

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Wednesday, 26 April 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, Councillor Molly Kendall and Harry Quick.

In attendance (in Chambers): Emilio Reale (Acting General Manager), Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), Luke Chiu (Acting Director Infrastructure and Works), David Ronaldson (Executive Manager Stakeholder Engagement), Allan Wise (Manager Finance), Paul Garnsey (Manager), Robbie Shafe (Manager), Lyndal Byrne (Senior Planner) and Trevor Boheim (Coordinator Planning Services).

In attendance (by video link): Marian Maclachlan (Executive Assistant to the General Manager)

Leave of Absence:

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date: Monday, 3 April 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Moonah Taste of the World
- Revision of Parking strategy
- Community Engagement Review

Date: Wednesday, 12 April 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Draft Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP)
- Bridgewater Bridge update
- Rate recovery

Date: Monday, 17 April 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- TasWater update

Date: Wednesday, 19 April 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Budget process

The Council meeting was live streamed on Council's website, Facebook page and YouTube channel. The peak number of viewers watching the live stream was 25 viewers and 17 members of the public attended in person.

The Chair opened the meeting at 3.31pm.

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

Alderman Kelly Sims.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

SLADE/KING

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday, 27 March 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

None.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

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

No interests were declared.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

None.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

John and Peta Pritchard – Claremont

(received 26 April 2023)

Q: A letter was sent to our neighbour at the old St Albans church, Main Rd Claremont. No one else in the vicinity of the old Primary School Site, received this or any other notification of any amendment. What makes this important, is the fact that an extension to the two year building start date, has been hidden in these planning amendments, something that would have allowed residents the opportunity to further express their concerns as to the structure height, plus parking and traffic concerns. Since the original approval it should be noted that council in their wisdom, declared Cadbury Rd., the main access route for B-Double trucks, adding further concern for parking on this road, as contained in the original approval, as well as creating further parking for the units, in the only parking area available for visitors to Windermere Reserve. This problem should have been witnessed by the Mayor yesterday (25/4/23), when the Anzac ceremony caused vehicles to park in Cadbury Rd., nearly causing an accident, when several of these huge trucks, ventured between the parked vehicles. What I am expressly asking, is that you use today's meeting to ask for this amendment to be revisited, with the view of giving residents the opportunity to be involved, prior to any extension of the building start date being granted.

A: [Acting General Manager] In relation to the amendment, only people who have put in a representation and/or adjoining property owners are sent a notice, that is why not everyone in the area received notification.

A traffic assessment accompanied that application and all of the items were assessed.

[Manager Development] An extension of time on the permit was granted on 23 February 2023 for a further two year period, this is allowed under the planning scheme if the developer is unable to start the development for a variety of reasons and this is quite a normal thing to happen. Separately, Council did receive a request to amend the permit, originally the permit had permission to

demolish some of the existing buildings, as well as the requirement to refurbish the original school house.

The amendment was to separate these two items. The amendment means that the refurbishment of the remaining school building is to commence within 12-months of the completion of the demolition works.

Due to the amendment we notified representators by letter to advise of the amendment which is basically a change in the staging of the application.

David Kernke – Claremont

(received 24 April 2023)

Proposed development at 8-10 Main Road, Claremont

Q1: 8 -10 Main Road, Claremont is a block of land over 10 metres in width that includes public parking spaces utilised by the Country Music Club, it has heritage issues subject to a part 5 Agreement pursuant to the land use planning and approvals dated 17 April, 1997. This is a perpetual agreement between Council and owners of Claremont House and has crownland status being on the same title as Lady Clark Avenue. Is Council now actively considering the sale or disposal of that Crown land and with whom?

A: [Acting General Manager] We are aware of the conservation management plan that sits on the Claremont House property. This strip of land is adjacent to the land, 8 to 10 Main Road, Claremont. Council is not considering sale or disposal of this land.

However, the Council is legally obliged when we receive an application, to consider an application to allow or licence a use of the land for whatever the purpose may be, without giving due consideration to the development. In other words, we have to be development blind when we receive an application or in this case a crossover over that land, but we would not be disposing of it. It would be either a nonexclusive licence or a permit to put a driveway crossover on the land, similar to driveways that cross over nature strips for private residents.

Council does have to look at it separate to the development. Therefore, we still have to make an assessment of that application. That is the reason why and we can't just outright reject it.

Q2: Why has Council not rejected access across 12 Main Road onto Lady Clark Avenue from 8 to 10 Main Road when that particular site has more than sufficient road access onto Main Road for a development commensurate with inner residential zoning?

A: [Acting General Manager] This is because we did receive an application to

consider, so we actually have to consider that application. Council has to look at the merits of either accepting or rejecting that application.

To give you a little bit more detail on what we do assess , we look at is it safe to provide access? Is there infrastructure which might be impacted by providing access? Does Council need that land for any other purpose? All of these things are considered when accessing the application.

Q2a: There is a range of issues here, not only the Part 5 agreement, but also Lady Clarke Avenue, as it is only five (5) to six (6) metres wide. Our concern is the application on 8 to 10 Main Road, Claremont and this has come up at the same time, which is clouding the issue a bit. As residents, we're very keen to monitor this very closely.

A: [Acting General Manager] We totally understand and we will take those issues into account during the assessment process.

Q2b: Will the residents have any access to the decision making process or will we be involved in that process?

A: [Acting General Manager] That sort of information could be provided by request for information, but let's see how the process goes.

Q3: Can we know who has made the application, is it McDonald's or is it the owner of the land?

A: [Acting General Manager] The owner of the land has made the application through a paid consultant who is acting as their agent, which is standard in development applications.

Ron Collidge, Claremont

(received 24 April 2023)

Q1. Why does this council make rules and by laws it has no intention of fulfilling? This council passed zoning laws to make the land at 8 -10 Main Road Claremont inner residential from commercial, making any commercial operation such as 24hr drive through prohibited on this site. So why does this council now ignore their own recommendations instead of upholding the planning scheme by rejecting outright any application that does not comply with the rules of inner residential zoning as applicable to this block of land?

A: [Acting General Manager] Council is aware the land is zoned inner residential and the application is for a 24-hour drive thru, which is actually a prohibited use of that land however, it doesn't prevent people from applying for a rezoning. Once the application is received we need to go through the process and make an assessment on how appropriate it is and whether a rezoning could be considered.

[Coordinator Strategic Planning] The assessment must occur to ensure it is an open and transparent process, so the applicant and any other interested party can see how it's been assessed and then how a decision has been made.

[Mayor] The State Government legislation sets out how Council is to receive and assess development applications and requests to initiate amendments to the planning scheme. Council is bound to follow the due process that legislation sets out and give any applicant a fair process in assessing an application, then the officers recommend to the Glenorchy Planning Authority whether to reject or accept a particular application, that is the process. This application is not at this stage. Officers have received an application, it has not come to the Glenorchy Planning Authority.

[Acting General Manager] Please note it does go through another process. If Council did actually accept and prepare for a zone amendment, it then has to go to the Tasmanian Planning Commission. They are an independent State body, they review the application and make their own independent assessment as to whether or not it should be accepted. Therefore, it does go through a two-stage process.

In addition, then the development itself gets assessed. So it is another process that will then come back before the Glenorchy Planning Authority to make a determination on.

[Mayor] Community members will have the opportunity to make representations through both of those processes, assessment of any development application and consideration of any proposed planning scheme amendment, but we are not at that point yet.

All the representations that are currently being sent in, we can note them, but we cannot formally consider them and they won't count as representations until such time as an application is formally advertised. At this time, you will need to send the representations back in again.

[Coordinator Strategic Planning] To clarify, looking at a planning scheme amendment process, it's quite different from a straight forward development application process. A report and a recommendation needs to go to the Glenorchy Planning Authority and if they decide to prepare the amendment, then it goes on public exhibition. If they decide not to prepare the amendment then it doesn't go on public exhibition.

[Mayor] A recommendation will come to the Glenorchy Planning authority on the requested amendment without community members being able to have their say on that, because it is not unless we decide to initiate an amendment that it goes on public exhibition. We want to be clear on that, as it might seem

like an anomaly, but that's the process for the planning scheme amendments.

[Coordinator Strategic Planning] As a further point of clarification. The request that we have before us at the moment is basically combining the planning scheme amendment request with the development application, therefore, they both could potentially travel through the process together.

If the Glenorchy Planning Authority decides to prepare the amendment, it would then turn its mind to whether it's appropriate to test the planning permit application, and if they were both deemed appropriate, it would then all go on public exhibition and the community would at this time have the opportunity to put forward their representations on both the planning scheme amendment and the development application.

Question on Notice – Paul Campton (received 24 April 2023)

In the Greater Glenorchy Plan, 2021, with regards to Claremont, it states under Principle 1: a local place for local people “the plan focuses on delivering a local centre that is a high-quality social connector with good accessibility, connectivity and safety, rather than identifying significant new retail or commercial development opportunities. Further medium-density residential development within walking distance to the activity centre, like at the former primary school site, will enhance the vibrancy of the centre”

Q1. Given the Greater Glenorchy Plan principle for Claremont CBD and the current Inner Residential zoning, for 8-10 Main Rd and the former Claremont Primary school site, does Council still prioritise housing for these residential sites in the current housing crisis or is commercial use now the focus for such inner residential sites?

A: [Mayor] Council does absolutely prioritise housing. We are undertaking a number of actions across our municipality to make sure we are maximising the use of land for residential housing purposes, but we are also open for business and have a duty under State Government legislation in relation to land use planning to assess any request for amendment to the planning scheme and development applications in accordance with that legislation.

Question without Notice – Paul Campton, Claremont

Q1: Council is aware it has an obligation to ensure that a planning scheme amendment meets Schedule 1 objectives of LUPAA, where it states it requires sound strategic planning and coordinated action by State and Local governments.

Does Council consider that it would be meeting its obligations under LUPAA when land that has been strategically zoned inner residential should now be available for prohibited uses?

A: [Mayor] Council takes advice from planning officers and considers all development applications based on their merits against the criteria of the planning scheme. Council does take that responsibility and our obligation under LUPAA and any other planning legislation very seriously.

Question without Notice - Janiece Bryan, Montrose

Q1: If you rezone and dispose of CBD car parks, what is Council's plan to provide accessible car parking for the people of Glenorchy to carry on with their daily lives?

A: Question taken on notice

Q2: Will the Council be providing the infrastructure for the Northern Corridor Apartment developments? How could this be called responsible, when the Updated Policy Agenda Item 10 page 16 states 'We encourage responsible growth for our City'? This is not responsible growth for the residents of this city.

A: [Acting General Manager] Council is looking at conducting some studies on what infrastructure is available and its capacity. If there is need to upgrade the infrastructure, that will probably be a condition of development applications as they arise, but it does depend on what sort of applications we get. As an example, there might be other ways that they can detain stormwater and have a zero net impact on the infrastructure. These are the type of things that we would look for and assess to ensure that the systems are not overloaded in relation to any development that takes place.

Q2a. My main concern is the cost to ratepayers.

A: [Acting General Manager] I can reassure you that is our concern as well. We are constantly looking at ways of minimising any impact.

Q3: Could you provide transparency to the community in relation to the land tenure of Berriedale Public Reserve? Has the Berriedale Public Reserve been disposed of?

If the answer is No – How is the land being legally occupied when there is no lease for the Caravan Park or the Berriedale Foreshore Reserve? This has been confirmed as a result of a Right to Information request.

If the Answer is Yes – What was the sale price for the Berriedale Public Reserve?

The land is being occupied, how is it legally occupied if there is no lease agreement for those parts of the Berriedale public reserve?

A: [Mayor] The Berriedale public reserve has a number of different titles on it, so I'm not sure if you're referring to a specific title on the Berriedale public reserve?

Q3a: I did put in a Right to Information request and there are leases and the land is being occupied. How is it legally occupied if there is no lease agreement for those portions of the Berriedale public reserve?

A: [Acting General Manager] Council does have a lease agreement on a car park that is being used by MONA. We do have a further potential lease, it is at stage one for when the BMX track is relocated, so they are under formal lease agreements.

We do have a temporary lease or a fixed-term lease in an area adjacent to the border where there used to be some caravan parking some time ago. It is being used for MONA staff for car parking and we have an Agreement letter for their builders to park their cars whilst the building works are going on at the MONA site within the old Caravan Park area.

Q3b. I am referring to that and also the Berriedale foreshore reserve, which is the area and north of the it's the car park that MONA acquired initially. There's quite a big area there that they're occupying, but I did not receive any information on any leases for that, that part of the peninsula.

A: [Acting Director Infrastructure and Waste] The area you are referring to is under a licence and I can send you a copy of those licences. Please note there are provisions within those licences called holdover provisions, so the same terms and conditions of the agreement apply in holdover.

Council is currently negotiating with MONA a new lease over that area, which is the 'Worm Chapel'. A new agreement will be put in place but the old agreement isn't invalidated, as it is in holdover provision.

[Mayor] We will take that on notice and provide the specific forms of licence to you.

Q4: Why have the Strategic Plan objectives been deleted from the Leasing and Licencing Policy. 'Making lives Better' has been replaced with 'Open for Business'? The welfare of ratepayers and residents has been made irrelevant.

You have removed community consultation, community goals, deploying council resources effectively to deliver value, accountability, referent to regulatory compliance in Councils systems and processes. Has there been prior consultation with the elected aldermen on these changes?

A: [Mayor] The strategic plan references have been removed because we now have a new Strategic Plan but it is not necessary to have strategic plan references in what are policy documents.

[Acting General Manager] The policies had a number of headings where we refer to legislative requirements and it also had a reference to the strategic plan on how they might align to them.

Council recently went through a new strategic planning process and we have developed new strategies, which have made the existing policies obsolete. A decision was made to remove the section where it referred to strategic plans on Council policies because it is not a common to have strategic plan references in policy documents. The policy does have some reference to legislative processes and then lays out a process that we need to follow in relation to our duties. The strategic plan references were not really there for any other reason except for showing where they might align.

Q4a: With allowing a letter, specifying a permit is not required, in lieu of issuing a valid planning permit, there are many issues not addressed in this policy. Who has the delegation to issue these letters, how are they assessed, how and who manages conflicts of interest and risk? Does this meet statutory requirements under the Legislation?

With previous changes to Planning Authority delegations, is there a conflict of interest register and how is this managed? Is risk management assessed?

A: [Acting General Manager]. Council does have a conflict of interest register, conflicts of interest are recorded and registered. The delegations are dependent on the development, based on this they are allocated to either a Planning Officer, or a Senior Statutory Planning Officer, or a Manager, or the General Manager.

If no permit is required it still has to go through an assessment process to determine that no permit is required, because if something meets all of the

planning requirements like the required setbacks, heights and everything else that it needs to comply with, then the applicant doesn't actually need to have a permit,

Under the planning scheme it sets out the process but an applicant doesn't have to come to council to get that, however, Council does recommend that they do go through the process, as this way it is verified and the applicant has a letter from Council advising it has been assessed and it doesn't require a permit.

Q4b. If Officers are doing planning approvals outside the planning authority authorising them, is there a separate conflict of interest register to the one used by the elected members?

A: [Acting General Manager] There is only one conflict of interest register.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

Council received a deputation from Ms Pauline Elliot, Claremont and Mr David Kernke, Claremont.

Ms Pauline Elliot addressed the Council in relation to the proposed development at 8-10 Main Road, Claremont

Council has received a development application in relation to 8-10 Main Road, Claremont. This proposal seeks to locate a 24 hour drive through facility in the midst of residential properties. There are residences on all four sides of the property.

The land is currently zoned inner residential, and as such a 24 hour drive through is prohibited.

Residents near this property are dismayed at the prospect of loss of amenity with constant noise, light, odour and traffic which will accompany such a development.

The zoning and planning is not ambiguous and this proposal should have never been encouraged.

Council Planning members have contacted various residents to also inform them of an application to access, sell/dispose of council land, presumably to the developers or to the owners of 8-10 Main Road Claremont. This is to enable an access point to the property from Lady Clarke Avenue. The property, 8-10 Main Road, has sufficient and generous access to Main Road for any allowable use commensurate with its inner residential zoning. Increased access can only mean a large volume of traffic is expected on the site, and the inappropriateness of directing it into a small side road, less than 6 metres in width, leading to a retirement village is obvious. If this apparent land grab by the owners or developers is approved it can only be interpreted as tacit Council approval for the whole prohibited development. This land grab we are informed in considered separately from the development application, yet it is self-evident that extra access is due to the traffic demands of the 24 hours drive through and thus it cannot be seen in isolation and it is naïve to pretend otherwise.

If it is indeed seen independently then there is no justifiable reason for allowing extra access to council land within current zoning.

The issue of the information given to residents by Council when purchasing properties in the area over the last two years needs to be considered. Prospective residents pursued due diligence and found they were bordering an inner residential zone and purchased their properties on this basis. Now they face the prospect of the properties being worth less than their mortgages and all the stress and expense that will bring through no fault of their own. The integrity of that information provided

by council, the planning scheme and the Greater Glenorchy Plan will be degraded if this current development application is approved.

Currently there are approximately 100 residents who are living in the Lady Clarke Retirement Village. These residents are extremely concerned about this proposed development. Primarily their safety and loss of amenity are their main concerns. If traffic is directed into Lady Clark Avenue, a very narrow road leading only to residential housing, it will be distressing and dangerous for locals to use. Also the road is a dead end and more traffic from this development could be expected to use the roads around the Lady Clarke Retirement Village to turn around.

The other documented concern for these residents is the increase in antisocial behaviour by those using the Lady Clarke Retirement Village as a short cut from Box Hill Road to the proposed development. This has been a problem in the past which after much effort has been controlled. Elderly residents and management reasonably foresee and are distraught with such behaviour recurring and the unreasonable loss of amenity as pedestrians illegally use the Lady Clarke Retirement Village as a natural shortcut to the proposed 24 hour development.

When this property was first zoned inner residential I sought information from the then Mayor. She informed me that Council Planning Officers has identified the property as underutilised, and suitable for housing. The current Mayor has featured in the media over the last few months promoting her commitment to housing and bemoaning the lack of suitable housing land. We commend her statements on the need for more housing. One might reasonably consider the Planning Scheme, the Greater Glenorchy Plan, the Statement on Commitment to Housing and numerous public recent statements by Council to be rendered worthless, if land set aside for housing development can be given to a commercial development which could be located in a more appropriate non-residential site.

The outcome which I, and all residents close to the proposed development seek, is to keep this land available for housing and refuse to amend the planning scheme to allow a 24 hour drive through. The developers have indicated they will seek another site in Claremont if this one is unavailable. This option allows the council to demonstrate its integrity by upholding its zoning and planning schemes, whilst still supporting commercial developments and jobs.

Mr David Kernke noted all residents are very concerned about the development application but they have been comforted somewhat by the fact that McDonald's have said they will look elsewhere and we are looking forward to a positive result.

Response:

[Mayor] We understand the sensitivity of this development and will be assessing the application in line with the Planning Scheme and the landowner consent process.

I can reiterate that the proposed drive through development is a prohibited use in an inner residential zoned site, nevertheless the applicant, as does anybody, has the right to request a planning scheme amendment, which has a defined process for assessment. Council officers are currently undertaking the assessment process.

It would be inappropriate for Council to any make comment or pre-determine the outcomes of the assessment as Council is legally required to keep an open mind on all development applications and requests for planning scheme amendments. Once the assessment has been made, Council officers will present a recommendation to the Glenorchy Planning Authority for consideration and decision. Should the Authority decide to initiate a planning scheme amendment, the final decision on any amendment will rest with the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

As you are aware there will be further opportunity for formal representations during the statutory processes of both the planning scheme amendment request and the development application and we will anticipate a formal representation from you when the time comes. It is through this formal representation process that Council is able to give full and due consideration to community feedback.

I am not able to provide any further comment, information or potential outcomes until the assessment is undertaken and recommendations are presented to the Glenorchy Planning Authority.

I appreciate your understanding of this process and thank you for your patience in awaiting the formal representation process.

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:

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 20 March to Sunday, 16 April 2023.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: "Leading our Community"

9. DANGEROUS DOG REGISTRATION FEE

File Reference:

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that a Council decision made at the Special Council meeting on Monday, 20 June 2022 to increase the Dangerous Dog Registration fee to \$1,000 for the 2023/24 financial year, be reconsidered to keeping it at \$500 for the first year of a newly declared dog, but \$200 for successive years.

Resolution:

QUICK/KING

That Council:

1. RESCIND Council decision 20 June 2022 to increase the Declared Dangerous Dog class registration to \$1,000 commencing 2023/24 financial year.
2. APPROVE the Registration Fee for the Declared Dangerous Dog class for initial registrations from the start of the 2023/24 financial year at \$500.
3. APPROVE the Registration Fee for Declared Dangerous Dog class of \$200 for the second and subsequent years of registration from the start of the 2023/24 financial year.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

10. UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

File Reference: Council Policies

Reporting Brief:

To present the Leasing and Licensing of Council Owned and Managed Properties Policy and the Event Management Policy for review and adoption.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KENDALL

That Council:

1. ADOPT the Leasing and Licensing of Council Owned and Managed Properties Policy in Attachment 2.
2. ADOPT the Event Management Policy in Attachment 4.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

11. QUARTERLY REPORT - QUARTER 3 2022/23

File Reference: Corporate Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To present Council's Quarterly Report for the quarter ending 31 March 2023.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE Council's Quarterly Report and Quarterly Annual Plan Progress Report for the quarter ending 31 March 2023.

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE Council's Quarterly Report and Quarterly Annual Plan Progress Report for the quarter ending 31 March 2023.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Alderman Russell Yaxley – Question on notice

Q: Can Council assist in the updating of the Glenorchy Community Fund’s “Faces of 2014” publication?

A: Council officer met with Glenorchy Community Fund (GCF) member. GCF are currently exploring the options of producing a new version of the Faces of Glenorchy. The GCF believed one way Council could greatly assist in the publication was by the sharing of photos taken at Council events. This request is being considered, such as ensuring the appropriate consent is obtained for photos that may be selected for the publication.

Alderman Stuart Slade – Question without notice

Q: We have all known many men and women who have done wonderful things for our community. They may not have been recognised as ‘Citizens of the Year’ or received an Australia Day honour, but they have provided many years of voluntary service to this community. Is there somewhere in our Council minutes where we can recognise these people on their passing?

A: [Mayor] There is an item titled ‘Announcements by the Chair’ and I would be more than happy for elected members to pass on any request for an announcements to occur under this item, so an individual can be recognised.

If an elected member feels strongly about making the announcement themselves in that particular section, I am happy to consider that upon request

Councillor Molly Kendall – Question without notice

Q: Due to the public interest and their attendance tonight about a development application, could we please clarify for members of the public how to make a representation, if any future application come to us for rezoning?

Where should they go to be alerted so they can make a representation and if they do make a representation, are they notified?

A: [Mayor] Anyone who has emailed Council on this matter to date, will be advised.

Please note this is not a requirement under the legislation, but we have committed to doing this given the significant community interest in this

development. Anyone who has already contacted us, will definitely be alerted and I think there is a group gathering who will also keep each other informed.

Development applications are advertised in the Mercury newspaper, Council also places development application on our website and we post on our social media for public representations to be made.

Adjoining landowners to the development application also will receive a letter advising them.

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/KING

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 and Slade, Councillor Kendall and Quick

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 5.35 pm.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Closed session commenced at 5.37 pm

13. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/QUICK

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

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

None.

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

None.

Recommendation:

KING/COCKSHUTT

That the meeting be moved back into open Council

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 5.38 pm.

Confirmed,

CHAIR