or possible litigation taken, or to be taken, by or involving the Council or an employee of Council) and (4) (In relation to subregulation 15(3) only, matters relating to legal (or possible future legal) action taken (or may be taken) by or involving the Council).*

---

#### 23. NOTICES OF MOTION – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)

---

**Resolution:**

KING/HICKEY

That the meeting be moved back into open Council.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley, Slade  
and Councillor Kendall.

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 7.09 pm.

Confirmed,

**CHAIR**