

**Minutes of the Meeting  
of the Glenorchy City Council  
held at the Council Chambers  
on Monday, 29 January 2024 at 3:30pm**



**Present  
(in Chambers):**

Alderman Bec Thomas (Mayor), Alderman Sue Hickey (Deputy Mayor), Aldermen Shane Alderton, Josh Cockshutt, Jan Dunsby, Steven King, Stuart Slade and Russell Yaxley, Councillor Molly Kendall

**In attendance  
(in Chambers):**

Tony McMullen (General Manager), Emilio Reale (Director Infrastructure and Works), Christine Lane (Manager Stakeholder and Executive), Emma Watkins (Coordinator Executive and Strategy), Allan Wise (Manager Finance), Ron Petterson (Manager Community), Tracey Ehrlich (Manager People and Governance)

**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, 15 January 2024

**Purpose:** To view:

- Benjafield Park
- Giblins Reserve
- KGV Soccer Pitch

**Date:** Monday, 22 January 2024

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Sponsorship, donations and bequests policy
- Caretaker policy
- Access & Inclusion Special Committee set up

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 22 viewers and 10 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

---

Councillor Harry Quick.

---

## 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

---

### **Resolution:**

COCKSHUTT/KENDALL

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday, 18 December 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

---

Council is expecting the Community Communication and Engagement Plan from consultants MI Global by close of business today.

It is expected that this document will outline how MI Global plan to engage with the community on the future of the War Memorial Pool site.

Council will share details and widely promote opportunities for the community to have their say, as soon as possible.

---

## 4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

---

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

No declarations of pecuniary interest were declared.

---

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

---

### Question without notice – Feras Shaheen, Moonah

**Q1: Is Glenorchy City Council prepared to support the Palestinian and Arab community in Glenorchy, Hobart and the rest of the world by calling for an immediate, permanent ceasefire?**

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

Response:

Glenorchy City Council acknowledges the tragedy and trauma associated with armed conflict and, however remote and removed Council may be from these conflicts, would always urge parties to seek peaceful resolutions in preference to hostilities.

Council also acknowledges that the impact of these global conflicts does not stop at the borders of the regions directly involved, but can, and do, extend all the way to our own community. We acknowledge and understand that these events affect members of our community, particularly people with family or other strong connections to the areas experiencing conflict.

Glenorchy City Council extends its sympathy to all those currently experiencing anxiety and despair as a result of the current international conflicts.

Council notes Australia voted in favour of an immediate humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza at the recent United Nations General Assembly, which Council recognises as the most appropriate and effective forum for achieving action on foreign affairs.

### Question without notice – Leeanne Rose, Glenorchy

**Q1: Will Council take measures to ensure public are safe in areas where there is broken glass and rubbish, including at Windermere Beach and take a risk assessment of all areas that people might go for a swim?**

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

Response:

Council has regular maintenance programs including the collection of glass and rubbish in open space recreation areas, above the low water mark.

Under Section 16 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, Council does not have jurisdiction over land below low water mark except in certain limited circumstances (jetties, accretions from the sea, etc). The management responsibility below the low water mark is the responsibility of Crown Land Services (Parks and Wildlife Service).

In areas potentially suitable for swimming, such as Windermere Beach, factors such as unrestricted public access and natural processes such as winds and wave action, can contribute to broken glass and litter.

Council will continue to maintain such areas as part of its regular maintenance schedule. If members of the public notice a particular glass or rubbish issue, they should report it through to Council's customer service team for a works request to be issued.

**Q2: Where specifically in the 50 metre pool was it leaking 300,000 (sic) litres of water a day (e.g., the lining, the mastic seal, the pipes or the pump) and where was the water running to?**

A: [Mayor] I am sure this question has been answered before.

The question was taken on notice.

Response:

When it was operational, the pool needed to be continually filled to ensure it had sufficient water volume. Water metering showed that this amounted to 35,000 litres a day, which is significantly more than could be attributed to water loss through evaporation or splashing.

The exact location of leaks has not been determined, however the reports received state that the excessively wide joints are prone to failure. The water had been leaking into the water table and surrounding environment.

### **Question without notice – Pauline Elliott, Claremont**

**Q1: In reference to the upcoming motion regarding the composition of the Glenorchy Planning Authority, what is the size of the Hobart City Councils planning committee and what is the rationale behind whatever size it is and how often does it meet?**

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

Response:

The City of Hobart Planning Committee has 12 members, which is the total number of their Elected Members. The City of Hobart's Terms of Reference are outlined below.

HOBART CITY COUNCIL TERMS OF REFERENCE Planning Committee

The Planning Committee is established by the Council pursuant to Section 23 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, to assist the Council in carrying out its functions.

### **1. Membership**

- 1.1 Membership of the Committee shall consist of all twelve (12) Elected Members.
- 1.2. Following each ordinary election, all Elected Members appointed to the Council will automatically become members of the Planning Authority Committee.

### **2. Appointment of Chairman**

- 2.1 In accordance with the Regulation 10 (3) (a) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, and Council Policy “Council and Council Committees – Meetings: Procedures and Guidelines”, the election of the chairman of each of the Council’s committees is reserved to the Council.
- 2.2 Where an appointed chairman may be absent from a Council Committee meeting, the provisions of Council Policy “Council and Council Committees – Meetings: Procedures and Guidelines” and Regulation 10 (4) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, apply to appointing the chairman for the meeting.

### **3. Quorum**

- 3.1 A quorum is seven (7) Committee members.

### **4. Conduct of Meetings**

- 4.1 Meetings are conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 and Council Policy “Council and Council Committees – Meetings: Procedures and Guidelines”.

### **5. Frequency and Location of Meetings**

- 5.1 Meetings of the Committee are conducted twice monthly in the Council Chamber at the Town Hall on those dates as adopted by the Council as part of its annual schedule of meetings.
- 5.2 Meetings are also advertised in The Mercury newspaper, in accordance with Regulation 7 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, a minimum of four (4) days and a maximum of fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduled date of the meeting.
- 5.3 Where special meetings may be convened, these are advertised a minimum of two (2) days prior to the meeting date.
- 5.4 Meetings are open to the public, except when the meeting is closed pursuant to Regulation 15 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

## 6. Committee Functions

- 6.1 The Hobart City Council Planning Committee shall fulfill the Council's obligation as a planning authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.
- 6.2 The Planning Committee shall have full power to make planning decisions on behalf of the Council.

## 7. Committee Delegations

- 7.1 The Council delegates all of its planning authority powers under the Land Use Planning Approvals Act 1993 to the Committee noting that the Council may also delegate some or all of these powers to relevant officers from time to time.

Note: The Council (City of Hobart), at its meeting held on 27 August 2012, acknowledged that an elected member may call in any delegated matter, including development applications, before the matter is determined under delegated authority by either a Council committee or a Council officer, provided there is sufficient statutory time to do so.

## Question without notice – Tracey Smith, Glenorchy

**Q2: Can you tell me did you release your Annual Report within 14 days of the Annual General meeting and if not, why not?**

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

Yes, we did.

Section 72 of the *Local Government Act 1993* requires the availability of the report to be advertised in a daily newspaper circulating in the municipal area together with an invitation to electors to lodge submissions on the report with the council for discussion at its Annual General meeting. However, no time frame is stipulated.

Section 72B requires the Council to publish a notice in a daily newspaper setting out the date, time and place of the Annual General meeting and Council cannot hold the Annual General meeting before 14 days after the notice is published.

The Annual General meeting was advertised in The Mercury on Saturday, 18 November 2023.

The Annual Report was published on Council's website on Monday, 20 November 2023.

---

## 6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

---

### Question on notice – Eddy Steenbergen, Rosetta (received Wednesday, 20 December 2023)

**Q1:** My questions relate to agenda item "11. Consideration Of Annual General Meeting Motion Re: Planning Authority Composition" at the December 2023 open council.

The recommendation in the agenda was:

*"1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Motion put by Ms Pauline Elliot and passed by a majority of electors at the Annual General Meeting on 4 December 2023, that Council:*

*DEFER highly contentious issues, such as removing land designated for housing and changes to allow prohibited uses, or where there are 5 or more representations, to the full Council.*

*2. After due consideration, NOT SUPPORT the motion as it would not produce any tangible benefits to the development approval processes for the reasons set out under "Consideration" this report."*

The motion put at the meeting was the full recommendation.

When I reflect now on that motion, it makes little sense. I would like some clarification on the following points.

If the motion had failed then the AGM motion would not have been RECEIVED or NOTED. Unlikely I know but still an absurd outcome.

Response:

The Council can resolve to Receive and Note the motion without supporting it, which is what the Council did.

**Q2:** It is unclear what "NOT SUPPORT" means in practice? What would "SUPPORT" by council mean in practice? It is just one step away from the way many politicians are fond of stating they are "COMMITTED TO" something.

Response:

To clarify, to resolve to NOT SUPPORT the motion meant that they did not agree with it and would NOT SUPPORT implementing the "deferral of highly contentious issues, such as removing land designated for housing and changes to allow prohibited uses, or where there are 5 or more representations, to the full Council". To SUPPORT would mean that the Council would agree to implementing the motion's proposal.



**Q3: Why is the phrase "After due consideration" there? And what is "due consideration" anyway?**

Response:

'Due consideration' refers to the fact that the motion was thought about and considered, and the pros and cons weighed up as per the details outlined under the heading CONSIDERATIONS in the council report.

**Q4: Why does the motion refer to "tangible" benefits? The motion did not claim to provide any "tangible" benefits; it was about major development being procedurally treated differently.**

Response:

The recommendation put to Council was suggesting that there were not any tangible benefits to be gained in supporting the motion (i.e., any better outcomes, efficiencies, better decisions, etc.). The report contends that there are more tangible benefits to be gained in maintaining the current Glenorchy Planning Authority (GPA) structure.

**Q5: Why does the motion refer to the reasons for the recommendation? It is historically very unusual for a council motion to contain the reasons for it. The agenda report generally speaks for itself.**

Response:

This was to provide some rationale and clarity for readers to understand on what basis the recommendation was made.

### **Question on notice – Bradley McDougall, Claremont**

**(received Wednesday, 10 January 2024)**

**Q1: Were Councillors instructed to read the Lacus Report in its entirety and had every Councillor read the report in its entirety before voting to close and not repair the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool.**

Response:

The Lacus Report was Attachment 1 to a Council Officer's report about the pool, provided to Elected Members as part of the agenda papers for the Council meeting on 31 July 2023.

The Council also received a briefing from consultants, KnowLedge Asset Management Services, at a Council workshop on 3 July 2023 on the implications of the pool condition assessment.

The 31 July 2023 Council Officer's report indicated that the General Manager had made the decision on 4 July 2023, in his capacity as "person controlling the business or undertaking (PCBU)" under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012, that the Glenorchy Pool not reopen for the coming pool season and that the pool remain closed until further notice. The recommendation endorsed by the Council was to note the report and General Managers decision.

**Question on notice – Natalie Larter, Montrose**

**(received Monday, 15 January 2024)**

**Q1: What is the cost of the feasibility study being undertaken by MI Global Partners, to assess options for 2a Anfield Street?**

Response:

Council received a \$200,00 grant from the State Government to fund the feasibility study.

The contractual terms with the consultant are commercial in confidence.

**Question on notice – Karen Forster, Montrose**

**(received Sunday, 21 January 2024)**

In the tender document for feasibility study of the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool site it stated: "While the site is not presently listed on the Local or Tasmanian Heritage registers, it holds historical and sociocultural heritage value. This recognition stems from its identification as a potential candidate for local listing during the Municipal Heritage Study conducted by Ian Terry and Paul Davies in 2004/2005." The tender document further states: "to further inform future site options, the Client has initiated a separate project/contract to commission an independent site-specific heritage assessment".

Questions in the interests of transparency: At the time of writing of the tender document it was stated that a separate project/contract to commission an independent site specific heritage assessment.

**Q1: To whom has this contract been awarded?**

Response:

Brad Williams, Praxis Environment.

**Q2: Can ratepayers have an assurance this assessment is NOT being undertaken by the GCCs own Heritage Officer, who although eminently qualified, is not independent?**

Response:

Yes.

**Q3: Why hasn't the Glenorchy Municipality History Group been consulted about this matter especially considering two Aldermen are members of said group?**

Response:

The work commissioned was a technical assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified cultural heritage practitioner.

## **Question on notice – Nicole Vout**

**(received Sunday, 21 January 2024)**

**Q1: GCC has dismissed the option to repair the Glenorchy Pool based on a non-invasive site inspection that did not call for permanent closure and demolition (Lacus, page 4) therefore I wish to ask again, for you Mayor, and all the Alderman, to move a motion to vote, to do further testing and assessment of the pool and to include in MI Global Partners scope the option to repair the pool, given other Councils have successfully repaired and refurbished their pools (eg. Western Australia's Geraldton pool) for amounts a lot less than what the GCC have estimated?**

Response:

Glenorchy City Council has appointed a consultant, MI Global Partners, to investigate options for the pool site, including the redevelopment of the pool facility. These options will then be presented to council for consideration.

Given this is occurring, Council will await the findings of the MI Global investigation into options before making any further decisions on the future of the pool site.

**Q2: Mayor, it's our understanding you have recently met with the Assistant Minister for Infrastructure, Senator Carol Brown and been made aware of the THRIVING SUBURBS PROGRAM, making available \$200 Million to Council's to address shortfalls in PRIORITY COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE in Urban and Suburban Communities. Can you assure the Ratepayers of Glenorchy you will be applying for this funding in relation to the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool. And, Mayor, can you guarantee the Community that If via the MI Global Consultancy there is a desire from the Community to retain, repair, or refurbish our pool, or better still acquire a new Aquatic Facility, that you will honour that wish by the Community and as Mayor will seek this funding from the Federal Government's Thriving Suburbs Program which is now available to repair or replace our pool with a new Aquatic Facility?**

Response:

The Thriving Suburbs Program was announced by the Federal Government in May last year, committing \$200 million over two years for locally-driven urban and suburban infrastructure and community projects.

Program guidelines, eligibility criteria and applications have not yet been released. However, it is noted this program is a national program, and a redeveloped pool would likely require anything up to 25 per cent of the program's total available funding.

Council is not ruling out any avenue for financial support in relation to the future of the pool site. Council has already applied for funding from the Federal Government as part of its budget process. To this point, those requests have not been successful.

Council has also included a redeveloped facility in its funding priorities document, which has been submitted to the State and Federal Governments for consideration in their 2024-25 budget preparation and will be provided to parties and candidates for consideration prior to the next state election.

Council will need to consider the findings of the MI Global investigation into options for the future of the pool site before it can determine the purpose and amount of any specific funding request and identify appropriate grant programs.

**Q3: Mayor, will you apply for any round of funding that will enable Glenorchy to retain an Aquatic Facility, if via the MI Global Consultancy there is a desire from the Community to retain, repair or refurbish our pool or better still acquire a new Aquatic Facility?**

Response:

Council will need to consider the findings of the MI Global investigation into options for the future of the pool site before it can determine the purpose and amount of any specific funding request and identify appropriate grant programs.

Council is not ruling out any avenue for financial support in relation to the future of the pool site. Council has already sought funding from the Federal Government as part of its budget process. To this point, those requests have not been successful.

Council has also included a redeveloped facility in its funding priorities document, which will be provided to parties and candidates for consideration prior to the next state election.

**Q4: Mayor, can you please advise why in a Public Forum Alderman Jan Dunsby made the comment our pool is, 'beyond repair'?**

Response:

What an individual elected member states is a matter for the elected member, however, it is well-established that the pool facility has reached a point in its operational life where it either requires replacement or redevelopment.

The pool does not currently meet a number of modern standards, including disability access and appropriate privacy screening in bathroom and changeroom areas. In addition, the facilities have a number of safety hazards which pose a risk to public and staff safety. As has been stated previously, any

short-term repairs would see the pool closed for this season and next season, and only add another few years of operational life before consideration of redevelopment or replacement would again be required. Council does not consider this to be a cost-effective solution, which is why it is instead exploring longer term options now.

**Q5: Mayor, can you please advise the Community of details of the ‘additional’ briefings given to Aldermen by Marcus Lightfoot of Lacus and Michael McCosker of Knowledge Asset Version: 1, Version Date: 22/01/2024 Document Set ID: 3336642 Management that led to the above statement by Alderman Jan Dunsby, that would lead Aldermen to believe our pool is ‘beyond repair’, contrary to what the Lacus says, the report that Council used Ratepayer money to commission?**

Response:

The Council received a briefing on the implications of the pool condition assessment from the consultants that commissioned the Lacus Report at a council workshop on 3 July 2023. The details of this briefing are publicly available in the powerpoint presentation published on Council’s website, via this link <https://www.gcc.tas.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Glenorchy-Pool-Presentation-Client-Final-ELT-Final.pdf>

**Q6: Mayor, can you please advise the Community of details of the ‘additional’ briefings by GCC staff as stated by Alderman Dunsby, that led Alderman Dunsby and possibly other Aldermen to believe our pool is ‘beyond repair’, contrary to what the Lacus says, the report that Council used Ratepayer money to commission?**

Response:

The Council received a briefing on the implications of the pool condition assessment from the consultants that commissioned the Lacus Report at a Council workshop on 3 July 2023. The details of this briefing are publicly available in the powerpoint presentation published on Council’s website, via this link <https://www.gcc.tas.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Glenorchy-Pool-Presentation-Client-Final-ELT-Final.pdf>

**Q7: Mayor, will you overturn the vote to close and not repair our pool on the 18/12/2023 as it appears some Aldermen have not understood and are confused regarding information included in the Lacus and in briefings by Consultants and GCC staff, to reach conclusions our pool is ‘beyond repair’?**

Response:

The briefing from the consultants clearly articulated “The need to comprehensively review return on investment using a life cycle model is essential in making a medium to long term financial decision” in relation to the major overhaul and renewal option and “Elected Members will need to inform themselves with a Life Cycle Cost Model to determine future costs and upkeep” in relation to a complete replacement option (see pp 20 & 21 of powerpoint presentation).

Therefore, it is in the best interests of the community to await the findings of the MI Global investigation into options before making any further decisions on the future of the pool site.

**Q8: Mayor, why have all Aldermen not read the Lacus report in full? How can Aldermen make informed decisions and vote to close and not repair our pool if they have not, therefore making their vote invalid, as it is not a fully informed vote on such an important matter?**

Response:

Council is provided with information in a range of mediums in order to provide for all levels of comprehension, which is critical to ensuring an inclusive environment for democratically Elected Members.

How Elected Members consume information and ensure they make fully informed decisions is a matter for each individual elected member.

**Q9: Mayor, why does Alderman Alderton state to retain a pool in Glenorchy all of Community have to want one? Why does this particular Asset require ALL of Community support when other assets such as MAC, bike trails, skateparks etc do not have to receive such scrutiny?**

Response:

What an individual elected member states is a matter for the elected member.

Council has engaged MI Global to investigate options for the future of the pool site, including redevelopment of the pool and alternative options. Community consultation is a cornerstone of this project, to inform Council on the views of the broader community.

The project will also provide detailed information on the lifecycle cost of a replacement facility.

At an estimated cost of \$30 million (much greater than other Council owned assets), Council wants to understand the financial viability and sustainability of a replacement facility, to help inform decision making.

Council also wants to ensure the initial and ongoing cost to ratepayers is provided as information to help inform community feedback on a replacement facility. Given the significant cost, it is only fair that ratepayers understand what the cost implications would be for them, so they can provide an informed view on what they want and are prepared to pay for a replacement facility.

**Q10: Mayor, from what Official Document does Alderman Alderton ascertain that only 2% of the Community want a pool in the Glenorchy Municipality as Council have failed to canvas the Community on this subject or provide a Public Meeting on this subject?**

Response:

What an individual elected member states is a matter for the elected member.

Council has engaged MI Global to investigate options for the future of the pool site, including redevelopment of the pool and alternative options. Community consultation is a cornerstone of this project, to inform Council on the views of the broader community.

Council held a Community Yarn on 17 October 2023, a public forum in which the pool was the main focus, including a presentation from the Mayor on the pool and a question and answer session, with more than 60 community members in attendance.

**Q11: Mayor, why was the Future Directions Survey extended from a closing date of Friday 15th December to Sunday 17th December, therefore reducing the time available for staff and Aldermen and General Manager to collate, review and consider the responses before the December Council Meeting on Monday 18th December, where the vote to close and not repair our pool was taken without consideration or mention of said responses, many of which I believe would've requested to retain, repair our pool?**

Response:

The Future Directions Survey aims to help inform the development of Council's annual budget. The results are presented and discussed at budget workshops and council meetings as appropriate, to help inform decisions on the annual budget.

The closing date was extended to enable more residents and ratepayers a chance to have their say on the priorities for Council's annual budget.

**Q12: Mayor, considering Future Direction Survey responses were not reported on at the 18th December 2023 meeting, if yourself, staff and Aldermen are not going to consider and analyse Community responses, prior to voting on such an important issue of closing and not repairing our pool, what is the point of funding a Future Directions Survey?**

Response:

The Future Directions Survey aims to help inform the development of Council's annual budget. The results are presented and discussed at budget workshops and council meetings as appropriate, to help inform decisions on the annual budget.



**Question without notice – Mala Crew, Glenorchy**

**Q1: Does the sponsorship of Tasmanian Racing Club come from coffers of Glenorchy City Council or your personal capacity?**

A: [Mayor]: This is within my personal capacity, I have previously sponsored races at the Tasmanian Racing Club from my own personal funds.

**Q2: You have joined forces with three other Mayors, namely Anna Reynolds of Hobart City Council, Brendan Blomeley of Clarence and Paula Wriedt of Kingborough to ask Tasmanian government for a further \$26 million in funding for a new ferry terminal at Howrah Point, Kingston Beach and Regatta Point, with \$6 million going towards completing redevelopment of Bellerive terminal. That's \$52 million in total.**

**My question is:**

**Why are you involved in this venture when the Glenorchy region does not feature in it, does not feature in the equation?**

A: [Mayor]: Glenorchy City Council is a part of the greater Hobart Strategic Partnership, which is an alliance formed between Glenorchy City Council, Hobart City Council, Clarence City Council and Kingborough Council. It was established out of the City Deal and the Greater Hobart Act, and we work together to lobby state and federal governments for projects that will benefit greater Hobart.

We successfully lobbied the federal government to receive \$20 million in funding from the federal government through the last election to provide infrastructure for ferry terminals to expand the network of our Derwent River ferry service, including a terminal at Wilkinson's Point and planning is underway for that.

So absolutely the Glenorchy community is part of the equation when it comes to ferries, and we are working with the state government and the other councils and the federal government on progressing plans to expand the ferry network to provide improved transport options for the people of Glenorchy.

**Question without notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose**

**Q1: Has the Council applied for pool funding grants?**

A: [Mayor]: Council has lobbied the federal and state governments and continues to lobby the federal and state governments for funding to redevelop the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool site. We have not yet applied for specific grant program funding because there is no grant program funding available that would provide for an amount of funding that we know is required to replace or redevelop the pool facility. We will await the findings of the MI Global consultation before we have clearer direction on what exactly we will be applying for when it comes to redevelopment of that site and what the specific cost will be. Typically grant programs require projects to be shovel ready. We don't have a shovel ready project to be applying for funding through a grants program.

**Q2: The Lacus report did not recommend the closure of the pool and believed testing was an essential requirement before Council and Aldermen made decisions about the future of the pool. That's testing of the pool shell and the concrete. Why didn't the Council authorise a chemical analysis of the concrete and pool shell to determine its true life expectancy as this was strongly recommended in the Lacus report, page 46? Why did this occur?**

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

### **Question without notice – Leeanne Rose, Glenorchy**

**Q1: In the bid for funding of the Pool and Tolosa Street Master Plan (where councils asked federal government for \$39 million i.e \$26 million for pool and \$13 million for Tolosa park) the council said and I quote 'Both these projects would provide a massive boost for our community infrastructure'. They support people in our community to be active and engaged. They provide spaces for residents and families to congregate and enjoy recreational opportunities. Overall they add to the liveability of our city for decades to come'. All council representatives, what has changed? why have you now blatantly and without good reason changed your mind about the "live-ability of our city" and the importance of a pool for Glenorchy its citizens, and people further afield who need to use our pool and why are you now dismissing and minimizing ratepayers opinions and concerns by continually speaking against the people on this subject during General Council meetings about our beloved pool, when only approx 6 months ago we were on the same page?**

A: [Mayor]: Council continues to lobby state and federal governments for funding for both the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool redevelopment and for Tolosa Park. We've just released a Priority Projects Investment document, which is available on our website and includes, like last year, a request for funding for both of those projects.

**Q2: In the Project Outline Investigation into Pool Redevelopment and Other Options, 2A Anfield Street, Glenorchy, Tony McMullen, 23 August 2023. Options considered.**

**To date, consultants engaged to assess the condition of the current pool facility and have identified a range of options:**

- **Permanent closure**
- **Remediation of current issues, involving multi-million dollar repairs resulting in pool closure while repairs are undertaken to gain a limited additional asset life.**
- **Redevelopment**
- **Arrangements for community use of alternative swimming pool facilities at the Hobart Aquatic Centre or at Clarence.**

**Q2a: The limited asset life statement above, what is the evidence behind this statement please?**

Response:

Based on the evidence obtained through their technical assessment of the age and condition of the pool assets, the consultants determined that repairs will result in limited additional asset life.

**Q2b: Taking into consider my statement above (please include in minutes); If you were a member of the 'Save the Glenorchy Pool community what would you think? How would you feel about these strategically bias documents that directs MI Global Partners to lean strongly towards discussions of alternative options (not pool or aquatic center) for the land in the center of Glenorchy (Pool Site)? If you disagree with this observation, why are 'alternative options' listed so widely in these document?**

A: [Mayor]: Council committed to exploring all options for the future of the site and wants to ensure in any decision making the financial viability and sustainability of a replacement asset on the site. The project brief clearly articulates that the work to be undertaken is to include analysis, concept designs and costings for a redeveloped pool on the site, so that certainly is within the scope of the project. It is not being excluded, that will be explored as part of the project and will be a really significant part of the consultation with the community. I do not believe the documents are biased.

### **Question without notice – Andrew Beven, Glenorchy**

**Q1: Earlier in January, Alderman Dunsby informed us via social media, that a verbal briefing to Elected Members on Lacus report was far more extensive and closing the pool immediately was the only option. Seeing the Lacus report provided many options, would you provide us with the minutes of that meeting so we can see what further information was provided in that meeting outside of the Lacus report?**

A: [Mayor]: Council doesn't keep minutes from workshops, so there are no minutes available to be provided. What I will say though, is the PowerPoint presentation that was provided to Elected Members in preparation for that workshop and that formed the basis for the discussion at that workshop is published on Council's website. It is publicly available.

**Q2: The New Norfolk pool, which was built in 1963, has recently been successful in gaining a grant fund for \$300,000 for work on the pool for various things. That grant was made under the Open Spaces program. Has the Council made any applications under the Open Spaces program for any funding for any public reserves?**

A: [Mayor]: Yes, if it's the same program I am thinking of through the Local Government Association of Tasmania's Open Spaces Program, Council was successful in receiving \$250,000 funding for a renewal of the skate park in Claremont.

**Question without notice – Deanne Gillie/Shaw, Granton**

**Q1: Currently you are running a paid Facebook ad giving away \$100 vouchers asking people to register their Facebook accounts.**

**My first question is:**

**What do you plan to do with this Facebook list? Will you be selling it or is it going to be used for political advertising? Or is it just going to snoop around to see who our friends are or what we're up to?**

A: [Mayor]: I am not aware of us collecting Facebook account information.

This question was taken on notice.

**Q2: Do you think MI Global should use a Facebook group to review investigating the other options in the tender process? Will you be using MI Global with your Facebook group?**

A: Council expects to receive the communication engagement plan from MI Global today. We will see in that engagement plan how in MI Global plan to consult with the community and we will be providing details of that to the community once we have that information.

**Question without notice – Lisa Rime, Goodwood**

**Q1: As a result of the government's commitment to implement the full 191 recommendations of the Child Abuse Commission of Inquiry, how does the City of Glenorchy monitor the safety of children and youths at the premises they lease to sporting clubs?**

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

**Q2: Are Working with Vulnerable Children registrations regularly checked and recorded and how are reportable incidents dealt with by the Council?**

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

---

## 7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

---

### Petition received

Before 12.00pm today, Monday, 29 January 2024, Ms Janiece Bryan submitted a petition to Council.

The petition provides:

Petition to Glenorchy City Council

We the undersigned, hereby request that Council

1. Urgently repair and re-open the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool
2. Hold a public meeting to address the pool related concerns.

According to the summary from Ms Bryan, the petition contains 4536 signatories of which 1873 are signatories with GCC addresses and 1183 contain suburb only GCC addresses. The remainder of signatories are from outside of the municipality.

### Initial checks to make sure petition is compliant

In order for the GM to be able to table the petition at a Council meeting, the *Local Government Act* requires, (under s. 58(3)) that the petition:

- (a) complies with s. 57 (which sets out what the requirements for a petition are);  
and
- (b) must not be defamatory; and
- (c) must not propose any unlawful action.

I, Tony McMullen, have examined the petition and am satisfied the petition meets the requirements to enable it to be tabled.

### Next steps

A petition is entitled to seek a public meeting.

Under s. 59 of the Act, a council must hold a public meeting if the petition complies with s. 57 and is signed by whichever is the lesser of 5% of the electors, or 1000 electors. At the 2022 local government elections, Glenorchy had 33,504 persons enrolled to vote. Therefore, in this case, the petition must contain a minimum of 1,000 electors to require a public meeting.

Electors are persons entitled to vote at local government elections or by-elections. (See ss. 3 & 254).

Council officers will begin a due diligence analysis of the petition to ensure that the required minimum number of electors has signed it. (The purpose of this process is to eliminate non-electors such as those outside the municipality not entitled to vote in Glenorchy local government elections, minors, duplicate signatories and those whose details are illegible or otherwise insufficient to establish that they are electors).

Under s. 60(1) of the Act, I am required to write to the person who lodged the petition and advise them whether the petition is sufficient to require a public meeting and give reasonable notice of when Council is to consider the petition.

Under s. 60(2), I am required, within 42 days of the tabling of the petition to advise the Council at a council meeting whether the petition is sufficient to require a public meeting (i.e. complies with s. 59) and the Council is to determine any action to be taken in respect of the petition.

Under s. 60(3), within 30 days after the Council meeting, if the petition complies with s. 59 or the Council otherwise resolves to hold a public meeting, Council is to hold a public meeting to discuss the subject matter of the petition.

## 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:**

HICKEY/ALDERTON

That Council:

1. RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 11 December 2023 to Sunday, 21 January 2024.

The motion was put.

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

##### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 9. BUSINESS UNIT REVIEWS - QUARTERLY UPDATE

---

File Reference: Quarterly Report

To present the quarterly report for noting regarding Project Hudson, Moonah Arts Centre (MAC) Business Plan, Childcare Connections and progress on the Community Development Action Plan.

### **Resolution:**

KENDALL/KING

That Council:

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

The motion was put.

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

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.



---

## 10. ACCESS AND INCLUSION SPECIAL COMMITTEE

---

File Reference: Access and Inclusion Special Committee

**Reporting Brief:**

This report recommends that Council establish an Access and Inclusion Special Committee and adopt Terms of Reference for it. The report also seeks the appointment of an Elected Member to the Access and Inclusion Special Committee.

**Resolution:**

KING/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. Establish the Access and Inclusion Special Committee
2. Adopt the Terms of Reference for the Access and Inclusion Special Committee
3. Appoint Alderman Jan Dunsby and Alderman Shane Alderton to the Access and Inclusion Special Committee

The motion was put.

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

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

# GOVERNANCE

## *Community Goal – Leading our Community*

---

### 11. RESCINDED COUNCIL POLICY

---

File Reference: Policies

#### **Reporting Brief:**

To recommend the now redundant Social Media Policy (Attachment 3) be rescinded.

#### **Resolution:**

YAXLEY/ALDERTON

That Council:

1. REVIEW and RECOMMEND to improve the Social Media Policy to current best practices on how Council communicates via Social Media.
2. REVIEW and RECOMMEND any changes to improve the Elected Member Code of Conduct that may clarify conduct on Social Media by Elected Members.
3. REVIEW the General Manager's Social and Other Media Directive and RECOMMEND a new policy that manages employees Social Media conduct.
4. RECEIVE a report on the recommendations by the April Council meeting.

The motion was put.

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

#### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 12. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 31 DECEMBER 2023

---

File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

### Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the monthly Financial Performance Report for the period ending 31 December 2023.

### Resolution:

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 31 December 2023 as set out in Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

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

### AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

---

### 13. NAMING OF A NEW SUBDIVISION ROAD IN CLAREMONT

---

File Reference: 3334599

Valuing our environment

#### **Resolution:**

KING/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. ASSIGN the name BOSTON COURT to the subdivision road shown on the municipal map included in this report under s. 11 of the *Place Names Act 2020*, and
2. SUBMIT the proposed name to Place Names Tasmania for confirmation and registration.

The motion was put.

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

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

## 14. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS EXEMPTIONS REPORT

---

File Reference: Procurement

### Reporting Brief:

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

### Resolution:

COCKSHUTT/YAXLEY

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Report relating to an exemption approved by the Director Community and Corporate Services for a five year extension licence of DocuSign e-signature software totaling an estimated \$130,000 excluding GST.

The motion was put.

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

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

---

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

---

### **Question without notice – Alderman Alderton**

**Q1: Why are the Council meeting agenda link and attachments no longer posted on social media?**

A: [Mayor Thomas]: The Communications Officer role is vacant. Will ensure that it is in future.

### **Question without notice – Alderman King**

**Q1: Are we covered by insurance for the vandalism/fire damage caused to the Giblyns Reserve new toilets, is there a way we can recover the costs?**

A: [Director Infrastructure and Development]: Damage estimated at \$14,000 for repairs. Insurance claim is being lodged, noting the excess is \$10,000. CCTV footage handed over to police and they visited those on the video. They are very young children who were known to the police. Police noted it is highly unlikely we will be able to recover costs. The old toilets have been cleaned and reopened, they are functional until the repairs are completed. This should be done by the end of next week.

### **Question without notice – Alderman Yaxley**

**Q1: Has Council received any update or response regarding the letter to Mr Ferguson regarding the update to the road safety issue?**

A: [Mayor]: No, nothing has been received. We will inform Elected Members when we do.

---

### 15.1. NOTICE OF MOTION - COUNCILLOR KENDALL - PROPOSAL THAT COUNCIL CALL FOR IMMEDIATE AND PERMANENT CEASEFIRE IN GAZA

---

File Reference: Notice of Motion

#### Reporting Brief:

To consider a notice of motion by Councillor Molly Kendall submitted in accordance with the requirements of regulation 16(5) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

#### Resolution:

KENDALL/HICKEY

That Council:

1. PROPOSAL that Glenorchy City Council Call for Immediate and Permanent Ceasefire in Gaza.

Alderman Alderton foreshadowed the following motion in the event that the original motion were to be lost.

*That Council:*

1. *That the Glenorchy City Council supports the Australian Government position on conflicts in Israel and Palestine, Ukraine and Russia, as well as all other areas of conflict worldwide by calling for an immediate ceasefire by all involved and the unconditional release of all Prisoners of War including hostages and the commencement of peace negotiations.*

The original motion was put.

**FOR:** Alderman Hickey and Councillor Kendall

**AGAINST:** Aldermen King and Slade

**ABSTAINED:** Aldermen Dunsby, Thomas, Cockshutt, Yaxley and Alderton

The motion was LOST

The foreshadowed motion became the motion.

**Motion:**

ALDERTON/KING

That Council:

1. That the Glenorchy City Council supports the Australian Government position on conflicts in Israel and Palestine, Ukraine and Russia, as well as all other areas of conflict worldwide by calling for an immediate ceasefire by all involved and the unconditional release of all Prisoners of War including hostages and the commencement of peace negotiations.

**Resolution:**

KING/HICKEY

That the matter be DEFERRED.

**FOR:** Aldermen Alderton, Slade, King, Hickey, Dunsby

**AGAINST:**

**ABSTAINED:**

The motion was CARRIED.



**Resolution:**

KING/KENDALL

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,  
Alderton, Councillor Kendall

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 5:19pm.

# CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Closed session commenced at 5:20pm.

---

## 16. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

---

### **Resolution:**

DUNSBY/COCKSHUTT

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Monday, 18 December 2023 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

**AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

Deputy Mayor Hickey and Alderman King left the meeting at 5:19pm and were absent for the Motion.

Deputy Mayor Hickey and Alderman King returned to the meeting at 5:21pm.

---

## 17. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

---

---

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

---

None.

### **Resolution:**

COCKSHUTT/ALDERTON

That the meeting be moved back into open Council.

The motion was put.

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

### **AGAINST:**

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 5.22pm.

Confirmed,

**CHAIR**