

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Monday, 30 October 2023 at 3.30pm**



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

In attendance (in Chambers): Tony McMullen (General Manager), Jenny Richardson (Director Community & Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Executive Manager Stakeholder Engagement), Luke Chiu (Acting Director Infrastructure & Development), Allan Wise (Manager Finance), Paul Gimpl (Chief Financial Officer), Tracey Ehrlich (Manager People & Governance), Patrick Marshall (Manager Assets, Engineering & Design), Craig Pitt (Chief Information Officer)

In attendance (by video link): Mandy Henderson (Executive Assistant to the General Manager), Andy Watson (Executive Assistant to the Mayor)

Leave of Absence:

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date: Monday, 2 October 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- One on One conversation session

Date: Monday, 9 October 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Tasmanian Community Fund options
- Financial Management Strategy 4-year review (2023-2032)

Date: Monday, 23 October 2023

Purpose: To discuss:

- Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group
- Customer Service Charter, Customer Service Annual Report, Complaints Management Policy
- LGAT General Meeting discussion

The Council meeting was live streamed on Council's website, Facebook page and YouTube channel. The peak number of viewers watching the live stream was 35 viewers and 15 members of the public attended in person.

The Chair opened the meeting at 3.30pm.

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

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

1. APOLOGIES

None.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

SLADE/KING

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday, 25 September 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

I wish to take a few moments to address the meeting regarding the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool, anticipating that some members of the public here this afternoon may have questions regarding the pool.

As Council has made the community aware, the pool will be closed for the foreseeable future following an independent condition assessment that identified a number of significant issues with the assets within the facility that pose an intolerable risk to public safety.

Council acknowledges that people are feeling upset by and angry about this.

As I have noted before, this was not something council expected to have to do this year. It is not something council wanted to do. While we acknowledge it makes it no easier to accept, the facts are that the council had little choice.

Council is now undertaking a project to fully investigate redevelopment options and associated costs and consult with the community, before coming to a decision on the future of the pool and the site.

We know the recreational and health benefits of aquatic facilities – we now need to understand the costs to Council and the ratepayer across the life of a new facility and ask what the ratepayer is prepared to pay for the provision of a pool.

The project we are now embarking on will include:

- Generation of options for aquatic and other recreational facilities in consultation with the community and stakeholders
- Preparation of concept designs for shortlisted options
- Preparation of whole of life strategic costs and benefits including capital and operating costs and site preparation; and
- Exploration of funding options.

The State Government has provided \$200,000 funding to support this piece of work. The tender for a consultant to undertake this work was advertised on 8 October with submissions closing on the 8th of November.

The project is expected to be completed in the first half of 2024 and we will keep the community informed of engagement opportunities and progress along the way.

Council recently held a Community Yarn where we again explained and answered questions about how we have arrived at this point, what we are doing to address it and how the community can be involved in the process into 2024.

The minutes from last week's Community Yarn in a full transcript are available on Council's website under the Let's Talk section.

I also encourage interested community members to view the Glenorchy Pool page on Council's website, which holds all of the consultant reports, Council reports, FAQs and public question time questions and answers about the pool.

Once again, Council acknowledges people feel strongly about the pool and want to be assured of the future of the facility. What we can assure you is that we are working as hard and fast as possible on the future of the facility.

I urge you to participate in the consultation and engagement process as part of the project and look forward to hearing your wishes and ideas for the future of this much-loved recreational facility.

On behalf of elected members, I assure the community that Council does want to achieve the best outcome for the community for the future of the pool site, and to work with the community in achieving it.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

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

Aldermen Thomas and Yaxley declared an interest in Item 12, Engagement with State Government on the AFL High Performance Centre Proposal.

Director Community & Corporate Services, Jenny Richardson, declared an interest in Item 10, Tasmanian Community Fund Grant Opportunity: Community Program – Youth Engagement.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Question without notice - Paul Campton, Claremont

Q1: Given McDonalds and Council have been in communication, have McDonalds indicated when they intend to supply Council with the additional material requested by the planning team?

A: [Mayor] Not to my knowledge.

Response provided:

Officers confirmed that as at 28 September 2023 the applicant has not indicated when they expect to respond to the request.

Q2: How long does Council typically wait for requests to applicants for such information?

[Director Infrastructure and Development] I believe the Act allows for up to 5 years. This will be confirmed.

Response provided:

Section 40(3) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* provides an applicant 5 years to respond to a request for additional information relating to a planning scheme amendment.

Question without notice - Pauline Elliott, Claremont

Q1: The Environmental Site Assessment Report of 2018 for 8-10 Main Road, Claremont concludes on page 9 that “the site is suitable for is suitable for on-going ‘commercial/industrial’ use (bolded in actual report) without an unacceptable level of risk posed to either:

- the human health of site workers or customers; or
- to the surrounding environment.

The report conclusions are made against the existing commercial/industrial land use. Further assessment may be required if a change to a more sensitive land use is proposed.

Is Council content to accept that a food service/restaurant at 8-10 Main Road, is an on-going ‘commercial/industrial’ use and to ignore the recommendation that further assessment is required for more sensitive land use?

Response provided:

An Environmental Site Assessment report is required to assess if land is suitable for 'sensitive use'. A 'sensitive use' is defined in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme – Glenorchy as a residential use or a use involving the presence of people for extended periods except in the course of their employment such as a caravan park, childcare centre, dwelling, hospital, or school. The proposal **is not** classified as a 'sensitive use' and therefore further assessment of the land for a sensitive use is not required.

- Q2: Given the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Report of 10 August 2018 was solely for Cooper Automotive and on page 33 it states, "solely for use by the Client and EM&C accepts no responsibility for its use by other parties". Will Council be seeking an ESA from the McDonalds developers for the application lodged in April 2023 or is Council to content to accept a report in which the consultants accept no responsibility for what is written?**

Response provided:

While the proposal is not a sensitive use, the application must satisfy the requirements under the Potentially Contaminated Land Code if there is more than 250m³ of site disturbance. A site assessment report has been provided and will be assessed against the provisions of this Code.

- Q3: The McDonalds application on Westbury Road, Launceston, which also uses an old service station site, encountered problems with the EPA (Environment Protection Authority) due to contamination. In light of this, will Council undertake due diligence to ensure that the Claremont site is not similarly contaminated by liaising with the EPA is or will it just accept the report provided by the developers?**

Response provided:

If the planning scheme amendment and planning permit is approved and works occur on decommissioning any underground fuel storage tanks, further engagement with the EPA would occur at that stage.

Question without notice – David Kernke, Claremont

Q1: In today's agenda, page 5, there was a response to question 1 (a) posed by Paul Campton *"In terms of the zoning amendment request for 8 to 10 Main Road, what additional information was required"*. The response did not answer the question. We do not wish to view the documents or information. Can you please just name the information requested? Is it about traffic, the environment, noise, signage, landscaping, light?

A: [Mayor] Confirming that you are after details of the nature of the information requested?

Response provided:

As per the response provided to the Questions on Notice from David Kernke at the 31 July 2023 meeting:

Council has issued a request for additional information to the applicant. This request was in respect to satisfying the statutory requirements and Schedule 1 Objectives of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, and further information required for the development proposal in respect of noise, odour, traffic safety, traffic volume, parking shortfalls, traffic light spill and lighting.

Generally, this letter exchange would be between a permit applicant and Glenorchy City Council, where the collection, use and disclosure of information would be protected by the Personal Information Protection Act 2004.

Any further requests for this information will need to be applied for under the *Right to Information Act*.

Question without notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose

Q1: When the Derwent Entertainment Centre (DEC) was sold the Council promised on page six of the Annual General Report (AGR) that the \$8M received would be spent on community projects. Will Council and Alderman please commit to spending the community money from the DEC sale to repairing and re-opening the Glenorchy Pool as soon as possible, or will this be a repeat of the loss of the BMX Track and the Skate Park from nine years ago?

A: **Derwent Entertainment Centre (DEC) and Proceeds of Property Disposal Policy**

Council made the official decision to sell the DEC and Wilkinsons Point to the Tasmanian Government in February 2020, ultimately achieving a sale price of \$8 million. After deducting costs associated with the sale, the net proceeds to Council were \$7,933,699.

The funds from the sale of the DEC and Wilkinsons Point were deposited into a separate term deposit account, which is currently earning interest.

The conditions for expenditure are governed by the Proceeds of Property Disposal Policy (the Policy) and require Council's express prior consideration.

As part of the sale negotiation, Council committed \$2.4 million of the proceeds to the upgrade of Loyd Road as part of its future development, meaning the net proceeds available for other community projects are approximately \$5.53 million.

Having considered the intent and requirements of the Policy, the Council, at its December 2021 meeting, resolved to allocate up to \$3,003,962 from the DEC sale proceeds to the Tolosa Dam reintegration project.

This commitment results in the remaining proceeds from the DEC sale being \$2.529 million.

The remaining funds can be allocated to community projects only through a resolution of Council.

The remaining funds are not sufficient to complete a pool redevelopment project.

Council has recently completed a new skatepark at Montrose Bay Foreshore Park and upgrades to the Glenorchy Mountain Bike Park, providing facilities that are openly accessible to all skate, scooter and bike enthusiasts in the community, free of charge and without membership fees.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Question on notice – Adrian Gordon, Glenorchy (received Monday, 18 September 2023)

Glenorchy has a graffiti problem – the streets are covered in spray paint on power poles and utility boxes. Recently this has escalated into expressions of hate speech – with nazi symbols being spray painted in public spaces. The Council's Graffiti Management Policy states that offensive material will be removed from Council assets as a priority – but that does not appear to include third-party assets such as the power poles owned by TasNetworks which have much of the graffiti. Without action taken – Glenorchy could be branded by this graffiti – and in effect be a perpetrator of hate speech.

Q1: What processes does the Council have to manage the growing graffiti problem, such as monitoring, tracking and reporting?

A: Council has a work program that prioritises areas prone to frequent graffiti.

Areas are identified as graffiti prone using Council's graffiti recording mechanism.

Where graffiti is found on Council assets this is promptly removed and logged in Council's maintenance management system, which can be retrieved and shared with Tasmania Police.

Council receives minimal reports of graffiti from the public – most of it is identified by Council officers in the course of their duties. Most of the requests that do come in from the public are regarding graffiti deemed offensive.

Q2: What steps does the Council take to remove reported graffiti?

A: Council has one dedicated staff member for graffiti removal. Contractors are used for heritage and significant assets. Council officers also work with Community Corrections to remove graffiti in certain locations.

Graffiti on Council's assets that contains racist, obscene or offensive material will be removed as a priority upon notification or discovery.

Council may assess, advise and assist property owners to remove such graffiti from private property that shares a boundary with Council property.

Council does not remove graffiti from private property unless it is bordering directly with Council property (as per above).

Council works with owners and occupiers of private property to encourage the prompt removal of graffiti.

Council offers general advice to the community on graffiti removal and what products to use.

Q3: For offensive material on third-party assets, does the Council take additional steps to remove the graffiti – such as seeking permission for Council staff to do the work?

A: Council has powers in the Environmental Amenity By-law to make the property owner remove the Graffiti. Extract from by law included below.

Glenorchy City Council Environmental Amenity By-Law 2017

16

34 Graffiti prohibited

An owner or occupier of property must ensure that graffiti placed on their property is removed, painted over, or otherwise permanently blocked from being viewed from a public place.

Penalty: Fine not exceeding 10 penalty units.

35 Compliance

- (1) An authorised officer may direct a person whom they believe on reasonable grounds is marking or attempting to mark graffiti Council property to leave the property.
- (2) An authorised officer may remove any person from Council property if the authorised officer reasonably believes the person is marking or attempting to mark graffiti.
- (3) An authorised officer may issue a verbal direction to the owner or occupier of property containing graffiti setting out remedial action to be taken and the date and time by which the remedial action must be taken to remove any graffiti.
- (4) Where property is not maintained free of graffiti an authorised officer who reasonably believes that a contravention of this Part has occurred may give written notice to the owner or occupier of the property requiring compliance with this Part within the time period specified in the notice but no sooner than 7 calendar days after notice is given.
- (5) Where property is not maintained free of offensive graffiti, an authorised officer who reasonably believes that a contravention of this Part has occurred may give written notice to the owner or occupier of the property requiring compliance with this Part within the time period specified in the notice but no sooner than 3 calendar days after notice is given.

Q4: Will the Council consider seeking ongoing approval from TasNetworks to remove graffiti from their assets in public spaces?

A: TasNetworks advises it will only remove graffiti that is racist, abusive, religious, or of a political nature. They also require that any work on a TasNetworks asset is done by an authorised, trained and competent person – unlicensed and untrained people cannot perform work on their assets under any circumstances.

Additional resources would be required for Council to take over responsibility for removal of graffiti from TasNetworks assets. It is unlikely TasNetworks would be prepared to fund Council to undertake this work.

Council will consider the scope for additional resources to be allocated to graffiti removal through its 2024/25 budget process.

Question on notice – Natalie Larter, Montrose

(received Saturday, 23 September and Sunday, 24 September respectively 2023)

Q1: Does Glenorchy City Council have any intention to contribute funding the Hobart City Council for Hobart Aquatic Centre at any time in the foreseeable future?

A: Council has not considered contributing funding to the Hobart City Council for the Hobart Aquatic Centre.

Q2: The Glenorchy War Memorial Pool Discussion document outlines 5 options for the future of Glenorchy War Memorial Pool. Options 1-4 outline scenarios which involve maintaining or refurbishing the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool. Would you kindly inform what the “estimated ongoing” refers to in scenarios 1-4 and what the likely cost of that will be, per scenario, per rate payer of Glenorchy City Council per year.

A: The consultant’s report/presentation was attached to the July Council meeting report and included these estimates which can be found on Glenorchy City Council’s website:

http://glenorchy.infocouncil.biz/Open/2023/07/OC_31072023_ATT.PDF

The “estimated ongoing costs” refer to the expenses expected to be incurred every year in operating and maintaining the facility, on top of the initial outlay required to maintain, refurbish or replace the pool facilities.

There are approximately 22,000 rateable properties in the Glenorchy municipality. The breakdown of estimated costs for each option per rateable property is provided below.

Option 1: estimated ongoing costs at a “minimum” of \$800,000 p/a, noting this option has a “risk profile that is not tolerable nor sustainable”, and hence could not be realistically considered.

- Ongoing cost to ratepayer - \$800,000 / 22,000 properties = \$36.36 per year.

Option 2: estimated initial outlay of \$1.35M and ongoing costs estimated at \$600,000 p/a, noting “operational costs will continue to rise” under that option.

- Upfront cost to ratepayer - \$1.35M / 22,000 properties = \$61.36.
- Ongoing cost the ratepayer - \$600,000 / 22,000 properties = \$27.27 per year and increasing.

Option 3: estimated initial outlay of \$5.133M and ongoing costs estimated at \$500,000 p/a.

- Upfront cost to ratepayer - $\$5.133\text{M} / 22,000 \text{ properties} = \233.32 .
- Ongoing cost to ratepayer - $\$500,000 / 22,000 \text{ properties} = \22.73 per year .

Option 4: is not for maintaining or refurbishing, but complete replacement with a new facility, at an estimated initial outlay of \$27M-\$30M and ongoing costs estimated at \$300,000 p/a (plus depreciation costs of between \$750,000 to \$1.5M p/a).

- Upfront cost to ratepayer - $\$30\text{M} / 22,000 \text{ properties} = \$1,363.64$.
- Ongoing cost to ratepayer - $\$300,000 / 22,000 \text{ properties} = \13.64 per year .
- Depreciation cost to ratepayer - $\$1.125\text{M} / 22,000 \text{ properties} = \51.14 per year .

As has been outlined previously by Council, and also by the consultants who undertook the condition assessment, a key issue is that even if the repair options were taken up (i.e., option 2 or 3 above) then the pool would need to remain closed for two seasons whilst these works were undertaken.

Further, repair works are only estimated to provide up to an additional five more years of life to the pool given the facility is already 60 years old. After these five years the community would still be facing the costs of fully redeveloping the site (i.e., option 4 above).

For these reasons Council has focused its attention immediately on the redevelopment option, rather than making a significant investment of community funds and taking the two years required for the repair option, only to be back to needing the full redevelopment costs in five years' time.

The project Council has committed to undertaking this financial year will investigate various redevelopment options, including cost-benefits analysis and the exploration of a potential rates levy to fund redevelopment of the site, as well as evaluating other potential funding options.

Question on notice – Angela Strk, Rosetta

(received Sunday 22 October 2023)

Q1: How much did the Glenorchy City Council pay Knowledge Asset Management Services for consulting services and workshops as related to the Lacus report on the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool?

A: The assessment and associated report and workshop was \$31,300 (excluding GST).

Q2: Given the current mental health outcomes for youth, what are the formal qualifications of the tutor, HK Vermeulen who was recently employed (14 April 2023) by Glenorchy City Council, at the Moonah Art Centre, to run a holiday workshop for 12-17 year olds "...learning drag makeup, performance techniques and movement"?

A: HK Vermeulen is an accomplished and respected performance artist, choreographer, dancer and vocalist.

Their CV includes teaching and choreography work for DRILL Performance Company and Creative Producing for Second Echo Ensemble.

HK, like all workshop facilitators contracted by the Moonah Arts Centre, holds a working with vulnerable people's card.

Both HK's lived experience as a non-binary performance artist and their passion for authenticity, creative expression and providing platforms for others to share their stories and voices makes them an ideal candidate to deliver these workshops.

The content and conversations explored in these workshops is endorsed by Working it Out Inc. and was programmed in response to Objectives and Strategies in Council's Annual Plan.

Building Image and Pride

Objective	We nurture and celebrate our proud and vibrant City with its strong sense of belonging.
Strategy	Encourage creative expression and participation in our community
Strategy	Welcome diversity and inclusion in our community, creating connections that enable a sense of belonging and acceptance
Strategy	Deliver or facilitate events to strengthen our community's sense of pride and belonging.
Action	Deliver events such as International Day for People with a Disability, Disability Awareness workshops, LGBTQIA+ safety and easy English training.

Q3: How much was HK Vermeulen paid to run this particular workshop at the MAC, 14 April 2023?

A: HK was paid a total of \$550 (\$100/hour + flat \$50 set-up/pack-down fee) to deliver a five (5) hour workshop at Moonah Arts Centre, as part of its April school holiday program. These are Moonah Arts Centre's standard rates, that seek to align with industry award rates, e.g., NAVA code of practice and live performance award.

Question without notice – Angela Strk, Rosetta

Q1: Why is Council refusing to hold a public meeting on the Pool?

A: [Mayor] The question was taken on notice.

Q2: Name two funds where the DEC money has been invested?

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

Question without notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose

Q1: Council's Community Goals from the Community Plan, Strategic and Annual Plan 2023-2024 include:

"Our social, recreational and cultural facilities, events and experiences will attract and retain people in Glenorchy to share our wonderful way of life."

Making lives better – "Council's role is to advocate for, and work with others to improve the daily lives of people in our city."

Leading Our Community: "Council exists to represent the best interests of the people of Glenorchy working together to manage community resources and further community priorities"

"Our community values the facilities provided in our City to improve its quality of life and protection of....special places now and into the future"

"We are a leader and partner that acts with integrity and upholds the community's interests."

Is any of this true?

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

Q2: As Glenorchy City Council now holds the Title to the YMCA Property previously acquired by State Growth in September 2017, could you please provide information to the community about the redevelopment and whether there will be a continuation of YMCA Programs for the community?

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

Q3. Can you explain how the \$5.25 million YMCA Development Application was approved by Planning Officers without being authorised by the delegated Glenorchy Planning Authority when the delegation stated a limit of \$1 million at the time?

- A: [Mayor]: A discretionary application for alterations and additions to the Glenorchy YMCA became valid on 01 June 2023 and was advertised from 06 – 19 September 2023. The 42-day statutory time limit in which to make a decision expired on 24 September 2023. An extension of time request for the matter to be decided at the next Glenorchy Planning Authority meeting (Monday 02 October 2023) was declined by the applicant on 5 September and therefore the application was decided under delegation by the Senior Statutory Planner on 22 September 2023.

Under the delegations that existed both pre and post the 25 September 2023 Council meeting, senior planning officers were delegated the power to determine applications for discretionary permits under a number of circumstances, one of which being ‘if the time in which the planning authority must grant or refuse a permit will expire prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Glenorchy Planning Authority, and the applicant has refused to grant an extension to that time period.’

Question without notice - Paul Campton, Claremont

- Q1: In relation to the response for Question 2 from Pauline Elliott in the September meeting, Council said an assessment report has been provided and will be assessed against the provisions of this Code. The report was clearly written for Cooper Automotive and on page 33 of the report said, “solely for use by the Client and EM&C accepts no responsibility for its use by other parties”. Now that the Council is prepared to accept a report where the authors accept no responsibility for what is written, then will Council accept responsibility and liability for what is written in the report given it has accepted it.**

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

- Q2: If Council does not accept responsibility for what is written in the ESA report, then who bears professional responsibility and liability for what is written given the authors specified do not accept responsibility?**

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

Question without notice – Mala Crew, Glenorchy

- Q1: Why have you failed the Glenorchy community by not being transparent?**

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

- Q2: Provide clarity on the issue of Multi-cultural Council of Tasmania (MCOT) Commercial Kitchen project and grant funding and why has it taken so long?**

A: [Mayor]: \$100,000 was provided in Federal Funding.

[General Manager]: Approximately \$60,000 was also provided in Tasmanian Community Funding

[Mayor]: It has taken a long time because while the federal funding was a federal election promise from the Labor Party, it has taken some time for the bureaucrats to prepare the grant deed which is now signed.

Question without notice – Michelle Smith, West Moonah

Q1: In relation to 8-10 Main Road Claremont, has McDonalds supplied Council with the additional material requested by the planning team or indicated when they intend to supply the information to Council?

A: [Mayor] No, we have not yet received the further information.

Q2 In today's Agenda on page 6, Q2 by Paul Campton asked, "*How long does Council typically wait for requests to applicants for such information?*". The Director gave the maximum time of five (5) years and not the typical time as asked. Can Council please give an indication of the typical or average time it waits on developers to provide additional material?

A: [General Manager] While the statutory time limit is 5 years, Council's experience is that information is generally provided much sooner. However, we are in the hands of the applicants.

Question without notice – Ron Collidge, Claremont

Q1: Where is it stated in the Land Use Planning Act that Council cannot refuse an application?

A: [General Manager]: We previously provided chapter and verse in response to the questions on this. Sections 43A and Section 40T are the relevant parts of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act.

Question without notice – Tracey Smith, Glenorchy

Q1: Belgravia had a three (3) year contract to manage the Glenorchy pool for Council. Can you confirm that Council is not stuck with the contract now the pool has closed?

A: [Mayor]: No. There was a clause in the contract to provide for termination of the contract in the event of pool closure.

Question without notice – Eddy Steenbergen, Rosetta

Q1: Can you provide me with details about recent Council Workshops. What was the purpose of the One on One Conversation?

A: [Mayor]: The Council schedules quarterly One on One catchups with the General Manager to discuss his performance.

Q2: Who requested the Workshop presented by the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group (HNSRAG).

A: [Mayor]: The HNSRAG requested a workshop to discuss their vision for the reactivation of the northern suburbs transit corridor.

Q3: In the updated Disposal of Council Land policy, why are there are several references to “sell” and “sale” when disposal provides for sale, lease, donation and exchange of land? Is the reference to sell and sale too narrow?

A: [Mayor]: The policy is geared around proceeds that can be expended.

[General Manager]: The Act makes it clear that Council can dispose land by lease, sale, gift, or exchange.

[Mayor]: Most references in the policy are to disposal.

Q4: Can Council rule out sale or long-term lease of the pool land?

A: [Mayor]: The council is open to community feedback about the future of the pool land.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

None.

COMMUNITY

Community Goal – Making Lives Better

8. ACTIVITIES OF THE MAYOR

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

Reporting Brief:

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

Resolution:

ALDERTON/KING

That Council:

1. RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 18 September to Sunday, 22 October 2023.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTEER AWARDS

File Reference: Volunteer Awards

Reporting Brief:

This report briefs Council on the outcome of the Community and Volunteer Awards trial and recommends that the combined event continue.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/ALDERTON

That Council defer the report to the next Council meeting.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Dunsby, King, Hickey, Cockshutt, and Alderton,
Councillor Quick

AGAINST: Aldermen Thomas, Yaxley and Slade

ABSTAINED: Councillor Kendall

The motion was CARRIED.

Director Community & Corporate Services, Jenny Richardson left the meeting at 4:10pm.

10. TASMANIAN COMMUNITY FUND GRANT OPPORTUNITY: COMMUNITY PROGRAM - YOUTH ENGAGEMENT

File Reference: TCF Grant

Public relations

Resolution:

KING/SLADE

That Council:

1. NOTE the Tasmanian Community Fund's grant program to deliver supported projects that remove barriers to enable 8 to 19-year-olds to stay engaged with and connected to learning with a significant opportunity for funding of up to \$1,000,000 with a 10% cash co-contribution over 5 to 7 years.
2. AUTHORISE submission of an Expression of Interest to the Tasmanian Community Fund to progress the design of a suitable project in consultation with the community and other partners.
3. NOTE that, if the EOI is successful, officers would progress the project design and resubmit it to Council for consideration before it becomes a formal application to the Tasmanian Community Fund.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Director Community & Corporate Services, Jenny Richardson returned to the meeting at 4:23pm

11. BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT QUARTERLY UPDATE

File Reference: Quarterly Report

Public relations

Resolution:

SLADE/KING

That Council:

1. RECEIVE AND NOTE the report on Project Hudson, Child Care Connections, the Moonah Arts Centre Business Plan and the Community Development Action Plan.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

ECONOMIC

Community Goal – Open for Business

Aldermen Thomas and Yaxley left the meeting at 4:35pm

12. ENGAGEMENT WITH STATE GOVERNMENT ON THE AFL HIGH PERFORMANCE CENTRE PROPOSAL

File Reference: Proposals - economic development

Reporting Brief:

To outline the steps taken by Council to engage with the State government about the AFL High Performance Centre Proposal.

Resolution:

SLADE/KING

That Council:

1. NOTE:
 - (a) the State government's call for bids from councils in the Greater Hobart area for development of an AFL High Performance Centre;
 - (b) that Council has worked closely with State government officials to explore the opportunity for a Centre in Glenorchy;
 - (c) that the State government's preferred option for Glenorchy has preliminary ranking as a lower priority option, would involve the Eady Street reserve / KGV AFL oval split site and would require a 27 year lease or donation of the land and relocation of four community sporting clubs;
 - (d) that there are not enough sites in the City to relocate all of the community sporting clubs that would need to relocate and that new sporting facilities would need to be built for them at significant cost.
2. RESOLVE NOT TO SUBMIT a bid to the State government for the AFL High Performance Centre for the above reasons.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Dunsby, King, Hickey, Cockshutt, Slade and Alderton,
Councillors Kendall and Quick.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Aldermen Thomas and Yaxley returned to the meeting at 4:45pm.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal – Leading our Community

13. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

File Reference: Financial Management Strategy

Reporting Brief:

To present an updated Financial Management Strategy 2023 - 2032 for adoption.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KENDALL

That Council:

ADOPT the Financial Management Strategy 2023-2032 in the form set out in **Attachment 1**

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. NEW AND UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

File Reference: Council Policies

Reporting Brief:

To present the following updated policies for review and adoption:

- Gifts and Benefits Policy
- Disposal of Council Land Policy
- Helicopter and other Aircraft Operations on Council Property Policy
- Privacy Policy
- Rates and Charges Policy

Several policies are now due for review and have been through a standard process or consultation and review.

Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/KING

That Council:

1. ADOPT the Gifts & Benefits Policy as set out in Attachment 2.
2. ADOPT the Disposal of Council Land Policy as set out in Attachment 4 with references to “sell/sale” to be amended to read “dispose/disposal” in clauses 3.1 and 4.3.
3. ADOPT the Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property Policy as set out in Attachment 6.
4. ADOPT the Privacy Policy as set out in Attachment 8.
5. ADOPT the Rates and Charges Policy as set out in Attachment 10.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

15. CAPITAL WORKS STATUS REPORT

File Reference: Capital Works

Reporting Brief

To provide a quarterly capital works status update report to Council and report changes to the Capital works program budget.

Resolution:

YAXLEY/KENDALL

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the capital works status report to 30 September 2023 with foreshadowed budget variation.
2. NOTE that confirmed budget changes will be returned to the Council in the next quarterly report, with formal endorsement of budget variations to be sought at that time.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman King left the meeting at 5:12pm

Alderman King returned to the meeting at 5:14pm

16. QUARTERLY REPORT - QUARTER 1 ENDING 30 SEPTEMBER 2023

File Reference: Corporate Reporting

Reporting Brief:

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

Resolution:

YAXLEY/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE Council's Quarterly Report, Quarterly Annual Plan Progress Report and Planning Program Report for the quarter ending 30 September 2023.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Question without notice – Alderman Dunsby (September meeting)

Q1: When is the report on the trial of Citizen of the Year processes coming back to Council.

A: A report is being prepared as soon as practical for Council to consider – at the latest, the report will be on the agenda for the November Council meeting.

Question without notice – Councillor Kendall

Q1: Can Council invite climate consultants, GeoNeon, to attend a Council Workshop?

A: [Mayor]: This has already been scheduled for 13 November 2023.

Motion without notice – Deputy Mayor Hickey

Resolution:

HICKEY/KENDALL

That Glenorchy City Council officers provide a report on how to remove single use plastics from our city, as per the Hobart City Council approach?

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Question without notice – Deputy Mayor Hickey

Q1: What are the current arrangements in the city for disposal of medical waste?

A: [Acting Director]: Certain types can be disposed with general waste. Council supply sharps containers for diabetes.

Q2: What happens with the sharps?

A: [Mayor]: The question was taken on notice.

Motion without notice – Alderman Alderton

Resolution:

ALDERTON/HICKEY

That Council officers provide a report about implementing a FOGO service for commercial rate payers.

The motion was put.

FOR: Councillors Quick and Kendall, Aldermen Dunsby, Hickey, Alderton

AGAINST: Aldermen Yaxley, Thomas, King, Slade, Cockshutt

The motion was LOST

Resolution:

KING/SLADE

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

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 5.44pm.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Closed session commenced at 5:44pm

18. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

KING/KENDALL

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Monday, 25 September 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

19. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

Resolution:

SLADE/KING

That the meeting be moved back into open Council.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 5:47pm.

Confirmed,

CHAIR