

**Minutes of the Meeting  
of the Glenorchy City Council  
held at the Council Chambers  
on Monday, 31 July 2023 at 3.30pm**



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

**In attendance (in Chambers):** Tony McMullen (General Manager), Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), Patrick Marshall (Acting Director Infrastructure and Works), David Ronaldson (Executive Manager Stakeholder Engagement), Tracey Ehrlich (Manager People and Governance), Allan Wise (Manager Finance), Luke Chiu (Manager Property, Environment and Waste) and Jill Sleifers (Community Development Coordinator).

**In attendance (by video link):** Marian Maclachlan (Executive Assistant to the General Manager) and Claire Evans (Communications Officer)

**Leave of Absence:**

**Workshops held since last Council Meeting**

**Date:** Monday, 3 July 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Draft Strategic Asset Management Plan
- Proposed speed limit reductions
- Glenorchy War Memorial Pool facility

**Date:** Monday, 10 July 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- GM's KPI's review and set 2023/24 KPI's

**Date:** Monday, 17 July 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Future of Local Government Review
- Reference and Working Group discussions

**Date:** Monday, 24 July 2023

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Community Development Action Plan
- Discussion on activities of Elected Members documentation.

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 35 viewers and 17 members of the public attended in person.

The Chair opened the meeting at 3.32pm.

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

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

---

## 1. APOLOGIES

---

Councillor Harry Quick and Councillor Molly Kendall.

---

## 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

---

### **Resolution:**

SLADE/KING

That the minutes of the open part of the Council meeting held on Monday, 26 June 2023 be confirmed

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

---

None.

---

## 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.

No declarations of pecuniary interest were declared.

---

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

---

### Question taken on notice – Ron Collidge, Claremont

(received 22 June 2023)

The drive through development by McDonalds at 8-10 Main Road, Claremont - the Planning Scheme Amendment and the development application.

Ratepayers should also be allowed to comment on each proposal individually.

**Q: Will Council consider separating these two proposals?**

A: The planning legislation (S40T of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act, 1993*) allows an applicant to combine a request for a planning scheme amendment with a request for a planning permit. This is what has been applied for and council cannot separate the proposal into two separate requests.

**Q: Did the General Manager or any other staff consult with nearby residents or inspect the site prior to making this decision as the Acting General Manager stated would occur prior to any decisions being made?**

A: The General Manager is familiar with the site, having visited it a number of times since his first involvement with it in September 2001.

The *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* does not require consultation before a decision to grant owner's consent to the making of an amendment request and planning permit application and the General Manager did not do so. However, the position of the residents was well known to him at that time of that decision as a result of the petition received by Council on 26 May 2023 and tabled at the Council meeting on 29 May 2023.

**Q: Were any Councillors consulted on this prior to the decision being made?**

A: Yes, all Councilors in attendance during the April Council Workshops were consulted about the proposal.

**Q. Can the Council overturn this decision or are the elected members overridden by the Manager to grant access across this piece of land**

A: The owner's consent decision has been made.

Owner's consent is to the making of a request. It is not a planning consent and it is not a consent from Council as landlord to occupy the land or undertake the works.

The planning merits of the amendment request and planning permit application are now to be considered. That decision will lie with the elected members sitting

in their capacity as a planning authority - first, to decide whether to prepare an amendment; and second, if that occurs, to consider representations and make a report on the proposal to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

If the process proceeds further, the Tasmanian Planning Commission would hear representors before making its final decision on the proposal.

The planning authority's decision will be made after considering expert assessment by experienced and highly qualified planners and engineers, which will include full consideration of the proposed access and egress arrangements.

### **Question taken on notice – David Kernke, Claremont**

**Q1: In reviewing the developers reports for 8-10 Main Road, Claremont there was no explanation for acoustic calculations, how they were derived, not data set provided so they could be independently verified.**

**Will Council be seeking the data sets and missing information from the developers to enable Council to form an opinion as to the reliability and accuracy of the data contained within such reports, thus enabling residents to also have the opportunity to have the data forensically examined.**

A: [Mayor] Planning officers are working through the assessment of the application and part of that does involve making requests for further information to applicants. I believe this is where the process is at this stage.

### **Response provided:**

Council has issued an extensive request for additional information and that went out last week to the applicant. These issues were in respect to satisfying the legislative requirements and Schedule 1 Objectives of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and further information in respect of the development proposal in respect of noise, odour, traffic safety, traffic volume, parking shortfalls, traffic light spill and lighting.

**Q2a: Often the expert reports are not very good, they're very biased and they shouldn't be there as they are focused on the applicant and the developer. We will forensically examine all of the reports and we would like to have the opportunity of have some input with Council representatives into the process before everything goes to recommendations. Is that is at all possible?**

A: [General Manager] I will take that on notice. Not because I am not sympathetic in terms of providing the community with input into the process, but it is because we need to take advice about whether we can do it at this stage of the process.

Council may be at a stage of the process that it is between the proponent and Council. Then, if Council decides to prepare the amendment, we will go into a public process and at that stage, there will be an opportunity, but it does depend on what happens in relation to the two options. That is if, Council decides not to prepare an amendment or decides to prepare an amendment. If Council decides not to, then we don't get to the public process.

**Response provided:**

Our planning area does not provide documents for review by the community until all the necessary information has been provided and the documentation is ready to go on public exhibition. This ensures that people are looking at the application that is being considered and assessed rather than reviewing something that may still be missing information.

**Question taken on notice – Vivianne Vanderburg, West Moonah**

**Q1: I ask that GCC update your Advertising Devices within Council Property Policy, and other relevant policies, to exclude sponsorship and signage from fossil fuel businesses and organisations in recognition of the impact on health and climate as Council has already done for gambling, alcohol and tobacco. Advertising significantly affects behaviour. Fossil fuels products are negatively impacting our community health and affecting the resilience of our city, eg gas which exacerbates asthma.**

A: Council acknowledges the impacts of fossil fuels upon health and climate outcomes.

A transition away from fossil fuels is occurring where viable and council is now trialing a hybrid electric vehicle as part of its fleet. However, Council remains reliant on fossil fuels for some of our operations including our fleet and plant, some of which do not yet have viable alternative options.

Council has committed to developing a climate change mitigation action plan setting out strategies and actions to reduce council's greenhouse gas emissions

over the next 4 years, as part of its 2023/24 Annual Plan. Considering ways to reduce Council's use of fossil fuels will form an important part of the development of the action plan.

As part of the development of the strategy, Council will consult both across council teams and with the community. Council will consider relevant policy reviews as potential actions in the strategy.

Council is also proud that its adoption of a FOGO program in recent years has reduced our organisation's greenhouse gas emissions by 54% per year.

**Q2. Does GCC's current investment strategy include companies whose primary business is coal and gas? If so, would Council consider divesting from these funds and only invest in funds that do not promote unhealthy or environmentally damaging products or activities.**

A: Council has two main investment categories, first its stakeholder investment in TasWater and second, the investment of surplus funds in the Short-Term Money Market.

TasWater's primary business is the provision of water and disposal of wastewater to the Tasmanian community. Therefore, our investment in TasWater is entirely appropriate and generates substantial revenue to fund the services we provide to the community.

In relation to investing surplus funds, our policy is quite specific that we can only invest in Authorised Deposit Taking Institutions (ADI) licensed by the Australian Prudential Regulatory Authority (APRA) to carry on banking business, including accepting deposits from the public. Our policy also places limits on how much we can invest in any one ADI to ensure we minimise risk. Therefore, Council does not knowingly invest with any speculative or single source streams, such as coal and gas, but does not have full disclosure of investments to any asset classes that any ADI may invest in.

---

## 6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

---

### Question on notice – Eddy Steenbergen, Rosetta (received 1 July 2023)

**Q1. Did Council make any allowance in its 2023-24 budget specifically for the maintenance or upgrade of bus stop infrastructure? If so, how much?**

A: Bus stop infrastructure is not the responsibility of local government, and Glenorchy City Council does not own any bus stop infrastructure, except for the Tolosa Street Bus Interchange. Council has no specific allowance in the 23/24 budget for the upgrading of bus stop infrastructure.

**Q2. Council has on many occasions mentioned the difficulty they have arriving at an acceptable agreement with Metro Tasmania for maintenance of bus stop infrastructure. What does council see as the sticking points in their negotiations with Metro Tas?**

A: Metro Tasmania is a Public Transport operator contracted by the Department of State Growth. Metro Tasmania advises that they are not contracted for, or funded to, upgrade or maintain bus stop infrastructure. The Department of State Growth claims bus stops on local roads are the responsibility of the relevant local government. However, bus stop ownership is not legally defined or legislated. The council has not accepted ownership of bus stops as it has never installed or owned bus stop infrastructure and does not have it listed as an asset on Council's assets register. This position is consistent with that of other councils and LGAT is undertaking advocacy to the state government in relation to ownership of bus stop infrastructure, on behalf of the sector.

**Q3. Council has repeatedly given the impression that it believes it should not have any responsibility for maintaining bus stops. It occurs to me that council taking control of bus stops could create opportunities. For example,**

- bus shelters might be used as a communications channel to the public, and
- it might be possible to sell advertising space on the shelter to defray maintenance costs.

A: Council has not explored the potential for this as we do not own the bus stop infrastructure. However, any revenues are unlikely to defray the costs to the community of owning, maintaining, renewing and replacing bus stop infrastructure.



**Q3a. Has Council ever requested from staff a comprehensive cost benefit analysis for taking over maintenance of bus stop infrastructure? If so, can I have a copy?**

A: No, council's priority is managing the over \$1billion of community assets it already owns. There are significant costs to ratepayers with taking on any new infrastructure. Even without a cost/benefit analysis, we know bus stop infrastructure would come with significant costs, including upgrades to meet *Disability Discrimination Act* (DDA) standards, in addition to the ongoing maintenance and depreciation.

**Q3b. Has Council ever requested any type of report on such a proposal? If so, can I have a copy?**

A: No, council has not requested this type of report. However, a desktop analysis in 2022 suggests there are 404 bus stops in the City, and upgrades to meet DDA standards would cost at least \$2 million plus project management costs.

**Q4. In 2022 the Department of State Growth announced a Bus Stop Upgrade Program triggered by a requirement for bus stop compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1992. The program allows Councils to access grant funds to assist in the upgrade of bus stop infrastructure to satisfy the Act.**

**Will Glenorchy City Council participate in the program? If not, why not?**

**If yes, how will Council select the bus stops to propose for upgrade, and how many would be included? Will it for example only consider the 40 or so bus shelters in the city?**

A: Glenorchy City Council made a submission for funding through the grant program, but later the Department announced that should Council's accept the grant funding, they would be accepting ownership and ongoing maintenance responsibilities for bus stop infrastructure. Once this was announced, the Council clarified its submission, stating that Council would undertake the required works to assist in making bus stops DDA compliant but would not accept the transfer of ownership by accepting the grant funding. The Department of State Growth withdrew their grant offer on this basis.

The council is willing and has offered to undertake the necessary works on a fee for service basis. This has not been accepted by State Growth. As mentioned earlier, this is consistent with the position of other councils and an issue LGAT is undertaking advocacy to the Government in relation to, on behalf of the sector.

The Department of State Growth has recently written to council stating they are reconsidering their approach to this matter and will advise councils of their new proposal in due course.

**Question on notice – Pat Mineely, Glenorchy**  
**(received 12 July 2023)**

**Q1. Can Council please list each of the capital upgrades and costs of each item for each of the past 10 financial years that have been paid from the GCC operational budget, as distinct from any grant payment by a third party eg federal government in respect of the swimming pool.**

A: The request is resource intensive and some of the older records may not be available. Council's care and maintenance of the Glenorchy Pool over the past six decades has enabled our community to have access to an outdoor pool facility for 60 years, despite the usual asset life of a commercial pool being just 40 to 50 years.

Council expenditure at the pool last financial year (2022/23) included:

Management Fee	\$254,616.00
Scheduled and reactive maintenance	\$ 38,097.74
Gas usage (excess)	\$ 80,229.31
Toddler pool shade cover renewal	\$ 4,193.39
Electrical switchboard upgrade (building)	\$ 4,314.00
Overflow carpark resurface	\$ 17,611.68
<b>TOTAL (2022/23)</b>	<b>\$399,062.12</b>

Similar year-on-year expenses to Council were incurred in previous financial years across the past decade.

Capital upgrades costs over the period include but are not limited to (noting some older records may be incomplete):

Shade Cover Renewal	\$	47,580.00
Eaves Replacement	\$	31,759.80
Backwash Pool Filter	\$	46,600.00
Pool Top Plinth Antislip	\$	8,745.00
Pool Slide Top Coat	\$	33,248.66
Re-paint Water Slide	\$	83,328.96
Pool Cover Motor	\$	4,150.00
Chlorine Holding Tank	\$	1,777.00
PVC & Clear Pool Divider Panels	\$	11,645.73
Outdoor Umbrellas X 5	\$	5,950.00
PVC Screens	\$	9,230.00
Signage Replacement	\$	7,986.00
Replace Roof on Glenorchy Pool Kiosk	\$	8,699.00
Pool Cleaner - Dolphin Pro Expert 2 X 2	\$	14,499.00
Pool Inflatable	\$	10,206.00
Pool Cover	\$	50,459.45
4 Gates Renewal	\$	14,354.00
Shade Cover Renewal	\$	24,699.33
Toddler Pool Shade Cover Renewal	\$	4,193.39
Electrical switchboard upgrade	\$	4,314.00
Overflow Car Park Re-surface	\$	17,611.68
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>441,037.00</b>

**Q2. What was the estimated design life of the original facility in years?**

A: 40 to 50 years is the expected life of a commercial swimming pool built in the 1960s.

**Q3. What is the asset value of the swimming pool including land on the councils asset register as at 30 June 2023 in terms of both the capital basis i.e. including improvements and the unimproved land basis.**

A: The written down asset value as at 30/06/23 is \$7,393,359.45. The estimated replacement cost is \$30M (but could be \$40M depending on designs).

**Q4. The safety report relied on by Council purports to infer a number of factors which make the pool asset unsafe including but not limited to old change rooms, toilet, structure of grandstand, dosing tanks etc these are long life assets.**

A: There is no definable question in the statement above.

**Q5. If we are to believe the safety report forms the primary information source informing Council's decision ie safety failures are the significant factor in recommending closure this summer and most likely permanently then why hasn't Council adequately provisioned progressively for the pool upgrades over say the past 10 years, as part of accepted best practice for Local Government management for the replacement of assets.? Please explain how the situation got to this stage of decrepitation of an asset that is very common in almost every council in Australia.**

A: The age of the pool is widely known (60 years) and Council has been open about the fact that there is a risk of pool closure if funds cannot be secured to redevelop the site. For example, the Council made a request to the last federal budget for \$26M to redevelop the site. The publicly promoted budget submission included the following statement *"The pool, grandstand, plant and amenity buildings are in need of significant upgrade or replacement, without which the Glenorchy community will face future closure of the facility"*. The same statement was also included in the Council submission to the last federal election. These submissions were both made public, promoted on Council's Facebook Page and website.

Significant recreational assets such as pools reach a point in time where no level of maintenance or upgrade will result in an acceptable standard of facility and amenity for the community.

The facility has stayed operational for 10 to 20 years longer than its expected life and can no longer be maintained by maintenance and upgrades. The pool is at the end of its life and requires complete replacement.

\$30M is the estimated cost of a new aquatic facility (which could be as high as \$40M depending on what the community desires). If State or Federal funding is not secured and the council and community considers it necessary and feasible to replace the pool, then the cost of replacing, operating, maintaining and depreciating a new pool over the life of the asset would need to be borne by rate payers, which would be a major burden on council and rate payers ongoing.

It is not unusual to rely on grant funding for the replacement of large value public assets that are used on a regional basis, rather than levy the Glenorchy ratepayers to fund the capital costs of such assets.

**Q6. If the answer to above is the usual excuse namely a lack of funds and council deficit, then how can Council justify this reasoning as the above safety report highlights areas that just didn't happen to deteriorate overnight or in past few years they have been known for years and Council had a duty of care at all times?**

A: In recent years a number of issues relating to structural integrity, water loss, maintenance and general condition of the pool facilities have become apparent. In response, a detailed pool inspection and full audit of the pool was commissioned and carried out by aquatic facility and asset specialists Lacus Consulting and Know-Ledge Asset Management Services.

This detailed assessment revealed the Glenorchy Pool facilities have reached an age and condition that presents significant health and safety risks.

Prior to this, council had not received advice that the facility was beyond its useful asset life and must be closed for safety reasons. As such, council had hoped the facility had a few more years left in it to provide time to plan for its future and continue to lobby for state and federal funding to replace it. Now this advice has been received, council would be negligent not to take immediate action.

**Q7. Why has council stated publicly that even if the pool closed permanently residents have still the option to go to the Hobart aquatic centre, and anyway patronage numbers do not support continued financial support from council or is at least problematic to support further council funds being expensed.**

A: There is a general appreciation that major facilities such as aquatic centres need to be considered in a regional context, as they generally service residents from outside of the local government area, as well as local residents and ratepayers. There are two existing major aquatic centres that operate year-round within a 10km radius of the Glenorchy Pool (Hobart and Clarence aquatic centres).

As outlined in the July Council report, figures from the City of Hobart indicate that approximately 69,500 of the annual visitation numbers to the Hobart Aquatic Centre are from the Glenorchy LGA, this is almost four times the total number of annual visits to the Glenorchy Pool last season (17,788).

**Q8. How does this type of thinking address the sustainability of the Glenorchy swimming club continued existence? Please comment.**

A: Council is yet to consider the long-term solution for the pool and at this stage has only made the call to leave the pool closed until further notice due to unacceptable risks to health and safety. Council will keep the community informed of all options and decisions regarding the long-term future of the pool.

**Q9. What assessment of impacts on local school swimming carnivals were considered by Council before publicly stating the public can use a pool distant or ought reasonably expected to have to access in the foreseeable near future or on a permanent basis?**

A: Based on the information contained in the condition report, council assessed that the risk to life associated with re-opening the pool for the coming season far outweighed the impact on the capacity for local schools to hold swimming carnivals.

**Q10. How many swim carnivals on average are potentially affected potentially this summer? Please comment.**

A: As Glenorchy City Council is not the pool operator, the exact number is unknown. It is appreciated the current closure will be an inconvenience to existing pool users and swim carnivals, however it is understood that there is capacity at Hobart and Clarence aquatic facilities. The existing annual visitation to the Glenorchy pool (17,788) represents only 3.2% of the annual visitation to the Hobart Aquatic Centre (556,000), suggesting the additional patronage could be comfortably absorbed.

**Q11. With a high migrant population many of whom do not have much prior water safety experience, where do these residents go to have a close at hand learn to swim training or is it just not important? Please comment.**

A: As detailed above there are two existing major aquatic centres that operate year-round within a 10km radius of the site (Hobart and Clarence aquatic centres).

**Q12 How is it equitable to expect a population the most disadvantaged in Greater Hobart to simply find an alternative pool 10km away and for many closer to 20km each way with no direct door to door public transport to that pool, which is not in anyway convenient to majority of young persons or families, and for which most residents has no connection at a local government level. Please comment.**

A: As detailed above there are two existing major aquatic centres that operate year-round within a 10km radius of the site (i.e. Hobart and Clarence aquatic centres). This is a very high level of aquatic centre access, relative to other parts of the country, and there is an appreciation that major facilities such as aquatic centres need to be considered in a regional context.

**Q13. Has council considered the impact on attracting residents to the municipality where there is no public swimming pool, a reasonable expectation of any family moving to an area in almost every suburban area in Australia Yes or No.**

A: There are two other year-round aquatic centres in close proximity to the Glenorchy municipality – this is a very high level of access relative to other parts of the country. There are a number of other facilities that could be classed as attractors to the municipal area, noting not all residents swim in the local pool (17,788 annual visits in total including school carnivals and people from other municipal areas).

**Q14. Why can't the sale of land proceeds in the Special Reserve Fund specifically designed to fund community infrastructure as distinct from playgrounds be accessed to expend some funds on the pool? Please explain or justify why not this fund.**

A: Council does not have sufficient funds available to fund a large-scale pool redevelopment. The facility is at an age where capital upgrades are not financially sound – it is at the end of its useful life and requires full replacement.

\$30M is the estimated cost of a new aquatic facility (which could be as high as \$40M depending on what the community desires). Council does not have this amount of funds available in reserve.

**Q15. What is the balance as at 30 June 2023 of Special Reserves Fund? Why can't this fund be used to fund renovations.**

A: This will be accurately reported in the annual Proceeds of Property Disposal Council Report in August 2023. However, the current estimate is Property Disposal Reserve Fund: \$556,989; Special Projects Reserve Fund: \$23,716; DEC sale funds \$2.49M (noting the associated Loyd Rd works are estimated at \$2.4M in this calculation).

**Q16. If the answer is No to question 14 on the basis Council has better plans for these funds, why did Council prioritise the entire purchase of a vacant block of land in Peltro Street over \$525,000 in July 2021, at a time when it knew or ought to have known of some of required the capital upgrades at the memorial swimming pool at the relevant date of Peltro Street purchase?**

A: Council did not specifically prioritise the purchase of 5 Peltro Street over expenditure on the pool, nor are the funds used for this purpose anywhere near enough to fund a \$30M redevelopment. Council also has the ability to sell the land if it desires.

**Q17. Please explain how a still vacant block of land above and likely to remain vacant for years as there will be no light rail which premised its purchase be of more benefit than actual community infrastructure in place over 60 years.**

A: This was a strategic purchase by council, which has been previously explained. Council also has the ability to sell the land if it desires.

**Q18. Council publicly stated if external funds to upgrade the pool cannot be achieved it will look at other developments on the site, why promote such talk. Again, this seems to infer some sections of council have predetermined purposes before even a discussion about triggering the sale of public land precondition.**

A: Council is being transparent about the reality of the situation. As outlined above, if State or Federal funding is not secured and council and the community decide it is necessary and feasible to replace the facility, then the estimated \$30M cost, as well as the ongoing operating, maintenance and depreciation costs, would need to be borne by rate payers, which would be a major burden to council and ratepayers. As detailed above Council is yet to consider the long-term future for the pool and at this stage has only made the decision to leave the pool closed until further notice, due to unacceptable risks to health and safety. Council will keep the community informed of all options and decisions regarding the long-term future of the pool.

**Q19. Can council rule out the swimming pool land would be offered to any AFL team as a high-performance site in conjunction with KGV oval?**

A: As detailed above Council is yet to consider the long-term future of the pool and at this stage has only made the decision to leave the pool closed until further notice due to unacceptable risks to health and safety. Council will keep the community informed of all options and decisions regarding the long-term future of the pool.

It is understood the State Government is exploring of a number of sites as the potential base for an AFL high performance centre, none of which are in Glenorchy.



**Question on notice – Angela Strk, Rosetta**  
**(received 17 July 2023)**

**My questions relate to the Glenorchy Pool Closure announcement - GCC Media release dated 11 July 2023.**

**Q1. Can rate payers read the consultant's condition report on the Glenorchy War memorial pool? I have asked Emilio Reale for a copy but have not been provided with one.**

A: Yes, this is attached to the July Council meeting report.

**Q2. I understand it is part of the council's role to provide leisure facilities to its community and maintain its assets, I'm therefore concerned that the Mayor's media release on the 11th of July 2023 stated despite council not formally considering the consultants condition report, a closure of the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool had already been decided upon, instead of a course of maintenance and to remain open. Given this and the historical significance of the pool (partly built with volunteer community labour), why is this the case?**

A: The detailed assessment has unfortunately revealed that the Glenorchy Pool facilities have reached an age and condition that presents significant health and safety risks. Now this advice has been received, Council would be negligent not to take immediate action.

The specialist advice also made clear that the works required to remove these risks would take more than 12 months to complete, hence the General Manager made the decision to announce that the pool will be closed for the coming season and until further notice in order to give the operator, Belgravia Leisure, and users of the pool as much notice as possible. The General Manager made this call in fulfilling his workplace health and safety duties as the responsible Person Conducting a Business Undertaking (PCBU).

Council is yet to consider the long-term solution for the pool and at this stage has only made the call to leave the pool closed until further notice due to unacceptable risks to health and safety. Council will keep the community informed of any decisions regarding the long-term future of the pool.

**Q3. If the extent of the current maintenance and safety concerns outlined in the report has suddenly warranted a complete closure of the pool, can you assure rate payers that council has been doing regular and robust maintenance on the pool?**

A: Yes, Council's maintenance of the pool has seen enabled the facility to remain operational for 10 to 20 years longer than its expected life. As outlined in the July Council report, expending the approximately \$5M required on the most worn-out elements will only achieve a further 5 years of operation of the pool given that it is already 60 years old. As outlined in the July Council report, expending the approximately \$5M required on the most worn-out elements will only achieve a further 5 years of operation of the pool given that it is already 60 years old. Therefore, the pool can no longer be maintained by maintenance and upgrades. The pool is at the end of its life and requires complete replacement.

**Q4. What evidence can the council provide to show ratepayers that maintenance has been sufficiently done on Glenorchy pool, given neighbouring outdoor pools as New Norfolk's (which is of the same size), is of the same age, and are in good condition?**

A: As outlined in the consultant's presentation (Attachment 2 of the July Council report) a facility such as this only has an expected life of 40 years, and Glenorchy has achieved 60 years.

The request for evidence is resource intensive and some of the older records may not be available. However, expenses to Council at the pool last FY (2022/23) included:

Management Fee	\$254,616.00
Scheduled and reactive maintenance	\$ 38,097.74
Gas usage (excess)	\$ 80,229.31
Toddler pool shade cover renewal	\$ 4,193.39
Electrical switchboard upgrade (building)	\$ 4,314.00
Overflow carpark resurface	\$ 17,611.68
<b>TOTAL (2022/23)</b>	<b>\$399,062.12</b>

Similar year on year expenses to Council were incurred in previous years.

Capital upgrades over the period and costs of the items are listed below, however as noted above older records may be incomplete.

Shade Cover Renewal	\$ 47,580.00
Eaves Replacement	\$ 31,759.80
Backwash Pool Filter	\$ 46,600.00
Pool Top Plinth Antislip	\$ 8,745.00
Pool Slide Top Coat	\$ 33,248.66
Re-paint Water Slide	\$ 83,328.96
Pool Cover Motor	\$ 4,150.00
Chlorine Holding Tank	\$ 1,777.00
PVC & Clear Pool Divider Panels	\$ 11,645.73
Outdoor Umbrellas X 5	\$ 5,950.00
PVC Screens	\$ 9,230.00
Signage Replacement	\$ 7,986.00
Replace Roof on Glenorchy Pool Kiosk	\$ 8,699.00
Pool Cleaner - Dolphin Pro Expert 2 X 2	\$ 14,499.00
Pool Inflatable	\$ 10,206.00
Pool Cover	\$ 50,459.45
4 Gates Renewal	\$ 14,354.00
Shade Cover Renewal	\$ 24,699.33
Toddler Pool Shade Cover Renewal	\$ 4,193.39
Electrical switchboard upgrade	\$ 4,314.00
Overflow Car Park Re-surface	\$ 17,611.68
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 441,037.00</b>

**Q5. What efforts have been taken in the past by the Council to secure funding to build a new pool if it has been known by the council that Glenorchy pool has been deteriorating to such an extent?**

A: Council made a request to the last federal budget for \$26M to redevelop the site which included the following statement *"The pool, grandstand, plant and amenity buildings are in need of significant upgrade or replacement, without which the Glenorchy community will face future closure of the facility"*. The same statement was also included in the Council submission to the last federal election. These submissions were both made public.

**Q6. If no funding is secured from Federal or state governments, how long will it take for funding to be secured and a new pool to be built in Glenorchy?**

A: This will depend on what funding opportunities exist.

**Q7. What community consultation has gone on regarding the closure of the pool?**

A: The detailed assessment revealed that the Glenorchy Pool facilities have reached an age and condition that presents significant health and safety risks. The specialist advice has made clear that the works required to remove these risks would take more than 12 months to complete, hence the General Manager made the decision to announce that the pool will be closed for the coming season and until further notice in order to give the operator, Belgravia Leisure, and users of the pool as much notice as possible. The General Manager made this call in fulfilling his workplace health and safety duties as the responsible Person Conducting a Business Undertaking (PCBU). As such no community consultation has been undertaken on this decision. A media release was distributed to ensure wide media coverage was achieved to announce the closure and all registered pool users, past pass holder's and schools that used the pool were notified directly.

Council is yet to consider the long-term solution for the pool and at this stage has only made the call to leave the pool closed until further notice due to unacceptable risks to health and safety. Council will keep the community informed of any decisions regarding the long-term future of the pool.

If Council makes a future decision to build a new aquatic facility or otherwise repurpose the site, then consultation with the community will occur to help inform decisions on such developments.

Council has developed a hydrotherapy pool at the adjacent KGV site. The hydrotherapy pool is run leased to Revive and operated by St Giles, who welcome bookings on referral from GPs, Physiotherapists, and other Allied Health Professionals - [www.stgiles.org.au/services-for-you/allied-health/](http://www.stgiles.org.au/services-for-you/allied-health/)

**Question on notice – Morris Malone, West Moonah  
(received 25 July 2023)**

At the November 2022 Council meeting, it was detailed that "unforeseen events [can] occur during a financial year let alone across several financial years" and that "the effect of these unforeseen events is that it is normal actual financial experience is different from budget." For the 2023/24 budget.

**Q1. What assurances can Council provide the community that appropriated funds will be expended as itemised?**

A: Question taken on notice

**Q2 What insurances are in the budget to mitigate the effect of unforeseen events?**

A: Question taken on notice

**Question on notice – Leeanne Rose, Glenorchy**  
(received 31 July 2023)

**Q: What price do our council representatives place on the physical, mental health and well-being of all its constituents? With the rising crime rate amongst the young people of this area where will they go in summer to cool off? The removal of this resource will have a knock-on effect and is a threat to the social and economic stability of our community. Please consider keeping our pool and improving it by adding a hydrotherapy section for our aging population.**

**A:** Council is yet to consider the long-term solution for the pool and at this stage has only made the call to leave the pool closed until further notice due to unacceptable risks to health and safety. Council will keep the community informed of any options and decisions regarding the long-term future of the pool.

If Council makes a future decision to build a new aquatic facility or otherwise repurpose the site, then consultation with the community will occur to help inform decisions on those developments.

**Public question - Paul Campton, Claremont**

**Q: In relation to 8 to 10 Main Road, Claremont, landowners consent was granted on 2 June 2023 and with normal development applications they have 42 days.**

**With the development application for 8 to 10 Main Road, what critical information was missing from the development application? Was it traffic? Was it acoustic? What was the critical information that was missing that Council had to go back and get from McDonald's?**

**A:** [Mayor] There has been a request made for a whole range of reports, including matters such as traffic and acoustics as you mentioned, but a range of other information has been requested. As you would be aware, the clock stops on that 42 day assessment period until the information has been provided, at which time the clock will start again.

**Q: And you haven't got that information back as yet?**

**A:** [Mayor] No, not as yet.

**Q: When might Council officers reasonably expect to have all the information to prepare this amendment, to either recommended or not, is there any time frame that you can give us?**

A: [Mayor] It is a matter for the applicant in terms of when they provide the information to us. It is their responsibility to provide that information. I'm not aware of there being a time frame in which they must provide it under the Act.

**Q: If it is a matter for the applicant what date did you ask?**

A: Question taken on notice.

### **Public question - David Kernke, Claremont**

**Q: Given the proposed McDonald's development application at 8-10 Main Road, Claremont is a prohibited use in the inner residential zone, why didn't Glenorchy City Council simply reject the application when it was initially lodged?**

A: [Mayor] It is the applicant's right to request a change of use under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act and it is the responsibility of Council and the Planning Authority to assess the merits of the application for a change to both the zoning and the use of a parcel of land under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act.

**Q: Isn't it unusual for a person to make an application for a prohibited use of the land? Why would it not to be rejected? Instead Council has gone back and ask for more information.**

A: [General Manager] As I have indicated to a number of residents, including yourself under section 4T of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act, it allows a person to make an application to Council.

Council as a Planning Authority is charged with assessing the application request for rezoning or a request for an amendment to the scheme, along with a development proposal as per the legislation under the Act.

Council frequently receives these types of combined amendment and planning permit application requests.

**Q: My understanding is other Councils would have rejected this application and not gone forward with it?**

A: [Mayor] Council has no discretion under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act and is not able to reject an application without first assessing it. Council

cannot fully assess an application until all the required information has been received.

**Q: McDonald's lodged 10 files and consultants reports in their DA application and paid for professional expertise including acoustic and lighting reports. If the DA was so flawed and it was missing critical information, why didn't Council reject the application at that point?**

**A:** [Mayor] Council has not yet assessed the application, as we don't have a full application before us to assess. Once we have received all of the information required, Council will make an assessment of the application and then be in a position to make a decision as to whether to reject or approve the application but we are not yet at this stage of the process.

### **Public Question - Pauline Elliott, Claremont**

**Q: Council has stopped the clock on the McDonalds development application to enable them to put in further information. Is Council acting less as an independent DA assessor and more as a DA supporter?**

**A:** [Mayor] Council is acting in accordance with the requirements of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act.

**Q: Is the extra time given to McDonald's so they can get their paid consultants to address all of Council's concerns, then Council can advertise the remodeled development application?**

**A:** [Mayor] The request for information has been issued in accordance with the requirements of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act.

### **Public Question - Leeanne Rose, Glenorchy**

**Q: The Glenorchy memorial pool commemorates those who served in various conflicts in which Australia has been involved. Five plaques were placed on the diving blocks at the shallow end of the pool on 25 April 1964, which have now been moved and are displayed in a glass frame at the entrance of the pool.**

The Glenorchy pool is listed as a monument on the Monument Australia website and I wondered if Council was aware of that fact and if Council can give me some more information about how it became a monument in honour of our service volunteers?

- A: [Mayor] Council is aware that the Glenorchy War Memorial pool is a memorial facility. Council has not yet made any decision about the future of the Glenorchy War Memorial pool, and we will take into consideration that it is a memorial facility in any future decisions that we make.

In relation to your request for information on the history of the site as a memorial facility, I will take the question on notice and provide some information back to you in writing.

### **Public Question - Vivianne Vandenberg, West Moonah**

- Q: Will Glenorchy City Council ban advertising on fossil fuel advertising slogans?**

- A: As noted in the response to your initial question, Council has committed to developing a climate change mitigation plan in its Annual Plan for this financial year 2023-2024 . Council will consider ways to reduce its use of fossil fuels and this will form an important part of the development of this action plan and this will include considering relevant Council policies as you have suggested.

- Q: How will the Community be involved in that process?**

- A: [Mayor] There will be community consultation on the development of our climate change action plan.

- Q: Will people like me be able to participate in that?**

- A: [Mayor] Yes. You will have the opportunity to provide input into that climate change action plan.

- Q: Will Glenorchy Council investigate who their investments are with and seek an alternative fund? If the investment is with companies that are predominantly fossil fuel base, will you please change to an alternative fund? I would like to know who you actually invest that money with and I would like to know how much money is involved.**

- A: [Mayor] This question will be taken on notice.

### **Public Question - Janiece Bryan, Montrose**

- Q: Will Council confirm the State Government through the Department of State Growth and the Council, has a partnership agreement that has identified the most valuable public land for disposal, dismantling community assets and facilities, and that ratepayers foot the bill for making the land development ready for property developers?**



A: [Mayor] No, we don't have a partnership with the State Government on the disposal of land.

**Q: I believe there is one. The partnership agreement was signed in the year 2000 and it is still current. There was a commercial in confidence list of public land for disposal drawn up.**

A: [General Manager] There was a partnership agreement process which was brought in under the Bacon Labor government, several State Governments ago and has long since been abandoned.

[Mayor] There is no active partnership on disposal of land with the State Government.

**Q: Please check before making that statement.**

A: [Mayor] Question will be taken on notice.

**Q: Is the pool site, the Berriedale Reserve, the YMCA CBD car parking included on the commercial in confidence list of public land for disposal to property developers?**

A: [Mayor] No.

**Q: The Lacus Consulting report states that the pool was in fair condition. The shell had been well painted and there were no major cracks and areas in need of repair. Why is Council stating the pool is losing 35,000 litres of water per day?**

A: [Mayor] The pool is losing 35,000 litres of water per day which would suggest that there are significant structural issues with the asset.

**Q: Why is this expensive report not flagging that? Where did it come from?**

A: [Mayor] Taken on notice

### **Public Question - Neale Hall, Claremont**

**Q: In relation to 8 to 10 Main Road, Claremont - earlier today, you said that a full application had not been received. How can you say that without an assessment being undertaken? In which case it should have been rejected that it was flawed.**

A: [Mayor] There has been a development application submitted and as is the normal process with development applications, in order to be able to properly assess them, often an applicant will be asked to provide further information.

That has been the case with this particular application, so it will be fully assessed once the full information required has been received.

**Q: Any idea on the time frame when we will hear anything?**

**A:** [Mayor] No.

**Public Question - Ron Collidge, Claremont**

**Q: Can the Council advise if the application for McDonalds at 8 to 10 Main Road, Claremont is the same application for the rezoning?**

**A:** [Mayor] Yes, there is a combined application.

**Q: By the same people? Because, I understand it is the people that own the property that have to make the application for the rezoning apart from the application for the development?**

**A:** [Mayor] My understanding is there has to be landowner consent for the making of the application but they don't need to be the actual maker of the application.

[General Manager] Yes, that is correct.

**Q: So they don't have to be the owner of the property to make their application?**

**A:** [Mayor] Yes, that is correct.

---

## **7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS**

---

None.

## COMMUNITY

### *Community Goal – Making Lives Better*

---

#### 8. ACTIVITIES OF THE MAYOR

---

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

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

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

##### **Resolution:**

COCKSHUTT/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 19 June to Sunday, 23 July 2023.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 9. STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2023-2032

---

File Reference: Asset Management

### Reporting Brief:

To present the Strategic Asset Management Plan 2023-2032 to Council for approval and adoption.

### Resolution:

DUNSBY/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. ADOPT the Strategic Asset Management Plan 2023-2032 set out in Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 10. GLENORCHY WAR MEMORIAL POOL

---

File Reference: Glenorchy War Memorial Pool

### Reporting Brief:

To outline the reasons for keeping the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool closed until further notice as announced on Tuesday 17 July 2023, and provide options to consider for the future of the pool.

### Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/SLADE

That Council:

1. NOTE the General Manager's decision, on 4 July 2023, in his capacity as "person controlling the business or undertaking (PCBU)" under the *Work Health and Safety Act 2012*, that the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool not reopen for the coming pool season and that the pool remain closed until further notice due to unacceptable risks to the health and safety of pool users, staff and contractors.
2. RECEIVE and NOTE this report and the attached reports of a detailed pool inspection and full audit of the Pool recently carried out by aquatic centre and asset specialists, Lacus Consulting and Know-Ledge Asset Management Services setting out the unacceptable risks to health and safety associated with the Pool (Attachments 1 & 2).
3. ENDORSE continued consultation with State and Federal Governments on potential funding opportunities for the future redevelopment of the site.
4. PROVIDE progress reports on the status of investigations into the site's future.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 11. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN 2022-23 UPDATE

---

File Reference: Community Development

### Reporting Brief:

To present the annual update to Council on the Community Development Action Plan 2022-23 priority actions.

### Resolution:

KING/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the attached report on the Community Development Action Plan 2022-23 (Attachment 2).

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 12. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN 2023-24 TO 2024-25

---

File Reference: Community Development

### Reporting Brief:

To present the Community Development Action Plan 2023-24 to 2024-25.

### Resolution:

HICKEY/KING

That Council:

1. RECEIVE AND NOTE the Community Development Action Plan 2023-24 to 2024-25 (Attachment 1).

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

### 13. COMMITTEES, REFERENCE AND WORKING GROUPS REVIEW

---

File Reference: Committees

#### **Reporting Brief:**

This report updates the existing Terms of Reference and Toolkits for Working Groups and notes identified additional Committees for potential establishment in the future.

#### **Resolution:**

HICKEY/KING

That Council:

1. NOTE the amendments to Terms of Reference and Toolkit for Committees, Working Groups and Reference Groups.
2. NOTE the process for additional Committees to be established.
3. NOTE that additional resourcing may be required to fund administration of committees.

The resolution was modified with the consent of the mover and seconder to read as follows:

That Council:

1. APPROVE the amendments to Terms of Reference and Toolkit for Committees, Working Groups and Reference Groups.
2. APPROVE the process for additional Committees to be established.

Alderman Dunsby foreshadowed a motion that the item be deferred to the September council meeting.



The modified original motion was put.

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt,  
Yaxley and Slade

The motion was LOST.

DUNSBY/SLADE

DEFER the item to the September Council meeting.

The foreshadowed motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt,  
Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Steven King left the meeting at 5.05pm.

## ECONOMIC

### *Community Goal – Open for Business*

Alderman Steven King returned to the meeting at 5.08pm.

---

#### 14. LOCAL ROADS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

---

File Reference: LRCIP

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

To seek Council's acceptance of funding under phase 4 of the Australian Government's Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Program and endorsement of project allocation.

##### **Resolution:**

SLADE/ALDERTON

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the attached report on Phase 4 of the Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Grant Program.
2. APPROVE acceptance of the Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Grant of \$912,827 offered by the Federal government.
3. APPROVE the allocation of Part A funding of \$578,903 for approved local road and community infrastructure projects under the Grant to the Benjafield Childcare redevelopment project;
4. APPROVE the allocation of Part B funding of \$333,924 for approved road projects under the Grant, to road projects in Council's 2023/24 roads capital works program.
5. APPROVE the reallocation of \$333,924 from the Council's 2023/24 roads capital works program budget to the Benjafield Childcare redevelopment project;
6. AUTHORISE the General Manager to take the necessary steps to execute the grant approval documents.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt,  
Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

## GOVERNANCE

### *Community Goal – Leading our Community*

---

#### 15. ELECTION OF NEW ALDERMAN - JUNE 2023

---

File Reference: 2023 Councillor Vacancy

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

To formally note the election on recount of Mr Shane Alderton to fill a vacant elected member position on Glenorchy City Council and the making by Alderman Alderton of his declaration of office.

##### **Resolution:**

SLADE/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. NOTE the election on 10 July 2023, on recount, of Alderman Shane Alderton to fill a vacant councillor position on Glenorchy City Council as set out in the Certificate of Election at Attachment 1.
2. ACKNOWLEDGE that Alderman Alderton made his declaration of office on Tuesday 11 July 2023 pursuant to s. 321(3) of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 16. FUTURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW SUBMISSION

---

File Reference: Local Government Reform

### Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's endorsement to make a submission to the Local Government Board in response to the Board's Future of Local Government Review Stage 2 Interim Report, March 2022.

### Amended motion:

HICKEY/KING

That Council:

1. MAKE a submission to the Local Government Board in response to the Board's Future of Local Government Review Stage 2 Interim Report, March 2022 in the terms set out under the heading "submission" in the body of this report.
2. NOMINATE the Mayor and General Manager to represent Council in the Public Hearing before the Local Government Board on 31 August 2023.
3. INVITE the City of Hobart to join Glenorchy City Council to investigate collaboration and synergies between the two Councils and any capacity for resource sharing.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 17. APPOINTMENT OF AUDIT PANEL PROXY

---

File Reference:                      Audit Panel

### Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council appoints an additional Elected Member as a proxy member of the Audit Panel for cover during absences, in accordance with statutory and policy requirements.

### Resolution:

SLADE/KING

In accordance with clause 2(7) of the Committee Nominations and Appointments Policy, it is recommended that a ballot be held to determine the member-elect to be confirmed in the available position on the Glenorchy Audit Panel.

That Council:

1. NOTE Alderman Jan Dunsby's existing appointment as a proxy to the Audit Panel.
2. CALL for nominees from the floor for one (1) additional proxy position on the Audit Panel and ask those nominees to provide oral statements in support of their nomination.
3. There being only one nominee for the additional elected member proxy position on the Audit Panel, APPOINT the nominee Alderman Yaxley to that position.

The motion was put.

**FOR:**                      Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 18. TOLOSA PARK HIRE FEES

---

File Reference: Tolosa Park

### Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council includes additional hire fees for events at Tolosa Park, as well as Minor, Medium and Major Event Application Fees, in the Glenorchy City Council Fees and Charges 2023/24.

### Resolution:

DUNSBY/KING

That Council:

1. APPROVE the addition of the fees outlined in *Table 'A' – Tolosa Park Event Fees* in the 'Proposal in Detail' section of this report, to the Glenorchy City Council Fees and Charges Register 2023/24.
2. APPROVE the addition of Minor, Medium and Major Event Application Fees, outlined in *Table 'B' – Event Permit Application Fees* in the 'Proposal in Detail' section of this report, to the Glenorchy City Council Fees and Charges Register 2023/24.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 19. AMENDMENT TO COUNCIL FEES AND CHARGES FOR 2023/24

---

File Reference: Fees and Charges 2023/24

### Reporting Brief:

To recommend amendments to the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24.

### Resolution:

HICKEY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. AMEND the Fees for the Moonah Arts Centre and Child Care Centres as detailed in Attachment 1.
2. ADOPT a Fee of \$250.00 for Permitted Visitor Accommodation applications pursuant to section 11A of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Regulations* 2014.
3. AUTHORISE these Fees be updated in the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.



---

## 20. QUARTERLY REPORT - QUARTER 4 2022/23

---

File Reference: Corporate Reporting

**Reporting Brief:**

To present Council's Quarterly Report for the quarter ending 30 June 2023.

**Resolution:**

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE Council's Quarterly Report and Quarterly Annual Plan Progress Report for the quarter ending 30 June 2023.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 21. CAPITAL WORKS STATUS REPORT

---

File Reference: Capital Works

### Reporting Brief

To provide a quarterly capital works status update report to Council and report the end of financial year position for 2022/23.

### Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/ALDERTON

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the capital works status report to the end of the 2022/23 Financial year.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

### AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 22. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS EXEMPTIONS REPORT

---

File Reference: Procurement

### Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of a procurement exemption under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts.

### Resolution:

YAXLEY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Report relating to an exemption approved by the Director Infrastructure and Works for repairs to the liner at the Jackson Street Landfill totaling \$27,164.90 excluding GST.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

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

---

### Question taken on notice – Councillor Molly Kendall

Back in March, the recent IPCC summary report outlined the need for all levels of government to commit to urgent climate action “everyone, everywhere, all at once”. This is no longer a matter of averting climate disasters but a duty of care to our residents right now, to prepare them for the disruption that’s locked in for the coming decade.

Many councils have a climate action plan, a climate officer, or a commitment to climate action of some kind.

**Q: So the community and elected members can know what our position is right now at GCC, as a point to progress from, can Council officers please report on what commitments to climate action GCC currently has?**

**A:** Council currently has no staff or resources allocated specifically to climate change. Nonetheless Council does undertake a range of actions to support climate change initiatives including:

- Membership of the Regional Climate Change Initiative (RCCI) made up of the Southern Region Councils, which works collaboratively on climate change initiatives at a regional level such as the development of the Regional Adaptation Strategy – Adapting to a Changing Coastline in Tasmania, <https://stca.tas.gov.au/rcci/our-projects/our-changing-coastline/>.
- introduced Food Organics and Garden Organics (FOGO) kerbside collection service, which as reported at the June 2023 Council Meeting has resulted in a very large, 54% reduction in Council’s total greenhouse gas emissions per annum
- partnered with LMS to extract gas from the Jackson Street landfill including the installation of 10 additional wells and a flare
- in the process of installing a large solar power installation at the Council Chambers and is investigating other potential sites suitable for solar power that have high day time energy usage
- has a hybrid electric vehicle in the council’s vehicle fleet
- have switched over the majority of our streetlights to energy efficient LEDs

- utilising energy efficient designs and fittings in new buildings and upgrades
- investigating options for partnerships to provide public EV charging stations in Council car parks
- proposed the development of a Council-wide action plan to reduce Council's greenhouse gas emissions in the 2023/24 Annual Plan.

**Q: In addition, can officers please make a recommendation about what form of climate commitment they think would be most impactful for us to adopt here in Glenorchy?"**

**A:** As outlined above, the Council has proposed the development of a Council-wide action plan to reduce Council's greenhouse gas emissions in the 2023/24 Annual Plan. It is recommended that this is the most appropriate step for Council to take at this point in time. It is however noted that there are no additional resources allocated to undertake this work, and Officers will be undertaking this on top of their existing duties. Additional resources are recommended if Council wishes to achieve more in this space, including implementing the potential actions that will come from the plan

### **Resolution:**

KING/ALDERTON

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, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 5.49pm.

# CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Closed session commenced at 6.02pm.

---

## 24. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

---

### Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/KING

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

The motion was put.

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

### AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 25. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

---

## GOVERNANCE

### *Community Goal – Leading our Community*

---

#### **26. REQUEST FOR TENDER NO. 916 - KGV PARK SOCCER BUILDING CONSTRUCTION - REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO AWARD THE 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).*

---

## **27. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO EXTEND - CASCADE REPORTING SOFTWARE**

---

*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).*



---

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

---

### **Resolution:**

KING/ALDERTON

That the meeting be moved back into open Council.

The motion was put.

**FOR:** Aldermen Dunsby, King, Thomas, Alderton, Hickey, Cockshutt,  
Yaxley and Slade

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 6.12pm.

Confirmed,

**CHAIR**