

Minutes of the Meeting of the Glenorchy City Council held at the Council Chambers on Monday, 30 May 2022 at 6.00pm



Present (in Chambers): Alderman Bec Thomas (Mayor), Alderman Steven King (Deputy Mayor), Aldermen Peter Bull, Jan Dunsby, Simon Fraser, Sue Hickey and Gaye Richardson.

In attendance (in Chambers): Tony McMullen (General Manager), David Ronaldson (Director Community and Customer Services), Emilio Reale (Director Infrastructure and Works), Bryn Hannan (Executive Officer).

In attendance (by video link): Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), Samantha Fox (Director Strategy and Development), Tina House (Chief Financial Officer), Marian Maclachlan (Executive Assistant to the General Manager)

Leave of Absence:

Workshops held since last Council Meeting	Date:	Monday, 9 May 2022
	Purpose:	To discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of Council Services
	Date:	Monday, 23 May 2022
	Purpose:	To discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• UTAS move to Hobart City• Policy update• Budget update

The meeting was live streamed on Council's website, Facebook page and YouTube channel. The peak number of viewers watching the live stream 31 viewers.

The meeting began with a prayer by Martin Hughes from City North Church.

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 opened the meeting at 6.00pm.

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

Aldermen Carlton, Ryan and Sims.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Tuesday, 26 April 2022 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

National Reconciliation Week

Mayor Thomas made the following statement about National Reconciliation Week:

It is National Reconciliation Week and Australia's newly elected Prime Minister, Anthony Albanese, has powerfully spoken about the Government's priority commitment to the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Similarly, Glenorchy City Council's Community Strategy 2021-2030 describes Council's priority goal to foster a community that understands and values the stories and aspirations of Aboriginal people. Objective 4 is to Nurture Council's relationships with Aboriginal people and groups in the Glenorchy community to foster mutual respect and build cultural awareness and I have a number of meetings with members of Glenorchy's Aboriginal community coming up.

The National Reconciliation Week 2022 theme, "Be Brave Make Change" is a challenge to all Australians, individuals, families, communities, organisations and government to Be Brave and tackle the unfinished business of reconciliation so we can Make Change for the benefit of all Australians.

National Reconciliation is a time for all Australians to learn and share about our shared histories, cultures, and achievements and to explore how each of us can contribute to achieving reconciliation in Australia. I encourage us all to find out more about National Reconciliation Week by visiting the website <https://nrw.reconciliation.org.au/> and by talking to local members of our community.

Appointment of Deputy Municipal Emergency Management Coordinator

Mayor Thomas presented Tim Horton, Operations and Maintenance Supervisor, with a Certificate of Appointment as Deputy Municipal Emergency Management Coordinator.

The Mayor also congratulated Mr Horton on 40 years of service with Glenorchy City Council and thanked him and his team for their efforts in preparation for, and response to, the recent severe weather event of 6 May 2022.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

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

No interests were declared.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Response to question taken on notice – Tegan George (from 26 April 2022 Council meeting)

- Q. I am aware that hooning and dangerous driving in the Glenorchy city council area is a regular occurrence causing noise, smoke, and danger to residents. I understand it is very difficult for police to intercept and prosecute since offenders have often left the area by the time police arrive.**

Is the council aware of any community led approaches that could help reduce this antisocial behaviour and is this something council could look at?

- A. The problem of motorists' hooning is very widespread, with some areas having a higher reported or observed incidence of hooning behaviour. Almost without exception, all areas in Glenorchy have evidence of hooning.**

The *Police Offences Act 1935* was amended in September 2004 to allow Police to charge motorists that drive in this unacceptable manner and confiscate their vehicles. However, it is not possible for Police to be everywhere at once and they rely on the public to notify them of problem locations, problem vehicles/drivers and problem times.

Council has been advised that the Police are seizing vehicles under this enacted legislation, many of them based on reports/statements made to them by the general public. As a result, residents are encouraged to report these hooning incidents to the Glenorchy Police as they are best placed to react to inappropriate driver behaviour.

Council is also looking to trial the installation of a hooning camera at known hot spot locations, with the footage to be provided to Police for enforcement. The installation of the hooning camera is subject to budget approval in the 2022/2023 financial year.

In relation to community-led approaches, Council's Community Department works directly with community to address anti-social and unsafe behaviour such as hooning, with a focus on understanding the underlying causes of the behaviour and developing appropriate community driven responses.

- Council's Community Development team has specifically responded to motorbike hooning and unsafe riding through delivery of the Full Gear Motor Bike Safety Program for young people, which is now in its 3rd year. This program resulted from community feedback about people feeling unsafe in the community because of motorbike hooning. The Council

responded by talking with local young people and the local community house and was subsequently successful in gaining a State Government (Department of State Growth) grant which funds a Project Officer position, a facilitator and materials to deliver co-designed programs that help young people consider the safety of themselves and others in order to gain their motorbike license. The program also works with Tas Police, legal aid and social support services to help the young people involved to better understand their responsibilities.

- The team has also previously worked on a collaborative project with Clarence, Kingborough and Derwent Valley Councils and were successful in gaining a Tasmanian Road Safety grant to work directly in local schools with year 11 and 12 students to educate young people about the dangers of driver distraction such as mobile phone use and drink driving.

In addition to the above, the establishment of Neighbourhood Watch groups can also help when communities connect and work with police to understand the correct process for reporting hooning and help increase perceptions of safety. This may be something you might like to consider, and Council would be happy to connect you with Neighbourhood Watch Tasmania if so.

Response to question taken on notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose (from 26 April 2022 Council meeting)

- Q. What action has Glenorchy City Council undertaken to protect, preserve and keep safe the irreplaceable Glenorchy's Historic Records that were stored in St Matthew's Church? Who is the custodian of these valuable items? Why is the Glenorchy Historical Society a small, closed group when the Community wish to participate in the preservation of Glenorchy's history? Why were the historic materials moved from the site when it was promised in the 2000 Partnership with the Government to be the permanent home for these records and artefacts? Funding was received by the Council and a commitment was made to curate and publicly display them.**
- A.** Council has no ongoing association with the Glenorchy Historical Society (GHS), which is a private organisation. Any questions about the ownership and storage of artefacts in the custody of the GHS need to be directed to the GHS.

[Council entered into a partnership with the Tasmanian Government \(led by then Premier Jim Bacon\) in 2000 that addressed a variety of issues.](#) The relevant pages which relate to the State Government and Council assisting the GHS are extracted below. Council's specific obligations under this agreement were met within the required time frames. The partnership agreement has long-since expired, however Council continued to support the activities of the GHS until 2020 by providing an annual contribution and providing the use of

the outbuilding at St Mathews Church as a history room and for the storage of their historical artefacts and records.

Council does not have any current plans to put historical artefacts on public display, however would consider a request for it to provide support to an application for external grant funding if approached by any interested community groups.

SCHEDULE 7: AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY

7.3 GLENORCHY'S HISTORICAL AND ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

7.3.2 GLENORCHY HISTORY GROUP AND ST MATTHEW'S CHURCH

Issues

The Parties agree the key issues to be addressed are:

- The Glenorchy region has a richness of early Tasmanian history which although currently little recognised extends from Aboriginal middens through to the times of settlement and recent industrial history
- There is a need to ensure that historical artefacts are protected, interpreted and retained for future generations
- St Matthew's Church is a significant historical property within the Glenorchy region with the capacity for expanded use for both tourism and history promotion activities

Strategies

The Parties agree the strategies they will employ are:

- The Parties will assist the Glenorchy History Group develop arrangements for the protection, interpretation and retention historical materials about the region, including the development of St Matthew's Church as a permanent home for the Group's collection
- Engage a facilitator to conduct a workshop for members of the Glenorchy History Group and Council staff to discuss the needs and perceived roles of each party.
- The State will contribute \$30,000 over two years to assist the History project through professional guidance on conservation, curation and display of historic materials
- The State will assist the Council by providing specialist advice and help to identify and investigate external grant funding opportunities

SCHEDULE 7: AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY

Performance Indicators

The Parties agree the indicators to be used are:

- Within twelve months of signing this Agreement, the Council will initiate development of conservation plans for St Matthew's Church and obtain professional advice on curation and display of historical materials
- Within fifteen months of signing this Agreement, the Parties will have worked to cooperatively identify and access external funding sources

Response to question taken on notice – Eddy Steenbergen, Rosetta (from 26 April 2022 Council meeting)

My questions relate to issues related to building construction at the McGill Rise subdivision which became public in early 2021.

According to the Mercury of June 12, Council vacated eight of the dwellings “until full engineering assessments can be carried out and any necessary remediation works are completed”. The Council is also quoted as saying that “where non-compliances with the National Construction Code have been identified, council has taken the necessary enforcement actions and will work with property owners to resolve”.

On a recent visit to McGill Rise, it was difficult to see any external evidence of remediation.

Q1. What remediation or rectification work has taken place so far? What future works are planned?

A. No remediation or rectification work has taken place for the eight properties affected by the emergency orders issued by Council for properties in the McGill Rise subdivision. Any remediation or rectification works would need to be carried out by the owners of those properties. We are not aware of what remediation works are currently planned, however will continue to work with the property owners to ensure the requirements of the emergency orders are met.

Q2. What role does Council see for itself in the resolution of the McGill Rise issues going forward?

- A. Council's role is to ensure compliance with the relevant legislation to ensure buildings are safe to occupy. That has, to date, included issuing emergency orders under the *Building Act 2016*, requiring evacuation of the buildings and ensuring compliance with those orders.

We will continue to work with relevant authorities and property owners to meet our statutory obligations and mitigate, as far as possible, any risk to the public. This may include issuing further orders or taking other enforcement action in relation to any non-compliance.

Q3. What resources has Council expended so far to progress the resolution of the situation?

- A. Council staff have spent considerable time in working with all affected parties to resolve this matter. Council has also engaged, at its own cost, independent engineering advice to investigate the extent of stability issues and other defective works in the subdivision, and the associated risks to safety.

Response to question taken on notice – Shane Alderton, Austins Ferry (from 26 April 2022 Council meeting)

Q. In relation to the PlaySpace at Giblins Reserve and the Montrose Foreshore Reserve Skatepark, have the estimated costs increased because of the time taken to deliver these projects?

- A. Construction costs have been increasing across all projects in recent times, and most notably since late 2020. This is predominantly due to labour and materials shortages caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Cost estimates for both the Montrose Skate Park and Giblins Reserve Playspace projects have been provided in February and March 2022, respectively. The actual construction costs of prospective contractors will not be known until the tender submissions are received and evaluated.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Questions on Notice – Bill Dodd, Claremont (received 26 May 2022)

As Glenorchy City Council considers making cuts to council services and initiative that many people rely on, it remains a fact that some businesses are not contributing their fair share of council rates.

In particular, rates calculations for businesses do not take into consideration whether or not the venue has poker machines. Venues with poker machines pay the same rates as those without, despite these machines greatly increasing annual profits. Inflated poker machine profits come at the detriment and destitution of many people in the community.

Q1. Will GCC consider applying differential rates for poker machine venues? This is a measure that is clearly provisioned in the Local Government Act. I recommend doubling the rates, as a statement of the GCC's long-standing stance against this harmful industry.

These revenues could fund a rates amnesty for venues that transition out of poker machines, a grants program for community-friendly activities and alternative revenue streams such as live music, pool tables etc, and bolster addiction and financial counselling programs.

While GCC has historically been an advocate against pokies, the community also needs and expects action on this issue. We cannot rely on State Government to act in the interests of our community on poker machines.

The question was taken on notice.

Questions on Notice - Samantha Batchelor, Australian Services Union (ASU)

Q1. At the last Council meeting, Alderman Fraser in regard to a motion calling for a review of Council Services, referred to “needing to find some low hanging fruit.” Given the Councils services are delivered by people, employees of Council, this was an utterly disgusting reference to throw so flippantly around. It has caused deep offence. What action has if any Alderman Fraser taken to apologise to the hard-working employees at Glenorchy City council? And by seeking to initiate a review outside of the Council’s strategic plan setting process on what basis does Alderman Fraser believe a mandate exists to look at changing or reducing Council services?

A: [Alderman Fraser] I did go back to the recording of our last meeting just to check exactly what I did say, and I think it’s fairly obvious that what I said about low hanging fruit has been taken completely out of context, to be clear I don’t consider anyone employed by Glenorchy City Council to be low hanging fruit. Everyone has an important role to play and I probably should have used a different turn of phrase, so that my meaning was clearer. I was of course referring to the need for a sense of urgency in reducing some of our operational costs. My hope is there are some quick wins that can be achieved in this area.

Second part of the question refers to a mandate to review Council services and I believe that is what I was elected to do, it is my role as an alderman to make sure this organisation is always accountable to the community and that the organization continues to be financially stable, which at the moment it is not. When I moved the motion for the review of Council services it was passed unanimously.

Q2. Similarly, at the last Council meeting Alderman Sue Hickey, you focused on the division of so called core and no core services? This is certainly not something defined in the LG Act. You named up for example, childcare and the jobs hub as non-core services. The Council’s strategic plan said the community placed high value on Childcare services and to another extent an area you may consider non core, the Arts. As I understood it, Council’s are responsive to the needs and wants of their community. So, I ask on what authority do you define these services as potentially non-core and flag the prospect of them not being delivered by Council?

A: [Alderman Hickey] I thank Samantha Batchelor for her question. Glenorchy City Council has had 10 operating deficits in the past 11 years and continues to be in financial difficulty, limiting the standard of services it would like to offer to its residents. As a duly elected alderman, I believe I am legally and morally obliged to ensure to the best of my ability the financial viability of this Council so it can continue to operate and protect the jobs of as many of our employees as is possible, amongst many other responsibilities. While core and non-core functions are not specified in the Local Government Act, basic business knowledge would explain the concept of those functions that Council is

legislated to provide to supply plumbing, planning, public health and sanitation and building, and those that it likes to supply but are not obliged to provide, such as the Jobs Hub, some of the Arts and childcare.

I am personally very proud of the passionate work of all of our staff in these areas, however, there is no inner City Council that provides childcare services or even a JobsHub and childcare presents a competitive neutrality issue for this Council, even Brighton Council does not operate childcare, the private sector does this very well for their community.

I rang Kingborough Council and they do not have a JobsHub. I think it is most unfortunate the staff have to worry about their positions, but until Council makes some very hard decisions on how it is going to fund the backlog of maintenance, fix its footpaths, roads and parks and be sustainable into the future, then there will continue to be uncertainty for some staff members.

Staff at this Council I believe deserve to have a great career opportunity for themselves and not to be under the pressure they find themselves at present due to the unfilled vacancies due to cost cutting. This is the current method enforced by this Council which is inefficient and unfair. I thank Samantha for her question, but I hope she understands we are doing this in the best interest for the majority of our staff.

Question without notice - Eddy Steenbergen

Q1. In the closed session at tonight's Council meeting there is a report on Greenshoots application. Does it relate to an external body, the community fund?

A. [General Manager] It relates to an application by Glenorchy City Council but does involve other partners.

Q1a. What does Greenshoots mean in this context?

A. [General Manager] Greenshoots is an employment incubator.

[Mayor] Mr Steenbergen you will recall when we received funding through the economic stimulus package on the back of COVID-19 we had an economic recovery program and at the February 2022 Council meeting we received a full report and update on the status of those projects and Greenshoots was included in that report. It was identified as a project, with the aim of supporting young people in particular providing support to those from migrant and refugee backgrounds, to develop their entrepreneurial and making skills in Glenorchy.

Q2. I note there was a Council workshop on the University of Tasmania Southern Tasmania transformation project and wondered why the need to discuss it?

A. [Mayor] University of Tasmania is consulting with a wide-range of stakeholders about their move into the CBD, including a number of Councils.

The General Manager and I had had a conversation with Professor Rufus Black, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Tasmania and we talked about having a presentation to a Council workshop to explain and to provide the opportunity to aldermen to ask questions about the move into the CBD.

Q2a. So this was an approach from the University of Tasmania?

A: [Mayor] Yes.

Q2b: Did Council come to a consensus on how they felt about the proposal?

A: [Mayor] No. Workshops are not decision making forums and the purpose of the workshop was to inform aldermen rather than for any decision making or consensus. We all have our own individual views, not something we need to make a Council decision on.

Q3. I notice there is a 'for lease' sign on the Centrelink building, which I thought Glenorchy would have a need for – can Council shed any light on this matter?

A: [Mayor] No, it is a private matter and I am not aware of it.

[Alderman Dunsby] The building is for sale, but Centrelink will be staying in the premises.

Q4: Item 19 'Review of Council Services', I assume that relates back to the last meeting where the decision was made to have a review, but why is it in closed session?

A. [General Manager] The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the review of Council services and to provide aldermen with options in relation to that review, including budget levels and the process going forward. Because it involves potential changes to Council staffing, it is appropriate for that matter to be discussed in private and closed Council, as it provides aldermen with the opportunity to ask candid questions and receive candid answers. I would propose following a decision from Council to then communicate with staff on the outcome of the discussion.

Q4a. Is tonight's agenda item not simply about the business case or is it about more than that?

A: [General Manager] It is about the process going forward. No, it is not about making any particular decisions at this stage. It is simply about the options to proceed with the review of Council services.

Q5. With McGill Rise and the extraordinary weather event which occurred on Friday, 6 May - did it make the situation any worse?

A. [General Manager] Council staff were actively monitoring McGill Rise to ensure there were no issues around that. Council took action last year, as a number of properties presented a risk to life and Council took action to ensure they were vacated to protect lives.

We are working through a process with the buildings owners in relation to building control matters and we are seeking to move to rectification of the issues there.

Q5a. Can you shed any light on this process, as it has been 12-months since they have been vacated?

A. [General Manager] The concerns that arose at the time were around the stability of building platforms that had been built on the site and for the potential for those to cause problems, which we are working through with the building's owners. It involves expert engineering advice and there maybe other legal process in play. Council is acting within its powers to monitor the safety of that sub-division.

Question without Notice – Roger Ayers, Berriedale

Q: I have lived at 42 Chandos Drive, Berriedale since 1975 and through that period of time I have managed to document nine flooding events. One of which let in a little bit of water into the house, but most of them have made an absolute mess of the house, my workshop and even pushed over the back fence. I realise people's on Mary's Hope Road have been severely damaged.

We are the base of Kilander and I have filmed water coming down across the field, down Barossa, across Taree .

My question is what is to be done? What can be done? Also, at Dooley's Avenue there was a grate put in and a pipe, but it wasn't there.

A. [General Manager] Immediately after the event, our maintenance crews were on and working overtime to clear the debris that had flown down into the area. Based on advise from our Engineers in these events what happens the stormwater overflows the stormwater system and basically follows the natural

drainage path.

In terms of the response going forward, we will be doing two things, firstly, our engineers will be reviewing our stormwater system to identify any enhancements that we can make and secondly, we will be responding to any insurance claims that come forward and we will be bringing those to the attention of our insurer.

- A. [Director Infrastructure and Works] In relation to specific issues that arose on the day, we are very aware that it had blocked and some work was undertaken to try and stop the debris from blocking it up so easily, by putting a grate over it and fencing it. However, in this storm event we had a 110mm received over 12-hours, so it is a significant amount of rainfall, quite a large volume for the capacity of our pipes. There are two valleys in that area that go into that inlet and tonnes of debris, rubble and large boulders were found, to such an extent we thought there had been a landslip but after our engineers carried out an investigation on the hillside, it was discovered it was just scouring from the amount of rain.

What can we do about it? Our hydraulic engineers are looking at it, given this is the second time it has occurred, we will look at a sediment retention system, with the aim to stop the debris coming any further, but still allow the water to flow into the pipe system.

As the pipes blocked, the water started to travel overland and affect other properties. The amount of water exceeded the volume of the pipes, they had reached capacity, which caused surge charging, popping the manholes off and the water ran overland.

One of the projects we are looking at is putting in more side entry pits into Chandos Drive to get as much water in the system as possible and to reduce the amount of overland flow, it won't take it away completely but reduce it. We are also looking to see where we can do some system upgrades, but we have to remember based on calculations this was a 1-in-75 year event.

We identified three areas which were worst affected in Berriedale including Chandos Drive, as well as Grove Road, Glenorchy and Main Road, Glenorchy. We will be looking at these three areas, not saying these were the only areas affected by the storm event, there were many areas, but these will be Council's initial focus in the short term. This is going to be a long-term project, with a number of capital work projects being done over a number of years. We need to cater for a wide range of flooding events.

Q1a. Would it be useful if I could provide a series of historical photos of flooding events which have occurred.

A. [Director Infrastructure and Works} Yes, it is very beneficial and useful information for us to have to understand the pressure points.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

A petition containing 29 signatures submitted by Wendy Ladaniwskyj on behalf of 30 residents located at Kilander Crescent, Kirala Court and Croome Court, Berriedale was tabled.

The meeting was advised that the petition did not meet the formal requirements for a petition under the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

However, it was also noted that action was being taken in respect to the subject matter of the petition, irrespective that it did not formally comply with the legislative requirements.

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 undertaken by the Mayor.

Resolution:

KING/RICHARDSON

That Council:

RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Wednesday, 20 April to Sunday, 22 May 2022.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

9. COUNCIL FEES AND CHARGES FOR 2022-23

File Reference: Fees and Charges 2022-23

Reporting Brief

To detail the recommended Schedule of Fees and Charges for the 2022-23 financial year.

Resolution:

KING/RICHARDSON

That Council:

1. APPROVE the fees and charges for the 2022-23 financial year as detailed in the Schedule of Fees and Charges forming Attachment 1 (other than fees and charges for Landfill Operations and Waste Services), and
2. NOTE that fees and charges for Landfill Operations and Waste Services are subject to approval as part of a separate report to this Council meeting.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

10. PROPOSED WASTE MANAGEMENT FEES AND CHARGES FOR 2022-23

File Reference: Waste Management Fees

Reporting Brief:

To recommend the proposed fees for Waste Management services for the 2022/23 financial year for incorporation into Council's 2022/23 budget.

Resolution:

That Council:

1. APPROVE the following kerbside fees for the 2022/23 financial year:

SERVICE TYPE	2021/2022 fees	Increase %	Increase amount	Final rounded charge 2022/2023
Standard Service				
Residential Garbage – 140L F/N	\$96.00	6%	\$6.00	\$102.00
Residential Recycling – 140L/240L F/N	\$101.00	3.5%	\$4.00	\$105.00
Residential FOGO – 140L/240L F/N	\$78.00	3.5%	\$3.00	\$81.00
Change bin from 240L to 140L	No charge	N/A	N/A	No charge
Residential Garbage - 240L F/N (increase bin size from 140L)	\$165.00	6%	\$9.90	\$179.00
Shared Services				
Residential Garbage – Shared Services	\$96.00	6%	\$5.40	\$102.00
Residential Recycling – Shared Services	\$101.00	3.5%	\$4.00	\$105.00
FOGO Shared Service	\$78.00	3.5%	\$3.00	\$81.00
Other Services				
Commercial Garbage – 140L F/N	\$167.00	6%	\$10.00	\$177.00

Commercial Garbage – 140L W	\$291.00	6%	\$18.00	\$309.00
Commercial Garbage – 240L F/N	\$286.00	6%	\$18.00	\$304.00
Commercial Garbage – 240L W	\$498.00	6%	\$30.00	\$528.00
Commercial Recycling – 140L & 240L F/N	\$101.00	3.5%	\$4.00	\$105.00
Commercial Recycling – 140L & 240L W	\$201.00	3.5%	\$7.00	\$208.00
Commercial FOGO – 140L & 240L F/N (New Service)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$210.00
Special Garbage – 140L F/N	\$192.00	6%	\$12.00	\$204.00
Special Garbage – 240L F/N	\$329.00	6%	\$21.00	\$350.00
Special Recycling – 140L & 240L F/N	\$201.00	3.5%	\$7.00	\$208.00
Special FOGO – 140L & 240L F/N	-	N/A	N/A	\$210.00

Notes:

1. W – weekly, F/N – fortnightly.
2. 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. All upgrades are required to be applied for by the resident/ratepayer for the property and must meet all relevant criteria
3. 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).
4. 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 2022/23 financial year:

Waste type	2021/2022 charges (inc GST)	2022/2023 (inc GST only)	Proposed firm charges 2022/23 (Includes Waste Levy).
Minimum gate fee	\$12 per visit	\$13 per visit	\$15 per visit
Passenger tyres	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each (levy)
Passenger tyres with rims	-	\$20	\$20 each (levy)
Light truck/ 4wd tyres	\$20 each	\$20 each	\$20 each (levy)
Light truck/ 4wd tyres with rims	-	\$40	\$40 each (levy)

Clean fill (conditions apply)	\$21/tonne	\$23/tonne	\$41/tonne
Brick/ concrete/ rubble	\$64/tonne	\$66/tonne	\$86/tonne
Green waste/ vegetation	\$79/tonne	\$82/tonne	\$100/tonne
General waste – domestic GCC residents (cars and single axle trailers only)	\$84/tonne	\$97/tonne	\$117/tonne
General waste – commercial/large vehicles and non GCC residents	\$104/tonne	\$120/tonne	\$140/tonne
Mattresses	\$20 each	\$21 each	\$24 each
Mixed waste – commercial/ industrial/ demolition/ construction (by negotiation)	\$157/tonne	\$175/tonne	\$195/tonne
Metal	\$105/tonne	\$109/tonne	\$109/tonne (levy N/A)
Recycling	No charge	No charge	No charge
Domestic quantity of double wrapped asbestos	\$50/ boot load \$100/ small trailer load	\$50/ boot load \$100/ small trailer load	\$50/ boot load \$100/ small trailer load (levy N/A)
Asbestos (conditions apply)	\$150/special waste handling fee plus \$180/tonne	\$155/special waste handling fee plus \$186/tonne	\$155/special handling fee plus \$186/tonne (levy N/A)
Controlled waste/ special burial (conditions apply)	\$150/special waste handling fee plus \$180/tonne	\$155/special waste handling fee plus \$186/tonne	\$155/special handling fee plus \$206/tonne
* A driver's licence or valid ID would need to be presented to the tollbooth operator to receive the discounted general waste rate.			

Waste type (only when weighbridge is non-operational)	Proposed charges 2022/23 (inc GST)
Boot Load (up to a maximum of 0.25m ³)	\$15.00
Green Waste Boot Load	\$15.00
Trucks GVM > 3 tonne to 7 tonne	\$83.00
Trucks GVM > 7 tonne to 12 tonne	\$189.00
Trucks GVM >12 tonne Single Axle	\$272.00
Trucks GVM >12 tonne Dual Axle	\$335.00
Dual axle trailers (behind trucks)	\$335.00
Skip/Bin up to 4m ³	\$113.00
Skip/Bin > 4m ³ to 8m ³	\$218.00
Skip/Bin > 8m ³ to 12m ³	\$354.00
Skip/Bin > 12m ³ to 15m ³	\$446.00
Skip/Bin > 15m ³ to 20m ³	\$582.00
Skip/Bin > 20m ³ to 25m ³	\$688.00
Skip/Bin > 25m ³ to 30m ³	\$793.00
Skip/Bin > 30m ³	\$1005.00
Compactors < 7m ³	\$267.00
Compactors > 7m ³ to 15m ³	\$570.00
Compactors < 15m ³ half full	\$425.00
Compactors > 15m ³ full	\$961.00
Compactors > 15m ³ half full	\$607.00

Foreshadowed motion

Alderman King foreshadowed a motion, being a motion in the form of the original recommendations put forward by Council officers in the report, including paragraph 3 which was omitted from the motion moved by Ald. Dunsby.

The original motion was put.

FOR: Alderman Dunsby

AGAINST: Aldermen Bull, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey.

The original motion was LOST.

The original motion having been lost, the foreshadowed motion was moved:

KING / BULL

That Council:

1. APPROVE the following kerbside fees for the 2022/23 financial year:

SERVICE TYPE	2021/2022 fees	Increase %	Increase amount	Final rounded charge 2022/2023
Standard Service				
Residential Garbage – 140L F/N	\$96.00	6%	\$6.00	\$102.00
Residential Recycling – 140L/240L F/N	\$101.00	3.5%	\$4.00	\$105.00
Residential FOGO – 140L/240L F/N	\$78.00	3.5%	\$3.00	\$81.00
Change bin from 240L to 140L	No charge	N/A	N/A	No charge
Residential Garbage - 240L F/N (increase bin size from 140L)	\$165.00	6%	\$9.90	\$179.00
Shared Services				
Residential Garbage – Shared Services	\$96.00	6%	\$5.40	\$102.00
Residential Recycling – Shared Services	\$101.00	3.5%	\$4.00	\$105.00
FOGO Shared Service	\$78.00	3.5%	\$3.00	\$81.00
Other Services				
Commercial Garbage – 140L F/N	\$167.00	6%	\$10.00	\$177.00
Commercial Garbage – 140L W	\$291.00	6%	\$18.00	\$309.00
Commercial Garbage – 240L F/N	\$286.00	6%	\$18.00	\$304.00
Commercial Garbage – 240L W	\$498.00	6%	\$30.00	\$528.00
Commercial Recycling – 140L & 240L F/N	\$101.00	3.5%	\$4.00	\$105.00
Commercial Recycling – 140L & 240L W	\$201.00	3.5%	\$7.00	\$208.00

Commercial FOGO – 140L & 240L F/N (New Service)	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$210.00
Special Garbage – 140L F/N	\$192.00	6%	\$12.00	\$204.00
Special Garbage – 240L F/N	\$329.00	6%	\$21.00	\$350.00
Special Recycling – 140L & 240L F/N	\$201.00	3.5%	\$7.00	\$208.00
Special FOGO – 140L & 240L F/N	-	N/A	N/A	\$210.00
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. W – weekly, F/N – fortnightly. 2. 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. All upgrades are required to be applied for by the resident/ratepayer for the property and must meet all relevant criteria 3. 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). 4. 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 2022/23 financial year:

Waste type	2021/2022 charges (inc GST)	2022/2023 (inc GST only)	Proposed firm charges 2022/23 (Includes Waste Levy).
Minimum gate fee	\$12 per visit	\$13 per visit	\$15 per visit
Passenger tyres	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each (levy)
Passenger tyres with rims	-	\$20	\$20 each (levy)
Light truck/ 4wd tyres	\$20 each	\$20 each	\$20 each (levy)
Light truck/ 4wd tyres with rims	-	\$40	\$40 each (levy)
Clean fill (conditions apply)	\$21/tonne	\$23/tonne	\$41/tonne
Brick/ concrete/ rubble	\$64/tonne	\$66/tonne	\$86/tonne
Green waste/ vegetation	\$79/tonne	\$82/tonne	\$100/tonne
General waste – domestic GCC residents (cars and single axle trailers only)	\$84/tonne	\$97/tonne	\$117/tonne
General waste – commercial/large vehicles and non GCC residents	\$104/tonne	\$120/tonne	\$140/tonne
Mattresses	\$20 each	\$21 each	\$24 each

Mixed waste – commercial/ industrial/ demolition/ construction (by negotiation)	\$157/tonne	\$175/tonne	\$195/tonne
Metal	\$105/tonne	\$109/tonne	\$109/tonne (levy N/A)
Recycling	No charge	No charge	No charge
Domestic quantity of double wrapped asbestos	\$50/ boot load \$100/ small trailer load	\$50/ boot load \$100/ small trailer load	\$50/ boot load \$100/ small trailer load (levy N/A)
Asbestos (conditions apply)	\$150/special waste handling fee plus \$180/tonne	\$155/special waste handling fee plus \$186/tonne	\$155/special handling fee plus \$186/tonne (levy N/A)
Controlled waste/ special burial (conditions apply)	\$150/special waste handling fee plus \$180/tonne	\$155/special waste handling fee plus \$186/tonne	\$155/special handling fee plus \$206/tonne
* A driver's licence or valid ID would need to be presented to the tollbooth operator to receive the discounted general waste rate.			

Waste type (only when weighbridge is non-operational)	Proposed charges 2022/23 (inc GST)
Boot Load (up to a maximum of 0.25m ³)	\$15.00
Green Waste Boot Load	\$15.00
Trucks GVM > 3 tonne to 7 tonne	\$83.00
Trucks GVM > 7 tonne to 12 tonne	\$189.00
Trucks GVM >12 tonne Single Axle	\$272.00
Trucks GVM >12 tonne Dual Axle	\$335.00
Dual axle trailers (behind trucks)	\$335.00
Skip/Bin up to 4m ³	\$113.00
Skip/Bin > 4m ³ to 8m ³	\$218.00
Skip/Bin > 8m ³ to 12m ³	\$354.00
Skip/Bin > 12m ³ to 15m ³	\$446.00
Skip/Bin > 15m ³ to 20m ³	\$582.00
Skip/Bin > 20m ³ to 25m ³	\$688.00
Skip/Bin > 25m ³ to 30m ³	\$793.00
Skip/Bin > 30m ³	\$1005.00
Compactors < 7m ³	\$267.00
Compactors > 7m ³ to 15m ³	\$570.00
Compactors < 15m ³ half full	\$425.00
Compactors > 15m ³ full	\$961.00
Compactors > 15m ³ half full	\$607.00

3. APPROVE the cessation of the annual, free waste disposal weekend for the reasons outlined in this report under the heading Free Waste Disposal Weekend for Residents.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

11. SOUTHERN TASMANIA REGIONAL WASTE AUTHORITY

File Reference: Waste Management

Reporting Brief:

To update Council on the creation (with other Southern Tasmanian councils) of a new joint authority to be known as the Southern Tasmanian Regional Waste Authority and associated public consultation outcomes.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/FRASER

That Council:

1. NOTE that no submissions were received during the public consultation process undertaken as a component of the establishment of the Southern Tasmanian Regional Waste Authority
2. APPROVE the proposed rules of the Southern Tasmanian Regional Waste Authority, as notified in accordance with section 31 of the *Local Government Act 1993 (the Act)*, and
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to undertake all necessary actions to enable the establishment of the new joint authority in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1993*, including providing certification to the Director of Local Government that the rules have been made in accordance with the Act.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

12. CAPITAL WORKS PROGRESS UPDATE

File Reference: Capital Works Program

Reporting Brief

To provide a capital works status update report to Council for the three-month period ending 30 April 2022.

Resolution:

FRASER/RICHARDSON

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Capital Works Status Summary Report for the period ending 30 April 2022, and
2. RECEIVE and NOTE the adjustments to Capital Estimates documented in the report, pursuant to Section 82(7) of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

Alderman Bull left the meeting at 19:42 pm.

Alderman Bull returned to the meeting at 19:47 pm.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

13. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS - MONTHLY REPORT

File Reference: Procurement

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to procurements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts for the period 15 April to 17 May 2022 and provide an update on external legal expenditure in accordance with the Ministerial Directions.

Resolution:

BULL/DUNSBY

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Monthly Report for the period from 15 April to 17 May 2022.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 30 APRIL 2022

File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide the monthly Financial Performance Report to Council for the period ending 30 April 2022.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/FRASER

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 30 April 2022 as set out in Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Question without notice - Alderman Dunsby (Volunteer Awards)

Q1. Now we are aware of the process for the volunteer awards, will the report be made public and a report provided back to Council as I requested?

A: [General Manager] Yes, we will bring a report back to the next Council meeting and we can provide a further update for public record now.

[Director Customer Service and Community] Yes, the Volunteer Awards process is being rolled out. In May, during Volunteer week, we recognised the 20-year contribution Claremont Library volunteers had made with the celebration held during Volunteer Week. The Volunteer Awards themselves will take place on Wednesday, 15 June 2022.

Question without notice - Alderman Dunsby (Bookings for Council meetings)

Q2. Why do we require registration for Council meetings, given density limits have now been lifted by the State Government?

A. [General Manager] At present, we still have the registration information on our website. Our website will be updated in the coming days to remove the requirement to pre-book to attend Council meetings.

Alderman Hickey

Alderman Hickey noted that there was a suggestion if anyone is interested in joining to find out how they may put their hand up and to become an alderman.

A: [Mayor] Yes, there is an election and it will be held in October with the process to enroll commencing in September. Polling will close on 25 October 2022.

Resolution:

BULL/FRASER

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

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 7.57 pm.

The meeting was adjourned for a short break.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The meeting re-commenced at 8.05pm.

Motion:

KING/BULL

That the agenda be reordered such that Item 19 is dealt with as the last item on the agenda.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

16. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Tuesday, 26 April 2022 be confirmed.

DUNSBY/RICHARDSON

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

17. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

None.

ECONOMIC

Community Goal: "Open for Business"

15. GREENSHOTS APPLICATION TO THE TASMANIAN COMMUNITY FUND

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

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

None.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: "Leading our Community"

19. REVIEW OF COUNCIL SERVICES - OPTIONS

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)(a) (Personnel matters, including complaints against an employee of the Council and industrial relations matters).

Resolution:

FRASER/BULL

That the meeting be move back into open Council.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Ryan, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser,
Carlton, Sims and Hickey

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 9.34pm.

Confirmed,

CHAIR