

COUNCIL AGENDA

MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 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:

**Workshops held since
last Council Meeting**

Date: Monday, 6 February 2017

Purpose: To discuss:

- Public Transit Corridor Project
- GASP Presentation

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

ECONOMIC	6
8. GLENORCHY TO HOBART PUBLIC TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY - FINAL REPORT.....	7
GOVERNANCE	16
9. COUNCIL POLICY - HELICOPTER AND OTHER AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS ON COUNCIL PROPERTY	17
10. COUNCIL POLICY - DOG MANAGEMENT POLICY	20
11. RESCISSION OF COUNCIL POLICIES.....	23
12. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - DECEMBER 2016.....	26
13. ACTIONS LIST - UPDATE REPORT	28
14. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE	29
CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	29
15. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	29
GOVERNANCE	29
16. DERWENT ESTUARY PROGRAM CONSTITUTION	29
17. TASWATER QUARTERLY REGIONAL BRIEFING TO THE OWNERS' REPRESENTATIVES	29
18. ACTIONS LIST - UPDATE REPORT	29
19. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)	30

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 23 January 2017 be confirmed.
That the minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on 31 January 2017 be confirmed.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Mrs. Kaye Smith, Glenorchy

In relation to Notices of Motion at items 14.4 and 14.5 on the Agenda, which concern the Hydrotherapy Pool at the KGV Sports and Community facility:

Question 1

Is it true that there are no change cubicles for female or male patrons or that matter even clients with disabilities to change out of or into their clothing? I believe there is just a room with benches with toilets and showers in the same room?

Answer

An accessible multi-use room (as permitted under the relevant Australian Standard and Building Code of Australia) has been built to accommodate showering, changing etc.

It has been envisaged that with the projected low volume of clientele and the size of the venue, that separate additional facilities would not be justified in the existing layout. Notwithstanding, the lessee has additional facilities that they may wish to consider making available at their discretion.

Question 2

Is it a true that there are no lockers to keep their valuables in? i.e. purse, wallet, keys etc. I believe these items will need to be carried with them along with their clothing out to the pool area. If left in the change room it will invite theft and anyone who thinks this wouldn't happen lives in land cuckoo.

Answer

As with the operators of the Glenorchy Memorial Pool, the supply of lockers at the hydrotherapy pool is the responsibility of the lessee/operator and it is a matter for them to consider as part of their fit-out arrangements.

Question 3

Is it a true that the floor cannot be mopped dry because of the render shredding the mops and therefore the floor will be constantly wet because it can only be hosed down?

Answer

Council are unable to comment on this specific issue. The current floor surface was in consultation chosen by the lessee to fit their requirements and meets the relevant Australian Standard and Building Code of Australia. The everyday maintenance and cleaning of the floor is an obligation of the lessee.

Question 4

Is it a true that those using the gym will also be using the same area used for the pool patrons, i.e. the showers and toilets?

Answer

It is envisaged that this is unlikely as the hydrotherapy pool has a dedicated accessible multi-use room that opens directly from the pool. The recreational space similarly has a separate facility for its patrons.

Question 5

When will the pool be available for the expected tenant/s and their clients?

Answer

The pool will be opened once commissioning of the relevant equipment is finalised and final approvals are in place.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

ECONOMIC

8. GLENORCHY TO HOBART PUBLIC TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY - FINAL REPORT

Author: Acting Director, Community, Economic Development and Business (Tony McMullen)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Peter Brooks)

ECM File Reference: GCC/HCC Joint Public Transit Corridor Working Group

Community Plan Reference:

City of Glenorchy Community Plan 2015-2040

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

Community Goal

Valuing Our Environment

Objective

3.1 Create a liveable and desirable City.

Strategy

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:

To provide Council with the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study, October 2016, which identifies urban renewal and land value uplift opportunities along the former rail corridor between Hobart and Glenorchy.

Proposal in Detail:**Background**

At its meeting on 25 January 2016, Council agreed to participate with Hobart City Council in a project to investigate the potential economic benefits flowing from greater utilisation of land along the Glenorchy to Hobart public transit corridor (former rail corridor).

A Memorandum of Agreement was subsequently exchanged between both Councils in accordance with the terms and conditions agreed by the respective General Managers.

The Project Steering Committee comprised of HCC Alderman Thomas and Reynolds, and GCC Aldermen Branch-Allen and Quick considered the Project Brief at its meeting on 4th March 2016. A copy of the Project Brief is Attachment 1 to this report.

The key objectives of the project as described in the Project Brief were:

- examine the potential for urban regeneration in Hobart and Glenorchy capitalising on public transit corridor use
- identify a Vision for urban regeneration in Hobart and Glenorchy arising from use of the public transit corridor, including visualisations to assist with communications
- understand planning changes required to facilitate urban regeneration along the public transit corridor
- focussed engagement to understand potential private sector investment interest along the public transit corridor, and
- identify economic development opportunities arising from urban regeneration along the public transit corridor.

Following a quotation process, GHD Pty Ltd was subsequently engaged to undertake the work in accordance with the project specification.

GHD's Report

The '*Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study, October 2016*' prepared by GHD is Attachment 2 (the Report).

The Report provides a summary of the land use and strategic context for the Transit Corridor, the report methodology, an outline of the developed Structure Plans for each key precinct station, and projected growth for residential and employment.

The Report is comprised of nine sections:

Section 1 presents the project rationale and objectives; report purpose and methodology.

Section 2: Background - summarises the key relevant findings from previous transit corridor studies between 2009 and the present, the land use planning context along with a brief synopsis of Transit Corridor's historical timeline.

Section 3: Site Context - identifies the study area location, demographic characteristics including housing growth forecasts to 2036 taking into account scenarios for regional population growth distribution inclusive of potential induced effects of a public transit system along the corridor, and preliminary local market analysis.

Section 4: Transit Corridor Infrastructure Analysis - provides a constraints and opportunities analysis for urban regeneration in terms of transport and movement, utilities and infrastructure and identifies the infrastructure required to support projected growth. This includes comments on the potential synergies between the rail corridor and main road.

Section 5: Precincts Urban Renewal Strategies - identifies a vision for urban regeneration arising from use of the public transit corridor, and the unique attributes of each key precinct station. The places created along the corridor will allow a range of experiences, conditioned by a focus on origin and destination (and a combination of both in the major activity centres) and a mix of activities including residential, commercial, retail and leisure.

Section 6: Urban Design and Planning Strategy - provides a high level structure plan for the public transit corridor which is designed to identify key precincts for urban infill development; identifies the existing characteristics, opportunities and constraints for each of these precincts; and provides visualisations of what the corridor might look like if developed.

Section 7: Economic Analysis: Key Findings - provides a preliminary assessment of how Local Government and the State Government might capture some of the value increases (via land and property based taxes) to contribute to the financing of a public transit project including identification of the capacity for land value uplift and opportunities that may lead to uplift. The detailed Value Capture Funding Analysis is provided in a separate report ([Attachment 3](#)).

Section 8: Market Demand Analysis - outlines Knight Frank's market demand knowledge and private investor feedback on the identified urban renewal opportunities along the transit corridor for residential, commercial and mixed use development as well as specific comments on key precincts and sites.

Section 9: Implementation Plan - considers the planning policy and statutory changes that may be required to facilitate urban regeneration along the public transit corridor such as approvals processes, governance (i.e. land development authority) and market interventions.

The Value Capture Funding Analysis Report ([Attachment 3](#)) presents a range of alternative mechanisms that either the Local and/or State Government could implement to meet the funding requirements of the project. It also provides a strategic assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of each mechanism and the alternative rates/tax values that would have to be applied to support government to meet the overall funding requirement of the project.

Key Conclusions

The key conclusions of the GHD Glenorchy to Hobart Transit Corridor Study are as follows:

Urban Renewal

The role that the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor will play as a catalyst for urban renewal to the region should not be underestimated. The Corridor has some intrinsic advantages that will enhance the prospects of attracting higher density forms of development. By improving connectivity with the CBD, the transit way has the potential to also deliver significant economic benefits to the area as well as promoting urban renewal in the areas surrounding the stations. It will be a significant catalyst for the revitalisation of centres such as Albert Road, Moonah and Glenorchy Central.

The improved connectivity that will be realised through the provision of new transport infrastructure could provide the stimulus to strengthen the critical mass of commercial, retail and residential activity in each of the nodes, and facilitate the development of a series of transit precincts along the corridor.

Urban renewal along the Corridor will be dependent on the delivery of high quality transit and facilities such as the stations or stops, but the success of these areas as places is founded on the positive perception of quality of life, walkability and pedestrian priority, connectivity and wayfinding, the successful mixing of uses in higher density forms and high frequency transit.

Vision

The Vision for the Corridor was produced to provide a planning framework to achieve the quality of the public realm and the standard of development needed to attract people to want to live in these precincts. Creating a strong sense of place, producing a human scale, and ensuring safety are all essential ingredients in the creation of attractive urban renewal communities.

The Corridor features a number of activity centres with five distinctive community types – residential, urban, retail, cultural and sporting villages. These typologies invite similar future land uses and strengthen neighbourhood character, attracting more people to these precincts to work, live and play. These typologies feature a range of attractions and facilitate new forms of development and higher density along the corridor.

The Corridor will be a major transport infrastructure facility that will be used by the public on a daily basis. Getting the right look and feel for public transport is considered to be a critical part of not only encouraging people to support and use public transport, but also to live in close proximity to public transit.

Planning Schemes - Zoning

The up-zoning of land uses and amendments to the planning scheme within the Corridor precincts has the potential to result in an uplift of capital values in the immediate vicinity to reflect these higher and best uses, but this will only occur if there is sufficient confidence that the transit way will be delivered by the federal, state and local governments.

Rezoning within these communities would allow for a variety of unique residential offerings to take advantage of precinct characteristics.

Value Uplift and funding

The proposed development of the Hobart rapid transit could bring a range of economic and social amenity and benefits to the neighbouring communities. These benefits have the potential to directly result in an increase in the demand for property in close proximity to the stations, as a result of improving the amenity of the local area as well as improving the ease and time to access main centres.

Regardless of the financing and commercial model applied to support the delivery of an infrastructure project such as the Glenorchy to Hobart public transit corridor, funding from external sources will be required to support its feasibility. Historically this investment has been provided by general Government funding sources.

A range of Value Capture and other funding mechanisms have been analysed and it is recommended that government assess the equity and efficiency; community acceptance; stability of funding stream and quantum of funds accessible from each alternative.

The initial assessment of the opportunities available to the Hobart to Glenorchy Corridor concluded that value uplift was a potentially suitable funding stream. The corridor could potentially enable accelerated residential and commercial activity both along the corridor, and at each end. Due to the urban density along the corridor, however, it is likely that any value uplift methodology will need to be shared across a wide economic area (incorporating residential, developer and commercial participants), rather than being contained locally, to stabilise the funding stream for the life of the project financing.

This analysis has assumed that the total cost of the project should be equitably shared between all beneficiaries, including various levels of government (incremental taxes), the wider community (contributing through general taxes) and those that directly benefit (users and local residents through value capture). Therefore only a proportion of the total cost should be assigned to those local residents that realise increased land values.

It has been estimated that the total cost of the project, including costs associated with urban renewal, would represent a project cost of approximately \$200 million.

If it is assumed that each level of government equally benefits from the project, then they should equally contribute to the projects overall costs. If this is the case, then the Hobart and Glenorchy City Councils would each need to find approximately \$30 to \$35 million in funding and/or benefit in kind to support the development for this project.

Further analysis is likely to be required to support implementation of any proposed funding mechanism, and should include:

- detailed analysis of the links between beneficiaries and those that will pay
- detailed analysis of the potential returns and uptake of the development opportunities along the Corridor
- socio-economic analysis of people's ability to pay and the impact on living standards, and
- detailed analysis of the most effective implementation of a proposed value capture mechanism to optimise returns and reduce the risk to government.

Implementation

Implementation of the Study would involve both local and state governments, infrastructure agencies and the private sector.

It is proposed that Council consider the outcomes of Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Project and engage with the 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. It is also proposed that the project outcomes be considered as part of any future 'City Deals' proposal.

It is noted that the challenge of facilitating urban regeneration and increased residential density infill development is significant. Such development is often complex (multiple land owners, zonings, land use conflict), lengthy (approval processes) and costlier to the developer than greenfield development. This is evidenced by the housing market in Tasmania which is geared to greenfield with 85% of new dwellings in greenfield locations.

To tilt this growth to support urban regeneration projects, such as identified for the transit corridor, it is widely recognised that some form of government intervention is required to change existing policies and practices.

There are a number of strategies that can be implemented to make infill development and urban renewal more attractive. These include demand and supply incentives, planning and governance initiatives such as a land development authority.

Peer review

Following completion of the GHD Report, Hobart City Council commissioned LUTI Consulting (Transport Economists) to conduct a peer review of the GHD Economic and Value Capture Funding Analysis and also to review the suitability of the project outcomes as an input into any future City Deal proposal ([Attachment 4](#)).

The key conclusions of the peer review are as follows:

- GHD's analysis of the Value Capture potential for the Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor was comprehensive
- the main area for improvement is in delineating the benefit attributable to urban renewal components of the project and the design of the value capture mechanism to share in the value created for these beneficiaries, and
- in response to this it should be noted that the GHD report did identify that further detailed analysis was required to support implementation of any proposed funding mechanism. This would include detailed analysis of the most effective implementation of a proposed value capture mechanism to optimise returns and reduce the risk to government.

Conclusion

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.

The rezoning of land and associated amendments to the planning schemes within the corridor precincts has the potential to result in an uplift of capital values in the immediate vicinity to reflect these higher and best uses. However, this will only occur if there is sufficient confidence that the transit way will be delivered by state and local governments.

Value capture funding analysis shows that the quantum of funds returned by any one value capture mechanism, with the exception of the visitor tax, will not be enough of itself to fund the required infrastructure without imposing the tax on the community at what is likely to be seen as an unacceptable rate.

The implementation of any value capture mechanism as well as who will ultimately be targeted (i.e. rate and applicable safety nets) is a matter of public policy and therefore a decision of government. Further analysis is likely to be required to support implementation of any proposed mechanism.

It is noted that the challenge of facilitating urban regeneration and increased residential density infill development is significant. Such development is often complex (multiple land owners, zonings, land use conflict), lengthy (approval processes) and costlier to the developer than greenfield development. This is evidenced by the housing market in Tasmania which is geared to greenfield with 85% of new dwellings in greenfield locations.

To tilt this growth to support urban regeneration projects, such as identified for the transit corridor, it is widely recognised that some form of government intervention is required to change existing policies and practices.

There are a number of strategies that can be implemented to make infill development and urban renewal more attractive. These include demand and supply incentives, planning and governance initiatives such as a land development authority.

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.

Consultations:

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 2017, Council resolved to allocate up to \$75,000 as its contribution to the cost of engaging a consultant, subject to Hobart City Council agreeing to allocate \$75,000 with the total fee for the consultancy not exceeding \$150,000.

The future years' financial impact is not known. This would be a matter for more detailed consideration at a later date, depending upon how the project might be implemented.

From a human resource perspective, Council's town planning resources are fully taken up with the Statewide planning schemes project and there would be limited capacity in the short term to effect further planning changes that might be required to progress the rezoning aspects of the project.

From a risk management perspective, Council, if it were to endorse the recommendation, would be committing only to further engagement with the State government in relation to urban renewal and to consideration of the Study outcomes as part of a future City Deal proposal.

It should also be noted that (it is understood) Infrastructure Tasmania is currently working to better define what the City Deal process might entail for Tasmania. Broadly speaking, city deals involve multilateral identification of priority infrastructure projects at metropolitan level, agreement to and funding of those projects.

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.

The Department of State Growth – Infrastructure Tasmania has been kept informed in relation to this project. GHD have undertaken targeted engagement with the investment industry.

Recommendation:

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.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Project Brief
- 2  Glenorchy to Hobart Public Transit Corridor Study, GHD, October 2016
- 3  Value Capture Report
- 4  Peer Review for HCC, LUTI

GOVERNANCE

9. COUNCIL POLICY - HELICOPTER AND OTHER AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS ON COUNCIL PROPERTY

Author: Manager, Governance and Risk (Simon Scott)
Qualified Person: Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel
(Seva Iskandarli)
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:

Annual Plan Reference 4.1.3.04 *Implement the Governance Strategy*

Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council adopts a ‘*Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property*’ Policy, by which Council will not permit any helicopter or other aircraft to take-off or land on any Council owned or controlled land or property (except in limited circumstances).

Proposal in Detail:

Council is occasionally approached by the public to provide its permission for a helicopter or other aircraft to land and take-off on Council owned land (for example, the Derwent Entertainment Centre or Tolosa Park). The aircraft operations for which permission is sought are typically in conjunction with a community event, joy flight or similar event.

Requests for permission have increased in recent years, possibly as a result of the Hobart City Council’s decision to remove the general permission for non-emergency helicopter operations at Regatta Point. Applications are typically received without sufficient notice for Council officers to conduct a formal risk management process. Council has generally erred on the side of safety and refused such applications.

During investigations into an appropriate response to these applications, it was identified that as part of Council’s Broadform (public liability and product liability) policy, there is a minimum \$10 million deductible that applies to claims arising from an aircraft landing on Council land. This means that if a helicopter or other aircraft was involved in an accident on Council land and a successful claim was brought against Council where it could be shown, or alleged, that Council had in some way acted negligently, Council would be required to pay \$10 million out of its own pocket before its insurer would pay any additional expenses.

Arguably, this is a position that Council should not be willing to tolerate or accept any risk exposure against.

Though some statutory protection is provided under the *Damage by Aircraft Act 1963*, it is not sufficient to mitigate the significant financial risk posed to Council by permitting aircraft operations on its land.

Adoption of Policy

In view of the unacceptable risk posed to Council by aircraft operations on Council owned or administered land, Council has prepared a draft '*Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property*' for consideration and adoption.

The draft Policy is Attachment 1 to this report.

The draft Policy provides that Council will not permit any helicopter or other aircraft to take-off or land on any Council owned or controlled land or property, except in the following circumstances:

- where the helicopter or other aircraft is providing rescue, medical treatment or a fire fighting service, or
- when the landing of the helicopter or other aircraft is a result of a medical or other emergency (including break-down) on board the aircraft.

In addition to helicopters, the policy also applies hot air balloons and other small aircraft.

Consultations:

Municipal Association of Victoria Legal
Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel
Manager, Legal and Property
Senior Risk and Assurance Advisor

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

There are no material human resource or financial risk implications. In relation to Risk Management implications:

Risk Identification	Consequence	Probability	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
If Council does not limit helicopter or other aircraft from taking-off or landing on any Council owned or controlled land or property, it could expose Council unnecessarily to a \$10 million deductible in light of a public liability claim.	Major	Possible	High	Council adopts the recommended policy to limit helicopter or other aircraft taking-off or landing on any Council owned or controlled land or property.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil.

Recommendation:

That Council:

ADOPT the *'Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property'* policy, as attached.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Policy - Helicopter and Other Aircraft Operations on Council Property

10. COUNCIL POLICY - DOG MANAGEMENT POLICY

Author: Manager, Governance and Risk (Simon Scott)
Acting Compliance Co-ordinator (James Don)

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

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:

Annual Plan Reference 4.1.3.04 *Implement the Governance Strategy*.

Reporting Brief:

This report is to seek Council’s approval of *Glenorchy City Council Dog Management Policy 2017*, which has been revised following the completion of the public consultation process.

Proposal in Detail:**Statutory Requirements**

Section 7(1) of the *Dog Control Act 2000 (the Act)* requires that Council ‘... *develop and implement a policy relating to dog management in its municipal area*’.

Under section 7(2), the dog management policy required under the Act is to include:

- a code relating to responsible ownership of dogs
- the provision of declared areas
- a fee structure, and
- any other relevant matter.

Council is required to review its policy every five years (section 7(4)) and in reviewing the policy, is required to:

- invite public submissions relating to a proposed Policy
- consult with any appropriate body or organisation, and
- consider any submissions and results of any consultation before finalising the policy (sections 7(3) and (5)).

Public Consultation

At its Council meeting held on 29 August 2016, Council resolved and noted that the draft *Dog Management Policy 2017* would go out to public consultation with the view of submitting the finalised policy at a future Council meeting for consideration and adoption.

Accordingly, public submissions were invited through The Mercury, The Glenorchy Gazette and Council's website over the month of October 2016.

In total, nine (9) public submissions were received by Council, from the following:

- Mr. Michael Swanton (President, Southern Coastcare Association of Tasmania)
- Ms. Tanzi Lewis and Mr Philip Eldridge (President and Secretary, Hobart Dog Walking Association)
- Mr. Liam Chivers (Animal Management Officer, Glenorchy City Council)
- Ms. Angela Offord (Executive Officer (Tas), Australian Veterinary Association)
- Glenorchy City Council's Environment Section
- Ms. Ruby Wheeler
- Mr. Robert Holderness-Roddam
- Ms. Janice Warren, and
- Mr. Mike Hancock

Copies of the submissions received during the consultation process are Attachment 1 to this report.

Revised Policy

A copy of the draft policy for consideration by Council, being the *Glenorchy City Council Dog Management Policy 2017* is Attachment 2 to this report.

Taking into account the public submissions received and further input from areas within Council, the policy has been extensively revised into a new format.

The following is a summary of material changes since the draft policy went to public consultation:

- a revamped 'Definitions' section
- under the 'Code of Responsible Dog Ownership', an improved 'Dog Choice' section
- under the 'Fee Structure', the inclusion of 'Return Dog Home Fee' considerations, and
- the addition of 'Foster Care Arrangements for Dogs' section.

Management is of the view that the proposed draft Policy strikes an appropriate balance between competing interests in the community with respect to dog management in the municipality.

It is therefore recommended that Council adopt the *Glenorchy City Council Dog Management Policy 2017* in the form of the draft.

Consultations:

Animal Management Section
 Manager, Governance and Risk
 Senior Internal Compliance Advisor
 Manager, Environment and Development

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

There are no material human resource implications. In terms of financial implications, it is noted that Management is considering a revised fees and charges structure that better reflects the intent of the proposed policy and this will be presented to Council at its March 2017 meeting.

Risk Identification	Consequence	Probability	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
If identified policy is not adopted as recommended, then governance control effectiveness is less optimal	Minor	Almost Certain	Medium	Council adopts the 'Dog Management' policy

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

In accordance with section 7(3) of the Act, Council consulted and invited submissions from the community and other appropriate bodies or organisations over the month of October 2016.

Recommendation:

That Council:

ADOPT the revised *Dog Management Policy 2017* as attached.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Dog Management Policy 2017 - Submissions
- 2  Dog Management Policy

11. RESCISSION OF COUNCIL POLICIES

Author: Senior Internal Compliance Advisor (Bryn Hannan)
Qualified Person: Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel (Seva Iskandarli)
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:

Annual Plan Reference 4.2.4.03 *Implement the Governance Strategy*.

Reporting Brief:

This report recommends that Council rescinds three (3) Council policies, in accordance with the ongoing Council 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.

It follows the report presented to Council at the Council meeting on 23 January 2017 (Item 10) at which Aldermen were provided with a comprehensive update on the review process including details of the expected completion date for the review of each remaining policy.

Since the January Council meeting, officers have commenced the process of reviewing the policies of the Legal and Property Department. Of the twelve (12) listed policies under that Department’s responsibility, the following three (3) have been identified as being suitable for rescission:

Community Hall Utilisation (Policy No. 05-5)

This policy purports to set out the basic conditions that will be followed in order to hire a Council administered community hall (see [Attachment 1](#)).

All of the matters the subject of the policy are addressed in the standard Community Hall Rental Agreement which all applicants are required to complete.

Use of Council Owned Venues for Council Events (07-3)

The Policy Statement for this policy provides as follows:

1. *That all Council organised events be held at Council owned venues except where inherent requirements of the event cannot be accommodated at a Council owned venue, and*
2. *Approval for the use of a non-Council owned venue must be given by the General Manager.*

(see [Attachment 2](#))

It is considered that the matters the subject of this policy are best left to managerial discretion. Alternatively, if the matter is staff-related it should be dealt with as part of Council's Human Resources Strategy.

ANZAC Day Use of Sports Grounds (03-5)

This policy aims to prohibit the use of any Council administered sporting grounds during the normal period of remembrance services on ANZAC Day. It goes beyond the ordinary prohibition imposed in the *ANZAC Day Observance Act 1929* which expressly does not apply to children's sports (see [Attachment 3](#)).

Though its aim is well established, the matters dealt with by the policy are more properly left to the Act to regulate, or alternatively to self-management by individual sporting clubs. Council will not be at a disadvantage as a result of the rescission of the policy.

Consultations:

Director, Corporate Governance and General Counsel
 Manager, Legal and Property
 Manager, Governance and Risk
 Property Coordinator

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

There are no material human resource or financial risk implications.

Risk Identification	Consequence	Probability	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
If the identified policies are not 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 rescinds the identified policies as recommended.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil.

Recommendation:

That Council:

- (a) RESCIND the *Community Hall Utilisation policy (05-5)*
- (b) RESCIND the *Use of Council Owner Venues for Council Events policy (07-3)*, and
- (c) RESCIND the *ANZAC Day Use of Sports Grounds policy (03-5)*.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Community Hall Utilisation policy
- 2  Use of Council Owned Venues for Council Events policy
- 3  ANZAC Day Use of Sports Grounds Policy

12. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - DECEMBER 2016

Author: Reporting Officer (Len Newton)
Qualified Person: Acting Director, Community Economic Development and 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 the following strategies:

- 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 December 2016 for Aldermens' 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 2015-2016 Budget Carry-Forwards as approved at the August 2016 Council Meeting.

For December 2016 we have one red light and five yellow lights, with the remainder being green lights.

Red light

Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate (LTIFR): Month (MTD) 28.45 LTIFR for December (page 29). There was one LTI for December and the rolling 12 month LTIFR is 36.04. This is up on the November result (33.67) but still lower than for the same time last year which was 36.66. Safety remains a priority for the organisation and all incidents are reviewed to ensure policies and practices are refined to avoid future incidents.

Yellow lights

Capital Expenditure Property (page 18): The capital program for 2016/17 included significant project spends in the middle months, however spending has been well under budget. Forecasts suggest that the program will be completed for the full year. For that to eventuate, spending will need to increase.

Capital Expenditure Stormwater (page 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 increase.

Capital Expenditure Other (page 19): The capital program for 2016/17 started slowly and remains well under budget. Forecasts suggest that the program will be completed for the full year. For that to eventuate, spending will need to increase.

Accounts Receivable (page 22): Overdue debtors are above target due primarily to Derwent Park Reuse Scheme Contractor \$1,597k.

Total Salaries and Wages for Capital Projects (page 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.

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 December 2016.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1  Corporate Indicators - December 2016
- 2  Appendix B Capital Report - December 2016

13. ACTIONS LIST - UPDATE REPORT

Author: Senior Internal Compliance Advisor (Bryn Hannan)

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

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:

Annual Plan Reference 4.2.4.03 *Implement the Governance Strategy*.

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the latest Actions List (Open Council Meeting), updated following the 23 January 2016 Council meeting.

Proposal in Detail:

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

The Actions List (Open Council Meeting) ([Attachment 1](#)) highlights the progress of the items on the list following the 23 January 2016 Council meeting.

Consultations:

Relevant Council officers

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

No cost

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil applicable

Recommendation:

That Council:

NOTE the progress of the items on the Actions List (Open Council Meeting), as updated following the 23 January 2016 Council meeting.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 [Action List - Open Council Meeting](#)

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

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

15. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

GOVERNANCE

16. DERWENT ESTUARY PROGRAM CONSTITUTION

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).

17. TASWATER QUARTERLY REGIONAL BRIEFING TO THE OWNERS' REPRESENTATIVES

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).

18. 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 Regulation 15(2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

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