

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Monday, 30 September 2019 at 6.00 p.m.**



Present: Aldermen Kristie Johnston (Mayor), Matt Stevenson (Deputy Mayor), Peter Bull, Melissa Carlton, Jan Dunsby, Simon Fraser, Steven King, Gaye Richardson, Kelly Sims and Bec Thomas.

In attendance: Jenny Self (Acting General Manager), Tracey Ehrlich (Acting Director Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Director Community and Strategy), Samantha Fox (Director Development and Customer Services), Ted Ross (Director Infrastructure and Works), Bryn Hannan (Executive Officer), Alex Woodward (Manager Property, Environment and Waste), Tina House (Manager Finance and ICT), Merv Graham (Property Sales and Acquisitions Officer), Neal Ames (Project Manager – Sport and Recreation), Alli Coombe (Open Space Coordinator), Marina Campbell (Manager Community), Erin McGoldrick (Manager City Strategy and Economic Development), June King (Mayoral and Executive Support Officer) and Janina Gauden (Executive Support Officer).

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date: Monday, 2 September 2019

Purpose: To discuss:

- Local Government Review Directions Paper
- 21st Century Councils

Date: Monday, 9 September 2019

Purpose: To discuss:

- Risk Management

Date: Monday, 16 September 2019

Purpose: To discuss:

- FOGO Exemptions

Date: Monday, 23 September 2019

Purpose: To discuss:

- FOGO Exemption
- Land Disposal

Date: Tuesday, 24 September 2019

Purpose: To discuss:

- Ministerial Briefing
- City Deal Implementation Plan

Seventy (70) members of the public attended the open part of the Council Meeting.

The meeting was opened with a prayer by Joel Ortiz – Mabuhay Christ Homes.

The Chair acknowledged and paid respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the traditional and original owners and continuing custodians of the land.

The Chair read the following two statements:

Statement 1:

In relation to work health and safety at the Council meeting.

Statement 2:

In relation to the Audio Recording of the Council Meeting under regulation 33 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* and Council's 'Audio Recording of Council Meetings' policy.

1. APOLOGIES

None.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

BULL/KING

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday, 26 August 2019 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Food Organics Garden Organics (FOGO) kerbside service

The Mayor made the following statement:

“Each year we place approximately 20,000 tonnes of waste in to landfill. That’s enough to fill about 40 Olympic swimming pools.

Currently, 50 per cent of the contents in our ratepayer’s bins are organics, which should be diverted from landfill.

This is about solutions to our community’s waste, however, is it part of a much broader narrative, one of climate change and the effects of global warming.

Food and garden waste in landfill generates methane gas, which has 25 times the impact CO2 has on global warming. We need to do what we can to reverse our emissions.

Our Jackson Street landfill site is filling up, fast. We are currently looking at ways to expand the site to extend its life, but regardless of our efforts we need to face reality: If we continue along like this our landfill will be at capacity by 2022 with no viable alternative.

It is clear this system is not sustainable for many reasons, with the environmental consequences at the forefront, and with the State Government posed to impose a mandatory waste levy for all waste going to landfill, this will cease to be a financially viable option for the community.

While costs have not been finalised for the State Government's mandatory waste levy, what we know from other states and territories around the country that have gone before us is that costs start at around \$100 per tonne.

What we are providing with the food organic and garden organic (FOGO) service is a universal food and garden organic waste service to redirect, recycle and reuse what can be a valuable resource. The nutrients in this waste can be used to improve soil health and retain moisture – something we desperately need in our rural areas.

It literally takes our trash and turns it into composted treasure.

During this evening's Council meeting we will be reviewing and voting on the proposed exemption criteria for the FOGO service.

Council is currently in negotiations with other local councils to prepare a joint request for tender for kerbside collection services. We see this as the most cost-efficient option and are dedicated to negotiating a competitive contract for the service provided to our community.

Our community has told us that they want a FOGO service but they are unhappy with the way it has been implemented to date.

We acknowledge that we could have done this better and should have provided all relevant information to you when we announced the program. We apologise for any confusion.

Council is working hard to develop the finer details of our FOGO service and is eager to keep the community up-to-date with all developments.

You can also sign up for email updates on our Waste Starts With U website, by following the link to the sign-up page and submitting your information.

We look forward to working with you, our community, to help effect real change on a global scale."

Nomination for national customer service award

The Mayor announced that Glenorchy City Council was nominated in the 2019 National Local Government Customer Awards and has been shortlisted as a finalist for the 2019 Customer Service Team of the Year Award.

The winner of the award will be announced in October.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATIONS

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

- Alderman Richardson declared an interest in Item 18 (Investigation into the Disposal of Council Land)
- Alderman Carlton declared an interest in Item 10 (Appointment of Community Representatives to Glenorchy Carols Special Committee)

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Alison Stone – Address not supplied (received by email on 26 August 2019)

Q. Can the Council please provide minutes from all meetings relating any community consultation with regards to the design and replacement of Skate Central, including that of the Railway group?

A. Minutes of Council's previous meetings are available on our website <http://glenorchy.infocouncil.biz/Default.aspx>. This item was referenced at the following meetings:

- 14 January 2013
- 15 February 2016
- 20 March 2017
- 29 May 2019
- 29 July 2019

Q. Can council provide list of all entities that have been consulted regarding the replacement of Skate Central?

A. Throughout 2016 and 2017, Council officers undertook extensive community consultation about the proposed project, including about the type of facility that would meet the community's needs, the suitability of the location and the impacts on the surrounding area. Council officers undertook the following consultation activities:

- holding preliminary informal discussions with neighbouring stakeholders
- holding a community forum in May 2017

- holding extensive discussions with the skating community (through the Southern Tasmanian Skateboarding Community) to utilise their design experience and ascertain what type of facility would best meet their needs
- conducting surveys of the general public at Tolosa Park
- meeting with the Southern Tasmanian Skate Board Association , attending a skate event at Tolosa Park to consult with members of the public, meeting with Jimmy Skate and Street, meeting with “She Shreds Girls Skate Crew”, meeting with the Rosny Skate Park designers, and meeting with the Y.M.C.A’s National skating liaison officer
- conducting open days at which officers and volunteers were available to answer questions and provide information
- letter dropping in excess of 320 neighbouring residents, notifying them of information sessions and inviting them to attend
- similar notification and information sessions with key stakeholders (non-residential), and
- continued ongoing discussions and consultations with neighbouring stakeholders and residents, including:
 - YMCA
 - Football Federation Tasmania
 - Scooter Stop
 - Tas Rail
 - Hobart Skate Park Pty Ltd
 - MRC
 - Tasmanian Transport Museum
 - Northgate Centre Management
 - Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group Monday
 - Special Committees of Council, and
 - Neighbouring residents

A workshop was conducted with Aldermen in late 2016 to brief Council on the preliminary ideas for the facility and the outcomes of the community consultation.

Q. Can you please provide a list of all grants applied for by Council or others, successful or not, in the time period between Councils first announcement of the decision to demolish Skate Central and now?

A. No grants have been applied for in relation to any skate facilities.

Q. How much of the recently granted \$6million for the KGV precinct has been dedicated to the replacement of Skate Central or skateboarding as a sport?

A. This funding is between Andrew Wilkie, the Federal Government and the YMCA. Council is not a party to the funding agreement and is therefore unaware what portion relates to skating.

Q. What amount of money does Council currently has in its budget for the construction of a new concrete skatepark in the 2019-2020 FY budget?

A. \$250,000, which is the amount of the DHHS grant that was received in 2015.

Council is also committing staff resources to the project and engaging a consultant to work with the community to prepare a concept design. There are also additional projects underway which will assist Glenorchy to be more skate friendly.

Q. What efforts is Council currently engaged in to ensure the replacement of Skate Central is adequately funded? Can you please provide copies of any existing design concept (current or not) either produced in-house or externally, relating to the replacement of Skate Central (please include plans and images of the rumoured pre-fab 'pump-track' proposal for Montrose Bay)?

A. Council has a budget of \$250,000 for a new skate facility. Council has engaged consultants who will assist the community to develop a concept design through community workshops and from the results of a community survey. There is no set design for any of the locations. At one stage Council had looked at the potential for a pump track at Montrose Bay as one option for expending the funds, however there is now an opportunity to have more time for an open conversation with the community about how they would like to see the funds spent and to provide Council with important information about how to progress skating in the community into the future.

Q. Can you please provide copies of any official minutes related to the discussion and decisions made by Council relating to the replacement of Skate Central?

A. Please refer to the answer to the first question, above.

Q. Can you please provide any documentation relating to the process and by whom the decisions were made, as to the valuation of the Skate Central facility prior to its destruction, and how Council had planned on making up the shortfall to replace the facility?

A. The Glenorchy Planning Authority Meeting from the 2 June 2014 states that "The relocation of the skate ramp was discussed with Council's Manager of Council Property who said that any associated costs would be part of contractual arrangements".

Council entered into an agreement with DHHS to compensate for the loss of the facility when the property was sold in 2015 in the form of the \$250,000 grant.

Q. Can Council please provide a copy of the report, and identify the group or individuals referred to as "Councils Advisers" (from early 2016) for the Council to issue the statement that: the report from Councils Advisers, stated that the Glenorchy Bowl was an unused facility and was way too gnarly for the average skateboarder, and recommend it not be replaced.

A. Stakeholders are mentioned above.

Additionally, on 15 February 2016 it was reported that Council officers undertook a thorough investigation into the potential locations of the proposed site for the community park. Investigations commenced in 2016, with officers taking a number of factors into consideration including:

- the visibility of site
- passive surveillance (whether there was a clear line of sight into the area)
- access to public transport, and
- proximity to nearby housing

The feedback received within 2015/2017 from the public and stakeholders can be summarised as follows:

- the proposed skate park will not compete with major skate parks like Rosny or Elizabeth College. It should be however a popular addition to the Glenorchy CBD by skaters in the area, including experienced skaters.
- the skate park is geared to beginner and intermediate skaters.
- vert ramps and bowls were popular in former decades, but not so much in contemporary times.
- that Council should concentrate efforts on 'the transition of skating manoeuvres' to cater for contemporary skating.
- skate parks are vulnerable to graffiti, and methods should be employed to reduce the impact of graffiti including surface treatment of hard surfaces.

Q. Will the Council engage in a genuine consult with users of a future skate park? Who are you inviting and how do you plan to reach the appropriate audience?

A. Yes. Please refer to the report on the agenda for the current Council meeting for details of the proposed community consultation.

Q. What will the consult look like?

A. There will be consultant led workshops with schools and all other stakeholders, and a community survey. Please refer to the report at item 14 on this agenda.

Q. How can the community be reassured the Council will not present them with the Council's preferred option of Montrose Bay Park?

A. The location and configuration of the skate park will be determined after Community consultation

Q. Skate Parks are expensive is the Council planning to apply for more funding-given the Rosny skate park was \$1.4m 3 years ago?

A. There are not currently any plans to extend the budget beyond the grant amount of \$250,000.

- Q. A playground was supposed to be built in front of the GCC chambers-would council now consider a skate park in this space? If this is a no, will Council give genuine consideration to solutions presented by the community?**
- A. You will have the opportunity to make a submission about the location of the skate park as part of the public consultation. Council will give genuine consideration to solutions developed during the consultation process.
- Q. How much interest did the \$250,000 earn whilst sitting in the bank?**
- A. It has not been sitting in a separate reserve, but rather is set aside in Council's annual budget.
- Q. How will GCC be inviting residents etc. to be involved in the process?**
- A. Yes. Please refer to the report on the agenda for the current Council meeting for details of the proposed community consultation.
- Q. How will GCC determine whether people employed to construct the skate park are adequately experienced in building a skate park?**
- A. Any contracts for the construction of a skate park will be managed through tender process conducted in accordance with Council's procurement processes, part of which will involve an assessment of the capabilities of any tenderers.
- Q. Will the GCC establish a balanced group of key stakeholders to be on the committee to make decisions about the skate park process?**
- A. There are no plans to form a committee, but rather open community discussion.
- Q. When will the GCC be briefing residents about the options for the location of the new skate park?**
- A. Consultation is planned for October 2019
- Q. How will the GCC ensure that it is a transparent process?**
- A. Please refer to the report at item 14 on the agenda for the current Council meeting for details of the proposed community consultation.
- Q. How will GCC mitigate against conflicts of interest?**
- A. Council has an engagement framework which guides best practice consultation. Any conflicts of interest will be declared as required.
- Q. Given the interest by longstanding advocates for GCC replacing the skate park and the increased interest from a range of people over the years and currently will GCC be applying for additional funding to ensure that we have an appropriate skate park for everyone?**

- A. Following the outcomes of the community engagement and preparation of a skate action plan, Council will consider what resources are required. It may guide future development of skating and the need to apply for funding beyond the implementation of the DHHS grant.
- Q. GCC have stated that they have conducted community consultation previously will interested people be provided with copies of this process?**
- A. Information about previous consultation is provided above. Council will use this historic information and any future engagement outcomes to prepare a draft action plan.
- Q. Will the GCC post on the New Glenorchy Skate Park FB page to keep everyone informed?**
- A. Council will post on our official Facebook page to keep people informed. Council's social guidelines prevent Council from posting or commenting on other people's pages.

Darrell Vincent, 36 Teering Road, Berriedale (from 26 August 2019 meeting)

Mr. Vincent advised that recently a volunteer driving a St John's Ambulance vehicle was unable to find a parking space outside the Glenorchy Eye Clinic and parked illegally near the building on Main Road, for which he received a parking infringement notice and a \$128 fine.

- Q. What options does Council suggest for disability parking other than parking illegally or receiving a parking infringement notice and refusing to pay it?**
- A. The Infringement Notice referred to by Mr Vincent was issued to the driver after he parked in a temporary no-stopping zone in the middle of road works on Main Road, in the Glenorchy CBD.

The driver parked the car in a way that both obstructed traffic and also endangered the safety of himself and his passenger as well as pedestrians and other road users, including the passengers of a bus that was forced to swerve into another lane and knocked over a series of witches' hats on its way past in order to avoid colliding with the parked car.

Photographs taken by Council's Parking Compliance Officer at the time of the offence are below:



The driver was given the opportunity to move the car to avoid receiving an infringement but he refused. The driver then verbally abused Council's Parking Officer. Council has raised this issue and our concerns about the conduct of the volunteer with St John's Ambulance.

Now that the works are complete, there is a disabled parking space in that location which is available for people visiting the Glenorchy Eye Clinic and surrounding businesses. Other disability spots are available at the rear of the Glenorchy City Council Chambers, as well as in both Northgate and Glenorchy Central car parks, however there are many other regular parking spots distributed along the streets closer to the Glenorchy Eye Clinic.

James Bryan - 14 England Avenue, Montrose (from 26 August 2019 meeting)

Q Recently, The Mercury published an article on the gift registers that councils are required to maintain and publish on their websites. When did the current register of Gifts and Benefits on Council's website open? How long does the register remain open? Is it permanent or the term of this Council and is the register archived?

A. The current register on the website covers the period after the election of the current Council. Section 56B of the *Local Government Act* does not specify how long the register that is published on the website is required to be kept. In the absence of further instructions, Council intends to publish the register for the term of the current Council. It will be retained after that in accordance with Council's statutory requirements for maintaining corporate records.

Q. Service levels for Council's public toilets and were added to Council's website in May. However they do not inform us as what the operational maintenance levels are. What is the schedule for inspections and maintenance of playgrounds, is it daily, weekly or is it not scheduled? Concerns are in the soft fall surfacing. Considering there are 50 parks or reserves in Glenorchy area and some 44 have playground equipment, has the playground equipment in Glenorchy been evaluated against the AS4685 for playground equipment and surfacing Standards?

A. Council's playgrounds are on a weekly inspection and maintenance program. Maintenance includes replacing some soft fall surfacing (such as pine bark), however the replacement of synthetic surfacing needs to be programmed into capital works as it can be expensive (depending on the size of the area) and is prioritised according to safety and need.

Council engages an external consultant to conduct an annual audit of all its playgrounds against the requirements of AS4685. Any issues identified in that audit are also prioritised according to safety and need.

Shane Alderton, 296 Main Road, Austins Ferry (from 29 July meeting)

- Q. Item 9 on tonight's agenda is about Customer Complaints from 2018/19. The KPIs state that you have received 18 or 19 complaints and that you have responded to 88 or 90% of those complaints within time. The number of complaints seems to be quite low, so I was wondering what constitutes an actual complaint?**
- A.** 'Complaints' for the purposes of this report are in accordance with the description in Council's Customer Service Charter, which states that "a complaint is if you are not satisfied with a service you have received". It refers to formal complaints lodged and investigated during the period in accordance with Council's process. It does not record informal complaints or commentary on Council's services.

NOTE: The following questions asked by Mr. Alderton on 26 August 2019 will be answered at a future Council meeting:

- Q. Apart from the \$35 FOGO charge on rates notices, will Council be passing the rollout costs of the FOGO service onto its ratepayers as part of the service? If so, how long will this charge occur to recover costs?**
- Q. If Council were to wait and implement FOGO as a collaborative service with other Councils, would the potential saving cost of up to \$16 per recipient per year (stated in Council's May business case) be passed on in reduced charges to ratepayers for this service?**

Eddy Steenbergen, Mary's Hope Road, Rosetta (from 26 August 2019 Meeting)

- Q. In Item 9 on tonight's agenda (Police and working with vulnerable people checks for committee members) it states that members of Special Committees are effectively volunteers of Council. What insurance coverage does Council have for anyone that operates as a volunteer in any Council operations?**
- A.** Council has a portfolio of insurance policies that protect the interests of Council as well as volunteers. The policies taken out by Council that are relevant to our volunteers include:
- **Personal Accident cover:** This covers for costs arising from a personal injury or illness that arises whilst the person is acting in the capacity of a volunteer for Council. The cover is activated after the Medicare rebate has been exhausted. An example of a type of claim is a person falling over and hurting their back while volunteering for Council.
 - **Public, Product and Professional Indemnity:** In the unlikely event that a claim is made against Council for personal injury or property damage arising through the negligent actions of a volunteer, the public, product and professional indemnity policy would respond.

For example, a volunteer who accidentally leaves a shovel on the ground that someone else trips over, resulting in an injury.

- **Fleet policy:** In the event that a volunteer, who is engaged in work on behalf of Council, used a Council fleet registered vehicle (such as a car) and was involved in a motor vehicle incident, the fleet policy would respond to the damage caused to Council's vehicle, as well as any damage sustained to third party property/vehicles etc.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Shane Alderton, 296 Main Road, Austins Ferry

On page 47 of tonight's Council meeting agenda in reference to the response given to the FOGO Petitions, the agenda states consultations were undertaken with the Waste Wise Advisory Group. I am a member of the Waste Wise Advisory Group and this statement is incorrect. The only meeting held so far was basically an introduction meeting and it was only explained to the group what the exemption criteria would consist of, no consultation was undertaken, and the petition was not even discussed.

Q. Can the reference to consultation being undertaken with the Waste Wise Advisory Group be removed from the agenda?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Q. If Council passes the Climate Change Emergency motion put forward by Alderman Sims:

- will Council be legally liable for damage caused to any developments or infrastructure on land potentially effected by climate change that are approved by Council after this motion has been passed?
- will it have an impact on the sale of the DEC and Wilkinsons Point as these areas have been identified potentially as being impacted by climate change?
- will it have an impact on the proposed developments at the former Claremont Primary School site and Whitestone Point as these areas have been identified as being impacted by climate change?
- would Council be legally liable to build infrastructure (sea walls etc.) to protect low lying areas that have been identified potentially as being impacted by climate change?
- what would be the legal ramifications for Council?
- can Council defer this motion instead of passing or defeating this motion so legal advice on this matter can be obtained.

A. The questions were taken on notice.

Rowan Meyers, Norman Circle, Glenorchy

Q. In relation to the proposed Climate Change Motion before Council, given the level of potential terror that anyone under the age of 40 feels regarding the climate change and the ongoing impacts not necessarily in the next 4 to 5 years but the next 10 to 20 years, and the level of real intensity fear and emotion that the public are feeling and given the fact that, as a planning body and as a local council you are responsible for the day to day wellbeing of a lot of aspects of life for people that live in your Council area, what competing priorities will Council identify as anything that could outrank the existential threat of climate change? What other issues would council see as taking precedence over this or as a justification for deferring or voting down this motion?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Kaye Smith, Constance Avenue, Glenorchy

Q. Several paragraphs in the report to Council around FOGO exemption give ratepayers the impression that their general waste is going to Jackson Street when in fact it is going to Copping. Why has this not been made public on the GCC website or announcement in the Glenorchy Gazette?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Q. If, as shown on the Agenda, the State Government will soon introduce a waste levy, will this then be added to our rates notice as an extra cost? If it is then will it be collected on behalf of the Government like the fire levy? If the answers to these questions is yes, then will the Government return this money back to the relevant councils to utilise for their own waste management therefore reducing the waste levy already being paid by ratepayers?

A. (Mayor) There will be a number of ways that it may be applied but these are still under discussion as the State Government's waste action plan is still in draft form. It may be added onto the cost of our kerbside collection services and passed on to the State like the fire levy is. It is also likely that if you were to deposit waste at a landfill (whether it be Jackson Street, Copping or McRobies Gully), you would pay the additional waste levy component at the gate which would also then be passed on to the State. The way the State would spend any funds it collects is still up for discussion, but the local government sector's view is it ought to be funneled back into waste management activities, particularly around reducing our waste and responsible waste management.

Q. Why is Council waiting until February before ratepayers who are wishing to apply for an exemption to FOGO for them to complete the relevant form? Why can't this process be ready and in place before the bin rollout therefore saving Council time and effort delivering bins to those that have applied and accepted for opting out of this service?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Q. Why should those that will be applying to opt have to 'trial' these bins if they have no intention of using them?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Q. Is it so that Council can then say the \$35 we have paid for a bin we haven't go has now been delivered and therefore we will not have to refund our \$35?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Q. How much is all this obstacle course for ratepayers to jump through to apply for an opt out costing the Council and inevitably the ratepayer? Is it not a fact all that is required is for the forms to be made available now, ratepayers fill them in, Council approve or not approve, Council need not deliver bins that are unwanted and the \$35 already paid be subtracted from their next rates bill?

A. The question was taken on notice.

Eddy Steenbergen, Marys Hope Road, Rosetta

In relation to a proposed subdivision at 90 Marys Hope Road, the development application was submitted on behalf of Housing Services Tasmania which provides affordable social housing and has already spent nearly \$1M purchasing that land.

Q. Did council recommend the property to Housing Choices Tasmania to purchase?

A. (Mayor) Not that I am aware of.

Q. Did council Aldermen or staff give any commitments or guarantees to Housing Choices as to how their application will be processed?

A. (Mayor) There is currently a live planning application before our Council. We have a responsibility as a planning authority and all Aldermen are part of that planning authority. The application will go through a planning process where it will be assessed by planning officers and they will make a recommendation to the Glenorchy Planning Authority for consideration. At that time, we would assess how that report matches with our planning scheme and make a determination. This is a very different role to the role we have as a Council where we might like to strategically see properties developed or not developed. The planning authority's role is only to apply the planning scheme.

Q. Did Aldermen or Council staff have any involvement in the development of the application?

A. (Mayor) When an application is submitted, developers typically speak to planning staff members and there is an opportunity for them to seek advice. This is commonly done at both the pre-lodgment stage and also the lodgment stage (in terms of what documentation is required). Certainly our staff have been involved in those discussions, as appropriate.

Q. Given that the application is relating to affordable/social housing, has Council provided any concessions, fee remissions or anything else?

A. (Mayor) No.

Jenni McLeod, spokesperson for the Glenorchy Skatepark

Q. In relation to Council's proposed the construction of a skate park in Glenorchy:

- **Could the Council please stop referring to the \$250,000 from DHHS as a grant?**
- **Can the Council please confirm what the DHHS stipulations were for the use of the \$250,000?**
- **Was the \$250,000 an aspect earmarked specially for the skatepark in the agreement between DHHS and the Council?**
- **Can the Council please acknowledge publicly that at the time of the closure of Skate Central, the skate, BMX, Scooter and Roller communities were very supportive of the noble cause of which Skate Central was laid to rest (health clinic) and actively quelled initial user community resistance while creating positive events that said 'goodbye' in style.**
- **Community has noticed the language around the skatepark has changed to 'Glenorchy Community Park' and 'skate pump ramp'. Is there a reason for this?**
- **Does the Council have a Manager Community, Coordinator Community Planning and Inclusion, Community Engagement Officer and a Community Development Coordinator?**
- **How much do ratepayers pay for these positions collectively, each year?**
- **What is the role of Enlocus Landscape Architects on this project?**
- **What process of selection was undertaken to determine Enlocus Landscape Architects?**
- **How will Council pay for their services, i.e. where is the funding coming from?**
- **What is the estimated cost of Enlocus Landscape Architects?**
- **Can Council provide a copy of the quotation received from Enlocus Landscape Architects or confirm their costs to perform the consultant?**
- **Are these the same architects engaged for the re-development of the Montrose Bay playground?**
- **Why has Council ignored the knowledge and expertise of local Tasmanian skate park specialists in favour of outsourcing to an expensive interstate consultant?**

- **Why has Council employed expensive interstate consultants to do their work before consulting with skatepark specialists here?**
- **Design phase and community consultation are separate workloads. If the Clarence City Council and the Hobart City Council can use its community development staff to undertake community consultation on similar projects, without impacting on money set aside for the project build (e.g. South Arm Skatepark and the Wellington Foothills Mountain Bike project), why is Glenorchy City Council engaging consultants to do this job? Please note: 'In kind' assistance paid for by Council to do Council work is NOT in kind, it is actually just work.**
- **Surveys are not a suitable form of consultation on any matters. They can be supplementary but not replace a normal consultation process – community is expecting to be met by council as a start point, will the council commit to rolling back on its 'preferred' solutions and start again with the community?**
- **Could the Council please provide date collected from the 2016-17 consultation process?**
- **Can the Council please explain what happened to the process between 2017 and now?**
- **Does the Council plan to do a push poll?**
- **Is the Council planning to poll our communities with only Montrose, Abbotsfield and Tolosa on the poll? Will Council reconsider this approach?**
- **Can Council please provide a definition of a push poll?**
- **Can the Council please explain why a central location has not been considered?**
- **Can the Council please say definitively whether or not it will fulfill its obligations and vow to build a park to replaced Skate Central 'like for like'?**
- **Community understands there was previously a KGV Working Group – can Council please explain what happened to this group? Can Council please provide meeting notes and follow ups from previous meetings with the KGV Working Group?**
- **Has Glenorchy City Council followed up on concerns raised by stakeholders when the KGV Working Group was operational? If so, what action has been taken?**
- **Excluding funding, what are Council's 5 primary objections to the KGV recreation precinct site being a preferred site?**
- **Users are seeking an intermediate to advanced skating experience and replacing 'like with like' infrastructure, will Council commit to this if this is reflected in community consultation, especially as easier options already exist (i.e. Tolosa Park)?**

- **Will Council commit to seeking and obtaining additional funding (such as a Sport and Recreation Grant, which is currently open) to match the existing funding to deliver a quality facility to suit Olympic standard design requirements to give our young people their best chance at developing their skating to a high standard?**

A. The questions were taken on notice.

Angelique Payne, Tolosa Street, Glenorchy

Q. Regarding the Public Space Enhancement Grant for \$500,000 that was provided to Glenorchy City Council by the State Government in August 2015 for the specific purpose of a Children’s Playground to be constructed in the front of the Glenorchy Council building, and subsequent report dated February 2018 provided after much positive community consultation:

- **Is the Playground to proceed and when can the community expect construction to commence?**
- **If the playground is not to proceed, what is the reason?**
- **Will the playground proceed at some point in the future, if so when?**
- **What is the timeframe in the Grant Deed to expend the funds on construction of the Children’s Playground, and if expired has Council sought an extension, if so until when?**
- **Is the \$500,000 specific purpose funding for Children’s Playground still held by Council or has it been returned to the State Government?**
- **Has the \$500,000 specific purpose funding for Children’s Playground been utilised for any other purpose, if so what?**
- **Has the State Government been notified by Council that the funding has not yet been expended for its specific purpose?**

A. The questions were taken on notice.

Jenny Gibson, Grove Road, Glenorchy

Q. Regarding Council’s proposed FOGO service:

- **Where are people who live in units going to place their bins as we are all fully aware the planning and development schemes have allowed for two bins, if we are going to bring in a third bin where are all these bins going to go in these closed housing developments?**
- **Can the council provide me with a service that has to be paid for without the service existing?**

A. The questions were taken on notice.

Patrick Berry, representing the Southern City BMX Club, Berriedale

Q. The Southern City BMX Club would like the Glenorchy City Council and its Aldermen to provide answers to the following questions in regard to the current location of our club along with other concerns we currently have as to the future of our club and the sport within our community:

- **Does the Council support providing public space for healthy activities?**
- **In regard to 671 Main Road, Berriedale and the potential disposal of the land, will our Club be a part of the consultation process? We ask, as to this point, we feel like we have been left out of the conversation to date.**
- **Our Club has been located at 671 Main Road, Berriedale for over 20 years and have spent a lot of time building a community of passionate BMX riders. Should the Council decide to sell off the land our club currently leases, what is your vision for the future of our sport within the Glenorchy community?**
- **There has been a lot of talk/rumours over the past 10 years that the Council has the opinion that Southern City BMX Club would be moving to the top of Tolosa Street. Is this still part of the Council's plan to include us within the MTB Park?**
- **Over the past 12 months our club has spent approximately \$105,000 at our current location, these funds have been obtained through hard work and government grants. If we were to move, we would struggle to raise the required funds to relocate. Is the Council prepared to help source funding to move our club?**
- **In moving locations Southern City BMX Club would be required to build a BMX Australia Standard race track which could potentially cost between \$550,000 to \$600,000 to meet the new current standards. Is Council aware of the costs involved in building a BMX track?**
- **If this has been on the Council's radar in recent months, why have the Council been happy to take our money in regard to planning permits for the installation of our lights at the track? Are you prepared to refund these funds or allow us to transfer the approvals over to a new location at no cost?**
- **If Southern City BMX Club were asked to relocate, is the Council prepared to ensure the new track was complete prior to requiring the club to leave its current location? If the club was forced to leave prior, we would lose too many members in the downtime which would be detrimental to our club.**
- **Finally, what are your expectations regarding time frames? We ask as we are currently in negotiations with BMX Australia regarding hosting another national event in 2021 and we need to ensure we have a track to host the event on.**

A. The questions were taken on notice.

Name and Address not provided

- Q. Given that there is a large turnout here to see Council debate Climate Emergency Declaration (Item 26.1), would the Chair and Council consider moving that item forward so it is dealt with earlier in the meeting?**
- A. (Mayor) I won't entertain re-ordering tonight's agenda. There are a lot of items on the agenda which are very important and, as you've seen, we've had a lot of questions about other items such as FOGO and the disposal of 671 Main Road, Berriedale. There are also people here tonight to see the debate about those items. We'll proceed through the agenda as is, but I do appreciate that the climate change item is important to you and other members of the gallery and we will try to get there as quickly as possible.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

Council received a deputation from Eddy Steenbergen of Mary's Hope Road, Rosetta about the need for Council to acknowledge the impacts of climate change and expressing support for Council approving a motion to that effect.

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

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

Reporting Brief:

To receive the announcement of events attended by the Mayor for the period from 20 August to 23 September 2019.

Resolution:

BULL/THOMAS

That Council:

RECEIVE the announcements about the activities of the Mayor's office during the period from 20 August to 23 September 2019.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. SPECIAL COMMITTEES ANNUAL REPORT

File Reference: Special Committees

Reporting Brief:

To present the Annual Special Committees Report to Council in accordance with Council's Committees Policy and Committees Guide and Procedure.

Resolution:

THOMAS/RICHARDSON

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Special Committees Annual report for the period 1 July 2018 – 30 June 2019 and the attached annual reports of the Glenorchy Access Advisory Committee, the Glenorchy Art and Culture Advisory Committee, the Glenorchy Carols Committee, the Glenorchy Healthy Communities Advisory Committee and the Safer Communities Advisory Committee.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Carlton declared an interest in the following item and left the meeting at 6.44 p.m.

10. APPOINTMENT OF COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES TO GLENORCHY CAROLS SPECIAL COMMITTEE

File Reference: Glenorchy Carols (Special Committee)

Reporting Brief:

To advise Council on the outcome of the recent recruitment process to fill vacant committee positions on the Glenorchy Carols Committee.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE this report on the selection of community members to the Glenorchy Carols Committee.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Carlton returned to the meeting at 6.46 p.m.

ECONOMIC

Community Goal: "Open for Business"

11. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY – ENGAGEMENT PLAN

File Reference: Economic Development Strategy 2019

Reporting Brief:

To update Council on the preparation of an economic development strategy for Glenorchy City and recommend that Council undertakes engagement in accordance with the proposed engagement plan.

Resolution:

FRASER/BULL

That Council:

APPROVE engagement with Glenorchy's economic stakeholders and the community about an economic development strategy, in accordance with the Economic Development Strategy Engagement Plan ([Attachment 1](#)).

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: “Valuing our Environment”

12. FOOD AND GREEN WASTE (FOGO) EXEMPTION CRITERIA

File Reference: Waste Management Strategy

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council adopts criteria and processes to allow some residents to apply for an exemption from Council’s new green and food waste (FOGO) kerbside collection service, which is due to commence in February 2020.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KING

That Council:

1. APPROVE the following criteria for residents to become exempt from the Food Organic Garden Organic (FOGO) kerbside collection service due to commence in February 2020:

Criterion 1: Home Composter

You may qualify for the ‘Home Composter’ exemption if you can demonstrate that you are effectively managing the organic waste that your property generates on your own property through a variety of methods.

Criterion 2: Exceptional Circumstances

You may qualify for Exceptional Circumstances exemption if you can demonstrate that there are exceptional or unusual circumstances which make the provision of a FOGO service unreasonable or impractical.

2. AUTHORISE the General Manager to develop internal guidelines for making decisions on exemption applications that are consistent with the Exemption Criteria
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to exercise his discretion to approve exemptions to the FOGO service that fall within the Exemption Criteria and further authorise the General Manager to delegate that power and discretion to Council officers, and
4. NOTE that Council’s proposed response to the petitions lodged by Bradley McDougall and Amanda-Sue Markham that were tabled at the 26 August 2019 Council Meeting is to adopt and implement the exemption criteria the subject of paragraph 1 of this resolution.

Alderman Stevenson foreshadowed a motion in the form of the recommendations in the Council Report, with the all instances of 'exemption' changed to 'service review'.

The original motion was put.

FOR: Alderman Dunsby.

AGAINST: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

The original motion was LOST.

The foreshadowed motion was moved:

STEVENSON/KING

That Council:

1. APPROVE the following criteria for residents to become eligible for service review from the Food Organic Garden Organic (FOGO) kerbside collection service due to commence in February 2020:

Criterion 1: Home Composter

You may qualify for the 'Home Composter' service review if you can demonstrate that you are effectively managing the organic waste that your property generates on your own property through a variety of methods.

Criterion 2: Financial Hardship

You may qualify for the 'Financial Hardship' service review if you can demonstrate that you are in genuine financial hardship under in Council's Financial Hardship Policy.

(NOTE: This will not exempt you from the FOGO service, but will provide options to assist with the cost of Council's rates and charges)

Criterion 3: Exceptional Circumstances

You may qualify for Exceptional Circumstances service review if you can demonstrate that there are exceptional or unusual circumstances which make the provision of a FOGO service unreasonable or impractical.

2. AUTHORISE the General Manager to develop internal guidelines for making decisions on service review applications that are consistent with the service review Criteria

3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to exercise his discretion to approve service review to the FOGO service that fall within the service review criteria and further authorise the General Manager to delegate that power and discretion to Council officers, and
4. NOTE that Council's proposed response to the petitions lodged by Bradley McDougall and Amanda-Sue Markham that were tabled at the 26 August 2019 Council Meeting is to adopt and implement the service review criteria the subject of paragraph 1 of this resolution.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST: Alderman Dunsby.

The motion was CARRIED.

13. DEVELOPMENT OF GLENORCHY MOUNTAIN BIKE PARK MASTERPLAN

File Reference: Glenorchy Mountain Bike Masterplan

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with a report on the proposed development of a masterplan for the Glenorchy Mountain Bike Park and recommend that Council proceeds with the preparation of a draft masterplan.

Resolution:

THOMAS/RICHARDSON

That Council:

NOTE that Council has commenced a project to develop a Masterplan for the Glenorchy Mountain Bike Park, that community engagement will commence prior to December 2019, that a draft Masterplan will be developed in early 2020 and will be presented to the community for further comment, and that a final Masterplan will be presented for the endorsement of Council by June 2020.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. GRANT FUNDING - GLENORCHY COMMUNITY PARK

File Reference: Skate Park

Reporting Brief:

To update Council on the progress towards the development of a community skate park.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the attached report on the Glenorchy Community Park, and
2. ENDORSE the proposed approach to community engagement for the project, as outlined in this report.

Alderman Fraser left the meeting at 7.22 p.m.

Alderman Fraser returned to the meeting at 7.24 p.m.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

15. STATE GOVERNMENT DRAFT WASTE ACTION PLAN

File Reference: Waste Action Plan

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council endorses a proposed response to the draft Waste Action Plan and submits this to the State Government and Local Government Association of Tasmania for consideration.

Resolution:

FRASER/RICHARDSON

That Council:

ENDORSE Council's proposed response to the draft Waste Action Plan and submit it to the State Government and the Local Government Association of Tasmania by 7 October 2019.

Alderman Sims left the meeting at 7.30 p.m.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser and Carlton.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: "Leading our Community"

16. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA COMMUNITY SATISFACTION SURVEY

File Reference: Community Survey

Reporting Brief:

To present the supplementary Glenorchy data obtained for the quadrennial Local Government Association Tasmania (LGAT) Community Satisfaction Report to Council.

To recommend that Council participates in the future LGAT Community Satisfaction Survey in 2023 and collects supplementary data from Glenorchy residents.

Resolution:

FRASER/BULL

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the attached report on the Glenorchy Community Satisfaction Survey, and
2. ENDORSE Council's participation in Local Government Association Tasmania Community Satisfaction Survey in 2023, including collecting supplementary data from Glenorchy residents to provide results specific to Glenorchy.

Alderman Sims returned to the meeting at 7.34 pm.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

17. INVESTIGATION INTO THE DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL LAND AT 671 MAIN ROAD, BERRIEDALE

File Reference: Disposal of Council Land

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council commences an evaluation and review into the future use parts of the Berriedale Foreshore Reserve which are currently being used as:

- An overflow carpark for Moorilla Estate and MONA under a lease with Moorilla Estate Pty Ltd, and
- a BMX track by the Southern City BMX Club.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KING

That Council:

1. AUTHORISE Council staff to undertake a community engagement process in relation to the part of the Berriedale Foreshore Reserve at 671 Main Road, Berriedale comprising approximately 15,950 m² adjacent to the Glenorchy City Tennis Club currently being used as vacant land, a car park and a BMX track (**the Land**), and
2. REQUIRE a further report to Council summarising the results of the community consultation process and identifying any specific concerns about the disposal of the Land and seeking authorisation to proceed with a statutory disposal process (if appropriate).

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Richardson declared an interest in the following item and left the meeting at 7.39 p.m.

18. INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL LAND

File Reference: Acquisition and Disposal (Property Management)

Reporting Brief:

To report back to Council on the outcomes of the community engagement processes around the potential disposal of 7 Council properties in accordance with Council's resolution made at the 29 July 2019 Council meeting and recommend that Council proceeds with the public land disposal process under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993 (the Act)*.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/THOMAS

That Council:

1. FORM an intention under section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* to dispose of the following parcels of public land (**the Land**):
 - No.3 Delwood Drive Lutana (Part of Certificate of Title Volume 64104 Folio 2)
 - No. 119 Pitcairn Street Glenorchy (Certificate of Title Volume 43742 Folio 1)
 - Nos. 11-13 Nielson Drive Montrose (Part of Certificate of Title Volume 46375 Folio 101)
 - No. 53 Springfield Avenue West Moonah (Certificate of Title Volume 113316 Folio 11)
 - No. 36 Elwick Road Glenorchy (Certificate of Title Volume 220338 Folio 2)
 - No. 11 Newman Court Berridale (Certificate of Title Volume 143454 Folio 3), and
 - No. 19a Clydesdale Ave. Glenorchy (Certificate of Title Volume 124973 Folio 3)
2. INVITE expressions of interest during the advertising period from anyone interested in purchasing the Land
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to take all actions necessary to complete public notification of Council's intent to sell the land in accordance with section 178 of the Act and Council's *Disposal of Council Land Policy*, and

4. AUTHORISE the General Manager to consider and acknowledge any objection received pursuant to section 178(6) of the Act and report to a future Council meeting.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Richardson returned to the meeting at 7.44 p.m.

19. RESPONSE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM DIRECTIONS PAPER PHASE TWO

File Reference: LG Reform

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's endorsement of a response to consultation on the State Government's Local Government Reform Directions Paper.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/DUNSBY

That Council:

ENDORSE the Council's proposed response to the Local Government Reform Directions Paper Phase Two as contained in [Attachment 1](#), and authorise the General Manager to submit the response on behalf of Council.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

20. STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR INFRASTRUCTURE ASSETS 2019-2023

File Reference: Asset Management Strategy

Reporting Brief:

To present the *Strategic Asset Management Plan for Infrastructure Assets 2019-2023* to Council for approval and adoption.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/SIMS

That Council:

ENDORSE the draft *Strategic Asset Management Plan for Infrastructure Assets 2019-2023* for Infrastructure Assets 2019-2023 in the form of Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

21. 2019/2020 SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES AMENDMENT

File Reference: Budget

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council approves an amendment to the 2019/20 Schedule of Fees and Charges to correct the Subdivision Asset Data Collection fee.

Resolution:

BULL/DUNSBY

That Council:

APPROVE the amendment to the Glenorchy City Council 2019/20 Schedule of Fees and Charges to include the Subdivision Asset Data Collection fee amounts set out in Attachment 2.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

22. COUNCIL'S RISK APPETITE AND STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

File Reference: Registers (Risk Management)

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council formally adopts its Risk Appetite Statement and Strategic Risk Register.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/THOMAS

That Council:

1. APPROVE the Risk Appetite Statement as contained in Attachment 1
2. NOTE that the Risk Appetite Statement will be made publicly available on Council's website, and
3. APPROVE the Strategic Risk Register – September 2019 as contained in Attachment 2.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

23. MINISTERIAL DIRECTIONS - MONTHLY AND SIXTH QUARTERLY REPORT

File Reference: Ministerial Directions

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of the progress towards completing the action items out of the Ministerial Directions Implementation Plan for the period ending 30 August 2019 and recommend that Council endorses the sixth quarterly report to the Minister.

Resolution:

BULL/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. NOTE the progress satisfying the Ministerial Directions as at 16 September 2019
2. RECEIVE the Ministerial Directions Implementation Report for August 2019 in the form of Attachment 1
3. ENDORSE the sixth Ministerial Directions Quarterly Report to the Minister of the progress of actions taken to comply with the Ministerial Directions in the form of Attachment 2 and approve the report being provided to the Minister, and
4. NOTE that the sixth quarterly report will be made publicly available on Council's website.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

24. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS - MONTHLY REPORT

File Reference: Procurement

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to the procurement requirements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts for the period 13 August 2019 to 17 September 2019 and provide updates on other relevant procurement matters.

Resolution:

THOMAS/DUNSBY

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Monthly Report for the period from 13 August to 17 September 2019.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

25. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 31 AUGUST 2019

File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide the monthly Financial Performance Report to Council for the period ending 31 August 2019.

Resolution:

STEVENSON/KING

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 31 August 2019 in the form of [Attachment 1](#).

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Question without notice - Alderman Dunsby

- Q.** Regarding requests to address a Council meeting, this was previously known as a deputation, but is now listed on the website as a 'request to address a Council meeting'. This language is not consistent with our minutes and agendas which still refer to it as a deputation. Can we make sure we have consistent language around this in minutes, agendas and our website?
- A.** (Acting General Manager) We'll take your comment on board and ensure that this becomes consistent.

26.1. NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN SIMS - CLIMATE CHANGE

File Reference: Notice of Motion

Reporting Brief:

To consider a notice of motion by Alderman Kelly Sims submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 16(5) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

Resolution:

SIMS/(no seconder)

That Council:

1. Affirms its commitment to future generations by addressing catastrophic climate change and biodiversity loss through its on-going policies, strategies and leadership by supporting the declaration of a climate and biodiversity emergency and registering with the Climate Emergency Declaration network (<http://climateemergencydeclartion.org/>)
2. Commits to building public awareness and engagement around the declaration of a climate and biodiversity emergency, by endorsing the information provided to Councils by the Climate Emergency Declaration network, and inline with the UN Sustainability Development Goals about a climate emergency response
3. Consults with other Tasmanian and leading Councils on the matter of declaring a climate emergency in order to work collaboratively including the sharing of ideas, practice and information about addressing climate change in an evidence based, best practice manner
4. Writes to the relevant State and Federal politicians and the Prime Minister to urge the Commonwealth Government to declare a climate emergency at a national level
5. Requests a further report to be presented to Council at *23rd December 2019 Council Meeting* containing work already completed and future recommendations for the implementation of a strategy and/or framework and/or action plan for Council's climate emergency response that aligns with the UN Sustainability Development Goals.

Because the motion was not seconded, the motion lapsed.

Motion without notice – Alderman Thomas

Alderman Thomas moved the following Motion without notice, which was accepted under regulation 16(1) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

THOMAS/BULL

That Council:

1. Confirms Council's position on climate change, as reflected in its support of the motion that was carried at the LGAT General Meeting in July 2019, which was:
"That LGAT call upon the Federal and Tasmanian State Governments and Parliaments urging them to:

- *acknowledge the urgency created by climate change that requires immediate and collaborative action across all tiers of government;*
 - *acknowledge that the world climate crisis is an issue of social and environmental injustice and, to a great extent, the burden of the frontline impacts of climate change fall on low income communities, vulnerable groups and future generations; and*
 - *facilitate emergency action to address the climate crisis, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and meet or exceed targets in the Paris Agreement.”*
2. Confirms Council’s commitment to future generations through ongoing collaborative action to collectively reduce, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change, through:
- participation in the Regional Climate Change Initiative to develop a Climate Change Adaptation Plan;
 - partnering with UTAS to develop a regional climate strategy and climate change action plan;
 - engaging in LGAT climate change activities; and
 - other partnership opportunities that arise.
3. Notes the work that Council currently does and will continue to do to reduce, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change in our municipality, within the scope of our role and through ongoing policies, strategies and leadership.
4. Writes to the Tasmanian and Australian Governments to inform them of the Council’s position on climate change.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser and Carlton.

AGAINST: Alderman Sims.

The motion was CARRIED.

Resolution:

KING/STEVENSON

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, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 8.21 p.m. for a short comfort break.

The meeting resumed at 8.35 p.m.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Alderman Sims was absent from the meeting when it resumed at 8.35 p.m.

27. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KING

That the minutes of the Council Meeting (closed meeting) held on Monday, 26 August 2019 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser and Carlton.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

28. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: "Valuing our Environment"

26. PROCUREMENT OF FOOD AND GREEN WASTE (FOGO) SERVICES

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) and (2)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal).

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: "Leading our Community"

30. HOBART CITY DEAL - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

31. PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential) and (2)(i) (Matters relating to actual or possible litigation taken, or to be taken, by or involving the Council or an employee of Council).

32. AUDIT PANEL CHAIR'S ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

33. AUDIT PANEL MINUTES

This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

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

Alderman Stevenson left the meeting at 9.14 p.m.

Resolution:

KING/BULL

That the meeting be re-opened to the public.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Stevenson returned to meeting at 9.16 p.m.

31. PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

File Reference: LGAT Motions

Reporting Brief:

To brief Council on the Local Government Association of Tasmania's resolution on behalf of all Tasmanian Councils to join the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse and seek Council's approval to endorse a Memorandum of Understanding between the State and Tasmania's local Councils around participation in the scheme.

Resolution:

STEVENSON/KING

That it be noted in the open minutes that the outcome of Item 31 during the closed part of the Council meeting was:

That Council:

1. RESOLVE to participate in the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, and

2. AUTHORISE the Mayor to sign the Memorandum of Understanding on the participation of local councils in the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse between the State Government, LGAT and Tasmanian Councils.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting closed at 9.21 p.m.

Confirmed,

CHAIR