

# **COUNCIL AGENDA**

## **TUESDAY, 15 MARCH 2016**



### **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:**

**Workshops held since last Council Meeting**

**Date:** Monday, 29 February 2016

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Major Strategic and Operational Projects Update to Council by General Manager

**Date:** Monday, 7 March 2016

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Demonstration of Audio Recording Equipment
- Presentation of CBD Traffic Study

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS:**

|           |                                                                   |          |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>APOLOGIES .....</b>                                            | <b>4</b> |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES .....</b>                              | <b>4</b> |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR .....</b>                           | <b>4</b> |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION .....</b>                      | <b>4</b> |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....</b> | <b>4</b> |

|                          |                                                                                 |           |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 6.                       | PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES).....                                          | 4         |
| 7.                       | PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS .....                                                     | 4         |
| <b>COMMUNITY .....</b>   |                                                                                 | <b>5</b>  |
| 8.                       | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR.....                                                 | 6         |
| 9.                       | INTERCITY CYCLEWAY PROPOSED CHICANE GATE CHANGES AT<br>ROAD INTERSECTIONS ..... | 10        |
| <b>ENVIRONMENT .....</b> |                                                                                 | <b>17</b> |
| 10.                      | TRAFFIC CONGESTION SUMMIT .....                                                 | 18        |
| <b>GOVERNANCE .....</b>  |                                                                                 | <b>21</b> |
| 11.                      | FEASIBILITY STUDY INTO LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM.....                             | 22        |
| 12.                      | CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - JANUARY 2016 .....                           | 26        |
| 13.                      | COUNCIL POLICIES .....                                                          | 28        |
| 14.                      | ACTIONS LIST - UPDATE REPORT .....                                              | 30        |
| 15.                      | NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT<br>NOTICE .....              | 31        |
| 16.1                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                                    | 31        |
| 16.2                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                                    | 32        |
| 16.3                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                                  | 33        |
| 16.4                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                                  | 34        |
| 16.5                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                                | 36        |
| 16.6                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                                  | 37        |
| 16.7                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                                    | 39        |
| 16.8                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                                    | 40        |
| 16.9                     | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                                | 41        |
| 16.10                    | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                                | 42        |
| 16.11                    | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                                    | 43        |
| 16.12                    | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                                    | 44        |
| 16.13                    | QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                                  | 45        |

|                                                                                 |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC .....</b>                                    | <b>46</b> |
| 17. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....                                      | 46        |
| <b>GOVERNANCE .....</b>                                                         | <b>46</b> |
| 18. CONFIRMED MINUTES OF AUDIT PANEL MEETING 2 DECEMBER<br>2015 .....           | 46        |
| 19. ACTIONS LIST - UPDATE REPORT .....                                          | 46        |
| 20. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT<br>NOTICE (CLOSED) ..... | 46        |
| 20.1. NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON.....                             | 46        |
| 21.1. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                            | 47        |
| 21.2. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                          | 47        |
| 21.3. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                            | 47        |
| 21.4. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON.....                            | 47        |
| 21.5. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                          | 47        |
| 21.6. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY.....                              | 48        |
| 21.7 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                           | 48        |
| 21.8. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                          | 48        |
| 21.9. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                          | 48        |
| 21.10. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON .....                         | 48        |

---

**1. APOLOGIES**

---

---

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 15 February 2016 be confirmed.

---

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

---

---

**4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION**

---

---

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

---

---

**6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)**

---

---

**7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS**

---

# COMMUNITY

---

## **8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR**

---

Author: Mayor Kristie Johnston  
Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)  
ECM File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

### **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:**

Annual Plan Reference *4.2.4.03 Implement the Governance Strategy*.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To receive the announcement of events by the Mayor.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

#### **Announcements by the Mayor**

The following is a list of events the Mayor has attended during the period 10 February 2016 to 8 March 2016.

#### **Wednesday, 10 February 2016**

- Attended the Taswater Owners Representative Quarterly Briefing meeting

#### **Thursday, 11 February 2016**

- Attended the launch of the Guys Gotta Know App
- Officially opened the Glenorchy Open Exhibition at the Moonah Arts Centre

#### **Friday, 12 February 2016**

- Attended the Local Government Association of Tasmania General Meeting in Launceston

#### **Saturday, 13 February 2016**

- Attended Symphony Under the Stars at Tolosa Park

#### **Monday, 15 February 2016**

- Attended the Inception Meeting for the Greater Hobart Council feasibility study
- Chaired the Council Meeting

**Tuesday, 16 February 2016**

- Guest Speaker at the University of Tasmania Leaders Forum in Launceston
- Attended the University of Tasmania Leaders Forum Dinner with the Vice-Chancellor

**Wednesday, 17 February 2016**

- Attended the Rail Corridor Working Group meeting

**Thursday, 18 February 2016**

- Attended a meeting regarding the Greater Claremont Australia Day Event
- Attended a meeting with a resident

**Friday, 19 February 2016**

- Attended a meeting with a business representative

**Saturday, 20 February 2016**

- Attended the Local Government Association of Tasmania's Elected Member Training and Dinner

**Sunday, 21 February 2016**

- Attended the Local Government Association of Tasmania's Elected Member Training
- Attended the Claremont Sub-Branch RSL Annual General Meeting and was appointed Patron

**Monday, 22 February 2016**

- Chaired the Glenorchy Planning Authority meeting

**Tuesday, 23 February 2016**

- Attended a DST Destination Management Planning Session
- Attended the Glenorchy Youth Taskforce induction meeting

**Wednesday, 24 February 2016**

- Attended a site visit to the Riding for the Disabled Association
- Attended the Supreme Court to hear the matter Branch-Allen v Mason & Easter

**Thursday, 25 February 2016**

- Attended a meeting with Ald Slade
- Welcomed attendees to the Access Plan Community Forum
- Attended a meeting with University of Tasmania Representatives
- Chaired the Safer Communities Committee
- Attended the Greater Glenorchy Precinct meeting

**Friday, 26 February 2016**

- Attended a meeting with a resident
- Attended a meeting with a resident

**Saturday, 27 February 2016**

- Attended the official opening of the 2016 Relay for Life at Tolosa Park

**Sunday, 28 February 2016**

- Coordinated the Clean Up Glenorchy Taskforce Claremont activity

**Monday, 29 February 2016**

- Attended the Brooker Highway Liaison Committee Meeting
- Chaired the Council Workshop

**Tuesday, 1 March 2016**

- Attended the Greater Moonah Precinct meeting

**Wednesday, 2 March 2016**

- Attended the Chigwell Child & Family Centre for a farewell function
- Participated in an ABC TV interview regarding poker machines
- Attended the STCA General Meeting

**Thursday, 3 March 2016**

- Attended the Greater Claremont Precinct meeting

**Friday, 4 March 2016**

- Attended the Rail Corridor Working Group meeting
- Attended the Official Launch of the Completion of the Street Light Project
- Attended the Traffic Summit
- Attended the Dedication of the Ian “Jesse” James Memorial Ground and the turn on of lights events

**Saturday, 5 March 2016**

- Attended the Moonah Arts Centre’s first birthday celebrations

**Sunday, 6 March 2016**

- Attended the Clean Up Australia Day Goodwood Community Centre Activity

**Monday, 7 March 2016**

- Chaired the Extra Council Workshop
- Chaired the Glenorchy Planning Authority



**Tuesday, 8 March 2016**

- Attended the Dominic College International Women's Day Breakfast
- Attended the Derwent Valley Council's International Women's Day Church Service and Governor of Tasmania's Luncheon
- Attended the Windermere Primary School Association meeting
- Attended the Glenorchy Community Fund Fundraising Committee meeting

Numerous internal meetings and administrative duties were also undertaken.

**Consultations:**

Nil.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Nil.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Nil.

**Recommendation:**

That Council:

1. RECEIVES the announcements about the activities of the Mayor's office for the period 10 February 2016 to 8 March 2016.

**Attachments/Annexures**

---

## 9. INTERCITY CYCLEWAY PROPOSED CHICANE GATE CHANGES AT ROAD INTERSECTIONS

---

Author: Transport Engineer (Amir Mousavi)  
Qualified Person: Director City Services & Infrastructure (Emilio Reale)  
ECM File Reference: Cycling Facilities

### **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:**

- 1.3.1 Identify the service expectations of our different communities and respond appropriately.
- 3.1.3 Deliver services that create sustainable and liveable built environments.

### **Reporting Brief:**

The purpose of this report is to inform Council on the proposal to remove one of the existing 'paired' chicane gates at all road crossings along the Intercity Cycleway. The report recommends that the existing 'paired' gates are retained and assessed for compliance with Australian Standards and Austroads guidelines.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

#### ***Background***

The Intercity Cycleway between Hobart and Claremont was commenced in 1992 and has been a resounding success. The Cycleway is a shared cycling/walking track that extends for 15.9 km, from Sullivans Cove waterfront in Hobart to Bilton Street in Claremont. The Intercity Cycleway is constructed on a disused railway line and (within Glenorchy) is located on the west side of the remaining rail line. The majority of the Cycleway is located in Glenorchy City Council municipality, with a length of approximately 13.5 km from the boundary with Hobart. The Cycleway has a concrete surface and is well used by cyclists and pedestrians of all ages and ability. The typical width of the Cycleway is 3.0 metres with a marked centre line.

Within the Glenorchy area, the Cycleway crosses several arterial and collector roads with high traffic volumes and high percentages of heavy vehicles, such as Elwick Road, Lampton Avenue, Derwent Park Road, Hopkins Street and Albert Road. Overall, the Cycleway has a total of 14 road junctions along its length in Glenorchy. Chicane gates have been installed on the approach to each road junction on the Cycleway (refer Council's Standard Drawing D687<sub>E</sub> – **Attachment 1**).

Chicane gates (named as Staggered Fence Treatment) are recognised in *Austrroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A: Pedestrian and Cyclist Paths* as an acceptable terminal treatment for bicycle paths. The purpose of the installation of the chicane gates is to restrict unauthorised vehicles from entering the path as well as to avoid ride-out and/or crashes at the road intersections. The existing chicane gates are typically constructed with 4 metres spacing between gates with the closer gate to the road positioned 10 metres from the road carriageway. This 10-metre gap provides space for riders leaving the road to clear the roadway before reaching the chicane.

### ***Proposed Chicane Gate Removal***

Cycling South has requested that the existing chicane gate arrangements along the Intercity Cycleway be modified. The proposed modifications include the removal of one of the chicane gates (i.e. the gate closer to the road) at each road crossing. The other gate would remain in place to allow directional signs to be affixed to the gate and to retain some visual and physical advance warning of the road crossing to an approaching rider.

Advice from Cycling South states that some of the issues/hazards that arise from the existing chicane arrangement include:

- Inexperienced riders are destabilised when going through them;
- Parents towing child trailers or people riding tandems clip the gates when they pass through;
- In many locations riders have formed a goat track that bypasses the gates anyway;
- Chicanes create bottle necks at the road crossings (especially for riders trying to get off the road); and
- They distract riders from “concentrating on the task of processing more important information relating to surrounding traffic conditions”.

Cycling South made a similar request to Hobart City Council (HCC) and following a risk assessment by HCC officers, one of the gates at each road crossing in the Hobart section was removed (since February 2014). It is understood that no crashes have been reported at the four (4) road crossings in the Hobart area since the chicanes were altered.

It is important to note however, that the road crossings along the Intercity Cycleway in the Hobart section are on lightly trafficked roads (Queens Walk, Bay Road, McVilly Drive and the access road to the Collegiate rowing club) and these roads are traffic calmed with speed humps or similar. The road crossings in the Glenorchy area are typically at moderate to highly trafficked roads, where traffic calming is not appropriate.

To provide an independent assessment of the proposed chicane gate changes, Council engaged MAV Liability Mutual Insurance to provide a targeted risk assessment (TRA) of the Glenorchy Intercity Cycleway (see **Attachment 2**).

The purpose of the report was to consider the issues created by the busy road crossings along the cycleway and the use of the existing chicane gates. The TRA noted that the use of chicane gates at road crossings along cycleways are no longer considered common or preferred practice. However the report importantly noted that it is also rare for a cycleway to have so many road crossings along its length. The key issues identified in the TRA were:

- The potential risk of cyclists being hit by vehicles while crossing intersections;
- The potential for head on collisions, between cyclists (on the cycleway) from opposite directions, caused by the restricted width of the chicanes;
- If the chicanes are too close to the road they prevent the cyclist from being able to cross the road quickly; and
- The chicanes may be difficult to see at night if there is no reflector tape.

The report's key recommendations, specific to the road crossings and chicanes were:

- The proposed removal of one chicane gate and improving signage, at each crossing point is recommended to be implemented. This will provide better warning for cyclists of the impending road crossing, decrease the likelihood of collisions between users travelling in opposite directions, and in some cases (where the chicane gates are located closer to the road) allow riders to get clear of the road quicker.
- Council should ensure that warning signage for road users of the pathway crossing is provided at all such crossings.
- Council should give consideration to developing a long term strategy for the improvement of the pathway through such means as re-alignments near crossings and/or potentially constructing bridges or underpasses for the higher risk crossings (such as Elwick Road).

MAV insurance company also recommended that an actual risk assessment be conducted for each of the crossings using Council's Risk Management procedures.

Council also engaged an independent traffic engineer, Midson Traffic to provide a risk assessment of the individual chicane gates on the InterCity Cycleway (see **Attachment 3**). The report acknowledges that the greatest hazard for pedestrians and cyclists utilising the Cycleway is the risk of being struck by a vehicle at any of the road crossings along its length. The report also indicates that the chicane gates were designed to reduce cyclist (and all users in general) approach speeds and maximise warning of approaching road junctions and they meet the general *Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A: Pedestrian and Cyclist Paths* requirements for a 'Staggered Fence' terminal treatment and are considered acceptable.

The key safety concerns with the existing chicane gates noted in Midson Traffic's report were:

- The chicane gates require cyclists to travel in the opposing lane on the approach to the gates. This increases the risk of a collision with a cyclist or pedestrian travelling in this lane.
- The chicane gates require a series of sharp manoeuvres at very low speed. This increases the risk of loss of balance (with associated 'falling' risk). This is particularly the case for cyclists with clip-in pedals.
- The chicane gates introduce delays for cyclists entering from the road. There is a risk of gates creating a queue when large groups of cyclists are using the facility (a recreational cycling group riding together for example). The relatively short space from the road to the gate may result in queues extending onto the road.

The report's key recommendation in relation to the chicane gates was that a single chicane arrangement provides a slightly improved level of safety through the reduction of road safety risks at the chicanes. However, the report suggests that the removal of one chicane gate structure should be undertaken with appropriate signage to warn cyclists of the approaching road junction, while consideration should also be given to providing a contrasting pavement treatment between the road and the chicane gate. Advice from Council's Engineering Projects section estimates that the costs associated with the installation of a 'Stop' sign and a stop line, together with the installation of contrasting pavement treatment at the location of all chicane gates along the length of Cycleway in Glenorchy would be approximately \$215,000.

It should be noted that Midson Traffic's report does not support the removal of both chicane gates, as the risk of a cyclist 'overshooting' the road junction is considered to be too great.

#### ***Traffic Engineering Comments on the proposed Chicane Gate removal***

A path terminal treatment is typically required where a shared path or bicycle path intersects with a road. This type of treatment applies to recreational and commuter paths that cross a road from a reservation or to paths that follow a major road and cross side streets. Path terminal treatments for off-road, shared-user paths and bicycle paths are generally provided to:

- Restrict illegal access by drivers of motor vehicles to road reserves and parkland to prevent damage to paths and other assets and prevent rubbish from being dumped illegally; and
- Advise cyclists that there is a road ahead and slow cyclists down before they cross the road.

*Austroroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A: Pedestrian and Cyclist Paths (Guide)* (refer **Attachment 4**) provides guidance for designing pedestrian and cyclist paths including any required path terminal treatment.

The *Guide* discusses different types of path terminal treatments including Separate Entry and Exit Treatment, Bollards and U-rails, Staggered Fence Treatment and Offset Path Treatment. It is noted that chicane gates can be classified as Staggered Fence Treatments.

According to the *Guide*:

*"The purpose of a terminal treatment is to restrict unauthorised vehicles from entering a path. Therefore, if there is no need for such a restriction then a terminal treatment should not be required at all, the path leading directly to an appropriate road crossing with adequate signs and delineation to warn cyclists and clearly define priority. Only where there is good reason to do so (e.g. history of ride-out incidents, near misses or crashes) a terminal treatment can be used to physically slow cyclists."*

The *Guide* also indicates that in some situations chicanes or other restrictive devices are unavoidable because cyclists have to be slowed down for their own safety. While the guide suggests that a staggered fence treatment (similar to chicane gates) is less preferred than other options, such as a separate entry / exit treatment, the narrow width available in the Rail Reserve, for the Intercity Cycleway, limits the options available to slow cyclists on the approach to the road crossings.

In terms of road safety performance at the Intercity Cycleway road crossings, Midson Traffic's Risk Assessment report states that there were two crashes were reported at the Cycleway crossings, one on Elwick Road and one on Derwent Park Road over the past five (5) years. Both of these involved minor injuries. There were no crashes reported on the cycleway itself over the five (5) year period. This highlights the importance of safety at the road crossing locations along the Cycleway.

While there were no crashes recorded on the Intercity Cycleway at the location of chicane gates, or elsewhere, (other than at the road crossings), both risk assessments assessed that the proposed removal of one chicane gate would provide a slightly improved level of safety through the reduction of risks at the chicanes (i.e. by decreasing the likelihood of collisions for cyclists coming the other way at the location of chicane gates). However, neither of the reports state that the risk of crashes at the road crossing points will not be increased due to the proposed removal of one chicane gate.

Crash records show that the existing road crossings have operated with a low level of recorded crashes over an extended period (in excess of 20 years at some locations). This is despite high traffic volumes on several of the road crossings within Glenorchy and increasing use of the Cycleway over time. The existing arrangements have provided a safe facility for a wide range of users, both in age and experience, from families with young beginner riders to experienced higher speed riders. How much of the low crash rate can be attributed to the existing chicane arrangement is difficult to objectively determine, however removal of one of the chicanes will certainly lead to riders approaching the road crossings at higher speeds than is currently the case. This has implications for the safety of both cyclists and other users of the cycleway.

In deciding whether to remove one of the chicane gates, an assessment needs to be made of one risk versus another. It is considered that, while there is a low likelihood of collision with a vehicle at a road crossing and also a low likelihood of collision between two cyclists at a chicane (or collision of a cyclist with a chicane), the consequences (and therefore the risk) associated with collision with a vehicle is significantly greater than collision with another cyclist or a chicane. For this reason it is recommended that the existing 'paired' chicane arrangement is retained.

It is acknowledged that, over time, there have been some inconsistencies in the way that the existing chicanes have been installed and treated with reflectors and signage. It is recommended that Council's Transport Engineer undertake an audit of existing chicane arrangements to ensure that the chicane gates comply with Australian Standards and Austroads guidelines and are treated with high visibility reflectors.

**Consultations:**

Cycling South

ELT

Glenorchy City Council's Recreation Coordination Working Group

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

In terms of risk, as noted above, it is considered that the existing 'paired' chicane arrangement should be retained as this mitigates the more significant risk of collision with a vehicle at the road crossings. It is acknowledged in Austroads guidelines that in some instances it is necessary to slow the speed of cyclists on the approach to road crossings. Given the width constraints of the Rail Reserve a staggered fence treatment, or in this case, chicane gates, is the appropriate treatment.

If the proposed removal of one chicane gate at the Intercity Cycleway road crossings is to be progressed then it is highly recommended that additional signage, linemarking and contrasting, coloured pavement treatment is adopted. The costs associated with the installation of the warning signs the contrasting pavement treatment would be approximately \$215,000 to treat all crossings.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

If the existing 'paired' chicane gates are retained it is considered that no community consultation is required.

**Recommendation:**

That Council:

1. RECEIVES and NOTES the report regarding the proposed chicane gate changes along the Intercity Cycleway.
2. DOES NOT progress the proposed removal of chicane gates on the Cycleway in the interests of minimising the risk of collision between a vehicle and a cyclist at the road crossings.

3. ENDORSES a review of existing chicane gates along the length of the Intercity Cycleway, to ensure that the chicane gates comply with Australian Standards and Austroads guidelines, and have a high degree of reflectivity.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Standard Drawings D687E - Intercity Cycleway Standard Arrangement  
Detainl at Road Crossings
- 2 MAV Targeted Risk Assessment Report
- 3 Midson Traffic Risk Assessment Report
- 4 Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A - Terminal Treatments



# ENVIRONMENT

---

## 10. TRAFFIC CONGESTION SUMMIT

---

Author: Director City Services and Infrastructure (Emilio Reale)  
Qualified Person: Director City Services and Infrastructure (Emilio Reale)  
ECM File Reference: Traffic Congestion Summit

### **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:**

- 1.3.1 Identify the service expectations of our different communities and respond appropriately.
- 3.1.3 Deliver services that create sustainable and liveable built environments.
- 4.3.1 Develop and manage collaborative relationships with other levels of Government.

### **Reporting Brief:**

On Friday 4 March 2016, the Tasmanian Government called a Traffic Congestion Summit which included the Lord Mayor of Hobart and Mayors of Glenorchy, Clarence and Kingborough who joined in good faith to advance solutions to the worsening issue of traffic congestion events in the Hobart CBD and the Greater Hobart area.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

Due to the worsening traffic congestion in the Hobart CBD and generally in the Greater Hobart area, the Minister for Police, Emergency Management and Infrastructure the Hon. Rene Hidding MP called a Traffic Congestion Summit to look at ways of dealing with the escalating situation.

The Summit involved representatives from the Department of State Growth, Mayors and General Managers from Hobart, Glenorchy, Kingborough and Clarence, Tasmania Police, and a duly appointed Traffic Engineer.

Mayors were invited to speak on behalf of their respective Councils and be signatories to a communique that was tabled at the Summit, (see attachment 1).

The Communique acknowledged that:

- Signatories to the communique agreed that traffic congestion events in Hobart's CBD and Greater Hobart is a serious and growing concern for the liveability of the capital's residents and the productivity of Tasmania's economy;

- Signatories committed to prioritise efforts to find solutions within their respective jurisdictions and to work cooperatively to resolve issues that contribute to traffic congestion events in Hobart's CBD and Greater Hobart, and that both supply and demand solutions will be required;
- Signatories agreed to share all available data relevant to the congestion issue;
- Signatories supported the agreement reached at the summit between the Tasmanian Government and the Hobart City Council to discuss transfer of ownership and management of Macquarie and Davey Streets to the Tasmanian Government – subject to final endorsement from each party - in order to allow the Tasmanian Government to urgently implement traffic flow optimisation measures;
- Signatories committed to sharing any future plans for significant changes to traffic management and road treatments within their jurisdictions that may impact on the Hobart CBD and Greater Hobart traffic congestion before they are implemented to ensure proper consultation and responsibility for decisions, including consultation with relevant utilities;
- Signatories acknowledged that the measures agreed to at the Summit represent just the first step in a process to improve traffic flow in the Hobart CBD and Greater Hobart and that longer-term measures will be required to manage the issue;
- Signatories agreed that the Department of State Growth will establish a contact point for public input into traffic congestion problems and solutions for consideration at future Summits; and
- Signatories agreed to meet quarterly to assess progress and to discuss new information and proposals to alleviate traffic congestion in the Hobart CBD and Greater Hobart.

**Consultations:**

Department of State Growth  
Hobart City Council  
Kingborough Council  
Clarence City Council  
Tasmania Police  
ELT

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

The Department of State Growth is the lead agency in the management in this project. Anticipated human resource, financial or risk management implications will involve participation at other Summit meeting and communication between officers to provide information as requested or as issues are identified.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

The Department of State Growth will establish a contact point for public input into traffic congestion problems and solutions for consideration at future Summits. These details will be passed onto each Council so public enquires can be referred to this contact point.

**Recommendation:**

That Council:

- a) RECEIVES and NOTES the report on the Traffic Congestion Summit.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1** Attachment - Traffic Congestion Summit

# GOVERNANCE

---

## 11. FEASIBILITY STUDY INTO LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Local Government Reform

### **Community Plan Reference:**

City of Glenorchy Community Plan 2015 -2040

We are a proud City; a city of arts; of opportunity; a city that makes exciting things happen.

We will be a progressive, positive community with strong Council leadership, striving to make Our Community's Vision a reality.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

Glenorchy City Council Strategic Plan 2013-18 (Interim)

Glenorchy City Council Annual Plan 2015/16 to 2018/19

Leading Our Community

Objective 4.1 Govern in an open and responsible manner in the best interests of the community.

Objective 4.2 Manage our resources to achieve community outcomes.

Objective 4.3 Foster relationships to deliver community outcomes.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To inform Council of a progress since the previous update and decisions by Council at its meeting on 31 August 2015 and 25 January 2016 and to confirm appointment of a consultant firm in conjunction with Hobart City Council, Clarence City Council and Kingborough Council to carry out the feasibility work required before Council and its community can consider options for local government reform.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

Council will recall that the Minister for Planning and Local Government, The Hon. Peter Gutwein MHA, invited Tasmanian councils to engage in a process of voluntary local government reform.

The Minister's invitation was for councils to consider shared services or voluntary amalgamation.

Council convened facilitated workshops on 4 and 17 March 2015 at which a set of 'draft guiding principles' was developed as an approach to assessing opportunities that might arise from the local government reform invitation.

Further information was provided to Council at its meeting on 6 July 2015.

In accord with Council's resolution on 3 August 2015, the Mayor and General Manager attended a meeting 7 August 2015 with the Mayors and General Managers from Hobart, Clarence and Kingborough Councils as observers to further discuss the local government reform process.

1. It was noted that the current positions of the Councils represented at the meeting had significant similarity in that all councils were interested in exploring the benefits of voluntary amalgamations and reform initiatives.
2. It was also acknowledged that there would be the potential for Councils to be involved in more than one feasibility study.
3. It was noted that any feasibility study into voluntary amalgamation would provide the foundation required to undertake study into shared services should that be desired.
4. At the conclusion of the meeting agreement had been reached on a draft terms of reference/common feasibility scope to take back to our respective Councils for consideration as set out below.

The Director of Local Government had conducted a formal tender process for shortlisting approved consultants to a panel for conducting feasibility studies into voluntary amalgamations and strategic resource sharing initiatives. The successful consultants were:

1. SGS Economics and Planning;
2. Ernst and Young;
3. Deloitte Touché Tohmatsu; and
4. KPMG.

At its meeting on 31 August 2015 Council formally adopted the following:

- a) That Council note the community feedback, results of the community survey and letters from other councils about local government reform.
- b) That Council's General Manager ensures that the 'Guiding Principles' adopted by Council are reflected in the draft scoping document as its assessment framework for considering local government reform opportunities.
- c) Approve the terms of reference for a scoping /feasibility study into voluntary amalgamation as outlined in this report.
- d) Authorise the General Manager to seek quotations from the State Government panel of approved providers and then bring a further report to Council on the results of this process.
- e) The General Manager arrange a workshop meeting to implement action item (v) of Council's adopted motion from 6 July Council meeting once we have received responses to the Mayor's letter sent to other Councils who expressed interest in talking about amalgamation to meet with all Aldermen.

In accord with Council's adopted motion, the General Manager ensured the guiding principles were included in the draft assessment framework previously provided – and the four Councils – Hobart City, Clarence City, Glenorchy City and Kingborough Council jointly requested quotations from the four approved consultants. The four consultants attended a pre-quotation briefing session held on 28 October 2015 where the process and any queries were answered. The Director of Local Government received quotations from each of the approved consultants.

Copies of the four formal quotations were provided to all Aldermen before Christmas.

On 4 December 2015 the Mayors and General Managers of the four Councils as well as the Deputy Director Local Government met to discuss the quotations and to consider an assessment of the tenders.

Council considered the 4 formal quotations in its closed session of its Council meeting on 25 January 2016 and resolved to allocate \$25,000 from the existing 2015-2016 consultancy budget in order to conduct a feasibility study into voluntary amalgamation and/or resource sharing and appoint SGS Economics and Planning to undertake the feasibility study subject to:

- (a) Hobart, Clarence and Kingborough Councils also resolving to appoint SGS Economics and Planning,
- (b) Hobart, Clarence and Kingborough Councils also resolving to contribute \$25,000 each toward the feasibility study, and

All 4 Councils have agreed to appoint SGS Economics and Planning to undertake the feasibility study and to contribute the \$25,000 each. The Mayors and GMs have met with SGS Economics and Planning and have agreed to an agreed timeline and terms of reference – **See attachments**

#### **Consultations:**

There have also been numerous meetings between Mayors and General Managers of the four Councils as well as involvement with the Deputy Director of Local Government and the Minister's office.

#### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

The required funding by Glenorchy City Council will be \$25,000 – this will be taken from the current Consultancy budget for 2015/2016. The \$25,000 each by the four (4) Councils will provide \$100,000 and the Minister's office has confirmed in writing that the State Government will provide the balance of funding required for the recommended consultancy.

There is likely to be significant in kind staff time in gathering and providing requested and required information to the consultants.

#### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Council has conducted two (2) community surveys and needs to get factual information and models before conducting any further consultation.



**Recommendation:**

That Council

- 1) Formally APPOINT the Mayor and General Manager to represent Glenorchy City Council on the Voluntary Amalgamations Steering Committee (noting that the terms of reference allow any Aldermen to attend as observers).
- 2) NOTES the updated information.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Terms of Reference - Voluntary Amalgamations Steering Committee
- 2 Proposed Timeline

---

## 12. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - JANUARY 2016

---

Author: Reporting Officer (Len Newton)  
Qualified Person: Acting Director Community Economic Development & Business (Tony McMullen)  
ECM File Reference: Traffic Lights

### **Community Plan Reference:**

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:**

The Corporate Performance Indicators are provided to Council in accordance with Strategy:

- 4.1.2 Ensure Council is open and transparent in its communication and dealings with our communities; and
- 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:**

To present the Corporate Performance Indicators as at the end of January 2016 for Aldermen's information.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The Corporate Performance Indicators are attached (**Attachment 1**) along with Appendix B (**Attachment 2**). Appendix B outlines expected year-to-date variances within the various Capital Works programs for this financial year.

Please note the Indicators include the 2014/2015 Budget Carry Forwards as approved in the August 2015 Council Meeting.

For January 2016 we have four (4) yellow lights with the remainder green lights:

Corporate Governance, Revenue (page 15): Corporate Governance revenue streams, particularly water sales remain behind budget due to low rainfall. Forecasts suggest that the underperformance in water sales will continue for the remainder of the year.

Total Capital Expenditure, Property (page 18): The capital program for 2015/16 remains under budget. Forecasts suggest that the program will be underspent for the full year, with several projects being deferred and completed next year.

Accounts Receivable (page 22): Overdue debtors are above the target due primarily to secured property debts of \$54k, Derwent Park Reuse Scheme Contractor \$1,597k and DEC debtor \$37k under arrangement.

Capital salaries and wages including on-costs (page 24): Capital salaries for 2015/16 remains considerably under budget due to increased use of external contractors on major projects.

**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:

1. ACCEPTS the information provided by the Corporate Performance Indicators for January 2016.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Corporate Performance Indicators - January 2016
- 2 Appendix B

---

### 13. COUNCIL POLICIES

---

Author: Manager Governance & Risk (Simon Scott)  
Manager Infrastructure & Engineering Services (Russell Grierson)

Qualified Person: Director Corporate Governance & General Counsel (Seva Iskandarli)

ECM File Reference: Council Policies

**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:**

Annual Plan Reference 4.2.4.03 *Implement the Governance Strategy*.

**Reporting Brief:**

This report is to seek Council’s adoption of two (2) revised Council policies (‘Roadside Directional Signs’ and ‘Street Lighting’) and one new policy (‘Traffic Management Plans’).

**Proposal in Detail:**

This Report follows the Aldermanic Workshops (25 May and 12 October 2015) in which Management presented to Council the current and proposed actions with respect to the ongoing Council Policy review.

With respect to the ‘Roadside Directional Signs’ policy ([Attachment 1](#)), this provides clarity and consistency when assessing external applications (mostly from community organisations, churches, schools etc.) for the installation of roadside information signs and to ensure consistency with the ‘Tasmanian Roadside Signs Manual’. This was last reviewed and adopted by Council on 21 October 2002.

Similarly, the ‘Street Lighting’ policy ([Attachment 2](#)) sets the minimum lighting standards for the Glenorchy City Municipality, based on the Australian Standard for Lighting of Roads and Public Spaces (AS/NZS 1158. 2005). This was last reviewed and adopted by Council on 21 August 2006.

Finally, the ‘Traffic Management Plans’ policy ([Attachment 3](#)) is a new policy and has been initiated by Management in order to provide clarity and consistency when developing, assessing and/or implementing Traffic Management Plans and reinforces compliance with the Australian Standard (AS1742.3) and the relevant guidelines. In particular, it serves to provide direction as to the requisite competency of the persons drafting, reviewing and undertaking traffic management plans and activities in the Glenorchy City Municipality.

**Consultations:**

The Executive Management Team and their respective Departmental Managers were consulted and provided input into the aforementioned policies.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

There are no human resources or financial implications.

| Risk Identification                                                                                          | Consequence | Probability    | Rating | Risk Mitigation Treatment                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| If identified policies are not adopted as recommended, then governance control effectiveness is less optimal | Minor       | Almost Certain | Medium | Council adopt 'Roadside Directional Signs', 'Street Lighting' and 'Traffic Management Plans' policies |

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Nil.

**Recommendation:**

That Council:

1. ADOPTS the 'Roadside Directional Signs' policy, as attached, to provide for the clarity and consistency with respect to the assessment of applications for the installation of roadside information signs in the Glenorchy City Municipality.
2. ADOPTS the 'Street Lighting' policy, as attached, to provide the minimum lighting standards for the Glenorchy City Municipality.
3. ADOPTS the 'Traffic Management Plans' policy, as attached, to provide for the clarity and consistency when developing, assessing and/or implementing Traffic Management Plans with respect to the Glenorchy City Municipality.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Roadside Directional Signs Policy
- 2 Street Lighting Policy
- 3 Traffic Management Plans Policy

---

## 14. ACTIONS LIST - UPDATE REPORT

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)  
Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)  
ECM File Reference: Actions Register - 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:**

Annual Plan Reference *4.2.4.03 Implement the Governance Strategy*.

**Reporting Brief:**

Actions List updated following 15 February 2016 Council meeting.

**Proposal in Detail:**

Council uses InfoCouncil software for the coordinating and drafting of Council, Committee and Glenorchy Planning Authority reports, agendas and minutes.

Following each Council meeting an action report is forwarded to a Council officer to action the adopted motions of Council. Management regularly accesses the software to ensure that Council motions are actioned.

The attached spreadsheet details of actions list.

**Consultations:**

Relevant Council officers

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

No cost

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Nil applicable

**Recommendation:**

That Council

1. NOTES the Actions Register, as updated following the 15 February 2016 Council meeting.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Actions List

---

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

---

---

### 16.1 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

#### **Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

#### **Question on Notice:**

Has the service level review process been factored into the consultancy brief for the accommodation strategy?

#### **Answer:**

Council has been advised that the Accommodation Strategy project has been factored into the service level review project. This fact was provided to Council on 26 October 2015 Council Meeting and a Consultancy Brief was attached as part of the Agenda.

In addition, in the 29 February 2016 Council Workshop, Council once again was given this information.

Accordingly, the answer to the question on notice was given to Council a number of times, the most recent ones being:

- 1) 26 October 2015 Council Meeting – Agenda Item 19
- 2) 29 February 2016 Council Workshop.

---

## 16.2 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

### **Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

### **Question on Notice:**

There are many council workshops for which Aldermen are not provided documentation prior to the meeting. Can the process be strengthened to ensure that Aldermen are provided workshop materials prior to council workshops, where appropriate?

### **Answer:**

Council has already a process in place in relation to its Workshops namely:

1. Management sends an Agenda about the Workshop well before the Workshop dates; and
2. The Agenda attaches, where it is possible, the documents about the items to be discussed at the Workshop, latest example of this is Audio Recording of Council Meeting where the Aldermen have been provided with the relevant documents with the Agenda before the Workshop which was held on 7 March 2016.



---

### 16.3 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

#### **Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Kristie Johnston submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

#### **Question on Notice:**

When is the whistle-blower policy and subsequent position of whistle blower officer going to be adopted by council?

#### **Answer:**

Council adopted the model procedures produced by the Ombudsman in relation to whistle-blowing at the Council meeting on 23 May 2011. It should be noted that the procedures were reviewed with minor amendments by the Ombudsman in May 2014 and current Council procedures remain valid. Whistle blowers are also protected under the *Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002*.

Under the *Public Interest Disclosures Act 2002*, the Principal Officer (being the General Manager), has the responsibility for receiving public interest disclosures and making sure that they are dealt with in accordance with the Act.

It should be noted that it is not a role of Council to adopt the position of a 'whistle blower officer'.

## 16.4 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

### Question on Notice:

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Kristie Johnston submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

### Question on Notice:

What are the pillars of the development of the governance strategy?

How were these pillars determined?

### Answer:

There are a number of different models of the governance framework that is under review (e.g. Governance Lighthouse – Audit Office of New South Wales, ASX Corporate Governance Principles, the Australian National Audit Office Public Sector Governance Better Practice Guide et.al.). In simple terms, the pillars can be determined along these lines:

| Pillars (or Principles)                                      | Key Governance Functions                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Solid foundations for management and oversight               | 1. Strategic and business plans<br>2. Regular reporting against plans<br>3. Clear accountability and delegations<br>4. Diversity policy (to be confirmed under Tasmanian legislation) |
| Accountability                                               | 5. Key governance committees                                                                                                                                                          |
| Act ethically and responsibly - integrity, service and trust | 6. Ethical framework<br>7. Fraud and corruption control framework<br>8. Compliance framework                                                                                          |
| Safeguard integrity in corporate reporting                   | 9. Audit and risk committees<br>10. Internal and external audit<br>11. Financial report sign-off                                                                                      |
| Fair remuneration                                            | 12. Remuneration is fair and reasonable                                                                                                                                               |
| Recognise and manage risk                                    | 13. Risk management programme<br>14. Adequacy of internal controls                                                                                                                    |

Council addresses these elements and will continue to monitor, update and refine them to adopt changing best practice.

---

**16.5 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

**Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Matt Stevenson submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

**Question on Notice:**

We were supposed to discuss monthly projects and major operational items report within the February 29 workshop however did not. When will council discuss, and then receive the monthly projects and major operational items report?

When will Council receive the quarterly report?

**Answer:**

On 8 February 2016 the General Manager sent an email to all Aldermen asking them to provide him their comments about the Project Update to Council which was held on 29 February 2016.

There was no comment from any Alderman, including Alderman Stevenson who is asking this question. Nevertheless, on 29 February 2016 Council held a 3 hours Workshop at which Council was given a full brief about a number of strategic and operational projects and given a 79 pages document by email and hard copy. Accordingly, Management is at a loss to understand the question. Management assumes that Alderman Stevenson's question is about the reporting framework on the major projects. At the Workshop on 29 February 2016 it was the role of the Council after receipt of a comprehensive and detailed project update report on major and operational projects to make its recommendations to Management about the required reporting framework but there were no comments made by any Alderman including Alderman Stevenson.

---

**16.6 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

**Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Kristie Johnston submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

**Question on Notice:**

- (a) How can the Director of Corporate Governance and General Counsel provide secretarial support to the GMPRC when the Terms of Reference explicitly prohibit it?
- (b) How can the Director of Corporate Governance and General Counsel provide legal advice to the GMPRC when she has a clear conflict of interest?

**Answer:**

- (a) Regulation 8 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Meeting Regulations 2015* requires the General Manager to prepare an Agenda for each Council Committee.

Regulation 32 requires the General Manager to ensure that the minutes of a Committee Meeting accurately recorded.

Section 64 of the *Local Government Act 1993* allows the General Manager to delegate to an employee of Council any of his functions or powers under Local Government Act or any other Act. This includes the function of providing administrative support to a Council Committee.

The General Manager has delegated the function to provide the administrative support to the Director Corporate Governance & General Counsel under section 64 of the Act in order to prepare the Agenda for the General Manager's Performance Review Committee (GMPRC) and ensuring that the Minutes of the GMPRC have been prepared. Therefore, this delegated function is envisaged by the Act and its Regulations and is appropriately, and in compliance with the Act and its Regulations, undertaken by the delegated officer, namely the Director Corporate Governance & General Counsel.

- (b) Section 65 of the Act states that a Council Committee is not to decide any matter which requires the advice of a qualified person without considering such advice unless the General Manager certifies in writing that such advice was obtained and taken into account in providing general advice to the Committee.

Section 65 of the Act requires the General Manager to ensure that any advice, information or recommendation given to Council Committee is given by a person who is qualified or has the experience necessary to give such advice, information or recommendation.

Regulation 15(6) permits the Chairperson to invite any person to remain at the meeting to provide advice or information to the Committee.

Accordingly, the General Manager has been expressly required by the Act to ensure that qualified advice is given to the GMPRC.

The Chairperson of the GMPRC is expressly empowered under Regulations to invite the Director Corporate Governance & General Counsel to provide advice to the GMPRC in her capacity as a lawyer.

The Director Corporate Governance & General Counsel takes NO part in the discussions and deliberations by the GMPRC of the review of the General Manager's performance, and simply provides, in accordance with the Act and its Regulations, administrative support and, where necessary, legal advice. Accordingly, there is no conflict of interest.

The TORs of the GMPRC cannot override the requirements of section 64 and section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* and the requirements of the Regulation 8, Regulation 15 and Regulation 32 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*. The TORs of GMPRC have been reviewed to ensure that they are in line with the requirements of the Act, its Regulations and good governance principles. The revised TORs will be considered by the GMPRC in its meeting on 18 March 2016.

---

## **16.7 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

### **Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

### **Question on Notice:**

In the 29 February council workshop, it was indicated that the [sic] has been considerable work on the Environmental Health By-law; when will this be presented to Council?

### **Answer:**

The Environmental Health & Services By-law has been revised by relevant Council Officers (EH, Planning, City Services Infrastructure, Legal & Property) and was then reviewed by, and discussed with, external legal counsel in late 2015. Further revisions were then undertaken and additional requested information provided. The current draft was sent back to the external legal counsel for review on 11 February 2016 and the draft will then be finalised and presented to Council once received.

---

**16.8 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

**Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

**Question on Notice:**

In the February workshop you suggested that Council had already been provided the annual plan progress report at the 18 January workshop. The document provided was a mock up with dummy data; clearly marked '*for illustrative purposes only*'. When will Council receive the actual annual plan progress report?

**Answer:**

At the Council workshop on 18 January, the Annual Plan Progress Report document provided was a mock up with dummy data; clearly marked '*for illustrative purposes only*'. This was for two reasons:

First, the focus of the workshop was on the format of quarterly reporting, not on the content per se; and

Second, while Annual Plan progress reporting had been completed via Cambron software for the quarter ending 31 December 2015, the latest financial information was not yet available following the 31 December close. (The lead time necessary for financial information availability was explained at the Workshop).

The guidance from the Council workshop as to the format required for monthly reporting was inconclusive – (detailed feedback was summarised in response to a question on notice presented to the 25 January Council meeting). Since that time, a Survey Monkey questionnaire was circulated and received responses from 4 out of 10 Aldermen.

Once there is clarity around the information that Council is seeking and it is feasible to provide that information, officers will provide it.

In the interim, quarterly information for the quarter ending 31 December 2015 consistent in format with the proposal discussed at the 18 January workshop can, if desired, be provided to the next Council meeting on 4 April 2016.



---

## 16.9 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

### Question on Notice:

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Matt Stevenson submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

### Question on Notice:

A number of reports have highlighted the deficit in project management capability within the organisation and have recommended the establishment of a PMO. These recommendations have been accepted by management over these many reports:

- When is the project management office going to be operational?

### Answer:

Development of a Project Management Methodology is on the Annual Plan with a target date of 30 June 2016. A steering committee comprising a number of managers and staff who were driving the project forward was formed in 2015 and a project charter, project plan (including a risk management plan) and results from a staff survey undertaken through Survey Monkey were compiled.

With the appointment of new Management Team and the Strategic Procurement Co-ordinator in February 2016, given the strong links to, and dependency on the Procurement Strategy, it is now intended to review this documentation, update and revise as appropriate and have the methodology approved by Management for implementation by 31 December 2016.

However, it should be noted that the successful completion of the PMO Project is subject to budget approval from Council.

---

## **16.10 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

### **Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Matt Stevenson submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

### **Question on Notice:**

Can we be provided with a copy of the ICT strategy?

### **Answer:**

Yes and the copy of ICT Strategy will be provided to the Aldermen by email week starting 14 March 2016.

---

## **16.11 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

### **Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

### **Question on Notice:**

Can we have an updated flowchart on all the plans and strategies with timelines and expected dates of completion?

### **Answer:**

This question has been answered under Item 16.5 and Item 16.8 Questions on Notice in this Agenda.

---

**16.12 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

**Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

**Question on Notice:**

In relation to strategic planning documents, when are the following documents being presented to Council?

- Transport Plan
- Stormwater Plan
- Building Condition Report
- Procurement Strategy

**Answer:**

These documents will be presented to Council on the 21 March 2016 in conjunction with the draft 2016 Capital Works Budget and Asset Management update.

- Transport Plan 21 March 2016
- Stormwater Plan 21 March 2016
- Building Condition Report 21 March 2016

As discussed in the 29 February Council Workshop the Procurement Strategy is currently under development and will be presented to Council upon completion in December 2016.

---

**16.13 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON**

---

Author: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: Question on Notice

**Question on Notice:**

To consider a Question on Notice by Alderman Kristie Johnston submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

**Question on Notice:**

You have pointed to the CT management report several times, and in particular the view that GCC's rates' revenue is below that of other comparable councils.

- Will you be suggesting our rates revenue is increased over and above that already forecast in the long term financial plan at the next budget to make a break even position?

**Answer:**

The Management is currently working on the draft budget for the 2016-17 financial year in accordance with Council's adopted 10 Year Long Term Financial Plan. The draft budget for the 2016-17 financial year will be presented to Council for adoption and it will be Council's decision about the rates.

# CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

---

## 17. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

---

## GOVERNANCE

---

## 18. CONFIRMED MINUTES OF AUDIT PANEL MEETING 2 DECEMBER 2015

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(g). (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential.)*

---

## 19. ACTIONS LIST - 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 Section 15(2)(g). (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential.)*

---

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

---

---

### 20.1. NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON

---

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

---

**21.1. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(i). (Matters relating to actual or possible litigation taken, or to be taken, by or involving the Council or an employee of the Council.)*

---

**21.2. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

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

---

**21.3. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON**

---

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

---

**21.4. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN K. JOHNSTON**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Section 15(2)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.) and (2)(g). (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential.)*

---

**21.5. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

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

---

**21.6. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN J. DUNSBY**

---

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

---

**21.7 QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

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

---

**21.8. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Section 15(2)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.) and (2)(g). (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential.)*

---

**21.9. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 Section 15(2)(d). (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.)*

---

**21.10. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALDERMAN M. STEVENSON**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of the Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(g). (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential.)*