

COUNCIL AGENDA

TUESDAY, 13 JUNE 2017



GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL

* *The General Manager certifies that the reports contained in this Agenda have been written by qualified persons under Section 65 of the Local Government Act 1993.*

Hour: 3.00 p.m.

Present:

In attendance:

Leave of Absence:

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.	APOLOGIES	3
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	3
3.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	3
4.	PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION	3
5.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	3
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES).....	5
7.	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS.....	5
	COMMUNITY	6
8.	COMMUNITY GRANT PROCESSES	7

9.	DRAFT GLENORCHY PARKING STRATEGY – PUBLIC CONSULTATION	12
10.	ON-ROAD BICYCLE LANES ON MAIN ROAD (STAGE 2) FROM AUSTINS FERRY TO GRANTON	15
	ECONOMIC	23
11.	GLENORCHY TO HOBART PUBLIC TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT - IMPLEMENTATION	24
	ENVIRONMENT	29
12.	CHANGES TO PLANNING DELEGATIONS AND FREQUENCY OF GLENORCHY PLANNING AUTHORITY MEETINGS	30
	GOVERNANCE	37
13.	ADOPTION AND RESCISSION OF COUNCIL POLICIES	38
14.	LGAT TASWATER CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION	44
15.	CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - APRIL 2017	46
16.	ACTIONS LIST (OPEN COUNCIL MEETING): UPDATE REPORT.....	49
17.	NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE	51
	CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	52
18.	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	52
	GOVERNANCE	52
19.	2017 LGAT PRESIDENT ELECTION.....	52
20.	DISPOSAL OF A PORTION OF COUNCIL LAND AT 23 BOSCO DRIVE, GLENORCHY	52
21.	DISPOSAL OF A PORTION OF COUNCIL LAND AT VICTOR PLACE RESERVE, GLENORCHY	52
22.	ACTIONS LIST (CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING): UPDATE REPORT	53
23.	NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)	53

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 15 May 2017 be confirmed.
That the minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on 25 May 2017 be confirmed.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Mrs. Kaye Smith – 10 Constance Avenue, Glenorchy

In relation to the credit card expense of \$5,194.83 related for the General Manager's return travel to Western Australia to attend a meeting:

Who authorised the credit card expenditure?

The credit card expenditure was authorised by the General Manager. The authorisation to pay the outstanding balance on the relevant credit card was given by the Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel.

Why was it business class?

Please refer to the answer below in relation to Council's travel policy.

Why was this just for a return flight for one person, or were there also accommodation costs?

The \$5,194.83 expense was for the cost of the return airfare for the General Manager. Any accommodation costs related to the trip were incurred in different transactions.

Is there, or should there be, a policy regarding lower cost travel options?

Council has a Travel Policy that applies to travel by Council officers. The policy relevantly provides, in relation to airline travel, that:

“Staff should endeavour to book the cheapest airfare available”

Accordingly, there is a policy in place of the nature you are referring to.

It is understood that an exception to that policy was made in this case due the length of the trip and the fact that General Manager is a senior executive who was travelling as a representative of the organisation.

It is understood that the General Manager and the Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel are on leave:

Will any of their legal expenses be covered while they are on leave?

The legal expenses of the General Manager and Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel will be covered by Council’s Directors and Officers Liability Insurance Policy, provided the claims relate to legal issues arising whilst they are employed by Council and in connection with their role as Council employees.

Council is unable to comment on whether such expenses would be paid by Council in the event they are not covered by the policy, because such a decision would depend on the particular circumstances of the relevant claim.

How long are they expected to be on leave for?

This question relates to matters concerning the employment information of Council employees, and is protected under the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004*.

Council is therefore unable to provide any further information.

Mrs. Pam Harvey – 32 Katoomba Crescent, Rosetta

In interviews with the Board of Inquiry (BOI), I was assured that the information given was to be kept confidential. Were the personal details of the interviewees that were given to the BOI released in the report that was given to the interested parties?

In response to your question, a Council officer spoke with the Board of Inquiry Secretariat.

The Secretariat advised that it was normal for a Board of Inquiry to give an undertaking that the identity of witnesses be kept confidential, but in this instance, in order for the Board to meet its procedural fairness obligations, the Board disclosed details, where necessary, to affected persons.

Nevertheless, the Board Secretariat advised the Council officer that Mrs. Harvey’s identity has not been divulged in the Board’s Draft Findings and Recommendations document or in the attachments that were provided to the affected persons.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

COMMUNITY

8. COMMUNITY GRANT PROCESSES

Author: Acting Director, Community, Economic Development and Business (David Ronaldson)
 Acting Manager, Community and Customer Service (Akin Falaki)
 Community Development Co-ordinator (Jill Sleiters)

Qualified Person: Acting Director, Community, Economic Development and Business (David Ronaldson)

ECM File Reference: Glenorchy City Council Community Grants Program

Community Plan Reference:

Making Lives Better

We continue to be a safe, inclusive, active and vibrant community.

Leading Our Community

We are a progressive, positive community with strong council leadership, striving to make Our Community's Vision a reality.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Making Lives Better

- 1.2 Support our communities to pursue and achieve their goals.
- 1.2.1 Encourage and support our communities to express and achieve their aspirations.
- 1.2.2 Build relationships and networks that create opportunities for our communities.
- 4.2 Prioritise resources to achieve our communities' goals.
- 4.2.1 Deploy Council's resources effectively to deliver value.

Reporting Brief:

In August 2016 Council resolved to create a small, one-off, grants process to facilitate community based initiatives, based on the funding saved from discontinuing the Community Precinct Program. This report provides Council with a way to achieve this initiative.

Proposal in Detail:

At the 1 August 2016 meeting, Council made the following resolution:

1. That Council ends its formal relationship with the Community Precinct Consultation System.

2. That Council re-direct the money used to support the precincts to provide small, one-off, grants to facilitate community-based initiatives on merit.

A range of local governments across the state (and, indeed) nationally have a variety of Community Grant processes and funding programs in place. The following table provides a summary of some local Tasmanian funding programs:

Local Government	Title	Value (\$)	Purpose
Brighton	Small Grants	Up to \$1,000	Support local community initiatives.
	Larger Grants	Over \$1,000	Support local community initiatives.
	Contingency Funding		5% of the broader fund set aside for urgent assistance.
	Sporting Grants	Up to \$200	Under 18 to full time students to assist with representing the state / Country.
Clarence	Quick Response	Up to \$150	Travel to sporting event, conference, small activities.
	Community Support	Up to \$1,500	Biannual grants process to support activities that benefit Clarence municipality.
	Partnership	Up to \$15,000	Distributed for projects over 3 years on partnership.
Hobart	Community Grants	Up to \$500	To community groups to develop projects and events
	Events Grants	Up to and over \$20,000	Events in the municipal area to benefit the community. (\$310,000 is available annually).
	Creative Hobart Grants	Up to \$15,000	A variety of small medium and large programs for cultural and creative activities. (\$100,000 is available annually).
	Venue Support Grant	Up to \$1,000	In kind assistance to assist community groups to use Council owned venues for an events / activity.
Launceston	Individual / Team / Group Grants	Up to \$300	For young people under 18 to represent North Tas, Tasmania, Aust in sport, academic or cultural activities.

Local Government	Title	Value (\$)	Purpose
	Organisations Program	Up to \$5,000	Community Events held in the municipality – one off.
	Events Sponsorship Program	Up to \$40,000	A range of small to large event sponsorship opportunities.
West Tamar	Community Grants	Up to \$5,000	Initiatives that respond to social, cultural, recreational, economic & environmental needs.
	Small Project Grants	Up to \$1,000	A range of outcomes and objectives for this program.
	Australia Day Grants	Up to \$2,000	To Community Groups to hold Aust Day events.

Additional detail of the above is provided in Attachment 1.

Further, Council current has a number of 'grant' processes that the community have access to as follows (all of which are facilitated by the Community Liaison Officer through the Community and Customer Service Department):

- Claremont College Bursary – One student from Montrose Bay High and Cosgrove High each receive \$250 per year for 2 years
- Mayor's Charitable Fund – Small donations available to assist charities and state sporting representatives. The yearly budget is \$5,000
- Eric Reece Scholarship – Available to a student residing in Glenorchy who is commencing a course relevant to local government and has an interest in working in local government. Courses may include engineering, earth sciences, environmental science, accounting etc. \$3,000 is awarded annually over the duration of their degree (3 – 4 years), and
- Glenorchy City Concert Brass Band – receive an annual donation of \$7,500 to support the activities of the Band.

Council would also be aware that Glenorchy has an independent community fund operating in the Municipality, The Glenorchy Community Fund (**GCF**). This independent organisation provides funding as follows:

- through the distribution of funding for only charitable purposes, to foster, benefit and strengthen the community of Glenorchy for present and future generations
- to assist in building a stronger, self-reliant and sustainable community
- to help not-for-profit organisations which work for the public benefit through the enrichment of community spirit and alleviation of social disadvantage, and

- to pay and apply its income and property to or for, and otherwise promote, the public charitable objects and purposes that the directors decide from time to time.

The GCF seeks to support projects which:

- address social disadvantage
- promote general health and wellbeing;
- strengthen community networks
- develop community pride and belonging, and /or
- build community capacity.

The GCF is overseen by seven volunteer board members drawn from the broader Glenorchy Community.

The GCF has been operating since 2010 and to 2017 has allocated \$50,000 in grants to the local community.

The discontinued Community Precinct Program had an annual budgetary amount of approximately \$4,000 that was allocated to a range community based activities initiated, run and support by the Community Precinct Committees.

An alliance with the Glenorchy Community Fund could be viewed as combining resources and energy to maximise the outcomes for Council's available budget in this community as this time. An annual allocation to the GCF and the ability to participate in the grant selection panel would be a positive and efficient use of budget and officer time.

Council already has a number of community focused grant processes in place as outlined above.

Options:

The following 3 options are presented to Council for consideration as to how to action its resolution from the Council meeting on 16 August 2016:

1. Council redirect funds previously used to support the Community Precinct Program to the Glenorchy Community Fund annually for distribution through their funding program.
2. Council make a budgetary saving and not contribute to the GCF.
3. Council revisit all current community grant processes with a view to combining all allocations into a Community Grants program with a dedicated officer to develop, advertise and administer as new funding program.

Consultations:

The following business sections have been consulted in the preparation of this report:

Arts and Culture
Community Planning and Inclusion
Community Development
Finance

Customer Service
Governance

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Research into Community Grant programs across other local government areas shows that those currently offering programs have a combination of significant funds to distribute to a community grants program and a dedicated resource to manage these processes.

Council has neither the significant funds nor a dedicated resource to manage a program of this variety. To attempt to create a program with these two items unaddressed presents a high level of risk to Council, the community and other programs that Council currently delivers.

The ongoing financial implication for this action will be an annual allocation of \$4,000 and a dedicated officer to participate in the grant recipient selection process, (nominally, the Manager Community and Customer Service or their delegate).

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

The Glenorchy Community Fund has been approached to investigate whether they would accept a proposal to make an annual allocation to the GCF from Council. Their response has been positive to this suggesting including an officer to participate in the grant selection process ([Attachment 2](#)).

Further, with the formal end of the precinct program in 2016, previous precinct members may see a positive for the previous program in seeing Council continuing to contribute directly to identified community outcomes.

If Council agrees to move forward with this proposal there is a positive public story to tell where Council is working with another Community Organisation to maximise the positive outcomes for the Glenorchy Community.

Recommendation:

That Council

1. APPROVE the redirection of the funds previously used to support the Community Precinct Program (\$4,000) to the Glenorchy Community Fund annually for distribution through their funding program for a period of three years
2. APPOINT an officer to the Glenorchy Community Fund allocations committee of the Glenorchy Community Fund to participate in the allocations process, and
3. REVIEW the allocation of funding to the Glenorchy Community Fund after two (2) years to determine the effectiveness of the contribution.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 [Summary of Grant Programs in some Tasmanian Local Councils](#)
- 2 [Letter from Glenorchy Community Fund](#)

9. DRAFT GLENORCHY PARKING STRATEGY – PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Author: Transport Engineer (Amir Mousavi)
 Qualified Person: Acting Director, City Services and Infrastructure (Paul Garnsey)
 ECM File Reference: Parking Working Group

Community Plan Reference:

Making lives better

The city is well-connected by extensive and well-maintained walking and bike paths, public transport and road networks.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Valuing our environment

3.1.3 Manage the City's transport network to promote sustainability, accessibility, choice, safety and amenity.

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval to undertake public consultation for the *Draft Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017 - 2027*.

Proposal in Detail:

A notice of motion in relation to cash-in-lieu for car parking was discussed at the Council meeting of 10 June 2014. This followed a question raised at an earlier meeting of the Glenorchy Planning Authority about the revenue actually generated by the cash-in-lieu car parking policy and the potential for the policy to be a disincentive for commercial development.

At the June 2014 Council meeting, it was resolved that:

Council provides a report on current Car Parking Strategy in the City commercial precincts including:

- *The present parking strategy for the future of the city, and any proposed changes.*
- *Detail cash-in-lieu payments in commercial areas, Glenorchy precinct, Moonah and Claremont – including total fees collected and numbers of spaces-in-lieu by year since the year 2000.*
- *Any feedback received from developers.*
- *How application of this policy and fee levels relate to the Regional Planning Scheme.*

- *A schedule of fee rates for all southern councils.*

Subsequent to that Council resolution, detailed information in relation to the status of the cash-in-lieu policy for car parking and how the policy applies to development applications was provided to Aldermen at the Council workshop of 30 March 2015. Feedback from Aldermen suggested that the current car parking strategy should be reviewed, rather than reviewing the cash-in-lieu policy in isolation.

It should be noted that the current Car Parking Strategy for Glenorchy's commercial precincts, titled the '*Commercial Precinct Car Parking Plan*', was initially drafted under the guidance of a 'Parking Strategy Working Group' and was adopted by Council on 8 November 2010.

Following the 30 March 2015 Council workshop, a report was presented to Council recommending that the Parking Strategy Working Group be re-established, to review the car parking strategy. The suggested members of the working group were as follows:

- one (1) Alderman
- General Manager
- Transport Engineer
- Coordinator, Parking and Compliance
- Coordinator, Planning Services
- Development Engineer
- Manager, City Strategy and Economic Development
- Interested Business Community Stakeholders (e.g. Moonah Business Community and Moonah Glenorchy Business Association)

It was also recommended that the terms of reference associated with the working group be developed by the group members at the first meeting.

At the 9 June 2015 Council meeting, it was resolved that the Parking Strategy Working Group be re-established to review Council's car parking strategy and that Council call for nominations from Aldermen to fill one position on the Working Group. The working group's Terms of Reference were subsequently endorsed by Council at the meeting of 15 February 2016.

To date, the Parking Strategy Working Group has met on eleven occasions to discuss issues in relation to parking in Glenorchy and to develop a new strategy document.

The development of the strategy commenced with a review of relevant past documents and previous studies, which had a focus on parking related issues in Glenorchy. Subsequent to the review phase of the study process, the issues in relation to parking in Glenorchy were discussed and investigated through the Working Group meetings and categorised into five (5) different themes, being Parking Infrastructure, Parking Management, Parking Enforcement, Parking Finance and Parking Education. A draft strategy statement was then framed for each theme and a number of objectives and measures were considered to address the identified issues. Finally, a set of draft actions were developed to assist Council to achieve these objectives.

Attachment 1 is the *Draft Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027*, developed by the working group that is proposed to be released for public consultation. The public consultation is scheduled to be undertaken between 3 July and 28 July 2017, in accordance with the Community Engagement Plan (refer Attachment 2).

Following public consultation, the *Draft Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027* will be finalised based on the findings from the public consultation and will be put to Council for endorsement and adoption.

Consultations:

Commissioner

ELT

Parking Strategy Working Group members

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The twenty eight (28) actions identified throughout the draft strategy document require human resources and financial resources to varying degrees and these are described more fully within the document.

Subject to final endorsement of the completed strategy by Council, progress of the actions will be contingent on future budgetary commitments and will be implemented in order of priority and subject to staffing and funding availability. The actions will need to be funded through the normal budgetary process, with budget bids being prepared based on the actions and priorities as set out in the plan.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

A specific Community Engagement Plan has been developed for this project (Attachment 2). The general community and relevant authorities and bodies (such as adjoining Councils, Metro, State Government, Business communities and the like) will be invited to comment on the *Draft Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027* through an online survey. It is expected that public consultation will be undertaken between 3 July and 28 July 2017.

Recommendation:

That Council:

AUTHORISE Council officers to commence public consultation for the *Draft Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027*, to be conducted in accordance with the Community Engagement Plan.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Draft Glenorchy Parking Strategy 2017-2027
- 2  Community Engagement Plan for Draft Parking Strategy

10. ON-ROAD BICYCLE LANES ON MAIN ROAD (STAGE 2) FROM AUSTINS FERRY TO GRANTON

Author: Transport Engineer (Amir Mousavi)
Qualified Person: Acting Director, City Services and Infrastructure (Paul Garnsey)
ECM File Reference: Safer Roads - Vulnerable Road Users

Community Plan Reference:

Making lives better

The city is well-connected by extensive and well-maintained walking and bike paths, public transport and road networks.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Making Lives Better

1.3.1 Identify the service expectations of our different communities and respond appropriately.

Valuing our Environment

3.1.3 Deliver services that create sustainable and liveable built environments.

Leading our Community

4.3.1 Develop and manage collaborative relationships with other levels of Government.

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to inform Council on the status of this project and recommend that Council approve the implementation the Stage 2 of the on-road cycle lanes project on Main Road, from Austins Ferry to Granton

Proposal in Detail:

Background and Project History

The Intercity Cycleway between Hobart and Claremont commenced in 1992 and has been a resounding success.

Since it reached its current termination point at Bilton Street Claremont, Council has been inundated with requests to extend the path further north and to improve linkages from the surrounding suburbs so more of the community can enjoy this facility. In addition, the Department of State Growth (DSG, previously named the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources [DIER]) has a key strategy to improve options for sustainable transport and is interested in encouraging commuter and recreational cycling opportunities.

In 2012, the DSG agreed to provide funding for the design and documentation of cycling facilities from Bilton Street, Claremont to Main Road ending at Granton. The rationale for this project was to provide facilities for cyclists within the northern suburbs of Glenorchy, to improve options for sustainable transport as well as to encourage commuter and recreational cycling opportunities in a safe environment.

Subsequent to the approval of funding, Council developed the scope of the project in consultation with the DSG. The scope of the project was the extension of the existing Intercity Cycleway in the form of an off-road cycleway parallel to the existing railway track from Bilton Street to Main Road, Claremont, opposite Abbotsfield Road. On-road bike lanes, then, were considered on both sides of Main Road from Abbotsfield Road, Claremont to Black Snake Road, Granton. The premise for the on road bike lanes was that they would be provided within the existing road seal width. Where existing width is not available to provide the bike lanes, the lanes terminate, with provision of appropriate signage, and re-commence once the road width widens.

Following the finalisation of project's scope, Pitt & Sherry Consultants were selected to undertake the design and documentation of the project. To date, the design of the on-road segments and the off-road part of the project have been completed, Stage 1 of the on road bike lanes between Abbotsfield Road and St Virgil's school has been constructed under previous grant funding, and further grant funding has been allocated to complete Stage 2 of the on road bike lanes, between St Virgil's school and Black Snake Road, Granton.

It is Stage 2 of the on road bike lanes which is the subject of this report. It should be noted that the design of the on-road bike lanes along Main Road includes relocation of some of the existing pedestrian crossings, removal of some existing on-street parking and the installation of associated line-marking and signage. Copies of the plans for Stage 2 of the on road bike lanes are Attachment 1 to this report.

In terms of the detail of implementation of the project, a submission was made to the DSG's Safer Roads: Vulnerable Road Users funding program in May 2014 for funding for the on-road bicycle lanes. This annual funding program is focussed on projects which will improve safety for vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists.

Council received a response to the funding submission in August 2014, confirming that while funding could not be provided for the full \$400,000 cost of on-road bicycle lanes north of Abbotsfield Road, consideration would be given to funding a partial stage of the project. Council Officers then met with the DSG and on this basis the project was resubmitted successfully for funding of \$250,000 for Stage 1.

Stage 1 - Implementation

Prior to the implementation of Stage 1, Community Consultation was conducted based on the detailed plans for the project, as later submitted for the development application, (from 10 to 25 March 2015).

The results of the Community Consultation showed that while the “general public response” and the “Community Panel response” tended to be very positive, the “residents in the area” was less conclusive, (i.e. 55% in favour and 45% opposed to the proposal).

In addition, advice from Council’s Planning Section stated that under the *Glenorchy Planning Scheme 1992*, a planning permit application was required to be submitted due to the significant modification to the current public utility by the project proposal. Consequently, a Development Application was submitted to Council’s Planning Section in June 2015. A comprehensive report was provided in terms of the safe movement of vehicles, cycle and pedestrian traffic. Finally, with consideration of the recommendations from Council’s Planning Officers, a planning permit was granted for Stage 1 of the proposal, in August 2015.

Following the public consultation and the receipt of the planning permit, a report submitted to Council recommended that Stage 1 be implemented, as designed and approved at the Glenorchy Planning Authority meeting 10 August 2015. However, at the Council meeting of 31 August 2015, several residents argued against the proposal and following deliberations of Council, the recommendation was rejected.

Subsequent to the 31 August 2015 Council meeting, Cycling South presented the strategic plans and future projects associated with cycling within the Glenorchy municipality to the Council workshop of 14 September 2015. At the workshop, it was suggested that the previous Council report be revisited at the 28 September 2015 Council meeting, with consideration of the information provided by Cycling South at the workshop. The information provided by Cycling South included national observations that on-road cycle lanes do in fact provide a safe area for cyclists to ride and this is evidenced by several studies into pre and post installation ‘on-road’ bike lane projects.

Consequently, a second report was submitted to Council, again seeking approval for the implementation of Stage 1 of the project. At the 28 September 2015 Council meeting it was resolved that:

- a) *The revised report regarding on-road bicycle lanes Main Road Claremont to Austins Ferry be received and noted.*
- b) *Council approves the implementation of the on-road bicycle lanes on Main Road, between Abbotsfield Road and St Virgil’s School as designed and approved at the 10 August 2015 Glenorchy Planning Authority meeting.*
- c) *Council endorses this project as a fully funded project through the Department of State Growth Safer Roads: Vulnerable Road Users program, including construction by an external contractor and project management by an engineering consultant.*

Subsequent to the Council resolution, Pitt & Sherry Consultants were appointed to undertake public consultation, tender documentation, contract administration and project management, while Statewide Earthworks Company was selected to undertake the construction works through a tender process on 14 January 2016.

The installation of Stage 1 of the project was completed on 25 July 2016.

It should be noted that since the installation of the cycle lanes, Council has not received any complaints relating to the operation of the bike lanes, nor have there been any bike related crashes recorded on this section of road.

Stage 2 – Proposed Implementation

With the successful completion of Stage 1 of the project, another submission was made to the DSG's Safer Roads: Vulnerable Road Users funding program, in June 2016, for funding of Stage 2, being on-road bicycle lanes on Main Road between St Virgil's College and Granton.

Council received a positive response from the DSG in November 2016, confirming that \$200,000 funding would be provided for Stage 2.

It should be noted that since the development of Stage 1 of the project, the *Glenorchy Interim Planning Scheme 2015* has come into effect. Advice from Council's Planning Section is that a planning permit is not required for Stage 2 of the project.

Community Consultation for Stage 2

Community Consultation was conducted from 10 to 28 April 2017, based on detailed plans for the project. A survey (both electronic version using the "Survey Monkey" website and hard copy version) was developed.

The survey was available on GCC's website. An information package including a cover sheet, relevant plan and the survey were also distributed to committees. The information package was mailed out to residents fronting Main Road between St Virgil's College and the end of Main Road in Granton. In terms of advertising, an article was published in the April Gazette to announce the survey and a public notice was included in the Mercury with reference to the survey. Displays were held in Claremont Village Shopping Centre (manned on the 21 April) and in Council's foyer from 10 to 28 April. The survey was also circulated to Council's Community Panel as well as relevant organisations, such as emergency services, Metro, Cycling South and St Virgil's College.

Overall, 230 participants including 94 Community Panel members, 100 general community members and 36 residents in the area responded to the survey over the period of the consultation.

Based on the responses, Council's Community Inclusion group produced three (3) reports detailing responses received from:

- Community Panel members' ([Attachment 2](#))
- the general public ([Attachment 3](#)), and
- residents in the area with frontage to Main Road ([Attachment 4](#)).

A careful consideration of the responses shows that the feedback is more positive than negative, with generally in the order of 19% opposing and 81% in favour of the proposal.

It is interesting to note that while the “general public response” and the “Community Panel response” tended to be very positive, objection to the proposal by the “residents in the area” was slightly higher (64% in favour and 36% opposed to the proposal).

Many respondents also provided comments to the proposal. The following points were typical comments provided in opposition to the proposal:

- the road is too narrow in most parts to accommodate bicycle lanes
- it will increase the risk to cyclists (i.e. people opening doors into the cycle lanes)
- this would be waste of rate/tax payers money
- money should be spent on projects with higher priority, and
- most cyclists are not from this area and local residents should take precedence.

The following suggestions were also provided:

- the preferred option is to extend the cycleway along the existing railway corridor
- the money would be better spent on footpaths, and
- the road needs widening.

During the public consultation period, one letter was also received in opposition to the proposal. A summary of the points of objection from the community member is as follows:

- parked vehicles encroach on the bike lane as the space is too narrow
- cyclists ride outside their allotted lane. Sometimes up to three abreast, and
- motorists adopt the attitude that they own their allotted lane and aggressively assert their assumed right.

In addition, submissions were received from Metro and the DSG in relation to the proposal.

Both letters from Metro and the DSG indicated no objection to the concept of the cycle lanes. However, Metro emphasise that buses and bikes should be able to interact as they do on bike lanes in other areas. Metro also provided some precautionary comments as follows:

1. *“By way of information, there is a bus stop on Main Road northbound, before Hestercombe Road and at the rear of the property at 13 Sanctuary Road. This bus stop is not marked on your map.*
2. *It is noted that Main Road northbound has no kerbing north of house No 304 through to Hestercombe Road. We would seek verification that the road width is sufficient to accommodate the bike lane. The aforementioned bus stop in the gravel verge.*

3. *We further note the presence of a pedestrian refuge on Main Road, a short distance south of the Hestercombe Road intersection and in the vicinity of the bus stop. We would further seek verification that the available road width can accommodate the bike lane and that buses, general traffic and bikes will be able to safely interact."*

Traffic Engineering Comments on Consultation Results

In December 2009, Council adopted the Hobart Regional Arterial Bicycle Network Plan (**Bicycle Network Plan**), a copy of which is [Attachment 5](#).

The Bicycle Network Plan provides strategic direction in the development of an integrated cycling network and future bicycle infrastructure investment within the Hobart Region and identifies roads that are part of the arterial bicycle network to ensure future State and local road projects incorporate bicycle-friendly design. It is noted that an extension of the Intercity Cycleway in the form of on-road cycle lanes along Main Road, between Abbotsfield Road, Claremont and Granton is an identified route in the Bicycle Network Plan for upgraded cycling facilities.

Advice from Cycling South, which was the responsible organisation for the development of the Bicycle Network Plan, states that the proposed bike lanes aim to make the route more comfortable for people already riding it, as well as to make it more attractive use for new riders. Available data from phone GPS apps confirms that the route is already well-used for cycling, even before the on-road bike lanes were in place.

It was considered that while the Intercity Cycleway could be extended along the rail corridor to Abbotsfield Road to join the foreshore reserve area here, further extension of the cycleway along the rail corridor becomes more problematic in terms of higher construction costs, lack of space in the rail corridor and in being a less direct route for commuter cyclists, (as the rail corridor follows the Derwent shoreline, rather than the more direct Main Road alignment). Hence on-road bicycle lanes were designed on Main Road, north of Abbotsfield Road.

Clearly on-road bicycle lanes are significantly less costly to provide at approximately \$200 per metre, as compared to \$1,700 per metre for the Intercity Cycleway extension, albeit that on-road bicycle lanes do not provide the same high standard, separate facility for cyclists and pedestrians. However, bike lanes provide a level of separation from motor vehicles, and allow bike riders on Main Road to maintain priority at intersections.

It is noted that road safety for all road users has been considered during the design phase and the plan complies with the requirements of Australian Standards and Austroads guidelines relating to the design of cycling facilities. The detailed design has been approved by the DSG's Traffic Management Section.

This section of road is regularly used by cyclists as both a commuting and training route. It is considered that there are already a significant number of cyclists using the road. This project will provide improved facility for existing cyclists and will encourage new cyclists.

A review of crash records shows that there were two crashes involving a cyclist along Main Road between Abbotsfield Road and St Virgil's College (Stage 1) in the past five years prior to the construction of the cycle lanes. Both of these crashes occurred in 2013. No bike crashes have been reported in this area since the construction of Stage 1.

Consultations:

Department of State Growth
ELT

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The project will be fully funded through the DSG's Safer Roads: Vulnerable Road Users program, including construction by an external contractor. Furthermore, construction of the project may be project managed by an engineering consultant (also funded through the DSG grant) if Council does not have the resources internally to project-manage the project.

The DSG has previously been queried regarding responsibility for ongoing maintenance of the bicycle lane markings. It has been confirmed that the markings would be maintained by State Growth, however the standard of maintenance would be dependent on funding availability against competing priorities, as is the case for other road line marking maintained by State Growth within municipal areas.

Further discussions with representatives from the DSG have confirmed that the approved funding for this project will be withdrawn if the project does not progress. In the event that the project does not proceed, the allocated Grant funding will be returned to the DSG Safer Roads: Vulnerable Road Users program to be reallocated to other State-wide projects on a priority basis. Expenditure that has already occurred on this project will not be covered by the Grant if the project is withdrawn.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

A community engagement plan was developed for the project, including mail outs to adjacent residents and businesses and a display at Claremont Village Shopping Centre.

Results associated with the public consultation are discussed above under the '*Community Consultation*' heading.

Recommendation:

That Council:

- a) APPROVE the implementation of Stage 2 of the on-road bicycle lanes on Main Road, between St Virgil's College and the end of Main Road in Granton, and
- b) ENDORSE this project as a fully funded project through the Department of State Growth Safer Roads: Vulnerable Road Users program, including construction by an external contractor.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Main Road Cycle Lanes - Plan
- 2  Community Panel Responses Report
- 3  General Public Responses Report
- 4  Residents Responses Report
- 5  Hobart Regional Arterial Bicycle network Plan

ECONOMIC

11. GLENORCHY TO HOBART PUBLIC TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT - IMPLEMENTATION

Author: Acting Director, Community, Economic Development and Business (David Ronaldson)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Tony McMullen)

ECM File Reference: Glenorchy / Hobart Public Transit Corridor

Community Plan Reference:

Our Community's Vision:

Transport connections, including public transport, enable us to easily commute between suburbs and our CBD's and between Glenorchy and Greater Hobart.

Our Community's Goals:

Making Lives Better

Our city is easy to get around, with a range of transport choices available to visit family or friends or to access services. The city is well-connected by extensive and well-maintained walking and bike paths, public transport and road networks.

Valuing our Environment

We will work actively to revitalise our CBD areas – making them places that are distinctive, vibrant, walkable and well-connected. We will improve the amenity of our public spaces through public art and quality landscaping, promote walking and bike access and encourage high standard contemporary design for new buildings alongside creative reuse of our heritage buildings.

Our Community's Priorities

Creating a strong economy; creating more local jobs; encouraging investment; revitalising our CBD areas.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Glenorchy City Council Strategic Plan 2016-2025

Valuing Our Environment

- 3.1 Create a liveable and desirable City.
 - 3.1.1 Revitalise our CBD areas through infrastructure improvements.
 - 3.1.2 Enhance our parks and public spaces with public art and contemporary design.
 - 3.1.3 Manage the City's transport network and the associated infrastructure to promote sustainability, accessibility, choice, safety and amenity for all modes of transport.
 - 3.1.4 Deliver new and existing services to improve the City's liveability.

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an update on the actions endorsed by Council when it considered the outcomes of the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study (GHD 2016) on 20 February 2017.

The report also recommends matching Hobart City Council's \$20,000 contribution to jointly fund specialist assistance to progress the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Project.

Proposal in Detail:

Council has received two previous update reports on this project, on 25 January 2016 and 20 February 2017.

At its meeting on 20 February 2017, Council resolved as follows:

That Council:

- (a) *RECEIVE and NOTE the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study (GHD Oct 2016)*
- (b) *PROVIDE the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study Reports (GHD Oct 2016) to the State Government*
- (c) *ENGAGE with State Government in relation to process and opportunities for governance change to help drive urban renewal projects such as proposed with the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Project, and*
- (d) *CONSIDER the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study outcomes (GHD Oct 2016) as part of a future City Deal proposal.*

The previous report also outlined the intention of both Hobart City Council (HCC) and Glenorchy City Council to form a steering committee for the implementation of the project and to prepare a communications strategy.

The current Transit Corridor Steering Committee met on 16 March 2017 and discussed the formation of an ongoing steering committee, which is proposed to be chaired by the Lord Mayor of Hobart, to undertake the work required.

The current Steering Committee recommends that the steering committee be a continuation of the current committee comprised of the following members, but with the addition of the Lord Mayor of Hobart as Chair:

- HCC Alderman Thomas and Reynolds
- HCC General Manager (N.D. Heath)
- GCC Council representative(s)
- GCC Acting General Manager (T. McMullen)
- Infrastructure Tasmania representative (A. Garcia)

The current Steering Committee also recommends that both Hobart and Glenorchy Councils commission a suitably qualified consultant with specialist expertise in projects of this nature to assist in and provide advice in relation to project implementation. This would include advice and assistance in relation to:

- engagement with State and Federal Government in relation to process and opportunities for governance change to help drive urban renewal projects such as that proposed with the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Project
- identification of and discussions with key players in the field of urban renewal and transit oriented development
- identification of private equity interest in urban renewal and transit oriented development, and
- development of Council-owned land along the corridor

It is estimated that the cost of such a consultant would be in the order of \$40,000. It is proposed that each Council would contribute \$20,000. The role would initially be for a six to nine month period, and, if progress was being achieved, a further extension and/or funding from other sources would be sought to progress the project. HCC has already agreed to contribute \$20,000 subject to Glenorchy contributing the same amount.

Subject to Council's support for this proposal, a brief would be prepared for endorsement of the Steering Committee and expressions of interest called.

Conclusion

As noted in the previous report to Council, the GHD Report has concluded that the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor has the potential to play a role as a catalyst for urban renewal due to a number of intrinsic advantages including:

- the corridor is already in public ownership
- it provides an opportunity for diversifying public transport modes
- increased community resilience by reducing car dependency, and
- delivering social equity improvements.

Urban renewal along the corridor will depend on delivery of high-quality transit, and facilities associated with stations or stops, but the success of these areas is founded on:

- positive perceptions of quality of life
- walkability and pedestrian priority
- connectivity and wayfinding
- successful mixing of uses in higher density forms
- economic viability, and
- high frequency transit.

These elements are the building blocks of precinct place-making and successful transit oriented developments capitalise on the opportunities presented by each location and respond to local context.

Implementation will involve both local and state governments, infrastructure agencies and the private sector and without state government support and commitment, is unlikely to eventuate.

A Hobart to Glenorchy light rail project could be a key project within a City Deal proposal.

This next allocation of funding to seek advice and assistance for implementation of the next stage of the project is an important next step to identify critical pathways to drive urban renewal along the Glenorchy Hobart public transit corridor.

Consultations:

As previously outlined, a Joint Steering Committee was set up to oversee and co-ordinate the project. It included representation of two Aldermen from Glenorchy City Council (Deputy Mayor Quick and Alderman Branch-Allen) and two Aldermen from Hobart City Council (Aldermen Reynolds and Thomas). Steering Committee meetings were also attended by the General Managers of both Councils, the Manager Planning Policy and Heritage (HCC), who was project manager, the Acting Director Community, Economic Development and Business (GCC), Allan Garcia (Infrastructure Tasmania) and Leigh Carmichael (Creative Director at MONA).

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

At its meeting on 25 January 2016, Council resolved to commission a joint consultancy (the GHD Study) with HCC.

It is now clear that a further contribution is required to progress to the next stage of implementation of this project.

The next stage requires a specialist skillset – in order to network effectively at senior level, with a good understanding of the measures required to progress the development of and along the Glenorchy to Hobart former rail corridor.

The shared contribution sought towards this specialist consultancy is \$20,000.

As there is no funding allocation in the 2016/17 budget, approval of a budget variation to that budget is sought from Council to fund the initiative.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

The GHD Report has identified that the transit corridor project has the potential to act as a catalyst to support urban renewal and generate significant economic and social benefits for the community.

Council officers would work with HCC to co-ordinate communications around the next stage of the project.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. ENDORSE the recommendation of the Glenorchy to Hobart Transit Corridor Steering Committee, that the committee be comprised of the following members:
 - (a) Lord Mayor of Hobart (Chair)
 - (b) HCC Alderman Thomas and Reynolds
 - (c) HCC General Manager (N.D. Heath)
 - (d) GCC Council representative(s)
 - (e) GCC Acting General Manager (T. McMullen), and
 - (f) Infrastructure Tasmania representative (Allan Garcia).
2. AGREE to contribute \$20,000 to match the contribution provided by HCC to engage a suitably qualified consultant with specialist expertise in implementation of urban renewal and transit oriented development projects.
3. AGREE to a variation to the 2016/17 budget estimates to fund the shared contribution.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

ENVIRONMENT

12. CHANGES TO PLANNING DELEGATIONS AND FREQUENCY OF GLENORCHY PLANNING AUTHORITY MEETINGS

Author: Coordinator, Planning Services (Kylie Williams)
Qualified Person: Acting Director, City Services and Infrastructure (Paul Garnsey)
ECM File Reference: Glenorchy Planning Authority (Council Committee)

Community Plan Reference:

Building image and pride
Making lives better
Valuing our environment
Open for business
Leading our community

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Glenorchy City Council Strategic Plan 2016-25

Valuing our environment

- 3.1: Create a liveable and desirable City.
- 3.1.4: Deliver new and existing services to improve the City's liveability.

Leading our community

- 4.2: Prioritise resources to achieve our communities' goals.
- 4.2.1: Deploy the Council's resources effectively to deliver value.

Glenorchy City Council Annual Plan 2016-17 to 2019-20

- 2.1.1.02: Progress the Interim Planning Scheme to a Single State-wide Planning Scheme.
- 3.1.4.07: Plan for the sustainable development of the City, ensuring compliance with the planning scheme and community involvement in the planning process.

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council amends the delegations given to senior planning positions under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, in order to facilitate a change in the frequency of meetings of the Glenorchy Planning Authority from once every fortnight to once every four weeks.

Proposal in Detail:

Background

Since at least 1998 meetings of the Glenorchy Planning Authority (**GPA**) meetings (formerly the Land Use Planning Committee) have occurred fortnightly.

Until early 2012, GPA meetings were conducted after-hours and sometimes ran until 10:00 or 11:00 pm. Fortunately this practice was seen as unsustainable, and the meeting time was changed to 3:00 pm in the afternoon from 23 January 2012.

Additionally, until approximately five (5) years ago the production of the agenda, minutes and associated correspondence for GPA meetings was undertaken by Council's Planning section, which placed a heavy administrative burden on some staff

The Glenorchy Interim Planning Scheme (**GIPS**) has been in operation since 1 July 2015. The Planning Services Section are now in a position to understand how the provisions of this Scheme have affected decision making at Council, and, in particular, how adequately the current delegations to planning officers deal with commonly applied provisions in applications.

With the benefit of that knowledge, officers are of the view that there are efficiencies to be gained by changing the frequency of GPA meetings from fortnightly to monthly, to reduce the administrative and time burden on Council staff and Aldermen (or the Commissioner). In order to facilitate monthly GPA meetings, it will be necessary to increase the scope of the power to determine applications for discretionary permits that Council has delegated to Senior Planning Staff under section 57(2) and (6) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA)*.

In considering whether such a change is appropriate, it is necessary to balance the efficiency gain against the need to maintain an adequate level of public and community participation in the decision making process.

From previous experience, the Planning Services Section understand the potential advantages and disadvantages from any changed approach to increased delegation to officers and less frequent GPA meetings.

Potential Advantages

Efficiencies will be achieved across the Planning Services section, including:

- increased time for Officers to process additional applications between GPA meetings
- improved time frames for assessment of all applications, and
- increased time for administrative staff for the preparation of permits and correspondence associated with all applications and permits.

Potential Disadvantages

- there may be more appeals to the Resource Management and Planning Appeals Tribunal if decisions for applications for which representations have been received are delegated to Officers instead of the GPA, and

- there may be a perceived reduction in community participation, resulting in more complaints to Senior Management.

Planning Decision Making of Other Councils

The following table outlines the procedures for planning decision making (e.g. to a delegated Council Committee or Council) for the six Councils in the greater Hobart region, including Glenorchy. Further comments are provided below.

Local Government	Committee/Council	Meeting Frequency	Other Meetings	Comments
Glenorchy	GPA	Fortnightly		Full Delegation
Hobart	City Planning and Full Council *	Fortnightly and monthly respectively		
Clarence	Full Council	Every 3 weeks	Special Planning Meetings *	
Brighton	Planning Committee	Monthly		Full Delegation
Kingborough	Planning Authority (forms part of Council meeting)	Fortnightly		Open session of Council meeting adjourned for PA and resumed at end of PA.
Sorell	Development Assessment Special Committee	Weekly as required*		Full Delegation

**see further comments below.*

Hobart City Council

Hobart's City Planning Committee meets fortnightly, and is the only Committee within Council to do so. All the others typically meet monthly.

In the main, the Committee acts as a conduit to full Council, having very limited delegated authority to determine applications independently. The only delegation the Committee currently has is to approve (not refuse) applications where:

- exactly three objections have been received to the application
- the proposed building doesn't exceed 2000m² in floor area or three (3) storeys in height
- in the case of a proposed subdivision, no more than one additional lot would be created
- council is not the applicant and does not own the subject site
- council is not being requested to make or take a financial contribution in relation to the development, or

- they support the officer recommendation.

The Committee also has the delegation to determine applications that would normally be delegated to full Council, but where Council is unlikely to achieve a quorum at their meeting, and where the applicant has declined to provide an extension of time to allow the application to be considered at the next Council meeting.

The Committee is also normally delegated power over each Christmas period to determine applications that would normally go to Council.

The other thing that sets the City Planning Committee apart from full Council is that applicants and representors are able to make a five (5) minute deputation to the Committee to present their views about the proposal to the Aldermen at that meeting.

Clarence City Council

‘Special Planning meetings’ can be held by Council for any development applications with a value greater than \$10 million.

Sorell Council

In practice, this committee is only required to meet infrequently as delegations to Officers are quite generally stated and are extensive.

As the table shows, the approach is varied and so is of little guide to demonstrate consistency with other areas.

Instead, as the current practice at Glenorchy is difficult to sustain a preferred approach is to analyse the types of applications being considered in this forum and whether matters that are simple and supported by technical assessment, can be dealt with under delegated authority.

Recent applications considered by GPA

In the period 16 January to 24 April 2017 the GPA considered a total of 20 applications which were unable to be decided by Council officers because it was not within the scope of officers’ delegated powers. The following is a summary of the reasons why the decisions were referred to the GPA:

- two (2) proposals involved representations from the public
- one (1) proposal involved a representation and a car parking variation
- one (1) proposal involved variation to car parking and a new commercial development
- nine (9) proposals involved variations to the car parking standards of the GIPS
- three (3) proposals were for multiple dwellings (two or more dwellings)
- one (1) proposal was for visitor accommodation
- one (1) proposal for miscellaneous use (carpark for racecourse), and
- two (2) proposals were recommended for refusal.

Attachment 1 to this report is a table providing particulars of those applications. The above shows that the most common reason that matters were referred to the GPA relate to representations being received, car parking variations and proposals for multiple dwelling units (or a combination of these things).

Recommended changes to Senior Planning Staff Delegations

As noted above, the delegations given to Council's three Senior Planning positions under LUPAA will need to be amended to deal the types of applications that are identified above.

The proposed changes to the delegations, as well as Council's Planning Section's comments on each change, are summarised in the table which forms Attachment 2 to this report.

It is recommended that Council approves the proposed changes to the delegations in the form outlined in Attachment 2.

Attachment 3 to this report is a Schedule setting out the estimated value of developments approved in Industrial and Commercial zones. The information in that table is relevant to Council's decision in relation to the recommended changes to the delegations in respect of development in those zones.

Council should note that it is not proposed to change the delegations to planning officers where any representations about a proposed development have been received from members of the public.

Past experience has shown that Glenorchy City Council has a low number of Planning Appeals. This is due mainly to the fact that the determination of these matters is done in an open and transparent manner at GPA meetings, and applicants and representors are invited to the meeting (where discussion is quite free). Our experience is that the opportunity to be heard, to ask questions of officers and to be involved in the decision making process reduces the incidence of appeal.

Statutory Considerations

Section 6(3) of LUPAA, provides that Council may, by resolution, delegate any of its functions or powers under LUPAA (other than the power of delegation) to a person employed by Council.

Accordingly, Council has the power to delegate its powers under LUPAA directly to Senior Planning Staff.

Conclusion

It is considered that it is appropriate to amend the delegations of the senior planning positions in order to achieve increased efficiency in the processing of all planning applications.

A balanced approach is recommended that increases powers of delegation for officers to address limited technical matters, but Council retains the exclusive power to consider planning decisions that require consideration of representations from the public.

Council should also note that in the event that it is necessary for the GPA to urgently consider a matter for which officers do not hold the delegated power, a Special meeting of the GPA is able to be called.

Consultations:

Commissioner Smith
Acting Director, City Services and Infrastructure
Acting Manager, Environment and Development
Manager, Legal and Property
Acting Manager, Governance and Risk

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

None

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Advertising of all required applications will continue to be undertaken in accordance with the statutory requirements of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

Any proposal where a representation in relation to the development is received will continue to be referred to the GPA for a decision (unless timeframes do not permit and officers are required to exercise their emergency delegation powers).

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. APPROVE the changes to the relevant delegations of functions and powers under section 57(2) and (6) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1998* given to the positions of Coordinator, Planning Services, Senior Statutory Planner and Strategic Planner that are identified in Column 5 of the Schedule forming Attachment 1 to this report, being the following:

Provision	Function or Power	Changed Conditions or Restrictions
LUPAA s. 57(2) & (6)	To determine applications for discretionary permits	Only in the following circumstances: Where an application for a permit is made pursuant to the <i>Glenorchy Interim Planning Scheme 2015</i> and for which no representations are received and regardless of whether formal comments have been provided by the Regulated Entity pursuant to Section 56Q of the <i>Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008</i>, for the following uses and developments: <u>Multiple Dwellings</u> Multiple dwellings to maximum of four dwellings in the General Residential and Inner Residential zones. <u>Car parking Standards</u> New development or Change of use and/or extension of existing buildings where the estimated cost of development does not exceed \$500,000 except where the development is an existing non-conforming use and/or the applicant is disputing a requirement for the provision of cash in lieu of car parking. <u>Development of Commercial/Industrial Buildings</u> New development or Change of use and/or extension of existing buildings where the estimated cost of development does not exceed \$500,000 except where the development is an existing non-conforming use and/or the applicant is disputing a requirement for the provision of cash in lieu of car parking.

2. NOTE, for the avoidance of any doubt, that the changes to the delegations as a result of the resolution in paragraph 1 do not in any way affect any other delegations currently given to the positions of Coordinator, Planning Services, Senior Statutory Planner and Strategic Planner under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1998* or any other Act, and
3. APPROVE changes to the frequency of meetings of the Glenorchy Planning Authority from once every fortnight to once every four weeks, effective from 3 July 2017.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Table: Reasons for Referral of Applications to GPA
- 2  Schedule: Proposed Changes to Planning Section Delegations
- 3  Table: Estimated Value of Development in Industrial and Commercial Zones

GOVERNANCE

13. ADOPTION AND RESCISSION OF COUNCIL POLICIES

Author: Acting Manager, Governance and Risk (Bryn Hannan)

Qualified Person: Acting Director, Corporate Governance (Simon Scott)

ECM File Reference: Council Policy

Community Plan Reference:

Under the City of Glenorchy Community Plan 2015 – 2040, the Community has prioritised ‘transparent and accountable government’.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community

4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to:

- recommend that Council adopts three (3) new policies and one (1) updated policy, and rescinds three (3) policies, in accordance with Council’s ongoing policy review process, and
- provide Council with an update on the progress of Council’s ongoing policy review process.

Proposal in Detail:

This Report is presented as part of the process of review of all Council policies, which has been an ongoing project since 25 May 2015.

Since the last Council meeting, Council has prepared three (3) new policies, updated one (1) policy and identified three (3) policies that are recommended for rescission.

This report provides an overview of the reasons for seeking the adoption or rescission of each of those policies. It also provides Council with an update on the progress of the ongoing policy review process which is nearing completion.

NEW POLICIES

Bushfire Mitigation Policy

Attachment 1 is a copy of the proposed ‘Bushfire Mitigation’ policy, which has been prepared by Council’s Coordinator, Bushfire Management.

This policy has been developed to delineate Councils perceived bushfire risks to human settlements and loss of life against the actual high risks that Council is responsible for managing.

It is reflective of Councils increased commitment to actively and adaptively mitigate bushfire risks to Glenorchy and the Greater Hobart area.

Its recommended adoption follows a presentation given by the Coordinator, Bushfire Management and the Tasmanian Fire Service to the Commissioner and Management on 24 May 2017.

The policy provides direction for Council to prescribe mitigation treatments for low probability but high impact bushfire events impacting the Greater Hobart community. It also emphasises the critical role that Council plays in bushfire mitigation.

The Bushfire Mitigation policy has five (5) key objectives:

1. mitigating the impact to human settlements and loss of life deriving from bushfire
2. continuously improving bushfire risk mitigation treatments
3. delivering a tenure-blind, integrated approach to mitigating bushfire risk
4. promoting a 'no-blame, lessons learnt' approach to planned burning, and
5. complying with legislative requirements.

The adoption of the policy will demonstrate Council's commitment to mitigating the risks associated with bushfire in the municipality and Greater Hobart region, and will instil confidence in external stakeholders that Council is increasing its previously limited level of involvement in bushfire mitigation.

Asset Management Policy

Attachment 2 is a copy of the proposed 'Asset Management' policy.

The policy has been prepared in accordance with section 70C of the *Local Government Act 1993*, which requires that Councils must prepare an asset policy for their municipal area. The policy outlines the following (as required by the legislation):

- Council's goals and objectives for asset management to facilitate delivery of services
- the principles, requirements and other matters relating to the management of relevant assets, and
- the assignment of responsibility for service delivery and the management of relevant assets.

The Policy sets out the principles by which the council intends applying asset management to achieve its organisational objectives. It has developed based on Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia's 'NAMS.PLUS' Asset Management approach. This is an initiative designed to assist councils and other organisations which provide services from infrastructure to develop a 'core' asset management plan and implement sustainable asset management practices. The approach has been adopted throughout Australia and is driving improvement and consistency in local government asset management processes within councils nationally.

The policy will replace Council's existing 'Infrastructure Assets Policy' which is recommended for rescission (see below).

Environmental Health Services Pro-rata and Refund Policy

Attachment 3 is a copy of the proposed 'Environmental Health Services Pro-rata and Refunds' policy.

Council's Environmental Health section is responsible for approving various licences, registrations, permits and approvals. These approvals usually require annual renewal and attract a Council fee. As businesses close or proprietors leave, requests are often made for refunds.

This policy provides direction on Council's pro-rata and refund provisions for the early cancellation of all Environmental Health Services licences, registrations and permits.

UPDATED POLICY

Subdivisions - Public Open Space Acquisitions and Contributions Policy

Attachment 4 is a copy of the proposed updated 'Subdivisions - Public Open Space Acquisitions and Contributions' policy.

Attachment 5 is the existing version of the policy, which is being updated.

The *Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1993* empowers Council to acquire public open space as a part of any subdivision proposal, to require cash in lieu of open space, or to refuse a subdivision application because it should include or omit public open space.

The policy provides a clear rationale for decisions, based on objectives and principles regarding the provision of well-designed and located open space in new subdivisions, as well as a consistent approach to requiring cash in lieu of open space.

The policy has been updated to ensure that it complies with current regulatory requirements. It has also been updated to:

- improve drafting, clarify ambiguities, ensure consistency with Council's other updated policies, remove superfluous provisions, and update references to legislation and other Council policies, and
- place the policy on Council's current policy template.

RESCINDED POLICIES

Infrastructure Assets Policy

Attachment 6 is a copy of Council's existing 'Infrastructure Assets Policy' (No. 36-2) which is recommended for rescission.

The policy was last reviewed in March 2006. Its subject matter is now addressed by Council's proposed 'Asset Management' policy which is recommended for adoption in this report, meaning that it will become superfluous upon the adoption of that policy. The policy is being rescinded rather than updated, because it is in a materially different form to the Asset Management Policy which replaces it.

Corporate and Heritage Collections Management Policy

Attachment 7 is a copy of Council's existing Corporate and Heritage Collections Management Policy (No. 22-4) which is recommended for rescission.

The policy sets out detailed procedures for the management of Council's collection of art, photographs, ephemera, artefacts and other cultural items that record the City's and Council's heritage. However, the policy was last reviewed in 2009, and internal procedures for the management of the collections have evolved such that the collections are no longer managed as the policy contemplates.

In-line with Council's objective of reducing the number of policies by removing superfluous and/or outdated policies, Council has determined that the management of the collection is better managed by Officers from various departments within Council on a case-by-case basis.

Grievance Policy

Attachment 8 is a copy of Council's current 'Grievance Policy'.

The Grievance Policy was approved by Council in 2015 after extensive internal consultation. However, Council's new Human Resources Framework provides for all internal directives, forms, procedures and the commitment statement will be made under the single, overarching 'Human Resources' policy. The Human Resources Policy was adopted by Council at its meeting on 20 March 2017.

However, the Grievance Policy will be replaced with an internal 'Grievance Directive' to be approved by the General Manager in consultation with the Manager, People and Safety. For Council's reference, a copy of the draft Grievance Directive is Attachment 9 to this Report.

UPDATE ON ONGOING COUNCIL POLICY REVIEW

Since the review of Council's policies commenced in May 2015:

- 88 policies have been reviewed
- 20 policies are still be reviewed
- 2 policies will be rescinded at a future date
- 54 policies have been rescinded (this is not shown in the attached register).

The above figures do not take into account the policies that are recommended for adoption and rescission in this report.

Attachment 9 is a copy of Council's current Master Policy Register, updated as at 7 June 2017. Management has been directed that all outstanding policies are to be reviewed and either updated or rescinded by the end of 2017.

Consultations:

Director, City Services and Infrastructure
Manager, People and Safety
Manager, Infrastructure Engineering and Design
Acting Manager, Governance and Risk

Acting Manager, Environment and Development
Asset Management Coordinator

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

There are no material human resource or financial risk implications.

In terms of risk management, please refer to the following:

Risk Identification	Consequence	Probability	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
If the identified policies are not adopted and rescinded as recommended, governance control effectiveness is less optimal due to the presence of superfluous or redundant policies leading to confusion and ambiguity.	Minor	Almost Certain	Medium	Council adopts the updated policies and rescinds the superfluous policies, as recommended.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. ADOPT the 'Bushfire Mitigation' policy in the form of Attachment 1
2. ADOPT the 'Asset Management' policy in the form of Attachment 2
3. ADOPT the 'Environmental Health Services Pro-rata and Refunds' policy in the form of Attachment 3
4. ADOPT the updated 'Subdivisions - Public Open Space Acquisitions and Contributions' policy in the form of Attachment 4
5. RESCIND the 'Infrastructure Assets Policy' (No. 36-2) in the form of Attachment 6
6. RESCIND the 'Corporate and Heritage Collections Management Policy' (No. 22-4) policy in the form of Attachment 7
7. RESCIND the 'Grievance Policy' in the form of Attachment 8, and note that the policy will be replaced with a Grievance Directive in the form of Attachment 9.
8. NOTE the progress of Council's ongoing policy review process.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 [Bushfire Mitigation Policy - Draft](#)
- 2 [Asset Management Policy - Draft](#)
- 3 [Environmental Health Services Pro-rata and Refund Policy - Draft](#)
- 4 [Subdivisions - Public Open Space Acquisitions and Contributions Policy - Draft](#)
- 5 [Public Open Space Acquisitions and Contributions Policy - Current](#)
- 6 [Infrastructure Assets Policy - Rescind](#)
- 7 [Corporate and Heritage Collections Management Policy - Rescind](#)
- 8 [Grievance Policy - Rescind](#)
- 9 [Grievance Directive](#)

14. LGAT TASWATER CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION

Author: Acting General Manager (Tony McMullen)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Tony McMullen)

ECM File Reference: LGAT

Community Plan Reference:

Our Community's Goals

The communities of Glenorchy will be confident that Council manages the community's assets for the long term benefit of the community.

Our Community's Priorities

Investment in infrastructure to achieve Our Community's Vision

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community.

4.1.2 Manage the City's assets soundly for the long term benefit of the community.

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's decision about making a financial contribution to the LGAT campaign on behalf of member owner councils against the forced takeover of TasWater by the State Government.

Proposal in Detail:

The President of the Local Government Association of Tasmania (**LGAT**), Mayor Doug Chipman, wrote to Council on 25 March 2017 inviting Council to make a contribution to a campaign authorised by TasWater's owner councils against the proposed forced takeover of TasWater by the State Government. A copy of Mayor Chipman's letter is Attachment 1.

LGAT has invited councils to contribute to its campaign the equivalent of at least 1% of their annual TasWater distribution.

LGAT has asked for formal advice from Council of its decision about a contribution so that it can plan its campaign.

Consultations:

TasWater owner councils met in Launceston on 11 May 2017 to receive a briefing from TasWater and to formulate a position on the proposed State Government forced takeover of TasWater.

A large majority of the local government sector, including Glenorchy City Council, resolved at that meeting:

“That Members confirm there is no water and sewerage crisis, reject the proposed State Government ownership of TasWater and, through LGAT, urge the State Government to work co-operatively with LGAT, Councils and TasWater on the optimal water and sewerage infrastructure upgrade program to achieve the best outcome for Councils and Consumers.”

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The requested contribution to the LGAT campaign based on 1% of the TasWater distribution in the 2016/17 Council budget would be \$20,525.

This amount does not form part of Council’s 2016/17 budget estimates and a Council decision would be required to support the additional expenditure.

As with past LGAT campaigns, any excess funds would be returned pro-rata to Council at the conclusion of the campaign.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

It is anticipated that any LGAT campaign against the forced takeover of TasWater by the State Government would seek to present the facts surrounding the proposal to the Tasmanian community.

Recommendation:

That Council:

- (a) APPROVE the contribution of \$20,525 to the LGAT campaign on behalf of TasWater owner councils against the forced takeover of TasWater by the State Government
- (b) RESOLVE under section 82(4) of the *Local Government Act 1993* to vary the 2016-17 budget estimates to support the additional, unbudgeted expenditure of \$20,525, and
- (c) AUTHORISE the Acting General Manager to formally advise LGAT of Council’s decision.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Letter from LGAT President

15. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - APRIL 2017

Author: Reporting Officer (Len Newton)
Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Tony McMullen)
ECM File Reference: Traffic Lights

Community Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

The Communities of Glenorchy will be confident that Council manages the Community's assets soundly for the long term benefit of the Community.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

- 4.1 Govern in an open and responsible manner in the best interests of the community
- 4.1.2 Ensure Council is open and transparent in its communication and dealings with our communities
- 4.2 Manage our resources to achieve community outcomes
- 4.2.1 Deploy the Council's resources in a way that maximises the effectiveness of the organisation and delivers value for money.

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to present Council's Corporate Performance Indicators as at the end of April 2017.

Proposal in Detail:

The Corporate Performance Indicators (**CPIs**) for April 2017 are Attachment 1 to this report. Appendix B to the CPIs is Attachment 2.

Appendix B outlines expected year-to-date variances within the various Capital Works programs for this financial year.

Please note the CPIs incorporate the 2015-2016 Budget Carry-Forwards, as approved at the August 2016 Council Meeting.

Monthly Results

For April 2017 the Council recorded:

- two (2) red lights, and
- six (6) yellow lights

The remainder are green lights.

Details of the red and yellow lights are recorded in the following table.

Light Colour	Item	Page	Comments
●	Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate (LTIFR)	29	There were zero (0) LTI's for April. The rolling 12 month LTIFR is 27.36, which is marginally lower than for the same time last year (which was 31.39). Safety remains a priority for the organisation and all incidents are reviewed to ensure policies and practices are refined to avoid future incidents.
●	Capital Expenditure – Property	18	The capital program for 2016/17 remains significantly under budget. Various delays on key projects have been identified which more than offset the overspending on the KGV project which is approaching completion. Estimates for carry forward funding on projects delayed are now approximately \$1.5M.
●	Capital Expenditure – Stormwater	19	The capital program for 2016/17 started slowly and remains under budget. Forecasts suggest that the program will be completed for the full year. For that to eventuate, spending will need to continue at its recent (higher) rate.
●	Capital Expenditure – Other	19	The capital program for 2016/17 started slowly and although the year to date position is consistent with budget, forecasts suggest that the budget will not be achieved. Estimates for carry forward funding on projects delayed are now approximately \$0.6M.
●	Accounts Receivable	22	Overdue debtors are above target due primarily to Derwent Park Reuse Scheme Contractor \$1,597k
●	Salaries and Wages including on-costs – Capital Projects	24	Some capital works that were budgeted to be completed internally are now being provided by external contractors, whilst some other works have been delayed.
●	Other Employment Costs – Operational	25	Relief and Casuals and Overtime are above budget and being used to service positions that are currently vacant.
●	Permanent Staff Turnover Rate	25	The turnover rate remains high due to the large number of terminations in recent months.

● = Red Light: Immediate action required

● = Yellow Light: Monitoring and/or investigation required

Consultations:

Capital and Operational Expenditure Program Leaders
Relevant Staff

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

As outlined in the Corporate Performance Indicators reports.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

No public relations implications are known at this point, and no community consultation has been undertaken.

Recommendation:

That Council:

ACCEPT the information provided by the Corporate Performance Indicators for April 2017.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 [Attachment - Report Indicators - April 2017](#)
- 2 [Appendix B - April 2017](#)

16. ACTIONS LIST (OPEN COUNCIL MEETING): UPDATE REPORT

Author: Acting Manager, Governance and Risk (Bryn Hannan)

Qualified Person: Acting Director, Corporate Governance (Simon Scott)

ECM File Reference: Actions List - Council Meetings

Community Plan Reference:

Under the City of Glenorchy Community Plan 2015 – 2040, the Community has prioritised ‘transparent and accountable government’.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:Leading our Community

- 4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community
 - 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency
- 4.2 Prioritise resources to achieve our communities’ goals
 - 4.2.1 Deploy Council’s resources effectively to deliver value

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the Actions List (Open Council Meeting), updated following the Council meeting on 15 May 2017.

Proposal in Detail:

Key actions arising out of Council resolutions and/or throughout the general business of Council meetings are captured and distributed throughout Council for completion and update by departmental staff on a monthly basis.

The Actions List (Open Council Meeting), which is Attachment 1 to this report, highlights the progress of the items on the list following the 15 May 2017 Council meeting.

In accordance with the Commissioner’s request at the Council meeting on 15 May 2017, the list has been reviewed with a view to reducing the total number of items. As a result of that review, thirteen (13) items have been removed from the list. The items removed were removed because they were either:

- complete
- being addressed on an ongoing basis but do not have a clear end point
- items for which the resolution made by Council has been addressed despite the relevant work being ongoing, and
- incidental matters that are not the subject of a resolution or which have no reasonable prospect of being actioned during the period of the Aldermens’ suspension (or are not necessary to action during the suspension).

Consultations:

Relevant Council officers

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

None.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

None.

Recommendation:

That Council:

NOTE the progress of the items on the Actions List (Open Council Meeting), as updated following the 15 May 2017 Council meeting.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Action List - Open Council Meeting

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

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

18. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

GOVERNANCE

19. 2017 LGAT PRESIDENT ELECTION

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

20. DISPOSAL OF A PORTION OF COUNCIL LAND AT 23 BOSCO DRIVE, GLENORCHY

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

21. DISPOSAL OF A PORTION OF COUNCIL LAND AT VICTOR PLACE RESERVE, GLENORCHY

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

22. ACTIONS LIST (CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING): UPDATE REPORT

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

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