

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Monday, 29 May 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, Councillors Molly Kendall and Harry Quick.

In attendance (in Chambers): Tony McMullen (General Manager), Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Executive Manager Stakeholder Engagement), Allan Wise (Manager Finance), Paul Garnsey (Manager Development), Marina Campbell (Manager Community), Luke Chiu (Manager Property, Environment and Waste), Jill Sleiters (Community Development Coordinator) and Leah McKinnon (Safe City Lead)

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, 1 May 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Benjafield Park – update on community engagement
- Communications strategy update
- Carols Grant update
- Voice Referendum to Parliament

Date: Monday, 8 May 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Tasmanian Planning policies
- Strategic Risk Review

Date: Monday, 15 May 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Collection of shopping trolleys
- Elected members expense policy
- Reflect RAP Draft document

Date: Monday, 22 May 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Budget process – final workshop
- Annual Plan
- Community Engagement Review

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 24 viewers and 23 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 Wednesday, 26 April 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

I would like to note the sad passing of John Radcliffe OAM earlier this month, who was a former Glenorchy Citizen of the Year. Mr Radcliffe was very well known and respected across the Glenorchy community and will be sadly missed.

On Thursday, 25 June 2023 at the MyState Arena, Glenorchy City Council celebrated our Community and Volunteer Awards. It was a wonderful celebration recognising the contribution of our volunteers across the community and awarding our Citizen of the Year Awards recognising the following people:

- Citizen of the Year - Lucy Baker
- Senior Citizen of the Year -Corrie Bartle
- Local Hero of the Year- John Shoobridge
- Young Citizen of the Year - Emily Gamez
- Business Person of the Year - Belle Parker
- Sports Person of the Year - Arielle Cannell

Congratulations to all of the Citizen Award nominees and award winners and thank you to all of our volunteers who were recognised on the night.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

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

Mayor Thomas declared a pecuniary interest in Item 18 –Local Government Association of Tasmanian (LGAT) 2023 elections.

Alderman Slade declared a pecuniary interest in Item 10 – Feedback from investigation into the property disposal at 12 Rothesay Circle, Goodwood and Item 11 – Investigations into potential Council land disposals to support housing supply.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON 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?

Question taken on notice response

A: The Greater Glenorchy Plan, a masterplan adopted by Council in February 2021, identifies there might be future opportunity to rezone some lots, including car parks, however there is currently no plan to rezone or dispose of any of Council's CBD carparks.

The Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027 is currently due for review and will be taken to the May Council meeting for re-adoption. The objective of the strategy is to manage the supply and use of parking for the Glenorchy municipality. The strategy is to ensure there is adequate parking in Glenorchy through the five main themes – Parking Infrastructure, Parking Management, Parking Enforcement, Parking Finance and Parking Education.

(As background to this: a recent Planning Scheme Amendment PLAM-22/04 is seeking to apply a Specific Area Plan to land currently within the Central Business Zone, the zoning of land within the Glenorchy CBD. This planning scheme amendment does not seek to rezone any of Council's existing car parks. The Greater Glenorchy Plan, a masterplan adopted by Council in February 2021, identifies there might be future opportunity to do this, but there is no current plan in place).

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.

- A: The Licence in question was emailed to Ms Bryan by Council officer Hayden Waterlow on 28 March 2023, and again by Council officer Luke Chiu on 18 April 2023. The holdover provisions mentioned at the Council Meeting are at "Clause 2.4 Holding Over" of this Licence, which note that the Licence may continue on a month-to-month basis, on the same terms and conditions, after the expiry of the term of the licence.

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.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Question on Notice – Morris Malone, West Moonah
(received 7 May 2023)

Q1. What is the rationale for fully fenced playgrounds that are not equipped with accommodating gates, such as Keats Reserve?

A: Boundary fences between parks and roads reduce the likelihood of incidents, and give adults some comfort when supervising children. They also act as a vehicle barrier and contain balls. The Keats Reserve pathway is used as a regular thoroughfare for people of all abilities, and it's virtually impossible for people in wheelchairs to reach locks on gates. A self-closing gate wasn't considered in this instance. This is consistent with current advice from Play Australia.

Q2. Does council believe the fencing at Athol Street Reserve is adequate, considering this playground is adjacent to a highway?

A: Council acknowledges your concern here. Contracts are currently out for pricing to replace this fence with a higher safety fence (1.2m high), with the inclusion of a self-closing gate. The gate will be self-opening inwards to the park, so if a child attempts to escape the park, they will have to pull the gate in and step back, giving a supervisor more time to respond.

Q3: For Athol Street Reserve & Kendall Street Reserve, both of which are adjacent to a highway, would Council at least consider installing self-closing gates for increased safety?

A: The Athol Street fencing and gate is currently being coordinated, as above.

Kendall Street Reserve fencing, with a self-closing gate, isn't currently on our list of priorities, however we will factor this into upcoming budgets. The future planning for Kendall Street Reserve is for the removal of the play equipment and replacement with park seats and gardens, to encourage passive recreation, as outlined in Council's Playspace Strategy.

Question on Notice – Paul Campton (received 25 May 2023)

Q1. Council is now considering granting to the owners of 8-10 Main Rd the effectively exclusive use of nearly 100 sq metres of crown land (zoned residential) at 12 Main Rd for access to their land for a currently prohibited use. Given the price of 8-10 Main Rd when last sold was \$700 per sq metre and the asking price per sq metre is now \$2000 per square metre, this access way now has a value of \$200,000 without any commercial considerations. Whilst highly beneficial to the land owners, what benefits would ratepayers and residents gain from this action?

A: Landowner consent for the use of this portion of Council land has not yet been determined. If consent is granted this will start the planning assessment process, but not form an approval for the exclusive use of the land or granting of a licence. As such, a potential license or proposed fee for the land has not yet been considered.

Q2. Given 8-10 Main Rd is currently residential and that land owner consent is being considered for the access across crown land from 8-10 then will access be revoked if 8-10 Main Rd is then used for a prohibited use, such as a 24 hour drive through?

A: Landowner consent (if given) is only for the purpose of lodging the application. It does not constitute either: Council support for the application on its planning merits; or Council's permission as a landowner to undertake development on its land.

If landowner consent is given, the assessment of the planning merits of the application will be undertaken independently by the Glenorchy Planning Authority.

8-10 Main Road, Claremont cannot be used for a prohibited use. The intent of the current application is to change the planning controls that apply to the land so that the use is not prohibited.

Question without Notice – David Kernke, Claremont

Q: My question relates to conflict of interest.

I reside at 12 Lady Clarke Avenue, Claremont and I represent the local Claremont residents who are gravely concerned about McDonald's Australia's development application.

McDonald's Australia are seeking to have a 24-hour drive through facility established in a residential precinct, on inner-residential zoned land at 8-10 Main Road, Claremont. Such prohibited use on land strategically designated by the Council for housing and which it currently has a DA for housing.

This property at 8-10 Main Road, Claremont is owned by a company called 8MLC Pty Ltd. The Directors of the company are Nicholas Lambrakis and Peter James Barrett.

We are seeking confirmation that there is no conflict of interest between McDonald's Australia Limited for the 24-hour drive through facility, the owners of 8-10 Main Road, Claremont and the Glenorchy City Council, the elected representatives of the Glenorchy City Council, the Glenorchy Planning Authority, or any Glenorchy City Council officers involved in the assessment process.

Are you able to confirm whether any conflict of interest does exist or are you able to advise in due course?

A: [Mayor] The Question will be taken on notice. I can say no conflict of interest has been raised with myself and I have not been advised by the General Manager of any conflict of interest. However, the matter as you are aware is still to go before the Glenorchy Planning Authority and it is at that time if there was a conflict of interest by an elected member it would be raised at that meeting.

Question without Notice – Shane Alderton,

Q: The community is well informed in regards to the activities of the Mayor through the Council minutes, but as ratepayers we don't get any information in relation to the activities of our hard working elected members.

Has Council considered having some form of medium, whether it be documented in the monthly minutes outlining the activities of what our hard working aldermen have been up to?

A: [Mayor] It is a matter for each elected member to choose how they communicate to the community, what activities they engage in, but we can take it on notice for consideration. We can have a discussion as a group to gather how the elected members feel about it.

Q: So you would be prepared to workshop the idea and see if the elected members agree to have something published on a semi regular basis?

A: [Mayor] We will discuss it.

Q: Council is coming up to the time when it publishes its Annual report. In last year's Annual report it covered off on the number of Council meetings that Elected Members had attended, but it didn't reflect on the workshops, or for that matter, any community events or community yarns or any other opportunities our hard working elected members had to engage with the community.

In regards to this year's Annual report detail, will it cover off on the number of meetings elected members attended, but will it also include information on the number of workshops and possibly even expand further into the number of potential community engagements they participated in?

A: [Mayor] This year's Annual report will include details on how many workshops have been held, as well as how many each elected member attended. I believe the Annual report from last year was updated to include that information after it had been published, as it was omitted in error.

The second part of your question around the reporting of other engagements within the Annual report is something that we can consider as part of our discussion in response to your first question.

Question without Notice – Eddy Steenberg, Rosetta

Q: In tonight's closed agenda item, what can you tell me about the outstanding rates?

A: [General Manager] The report considers a number of properties for which rates have been outstanding for more than three years, despite a number of attempts to recover that money. We are looking at the avenues that are available to Council under the Local Government Act to proceed with the collection of those monies.

Q: What amount are we looking at in a round figure?

A: [General Manager] Approximately \$127,000.

Q: How does that compare to recent years, is it a particularly high amount?

A: [General Manager] Overall, Council has a very high rate recovery and as a rule, the community is very good at paying their rates. We don't have a lot of people who shirk their rates responsibility, but there is a small minority of ratepayers who do not pay. But the properties that we are looking at today, include deceased estates, where the ownership might not be quite clear, or they have been vacant for a long time and despite Council's numerous attempts to contact them, we have been unsuccessful and by taking this action we hope we can get these issues resolved.

[Mayor] The Local Government Act only allows these powers to be used when the properties rates have been outstanding three years or more.

Q: In the closed agenda, there is a report on McGill Rise, what can you tell me about that item?

A: [General Manager]. McGill Rise was in the media some time ago about a number of properties which Council had issued vacation notices against, effectively because there was concern about the safety of those properties. As a result, those properties were vacated.

Council is now left in a situation where we have vacant properties that are owned mainly by Interstate parties, this is public information, there are some legal processes being undertaken involving those parties and the developer.

Council's paramount concern, as the building authority is to make sure that there is public safety, and we are exploring processes relating to addressing safety concerns with a number of those properties.

Q: Does the Council have any plans for 7 Peltro Street, Glenorchy?

A: [General Manager] That property came onto the market and is immediately adjacent to the Northern Suburbs Transit corridor. There has been a lot of discussion over the years and in the newspaper about light rail proposals and the activation of the transit corridor under the Hobart City deal.

At this stage the State government appears to support the rapid bus transit proposal, which would go along the corridor and any such service will require stations along the route. Given the proximity of this piece of land to the corridor, it was felt that it was an appropriate strategic purchase for Council. Essentially we are holding onto the land due to its proximity to both the Glenorchy centre and the northern transit corridor.

We don't know precisely what the Department of State Growth has in mind in terms of the design of stations along the corridor. But given its location, we felt it was an appropriate opportunity to purchase the land because it is better to have it now rather than have to purchase it under duress at a later date.

Q: In the Mercury there was an article about a budget submission from the four Greater Hobart Mayors, which mentioned some interesting items, for example, \$500,000 to make the transport corridor development ready.

What does Council plan if you do actually receive that \$500,000?

A: [Mayor] My understanding is, it is about investigating what services are essentially needed along the corridor to make it suitable for higher density development.

[General Manager] Council is a signatory to the Hobart City Deal, which includes the other inner metropolitan councils plus the State and Federal governments and the activation of the Northern Suburbs Transit corridor between within 5-10 years when that was signed in February 2019.

It was a commitment under the City Deal, there was an initial amount of \$25 million from the Federal government, then I believe a subsequent \$13.5 million. The money cannot be spent on anything other than infrastructure works as we understand it. The aim of the \$500,000 is to progress investigation into what development goes along the rail corridor, depending on which mode of transit is decided upon. The idea is that there would be greater densification along that corridor as an urban renewal approach.

There is a lot of planning work to be done, whether the services are adequate, where should the development go, what should that development look like etc. Council is on a steering committee, which has recently been set up, along with Hobart City Council and the Department of State Growth.

A project brief is being developed to explore the process. There are a lot of planning processes to work through, to identify where is suitable for development and how we move towards that. Ultimately, we want to end up with a situation where we have provisions in our planning scheme that support the increase in density along the corridor so that more people have access to better transport.

Q: In that same article it mentions \$5 million to make bus stops accessible. Historically, Council has had trouble with Metro Tasmania and the State Government arguing about the funding for bus stops.

Council spends money on roads, potholes, fixing potholes and looks after drivers very well, but historically there has been virtually nothing for bus travellers.

Is it about time for Council to consider spending some money on looking after the bus traveller of Glenorchy?

A: [Mayor] I wouldn't say we have spent nothing on bus stop infrastructure. Council has spent a lot of money replacing damaged infrastructure in the bus mall and we have done bits and pieces at other bus stops throughout the municipality. But you are correct, the ownership fiasco continues there is no agreed position between the State and local governments on ownership of bus stop infrastructure.

Bus stop infrastructure is not on Council's asset register, so we don't consider it that we own the infrastructure. Council will continue to have those conversations with the State government on ownership. We would be happy to come to a some sort of agreement with the State government on how bus stops are to be maintained. But at this point in time it remains in limbo.

[General Manager] The situation is there is a lack of agreement between the State government and the local government sector across the state about who owns bus stops. In Hobart, Metro and the former Metropolitan Transport Trust installed bus stops for years. What has changed is the Department of State Growth has looked to change the contract for bus services so that the bus operators have a purely service contract. They will deliver services to X routes on time.

With the State government wanting to excise bus stop infrastructure out of the contract, Councils are being told we have suddenly become the owners of bus stops, which is something that has been disagreed with for over a decade.

Ultimately it comes down to a discussion between the State and local government sector, about who owns them and who pays for them. We have

recently gone back to them and said we are quite happy to take over that role in Glenorchy on a fee for service basis.

But the implications for the Glenorchy community, is that suddenly we would have a whole lot of assets that we would pick up, that we would have to find more rates to service. That is the issue, does it come through rates or does it come through taxes. We are certainly working on with the State government on this issue, but it has been at a bit of an impasse.

Q: It is great to see the Skate park which is being built at Montrose Foreshore Park, but it does raise a question about safety at the intersection of the community park entrance. What has Council done to advocate for some form of upgrade of that intersection?

A: [Mayor] I know we have had conversations with Department of State Growth about the need for upgrades to that intersection, but I will ask the Director Infrastructure and Works for the latest update.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] The last time we spoke with the Department of State Growth they advised they were investigating and had actually received some budget funding amount for traffic lights at that intersection.

I believe there have been some delays because they are looking at the transport corridor, but they had indicated it would be in the 2024/25 financial year. No further update has been received since then.

Q: Has Council seen the actual proposal?

A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] We have had some discussions with the Department of State Growth representatives that govern that area and they have provided verbal updates on the installation.

Q: North Chigwell soccer ground, we are talking about over \$12 million, so it is a major investment, but I wonder about the long-term viability of it? I understand Council will retain ownership of the land and the buildings will be leased to Football Tasmania and the soccer club, but will the rent received cover the costs?

A: [Mayor] Council subsidises a wide range of sport recreation facilities across the municipality and it is fair to say that no sporting club or not-for-profit organisation fully funds the maintenance and depreciation costs of any of the assets. Council considers that it is something that ratepayers contribute to Council to subsidise for the good of the community overall.

We do have a Lease and Licencing Policy and Directive and when renewing leases across the municipality, we are looking at increasing lease amounts to ensure that it is fair, reasonable and equitable across the lessees of our facilities and

minimises the impact on ratepayers as much as possible, while still being affordable for those not-for-profit organisations.

Our officers have been in conversations with Metro Football Club who currently lease the facility, in terms of managing expectations of what is around a \$9 million facility which will require significantly higher lease fees to be paid.

The Club is aware of this and Council officers are working with them to look at potential options for sharing facilities eg. a sub-tenant or something like that to help cover costs. I can confirm those discussions are taking place with the current tenant being the Metro Football Club.

Question without Notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose

Q: In the ‘Activities of the Mayors’ list, can you give an update on your meeting with the YMCA President?

A: [Mayor] The YMCA has submitted a development application to Council for the redevelopment of the YMCA facility. The YMCA received \$6 million in funding from the Federal Government as an election commitment in 2018, so they are progressing that project. The YMCA are at the stage where their plans have been finalised and it is currently being assessed by Council officers

Q: Could you confirm the planning amendment PLAM 22/04, it changed the definitions for the central business zone. It was passed by the GCC Planning Authority on 15 May and it allows the disposal of our CBD car parks for apartment development, including the large Glenorchy Central shopping centre, all of the parking there is part of that planning amendment.

Could you confirm yes or no, that you can currently, if the planning amendment is passed through the Planning Commission, that those car parks, there is a possibility that they will be able to be developed for apartments?

A: [Mayor] Council has no intention to dispose of public car parks as part of that planning amendment.

Q: But is it possible because they're in the planning amendment, is it possible for them to be used for that purpose?

A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] The car parks are covered by a number of covenants, so they wouldn't be able to be disposed of but other council car parks are classed as Council land and would have to go through a s178 process if Council decided that they wanted to dispose of the land.

Q: Why doesn't the Council rezone them to community purpose to protect them for the community?

A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] Because the zoning is suitable for the location that they are in.

Q: Then why are they in the planning amendment? The car parks are used by the community to access businesses and services in Glenorchy.

A: [Mayor] The Council has no intention of disposing of that land for development.

Q: The question is, it possible because they're in the planning amendment that they can be used for apartment developments?

A: The question has been taken on notice.

Q: Has the Berriedale Public reserve been disposed of?

A: [Mayor] We have not sold the land, but we do have a number of leases and licences in place and I understand we answered that question last month.

Q: I don't believe the question was answered adequately last month. It spoke about leases, but it also said there were separate titles and I have a letter from the Mayor stating that there is a combined title for that land, which includes the whole Berriedale reserve.

A: [Mayor] When you ask if the Berriedale land has it been disposed of, Council has not sold any of that land, but we do have a number of leases and licences in place over that land.

Q: What are the tenancies on the premium property report for the areas used by the public on that land, there are certain areas that are used by the public. Why have tenancies being created and why are we paying to rent our own land back? The Childcare centre, the Bowls Club, Tennis Club, BMX Park and recreational reserve, the BBQ shelters and car parking.

Tenancies have been created to the \$180,000 a year to rent those areas. Are we the ratepayers paying to rent those areas back? If the land has been disposed of?

A: [Mayor] No, ratepayers are not paying to lease the land back.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] The disposal refers to long-term leases and there are two parcels of land that have been long-term leased to MONA. The car park which was originally their staff car park and the BMX track, but they haven't actually taken that over as yet, as the BMX track still sits on that land.

Once the land is cleared and there's clear agreement between all parties, they will take over lease over that land. They are the only parcels of land that have a long-term lease arrangement on them. There is a licence agreement on another part of land which I understand you inquired about last time, which is being used by some builders that are working on the MONA site, but that is not a long-term

disposal that has an end date. They are the only ones that we have in place for that land.

We can take it on notice and look at what you're referring to and provide you with a detailed answer on each of the areas you are talking about like the PID number areas.

Q: The caravan park in particular has no lease on it, that is a large area of the public reserve, so a few things don't add up. I'm just saying the answers to the questions don't make sense.

A: [Mayor] We haven't yet leased the land to MONA. Council has an intention to lease the land but our services aren't in place to enable us to do so once the development is ready. At this point in time the land is still under Council's control.

Q: In 2020 the Mercury reported that the Council in their document said, given the long-term nature of the investment, MONA's preference would be to own this parcel of land. (We are talking about the peninsula). This would assist MONA with securing the necessary finance for the project and provide it with long-term surety of tenure.

MONA wants to own that land and there's a lot of things that are not clear to me about the land tenure. And I would like to clarify.

A: [Mayor] Council has not formed an intention to dispose of that land by way of sale to MONA or anyone.

Q: In the answers to the questions, it is stated that the Berriedale reserve has a number of different titles on it. I am not sure if you're referring to a specific title on the Berriedale public reserve. In July last year, you confirmed to me in writing that all titles had been combined into one PID (properly identifier number) and the PID number was quoted. The letter also states the removal of the previous PID's was done by the Office of the Valuer General without the knowledge of the Council. Why did the Valuer General combine all of the titles for the public reserve into one title?

A: [Mayor] Yes, I am happy to clarify and if that was an error on my part, I am happy for it to be clarified.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] It's not unusual for land titles that are owned by the same owner to be included into one PID (a properly identifier number). It groups the individual titles together under one identifier, but they are still individual titles.

Q: I understand that, but when they are leased, how do you manage the leases? Because if they were on individual PID's you could effectively manage the leases. So putting it onto one title takes that ability away.

- A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] We can actually determine boundaries for a lease, without having to follow a title boundary. Therefore, we can identify the area of land to be leased on a map, it is not necessarily to restrict it to just titles.

Ron Collidge, Claremont

- Q: Regarding the discussion between Council ratepayers and McDonalds over the last couple of months, re: the use of 8-10 Main Road, Claremont for the use by McDonald's as a 24-hour restaurant and the protest by the local residents. How many councillors have actually been to the site or spoken to local residents about their concerns?**

- A: Elected Members have received correspondence from a number of community members on this matter and it is a matter for Elected Members to choose how they respond, whether this be by way of letter, phone call, e-mail or visit.

I have spoken with quite a number of community members about the matter and I am aware of the locality and have been to the site. But it would be a question for each individual Elected Member.

- Q: Apart from yourself, how many others have actually been out and seen the problem that we have?**

- A: [Deputy Mayor] We are aware of the property and we have receive detailed reports on it and know the area, but this Council doesn't encourage Elected Members to actually get involved in things like this. It is different to what it was in Hobart City Council, where we used to accept representations. But I have found that in this particular case, it is a little overheated because it isn't even an application at the moment.

It is unfortunate and we do empathise with you, each person around this Council does, but this is a matter of process and we have to be very careful that we don't overstep the boundaries because we wear two hats, and I'm not on the planning authority.

- Q: Sorry, Sue but I disagree with you on that. Elected members can come out and see the actual site.**

- A: [Deputy Mayor] We see the site, we can see it on Google.

- Q: No, you can't see on Google, the bend that comes around there that's going to cause issues.**

- A: [Mayor] Mr Collidge we will take your point on board and your suggestion that each and every Elected Member to go and visit the site in person.

Q: I would like that and am happy for Elected Members to contact myself and/or David Kernke and we will take you through the site to explain our concerns.

A: [Mayor] Thank you Mr Collidge. I can confirm there is an application currently with planning officers and it will come to the Glenorchy Planning Authority for consideration in due course.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

Council received a petition from Pauline Elliott, Claremont which has been signed by 264 people.

We the undersigned request that Council:

- does not support in any way the Development Application and amendment to the Tasmanian Planning scheme (Local Provisions Schedule) to allow a 24-hour drive through at 8 – 10 Main Road, Claremont.
- does uphold the Greater Hobart Glenorchy plan, the Statement of Commitment on Housing and the Tasmanian Planning scheme to ensure that 8-10 Main Road, Claremont is retained as inner residential zoning reserved for housing
- does not grant or allow the owners of 8-10 Main Road or developers of the proposed 24-hour drive through, their request for land, public parking spaces or access onto Lady Clark Avenue across the Crown land at 12 Main Road.

Council notes the petition and under the Act, Council is required to bring a report back to a Council meeting in relation to the petition within 42-days.

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/SLADE

That Council:

1. RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 17 April to Sunday, 21 May 2023.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL LAND AT 23A NORMAN CIRCLE, GLENORCHY

File Reference: Council Land - Disposal & Sale

Reporting Brief:

To present the results of the public consultation and notification process carried out under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* (the Act) and recommend that, after considering all objections, Council resolves to dispose of 23a Norman Circle, Glenorchy (the Land).

Resolution:

KING/HICKEY

That Council:

1. Having considered the objections lodged following public notification of its intention to dispose of the land at 23a Norman Circle, Glenorchy (CT212565/1), RESOLVE under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* to proceed with the disposal of the land after, either:
 - (a) no appeal is instituted during the period available to objectors for making appeals; or
 - (b) if an appeal is instituted, the discontinuation or dismissal of that appeal.
2. SERVE NOTICE in writing of its decision and the applicable appeal rights upon all objectors within 7 days after its decision.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Slade left the meeting at 4:55 pm.

10. FEEDBACK FROM INVESTIGATION INTO THE POTENTIAL DISPOSAL OF 12 ROTHESAY CIRCLE, GOODWOOD

File Reference: Council Land - Disposal & Sale

Reporting Brief:

To report back to Council on the outcomes of the community engagement process for the potential disposal of 12 Rothesay Circle, Goodwood (the Land), by way of donation, and recommend that Council proceeds with the public land disposal process under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* (the Act).

Resolution:

HICKEY/KING

That Council:

1. FORM an intention under Section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* to dispose of 12 Rothesay Circle, Goodwood (CT 156505/1) to Karadi Aboriginal Corporation, by way of donation.
2. AUTHORISE the General Manager to take all actions necessary to complete the public notification of Council's intent to dispose 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 Dunsby, King, Thomas, Hickey, Cockshutt and Yaxley
Councillors Kendall and Quick

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Hickey left the meeting at 5.12pm

Alderman Hickey returned to the meeting at 5.13pm

11. INVESTIGATIONS INTO POTENTIAL COUNCIL LAND DISPOSALS TO SUPPORT HOUSING SUPPLY

File Reference: Council Land - Disposal and Sale

Reporting Brief:

To provide an update on the progress of Council's current land disposals.

To present an assessment of Council-owned land with the greatest potential for disposal to increase housing supply.

To recommend Council begins preliminary investigations into the disposal of a further eight (8) Council-owned properties at Shiraz Court, Berriedale; Baltonsborough Road, Austins Ferry; 84 Sunshine Road, Austins Ferry; Brendan Crescent, Austins Ferry; Teering Road, Berriedale; Mason Street, Claremont; Cutler Place, West Moonah; and 16b Coleman Street, West Moonah.

Resolution:

KING/KENDALL

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the update on progress of Council's current land disposals.
2. ENDORSE the commencement of investigations into the potential disposal of the following Council-owned land:
 - a) Shiraz Court, Berriedale (General Residential) CT 133645/118
 - b) Baltonsborough Road, Austins Ferry (General Residential) CT 141060/101
 - c) 84 Sunshine Road, Austins Ferry (General Residential) CT 128489/91
 - d) Brendan Crescent, Austins Ferry (General Residential) CT14013/6
 - e) Teering Road, Berriedale (Open Space) CT117710/1
 - f) Mason Street, Claremont (Open Space) CT60979/79
 - g) Cutler Place, West Moonah (General Residential) CT6345/15, and,
 - h) 16b Coleman Street, West Moonah (Open Space) CT43660/2

3. AUTHORISE Council staff to undertake investigations to remove restrictive covenants, annotations on Titles and to prepare the Land for the community engagement process.
4. AUTHORISE Council staff to undertake a community engagement process, to identify any concerns about the potential disposal of the Land.
5. REQUIRE a further report to Council summarising the preliminary investigations, 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 and Yaxley
Councillors Kendall and Quick

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Slade returned to the meeting at 5:18 pm.

12. GLENORCHY CBD SAFETY AND YOUTH ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

File Reference: Community Safety

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to update Council on the effectiveness of actions taken to address public place behaviour in the Glenorchy CBD since the November 2022 Council meeting.

Resolution:

HICKEY/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. NOTE this update report on initiatives underway to address youth engagement and CBD safety.
2. NOTE that funding for ongoing security and the PCYC program has been included in the 2023/24 draft Council budget for consideration at the June Council meeting.
3. REQUEST an update report to the November 2023 Council meeting on public space behaviour in the Glenorchy CBD, particularly the effectiveness of using security guards, continued trial of the PCYC and collaborative approach with DECYP and any other grant funding available.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

13. GLENORCHY PARKING STRATEGY REVISION

File Reference: Parking Strategy

Reporting Brief:

To present the revised Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027 and Action List to the Council for adoption.

Resolution:

KENDALL/KING

That Council:

1. ADOPT the reviewed Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027 in Attachment 1 in unchanged form.
2. ADOPT the revised Action List priorities, timelines, and measures, in the form of Attachment 2 to better align with current trends and available resources.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal – Valuing our Environment

14. SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT TASMANIAN PLANNING POLICIES

File Reference: Planning Reform

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's endorsement of a submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission on the draft Tasmanian Planning Policies.

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/SLADE

That Council:

1. ENDORSE the representation on the Draft Tasmanian Planning Policies at Attachment 2 for submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was adjourned for a ten minute break at 6.30pm.

The meeting re-commenced at 6.40pm.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal – Leading our Community

15. PROPOSED WASTE MANAGEMENT AND LANDFILL FEES AND CHARGES 2023/24 FINANCIAL YEAR

File Reference: Waste Fees and Charges

Reporting Brief:

This report addresses the setting of annual waste management and landfill fees and charges for the 2023/24 financial year as required by s. 205 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

Early consideration of fees and charges is necessary to allow for renewals for some areas to be sent out in June to enable renewal of registration, licences, or permits in time for the start of the 2023/24 financial year. It also allows for up-to-date signage to be ready (e.g. waste management signs) and for receipting systems to be prepared.

Resolution:

QUICK/KING

That Council:

1. APPROVE the following kerbside fees for the 2023/24 financial year:

SERVICE TYPE	2022/2023 fees	Increase %	Increase amount	Final rounded charge 2023/2024
Standard Service				
Residential Garbage – 140L F/N	\$102.00	5%	\$5.00	\$107.00
Residential Recycling – 140L/240L F/N	\$105.00	5%	\$5.00	\$110.00

Residential FOGO – 140L/240L F/N	\$81.00	5%	\$4.00	\$85.00
Change bin from 240L to 140L	No charge	N/A	N/A	No charge
Residential Garbage - 240L F/N (increase bin size from 140L)	\$179.00	5%	\$9.00	\$188.00
Shared Services				
Residential Garbage – Shared Services	\$102.00	5%	\$5.00	\$107.00
Residential Recycling – Shared Services	\$105.00	5%	\$5.00	\$110.00
FOGO Shared Service	\$81.00	5%	\$4.00	\$85.00
Other Services				
Commercial Garbage – 140L F/N	\$177.00	5%	\$9.00	\$186.00
Commercial Garbage – 140L W	\$309.00	5%	\$16.00	\$325.00
Commercial Garbage – 240L F/N	\$304.00	5%	\$15.00	\$319.00
Commercial Garbage – 240L W	\$528.00	5%	\$26.00	\$554.00
Commercial Recycling – 140L & 240L F/N	\$105.00	5%	\$5.00	\$110.00
Commercial Recycling – 140L & 240L W	\$208.00	5%	\$10.00	\$218.00
Commercial FOGO – 140L & 240L F/N (New Service)	\$81.00	5%	\$4.00	\$85.00
Special Garbage – 140L F/N	\$204.00	5%	\$10.00	\$214.00
Special Garbage – 240L F/N	\$350.00	5%	\$18.00	\$368.00
Special Recycling – 140L & 240L F/N	\$208.00	5%	\$10.00	\$218.00
Special FOGO – 140L & 240L F/N	\$210	5%	\$10.00	\$220.00
Notes:				
5. W – weekly, F/N – fortnightly.				
6. All Residential tenements may upgrade their garbage service type from a 140 litre service to a 240 litre service fortnightly by paying the relevant charge listed above. There is no minimum number				

	of residents required to utilise this service. Upgrades are required to be applied for by the resident/ratepayer for the property.
7.	Weekly collections are for unit complexes only. However, all individual bin service residents have the option to upgrade to weekly collection by arrangement directly with Council's kerbside garbage collection provider, (Veolia).
8.	Special circumstance garbage, FOGO and recycling is a fortnightly service that manages a number of existing circumstances.

2. APPROVE the following disposal charges for the Jackson Street Waste Management Centre for the 2023/24 financial year:

Waste type	2022/2023 (Inc GST)	2023/2024 (Inc GST)	Increase %	Proposed final charges 2023/2024 (Includes Waste Levy).
Minimum gate fee	\$13.00 per visit	\$13.00 per visit	0%	\$15.00 per visit
Passenger tyres	\$10.00 each	\$11.00 each	10%	\$11.00 each (le N/A)
Light truck/ 4wd tyres	\$20.00 each	\$21.00 each	5%	\$21.00 each (le N/A)
Passenger tyres with Rims	\$20.00 each	\$21.00 each	5%	\$21.00 each (le N/A)
Light truck/ 4wd tyres with Rims	\$40.00 each	\$42.00 each	5%	\$42.00 each (le N/A)
Clean fill (conditions apply)	\$21.00 /tonne	\$30.00 /tonne	30%	\$52.00/tonne
Brick/ concrete/ rubble	\$66.00 /tonne	\$86.00 /tonne	30%	\$107.00/tonne
Green waste/ vegetation (Domestic)	\$82.00 /tonne	\$84.70 /tonne	3.5%	\$106.00/tonne
Green waste/vegetation (Commercial)	NA	\$107.00 /tonne	30%	\$128.00/tonne
General waste – domestic GCC residents (cars and single axle trailers only), and community groups.	\$97.00 /tonne	\$107.00 /tonne	3.8%	\$122.00/tonne
General waste – Non GCC residents	\$120.00 /tonne	\$144.00 /tonne	19.7%	\$165.00/tonne
Mattresses	\$21.00 each	\$22.00 each	8.3%	\$26.00 each
Mixed waste – commercial/ industrial/	\$175.00 /tonne	\$228.00 /tonne	30%	\$250.00/tonne

demolition/ construction (by negotiation)				
Metal	\$109.00 /tonne	\$115.00 /tonne	5.5%	\$115.00/tonne (levy N/A)
Recycling	No charge	No charge		No charge
Domestic quantity of double wrapped asbestos	\$50.00/ boot load \$100.00/ small trailer load	\$50.00/ boot load \$100.00/ small trailer load	3.5%	\$52.00/ boot load \$104.00/ small trailer load (levy N/A)
NOTES: 1. A driver's licence or valid ID would need to be presented to the tollbooth operator to receive the discounted general waste rate for Glenorchy residents. 2. Council no longer accepts commercial disposal of asbestos or controlled waste or special burials.				

Waste type (only when weighbridge is non-operational)	Proposed charges 2023/24 (inc GST)
Boot Load (up to a maximum of 0.25m ³)	\$16.00
Green Waste Boot Load	\$16.00
Trucks GVM > 3 tonne to 7 tonne	\$86.00
Trucks GVM > 7 tonne to 12 tonne	\$195.70
Trucks GVM >12 tonne Single Axle	\$281.60
Trucks GVM >12 tonne Dual Axle	\$346.90
Dual axle trailers (behind trucks)	\$346.90
Skip/Bin up to 4m ³	\$117.10
Skip/Bin > 4m ³ to 8m ³	\$225.80
Skip/Bin > 8m ³ to 12m ³	\$366.50
Skip/Bin > 12m ³ to 15m ³	\$461.70
Skip/Bin > 15m ³ to 20m ³	\$602.50
Skip/Bin > 20m ³ to 25m ³	\$712.20
Skip/Bin > 25m ³ to 30m ³	\$820.90
Skip/Bin > 30m ³	\$1040.30
Compactors < 7m ³	\$276.50
Compactors > 7m ³ to 15m ³	\$590.10
Compactors < 15m ³ half full	\$439.90
Compactors > 15m ³ full	\$994.80
Compactors > 15m ³ half full	\$628.40

3. RESOLVE that community groups, not-for-profits, and charities be charged the discounted local resident rate for waste disposal rather than the non-resident or commercial rate.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST: Councillor Kendall

The motion was CARRIED.

16. COUNCIL FEES AND CHARGES FOR 2023/24

File Reference: Fees and Charges 2023/24

Reporting Brief:

To present the recommended Schedule of Fees and Charges for the 2023/24 financial year.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. APPROVE the fees and charges for the 2023/24 financial year as detailed in the Schedule of Fees and Charges forming Attachment 1.
2. NOTE that fees and charges for Waste Management and Landfill are subject to approval as part of a separate report to this Council meeting.
3. AMEND the Schedule of Fees and Charges if necessary to reflect any changes to the recommended fees and charges for Waste Management and Landfill arising from Council's consideration of the separate report referred to in Item 2.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

17. REQUEST FOR LONG-TERM LEASE AT LUTANA WASTE TRANSFER STATION

File Reference: Waste Transfer Station

Reporting Brief

To consider a request from Southern Waste Solutions for a long-term lease over 129 Derwent Park Road, Derwent Park (known as the Lutana Waste Transfer Station), which is jointly owned by Glenorchy City Council and the City of Hobart.

Resolution:

QUICK/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. DETERMINES that the land at 129 Derwent Park Road, Derwent Park (CT 122420/1 and CT 132878/1) is not public land for the following reasons:
 - (a) the land would not be classified as Public Land under 177A of the *Local Government Act 1993* except for the blanket provision under Council's Disposal of Council Land Policy that treats all Council land as public land
 - (b) the land is industrial land that is not accessible to the public
 - (c) the land must only be used for a waste transfer station under the restrictions placed on the land by Crown Order No. 23 of 2001
 - (d) the s. 178 process undertaken for Lot 2 of the same land in 2021 received no objections
 - (e) the request to provide a long-term lease to SWS to redevelop and operate a waste transfer station is a continuation of the existing use; and
 - (f) the land is not considered Public Land under the co-owner, the City of Hobart's Policy.
2. NOTE that sub-resolution 1 would enable joint negotiation with the co-owner, City of Hobart, of a long-term lease of up to 20 years to Southern Waste Solutions to enable investment in a regional waste transfer facility, consistent with the purpose of the Crown order relating to the land, without triggering a disposal of public land process under s. 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

3. AUTHORISE the General Manager along with the co-owner, City of Hobart, to negotiate a long-term lease agreement of up to 20 years for the land with Southern Waste Solutions for consideration by Council at a later date.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST: Councillor Kendall

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Thomas left the meeting at 7:23 pm.

18. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA 2023 ELECTIONS

File Reference: LGAT

Reporting Brief:

To determine Council's votes for candidates in the 2023 Local Government Association of Tasmania Elections.

MOTION:

QUICK/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. CONSIDER and DETERMINE the following resolutions separately in sequential order.
2. VOTE for Alderman Bec Thomas as its first preference for the position of President of the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT)
3. CONDUCT a secret ballot to determine the allocation of second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth preferences for the position of President of LGAT
4. Having conducted a secret ballot, RESOLVE to allocate its second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth preferences for the position of President of LGAT as follows: [AS DETERMINED BY THE SECRET BALLOT IN ITEM 3]
5. VOTE for Alderman Bec Thomas as its first preference for the position of General Management Committee Member from the LGAT Southern District (for Councils with greater than 20,000 ratepayers).
6. CONDUCT a secret ballot to determine the allocation of its second and third voting preferences for the position of General Management Committee Member from the LGAT Southern District (for Councils with greater than 20,000 ratepayers)
7. Having conducted a secret ballot, RESOLVE to allocate its second and third voting preferences for the position of General Management Committee Member from the LGAT Southern District (for Councils with greater than

20,000 ratepayers) as follows: [AS DETERMINED BY THE SECRET BALLOT IN ITEM 6].

8. CONDUCT a secret ballot, to determine the allocation of its voting preferences for the position of General Management Committee Member from the Southern District (for Councils with less than 20,000 ratepayers)
9. Having conducted a secret ballot, RESOLVE to allocate its voting preferences for the position of General Management Committee Member from the Southern District (for Councils with less than 20,000 ratepayers) as follows: [AS DETERMINED BY THE SECRET BALLOT IN ITEM 8].
10. AUTHORISE the Mayor to cast votes in the 2023 LGAT elections in accordance with Council's allocated voting preferences.

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT / SLADE

That the operation of regulation 22 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* be suspended for five (5) minutes. (7.27pm)

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

MOTION:

KING/COCKSHUTT

That the agenda be reordered so that Item 18 – Local Government Association of Tasmania 2023 Elections be moved into the Closed session of the Council meeting.

The motion was put.

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

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Thomas returned to the meeting at 7:32 pm.

19. UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

File Reference: Council Policies

Reporting Brief:

To present the following updated policies for review and adoption:

- Meeting Procedures Policy
- Elected Member Expenses Policy; and
- Elected Members Code of Conduct Policy.

Resolution:

HICKEY/KENDALL

That Council:

1. ADOPT the Meeting Procedures Policy in Attachment 2,
2. ADOPT the Elected Member Expenses Policy in Attachment 4, and
3. ADOPT the Elected Member Code of Conduct Policy in Attachment 6.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

20. CAPITAL WORKS STATUS REPORT

File Reference: Capital Works

Reporting Brief

To provide a quarterly capital works status update report to Council for the period ending 30 April 2023.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the capital works status report to the end of the April 2023 quarter.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

21. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 30 APRIL 2023

File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the monthly Financial Performance Report for the period ending 30 April 2023.

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/KENDALL

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 30 April 2023 as set out in Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

22. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS MONTHLY 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/KING

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Report relating to an exemption of \$81,709.55 (excluding GST) for the supply of Teams Calling, noting Telstra is the only authorised provider of the service in Australia and as approved by the Director Corporate Services.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Question without notice - Alderman Hickey

Q: Could the Council have a report into responding to the Tenants Union Tasmania and in particular to the author of the letter that we all received from Benedict Bartl regarding the use of empty properties within our municipality, with a view to support the Launceston City Council's motion requesting the Local Government Association of Tasmania investigate and report on the implementation of vacant residential land tax for unoccupied homes within the State.

The rationale is a TasWater response indicated that there could possibly be up to 610 houses in the Glenorchy municipality alone that could be returned to the rental market if the owners were so persuaded, which they might be by a financial impost.

A: The question was taken on notice.

Question without notice - Alderman Cockshutt

Q: In relation to ground and facility hire for clubs, what payment method options do we provide to them? Clarence City Council don't accept EFT or BSB, does Glenorchy City Council offer these payment methods to Clubs and not-for-profit organisations?

A: The question was taken on notice.

Question without notice – Councillor Kendall

Q: To add to the Deputy Mayors recommendation, in the lead up to budget time in a very tight financial position that we are all in. I believe the prospects for raising revenue from vacant houses in order to offset the general population's rates, if possible, is one that has a lot of potential.

Could we extend the concept of the report to look at the possibility for differential rates based on the assessment of empty houses in conjunction with TasWater, which I think they are monitoring. Maybe there is scope there for applying differential rates at a Council level.

A: The 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 and Slade, Councillors Kendall and Quick

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 7.40pm.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Closed session commenced at 7.41pm.

24. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

SLADE/COCKSHUTT

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Wednesday, 26 April 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

25. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal – Leading our Community

Alderman Thomas left the meeting at 7.43 pm.

18. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA 2023 ELECTIONS

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).

Alderman Thomas returned to the meeting at 8:11 pm.

26. RECOVERY OF OUTSTANDING RATES

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) and (2)(j) (The personal hardship of any person who is a resident in, or is a ratepayer in, the relevant municipal area) 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).

27. UPDATE OF BUILDING COMPLIANCE MEASURES AT MCGILL RISE CLAREMONT

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).

28. CONTRACT 0351 - PROVISION OF BANKING SERVICES CONTRACT EXTENSION

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)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal).

29. 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).

ECONOMIC

Community Goal – Open for Business

30. REQUEST FOR TENDER NO. 930 - STANDING OFFER FOR CLEANING OF PUBLIC AMENITIES - REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO AWARD TENDER

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)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal).

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

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/SLADE

That the meeting be moved back into open Council.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.44pm.

Confirmed,

CHAIR