

**COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA
MONDAY, 21 DECEMBER 2020**



GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL

QUALIFIED PERSON CERTIFICATION

The General Manager certifies that, in accordance with section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, any advice, information and recommendations contained in the reports related to this agenda have been prepared by persons who have the qualifications or experience necessary to give such advice, information and recommendations.

Tony McMullen
General Manager
16 December 2020

Hour: 6.00 p.m.

Present (in Chambers):

Present (by video link):

**In attendance (in
Chambers):**

**In attendance (by video
link):**

Leave of Absence:

**Workshops held since
last Council Meeting**

Date: Monday, 7 December 2020

Purpose: To discuss:

- Glenorchy District Football Club – Lease negotiations

Date: Monday, 14 December 2020

Purpose: To discuss:

- Playspace Strategy objectives
- Aldermen Q&A session

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.	APOLOGIES	5
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (OPEN MEETING)	5
3.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	5
4.	PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION	5
5.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	5
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES).....	7
7.	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS.....	8
	COMMUNITY	9
8.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR.....	10
9.	GLENORCHY LEARN.....	14
	ECONOMIC	19
10.	BERRIEDALE PENINSULA MASTER PLAN.....	20
	ENVIRONMENT	28
11.	WELLINGTON PARK MANAGEMENT TRUST - UPDATE AND NOMINATION OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES	29
12.	BUSHFIRE MITIGATION STRATEGY 2020-2030.....	37
	GOVERNANCE	45
13.	INFRINGEMENT DEBT COLLECTION.....	46
14.	FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 30 NOVEMBER 2020	53
15.	PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS - MONTHLY REPORT	58
16.	UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES.....	61
17.	NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE	65
17.1	NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN DUNSBY: DISABILITY- INDICATED PARKING IN GLENORCHY CBD	65

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	67
18. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)	68
19. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	68
GOVERNANCE	69
20. AUDIT PANEL MINUTES	70
21. GENERAL MANAGER'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW 2019-20	70
22. GLENORCHY DISTRICT FOOTBALL CLUB LEASE	70
23. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)	70

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (OPEN MEETING)

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 30 November 2020 be confirmed.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Questions taken on notice – Kaye Smith, Glenorchy
(received Monday, 30 November 2020)

- Q1. Why, in the letters sent out to ratepayers, Council are not being fully up front with the ratepayer on their letter, when council knew that a building surveyor on an original application was (a) Deceased and (b) deregistered but unknown to the Ratepayer?**
- A. To date, Council has completed around 6,000 reviews of building and plumbing permit files. As a result of the reviews, 1,750 letters have been sent to property owners who have un-finalised, expiring permits. Council officers cannot be expected to have up-to-date information on the status of all building surveyors associated with these un-finalised, expiring permits.

Q2: What recourse or alternative has a ratepayer been given when said Surveyor is no longer available and also would not have been practising through no fault of the ratepayer, particularly after already having paid the surveyor for a particular job?

A. The onus is on the applicant or practitioner to finalise permits. Unfortunately, some property owners have needed to engage alternative practitioners to enable them to finalise expiring permits.

Q3: Is Council aware that a building surveying company that 'took over' a deceased surveyors accounts are now charging a massive amount of money (abt \$700) to go back through their books to ascertain what work and what forms had or had not been presented to Council?

A. Council is not aware of this.

Q4: What contact has Council made with the State Government in regards to their files that have not been diligently followed through by council over a period of up to 20 years and therefore will be adding a huge extra burden to their ratepayers?

A. Council has engaged with Consumer, Building and Occupational Services in the Tasmanian Government since the introduction of the amendments to the *Building Act*, highlighting the impact on our residents.

Q5: And if not, regarding Q4, why not?

A. See answer to question 4, above.

Q6: Ratepayers have already paid Council for their permits at the time of their Applications, why then are Council requesting a now inflated extra amount?

A. Any fees collected by Council at the time of permit issue reflected the cost of completing the works within an expected two-year window. The retrospective amendment to the legislation has forced Council to incur significant costs to review historical records, notify owners and finalise the permits at today's costs. It would be unfair of Council to impose these additional costs on the whole community. Costs to finalise permits have been reduced as much as possible to reduce impact on affected property owners.

Q7: Given the very short time frame of requesting payments from Ratepayers, i.e. 31 December why can't these payments be deferred a little longer bearing in mind the burden of costs to families at Christmas?

A. The deadline is set out under legislation and is therefore a matter for the Tasmanian Government. Council has no control over this deadline.

Q8: Given that a Ratepayer has already paid for surveying, are Council aware that the cost of a new Surveyor is at least another \$770?

A. Council is aware that surveyors charge variously to complete surveying works but has no control over this. It is a matter for individual surveyors.

Q8: Have Council considered, in some instances where the, for instance, a single car garage and to all intents and purposes had been thought to be finalised and not of a large construction, having Council's own Building surveyor and or plumber look over a property and give advice as to whether a cost of hundreds of dollars is necessary to their ratepayers? And if not, why not?

A. Council was the building surveyor for permits issued under the 1993 legislation. Council did not undertake building surveying work when the *Building Act 2000* was implemented in 2004. Council does not have the resources to undertake building surveying work for which it is not responsible.

Q9: Are Council aware of what other Councils are doing regarding help for their ratepayers in this matter? And if not why not?

A. Glenorchy City Council has taken the proactive step of reviewing all of its files and writing to property owners affected by the change in legislation, who have expiring unfinalised permits associated with their property. Many Tasmanian councils are not notifying property owners of their expiring permits, with these property owners only likely to become aware of this issue when they seek to sell their property.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Please note:

- the Council Meeting is a formal meeting of the Aldermen elected by the Glenorchy community. It is chaired by the Mayor
- public question time is an opportunity in the formal meeting for the public to ask questions of their elected Council representatives about the matters that affect ratepayers and citizens
- question time is for asking questions and not making statements (brief explanations of the background to questions may be given for context but comments or statements about Council's activities are otherwise not permitted)
- the Chair may permit follow-up questions at the Chair's discretion, however answers to questions are not to be debated with Council
- the Chair may refuse to answer a question, or may direct a person to stop speaking if the Chair decides that the question is not appropriate or not in accordance with the above rules
- the Chair has the discretion to extend public question time if necessary.

Questions on Notice – Janine Foley (received Monday, 14 December 2020)

Ms. Foley submitted an extensive list of questions relating to various historical matters and several relating to herbicide use.

The questions and supporting documentation provided by Ms Foley are included as **Attachment 1** to this agenda.

Matters relating to the historical dysfunction of Glenorchy City Council have been the subject of both a Board of Inquiry and an investigation (and report) by the Tasmanian Integrity Commission, both of which are publicly available. Council was subsequently issued with a set of directions by the Minister for Local Government in 2018 which

directed various actions be taken to improve governance practices and address historical issues, all of which have now been fully addressed (save for ongoing reporting requirements) to the Minister's satisfaction. In view of the extensive investigations undertaken to date, and the considerable action taken by Council both before and after those directions were issued to address deficiencies in its governance, it would be an inappropriate use of Council resources to have officers undertake the considerable task of researching and providing answers to Ms Foley's questions about historical matters. Answers to those questions will therefore not be provided.

Council will also take Ms Foley's questions relating to the use of herbicides in the municipality on notice and will provide information in response as soon as practicable.

Ms Foley will instead be invited to meet with the Mayor and General Manager to discuss her concerns in-person.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

A petition submitted by Janiece Bryan of Montrose titled "Stop selling our car park (Regina/Barry St) ", received on 15 December 2020 will be tabled.

COMMUNITY

Community Goal: “Making Lives Better”

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR

Author: Mayor (Ald. Kristie Johnston)
Qualified Person: General Manager (Tony McMullen)
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:

Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interests of the community
Strategy 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency

Reporting Brief:

To receive an update on the recent activities undertaken by the Mayor.

Proposal in Detail:

The following is a list of events and external meetings the Mayor has attended during the period Tuesday, 24 November to Monday, 14 December 2020.

Wednesday 25 November 2020

- Attended the Works Centre Men’s Health breakfast
- Attended an interview with ABC Radio Mornings program
- Attended the Launch of the Family and Domestic Violence video
- Attended a meeting with a representative of the YMCA Hobart
- Attended the label launch for Marilena Di Florio

Thursday 26 November 2020

- Attended the Dominic College End of Year Awards Ceremony
- Attended the Advanced Manufacturing Facility Opening at Incat

Friday 27 November 2020

- Attended a meeting with the Greater Hobart Mayors
- Hosted the final Emerging Leaders Club for 2020 at Montrose Bay High School
- Hosted Council’s Special Committees End of Year Gathering
- Attended the Acoustic Life of Zinc event at Nyrstar

Saturday 28 November 2020

- Attended the Kamara Family Fundraiser event

Monday 30 November 2020

- Attended the Greater Hobart Committee and Advisory Group workshop
- Chaired the Inaugural Glenorchy Jobs Hub Reference Group meeting
- Chaired the Council meeting

Tuesday 1 December 2020

- Attended a radio interview with Triple M Brian Carlton's show
- Attended the Local Government Challenge National Final Awards Ceremony online

Wednesday 2 December 2020

- Attended a meeting with Jane Addison (consultant)
- Attended the Millennials Forum II

Thursday 3 December 2020

- Attended the LGAT General Meeting and One Day Conference
- Attended the Variety from the Heart Cocktail function
- Attended the LGAT Annual Dinner

Friday 4 December 2020

- Attended an interview with Hit 100.9 Jimmy & Nath
- Attended the Young Elected Members breakfast
- Attended a meeting with a resident

Saturday 5 December 2020

- Attended the Glenorchy Carols Pop-Ups

Sunday 6 December 2020

- Attended the Multicultural Sports League Badminton Tournament

Monday 7 December 2020

- Attended an Aldermanic training session
- Chaired the Council workshop
- Chaired the Glenorchy Planning Authority meeting

Tuesday 8 December 2020

- Attended a LGAT Charitable Rates Steering Committee meeting

- Chaired the Glenorchy Community Awards Selection meeting
- Guest Speaker at the Multicultural Council of Tasmania Government forum

Wednesday 9 December 2020

- Attended a meeting with the Tasmanian Audit Office
- Hosted the final Emerging Leaders Club for 2020 at Cosgrove High School

Thursday 10 December 2020

- Guest speaker and award presenter, at the Indie School Awards Ceremony
- Visited Moonah Primary School to present the Classroom Christmas Decoration prize

Saturday 12 December 2020

- Hosted the Glenorchy Carols Christmas Pop-Up on the Council lawns
- Attended the Glenorchy City Lions Club Christmas BBQ
- Attended the Claremont Men's Shed Christmas BBQ

Sunday 13 December 2020

- Attended the Glenorchy City Bowls Club Christmas luncheon

Monday 14 December 2020

- Attended a meeting with Andrew Wilkie MP
- Chaired the Council workshop
- Attended the Ogilvie High School Awards Assembly

In addition to the above meetings and events, the Mayor attended numerous internal meetings and performed other administrative duties.

Consultations:

Nil.

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Nil.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil.

Recommendation:

That Council:

RECEIVE the announcements about the activities of the Mayor during the period from Tuesday, 24 November to Monday, 14 December 2020.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

9. GLENORCHY LEARN

Author: Director Community and Customer Services (David Ronaldson)

Qualified Person: Director Community and Customer Services (David Ronaldson)

ECM File Reference: Glenorchy LEARN

Community Plan Reference:

Making Lives Better

Young people and their families will be encouraged to play an active part in their education and community.

Open for Business

We will champion education, innovation and new technologies to stimulate creativity and to generate more jobs in the future.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Making Lives Better

Objective 1.2 Support our communities to pursue and achieve their goals.

Strategy 1.2.3 Promote creative expression and participation in lifelong learning as priorities for our communities.

Action 1.2.03.07 Facilitate activities that address community learning opportunities in conjunction with the LEARN network.

Reporting Brief:

To update Council on the achievements of the Glenorchy LEARN committee over the past 2-years.

Proposal in Detail:

Council adopted the 2014 – 2017 Building a Learning Community in Glenorchy Strategy (**Strategy**) in late 2014.

The strategy was developed in response to the following defined problem:

“The Glenorchy Local Government Area (LGA) has low participation and attainment in education and training across all age groups and we face complex social and economic issues. These issues include lower average wages, higher living costs, higher general and youth unemployment rates. Glenorchy also faces health issues that challenge community health and wellbeing such as smoking, obesity and chronic disease. These issues overlap and affect the future prosperity and wellbeing of our community.”

The Strategy outlined a whole of community approach to addressing the learning needs, issues, and challenges of our community. The Strategy links to the *City of Glenorchy Community Plan 2015-2040* that highlights a key community priority as 'Education and lifelong learning'.

While the direct provision of education services is not the core business of Council, Council does have an important role in:

- promoting a culture of learning
- facilitating lifelong learning opportunities
- advocating for investment in education, training and work opportunities
- establishing and developing partnerships, and
- providing programs in Glenorchy that support lifelong learning.

The four goals of the Strategy are to:

- establish a strong foundation in learning for young people in Glenorchy and provide our community with opportunities to continue learning for life
- build partnerships to improve education, training, and employment outcomes for young people in Glenorchy
- work with the community to achieve a shared vision for Glenorchy as a Learning Community, and
- encourage and support a culture of learning in Glenorchy.

The implementation of the Strategy was designed to use a partnership approach. Council was to establish a leadership group and network to review, monitor and progress the strategy, and to take responsibility for coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the Strategy in partnership with the leadership group.

Since the adoption of the Strategy, there has been significant change within Council's management team and responsibilities. During the period from 2015 to 2017, the LEARN (Learning, Engagement, Achievement, Respect and Networking) Strategy, as it became known, has been owned by the Community and Customer Services Directorate whose Director has acted as secretariat to the LEARN committee. The committee was established and continues to meet quarterly. The terms of reference for the Glenorchy LEARN committee are [Attachment 1](#).

The current membership of the Glenorchy LEARN committee comprises stakeholders from the various organisations and chaired by Alderman Fraser.

- Alderman Fraser (Chair)
- Glenorchy Library
- Skills Tasmania
- University College – University of Tasmania
- State Dept of Education

- TasTAFE

Membership of the LEARN committee is supplemented by guests to the meetings from invited stakeholders and officer support. Meetings of the Glenorchy LEARN committee are rotated across learning and training organisations.

During 2018 the LEARN committee, led by Council and the Glenorchy Library, identified and was successful in attracting the first of 2 rounds of 26TEN funding to address literacy and numeracy needs across the LGA area.

In February 2019, the LEARN committee held a facilitated session to develop a clear action plan for the period 2019 – 2021 (refer to [Attachment 2](#)).

A significant achievement of the partnership approach has been the attraction of 2 rounds of funding from the 26TEN Foundation over the 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 periods. The Glenorchy Library has led this work and shared office space and steering committee membership for this project. The detail of the second year of the 26TEN funding is included in [Attachment 3](#). In summary, this project has achieved:

- Mental Health Week at the Glenorchy Library. 800 people attended the event and 14 people directly engaged with 26TEN
- 26TEN week: Three (3) events including Pop-up 26TEN Café outside the Glenorchy Library – 50 people reached with 12 referrals for literacy support, Pop-up 26TEN 'Let's Talk' booth at Northgate - 500 people reached and 26TEN 'Let's Talk' morning tea at Glenorchy City Council
- Seniors Week: Live well Live long 80 attendees, 22 direct engagements
- Pop-up library in Northgate: nine direct engagements
- Northgate Jobs Fair – Two-day event with over 500 attendees and 24 direct engagements
- Playgroup on the Grass, six direct engagements.

The partnership with the Glenorchy Library, and now 26TEN itself, has seen an additional 2 successful grants for the continued development of literacy and numeracy skills with Council's Works Department and the Bucaan Community House Inc in partnership with three community organisations (Mission Australia Chigwell, Chigwell Child and Family Centre and Glenorchy YMCA). These organisations have successfully worked together towards a successful 26TEN employer grant to provide literacy assistance at each of their locations through a mobile project.

The Glenorchy LEARN committee also oversees the development and continued engagement of Glenorchy organisations in the 26TEN Community of Practice (**CoP**). The CoP aims to become self-sustaining and targeting businesses in Glenorchy to increase participation and engagement with 26TEN, workplace literacy and the value of increasing skills for life-long learning. Members of the CoP include:

- Glenorchy Library
- Bunnings Glenorchy
- OAK Possibility

- YMCA Glenorchy
- Incat
- Chigwell child and family centre
- Mission Australia Chigwell House
- Migrant Resource Centre Tasmania
- TasWater
- Metro Tasmania
- Bucaan Community House
- Glenorchy Health Centre
- Vicinity Centres (Northgate)
- Nyrstar

Goal 2 of the original LEARN Strategy is to “Build partnerships to improve education, training, and employment outcomes for young people in Glenorchy”. The recent development of the Glenorchy Jobs Hub is a key plank in achieving this goal.

The Glenorchy LEARN strategy and the LEARN Committee’s work is being considered in the context of Council’s 2020/2021 Annual Plan Action 1.1.2 (Deliver the Community Development Strategy). In addition to the work the LEARN Committee does, Council’s Community Development section also has high levels of engagement with local primary and secondary schools in the municipality, and currently works with all senior campuses of Cosgrove High, Montrose Bay High, Claremont College, Dominic College, Guilford Young College and all primary schools in the Glenorchy municipality.

Consultations:

Director Strategy and Development
Manager Community
Coordinator Community Development
LEARN Committee
Glenorchy Library - Manager
Skills Tasmania – Project Manager
University College – University of Tasmania – Deputy Principal
State Dept of Education -
TasTAFE – Executive Director Students and Education

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Financial

There are no material financial implications for this report.

Human resources

The Director Community and Customer Services acts as secretariat to the LEARN committee and the Manager Community attends meetings and delivers some

identified actions of the action plan. Council officers perform duties associated with the LEARN committee as part of their day-to-day roles.

Risk management

There are no material risk management implications.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Community consultation

There has been no community consultation in relation to this report. However, it is noted that during the development of the '2014 - 2017 Building a Learning Community in Glenorchy Strategy', over 200 people were directly involved in the consultation process, inclusive of in-depth conversations with 42 key education and training, and employment service providers.

Public relations

Council's role in driving the LEARN committee and the focus placed on building a learning community is a key good news story for the Glenorchy Community.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the attached report on activities of the Glenorchy LEARN Committee
2. NOTE that officers will review the Glenorchy LEARN Committee's terms of reference as a part of the broader Council Committees review process.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 LEARN Terms of Reference



- 2 Glenorchy LEARN Action Plan - Annual Review



- 3 26TEN Final report as at 30 June 2020



ECONOMIC

Community Goal: “Open for Business”

10. BERRIEDALE PENINSULA MASTER PLAN

Author: Manager City Strategy and Economic Development (Erin McGoldrick)

Qualified Person: Director Strategy and Development, (Samantha Fox)

ECM File Reference: Berriedale Master Plan

Community Plan Reference:

Open for Business

We will create a strong economy and jobs for the future. We will encourage business diversity, innovation and new technologies to stimulate jobs, creativity and collaboration. We will be a place where business can establish, continue and flourish.

Valuing our Environment

We will value and enhance our natural and built environment. Our CBD areas of Glenorchy, Moonah and Claremont will be revitalised, with a strong emphasis on great design, open spaces and public art.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Open for Business

Objective 2.1 Stimulate a prosperous economy

Strategy 2.1.2 Build relationships with government and the private sector that create job opportunities for our communities

Action 2.1.2.01 Implement the Economic Development Strategy and Economic Recovery Plan

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council endorses the Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan, developed as part of the Economic Recovery Program, to inform future public and private development of the area.

Proposal in Detail:

Glenorchy City Council owns and manages land to the north of the Museum of Old and New Art (**MONA**) as part of Berriedale Foreshore Reserve. The Reserve includes informal open space, play facilities, public toilets, picnic shelters and paths. Council land is leased to the Berriedale Bowls Club, Glenorchy Tennis Club, the Southern City BMX Club and includes the former Treasure Island Caravan Park. The Berriedale Child Care centre is on adjacent Council land abutting Main Road. TasWater owns and operates a regional waste treatment plant to the east of the tennis club. Land within the River Derwent is managed by the Crown.

Also situated on the peninsula is MONA, an internationally significant cultural tourism attraction. The site provides a range of services beyond those of a museum including hospitality, events (indoor and open air), large scale outdoor artworks (such as Spectra and Amarna), public open spaces, vineyards and breweries. MONA is consistently within the top three visitor attractions in Tasmania and, added to this, the grounds have potential to attract significant local visitation for events and community use.

There are a range of opportunities to access the Berriedale Peninsula. The Brooker Highway (part of the National Highway scheme) and its road connections allow vehicle access from both the north and south. The Inter-City Cycleway passes near the two entry roads. A daily commercial ferry service links MONA to Sullivans Cove and the Hobart CBD. Future planning is underway for activating the northern suburbs transit corridor with a public transport service. If a commuter train service from the Hobart CBD into the northern suburbs, is developed, it would be likely to involve a stop/platform servicing MONA and the local area.

Need to develop a Master Plan for the Berriedale Peninsula

The purpose of a Master Plan for the Berriedale Peninsula is to ensure the area is developed in a way that balances the community's need for open space, recreation and public amenity, with the broader economic and cultural opportunities afforded through the site's proximity to Mona and its patrons. The Master Plan for Berriedale Peninsula builds on existing resources, documentation and local knowledge, and, through engagement with community and commercial stakeholders, proposes a long-term integrated land use vision for the area that is in keeping with the vision and objectives of the *Glenorchy City Community Plan 2015-2040*.

A previous draft Master Plan was collaboratively developed by MONA and Council in 2014, however it was never finalised or endorsed by Council.

Given the significant public space, community facilities and connection to the Derwent foreshore, a Master Plan that is developed independently by Council was required in order to properly manage the area for future generations. Thus, the development and finalisation of the Master Plan commenced in 2020, informed through consultation and engagement with the local community and key stakeholders in the area.

Process to develop the Final Draft Master Plan

In August 2020, Inspiring Place was engaged to develop the Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan. The process for developing the Master Plan included the following steps:

- 8 August – project initiated, and discussions commenced with Council staff
- 7 September - *Future Directions* workshop held with key Berriedale Peninsula stakeholders
- 21 September to 10 October – survey open for Berriedale and Chigwell residents
- 26 October – Council considered the Draft Master Plan and approved release for consultation

- 2 November to 30 November - Draft Master Plan was exhibited for consultation, and
- 30 November to 8 December – consultation findings were incorporated into the Final Draft Master Plan.

The Final Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan is provided at [Attachment 1](#). This final draft is based on the draft previously developed by Council and MONA in 2014, updated and informed by rigorous consultation between August and November 2020 with Council staff, key stakeholders, nearby residents and the broader community.

Summary of engagement activities

It is critically important in the development of any long-term vision such as that provided by a Master Plan that the views and opinions of landowners, stakeholders and community who value the area, are taken into account. The Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan must ensure the interests of the community and user groups are captured, and that small group and community sentiments have equity with interests of larger stakeholders, such as TasWater and MONA, in contributing to the overall vision.

All of the engagements undertaken over the course of the Master Plan's development were incorporated into the key objectives and outcomes articulated in the Final Draft Master Plan. These engagements helped to ensure that the Master Plan actions and public and private developments in the area will contribute to the uniqueness of living in Berriedale and Chigwell and working or recreating on the Peninsula.

The first stage of engagement focussed on those organisations who were currently using, adjacent to or leasing the Berriedale Peninsula site. The *Future Directions* workshop explored:

- what is important about the Berriedale Peninsula and what their vision for the future is
- what facilities need fixing or upgrading
- what the important opportunities are for improving access, use and future development of spaces and facilities for the community.

Despite the restrictions of COVID-19, the workshop was well attended. Thirty-three people representing 18 organisations responded, and those who could not attend in person were invited to provide input via email or a follow up discussion, exploring the same themes.

Following the *Future Directions* workshop approximately two thousand flyers were circulated through a 'letterbox drop' to residents living in suburbs adjacent to the site, inviting them to participate in an online or printed survey available at Council Chambers. This engagement received forty responses. The survey sought comment on the objectives, opportunities and challenges for the area and identified residents' priorities.

The respondents to the nearby resident's survey were asked to prioritise the things they most like about the Berriedale Peninsula, the highest rated responses were;

1. The quality of scenic views
2. Being relatively quiet and safe place to live
3. Mona with its cultural attractions
4. Open space areas that provide a diversity of community, sport and recreation facilities
5. Access to the Intercity Cycleway

When nearby residents were asked what needed fixing or upgrading, the highest rated responses were:

1. Upgrade foreshore path connections to Windermere Bay (north) and
2. Elwick Bay (south)
3. Shared paths for bike riders and pedestrians along Main Road to
4. access Berriedale Reserve and Mona
5. Paths within and around Berriedale Peninsula foreshore

When nearby residents were asked what additional facilities would enhance your use and enjoyment of Berriedale Peninsula, the top five priorities were:

1. A public foreshore walk around the caravan park site
2. A public foreshore walk around the northern part of Berriedale Bay (across MONA's land)
3. Development of the caravan park site
4. A designated off-lead dog exercise area with dogs on-lead along foreshore paths and near picnic and play areas
5. A fitness trail

The findings of the *Future Directions* workshop and subsequent residents' survey were presented to Aldermen at a workshop on 28 September along with the Draft Master Plan that reflected the outcomes and priorities expressed through these initial engagement activities.

The final stage of engagement involved releasing the Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan to open consultation through Council's new Let's Talk Glenorchy engagement platform. The project page had 410 visits and of those visitors:

- 43 indicated they were engaged, 190 were informed and 301 were aware of the Master Plan
- 12 contributed to the survey, and
- 33 contributed to the quick poll of which 70% 'strongly support', 6% 'support most aspects of', 9% 'neither support nor oppose' and 15% 'don't support' the Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan.

The open consultation respondents' priorities were broadly consistent with those of the nearby residents across all themes.

When open consultation respondents were asked to prioritise things that they like most about the Berriedale Peninsula the top five results were:

1. The quality of the scenic views
2. Access to the Intercity Cycleway
3. MONA with its cultural attractions
4. Natural landscape and bushland
5. Pop-up roadside stalls selling produce (e.g. food and flowers) on Main Road

When open consultation respondents were asked what improvements would encourage your use and enjoyment of Berriedale Peninsula, the top five results were;

1. Upgrade foreshore path connections to Windemere Bay (north) and Elwick Bay (south)
2. Paths within and around Berriedale Peninsula foreshore
3. Upgrade the public toilets (located at Alcorso Drive)
4. Shared bike and pedestrian pathways along Main Road to access Berriedale Peninsula and Mona
5. Wider shared footpaths along Main Road to access Berriedale Reserve and Mona

When open consultation respondents were asked what additional facilities would enhance your use and enjoyment of Berriedale Peninsula, the top five priorities were;

1. a public foreshore walk around the caravan park site
2. a public foreshore walk around the northern part of Berriedale Bay (across Mona land)
3. station/platform to support a future light rail service
4. an avenue of street trees along Main Road
5. development of the caravan park site

These findings were integrated into the Final Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan ([Attachment 1](#)). A summary of the engagement findings is included in the final section of the document.

Next Steps

Council's agreement is sought to endorse the Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan to inform future public and private development of the area.

Consultations (to date):

Economic Recovery Steering Committee

Mayor

Director Strategy and Development

Manager City Strategy and Economic Development

Senior Communications Advisor

Coordinator Economic Development
Director Community and Customer Services
Manager Property, Waste and Environment

Executive Leadership Team

General Manager
Director Community and Customer Services
Director Strategy and Development
Director Corporate Services
Director Infrastructure & Works
Executive Officer

Project Working Group

Manager Property, Environment and Waste
Manager, Community
Manager, Infrastructure, Engineering and Design
Open Space Coordinator
Planning Services Coordinator
Strategic Planner
Economic Development Coordinator
Business Engagement Officer
Projects Officer

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Financial

The development of Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan is part of the Economic Recovery Plan, funded from a \$5 million, no-interest loan from the Tasmanian Government.

Implementation of the Master Plan is not funded at this stage. Implementation will occur as possible, as development proceeds and with funds sought from private investors and the Australian and Tasmanian Governments. Council will align its infrastructure and maintenance programs with the Master Plan. MONA will progress its developments as funds become available.

Human resources

There are no material human resource implications.

Risk management

Risk Identification	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation	Minor (C2)	Possible (L3)	Low	Ensure clear messaging regarding timelines and implementation following endorsement. The Community Engagement Officer will work closely with Council's Senior Communications Advisor to ensure that clear messaging is developed to mitigate this risk.
The Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan is endorsed, creating an expectation that Council will deliver the concepts identified in the Plan in the short-term				
Do not adopt the recommendation	Major (C4)	Likely (L4)	High	Continue to provide general investment and economic information to stakeholders or investors in an ad-hoc manner. Continue to inform the community on ad-hoc basis.
The Final Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan is not endorsed and does not proceed, creating uncertainty in the business and investment community, as well as the general community as to Council's vision for the future of the Berriedale Peninsula.				
Reputational impact over time due to lack of cohesive visioning for the Berriedale Peninsula.	Major (C4)	Likely (L4)	High	

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Consultation has already been undertaken with key stakeholders and nearby residents.

Full public consultation on the Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan was open from early November and concluded on 30 November 2020. A summary of the engagement is included as an attachment to the Final Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan

The full public consultation included:

- communication via Council website and social media
- public submissions open for four weeks
- a public survey open for four weeks
- a public quick-poll open for four weeks.

Recommendation:

That Council:

ENDORSE the Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan to inform future public and private development of the area, in the form of Attachment 1 with minor edits as required for publication.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1** Final Draft Berriedale Peninsula Master Plan



ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: “Valuing our Environment”

11. WELLINGTON PARK MANAGEMENT TRUST - UPDATE AND NOMINATION OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

Author: Director Infrastructure and Works (Ted Ross)

Qualified Person: Director Infrastructure and Works (Ted Ross)

ECM File Reference: Wellington Park Trust

Community Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

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

Valuing our Environment

The active involvement of the community means we will maintain and enjoy our natural treasures like Wellington Park.

Our walking path and bike path networks will be extended, connecting our natural environment and open spaces to the built environment. Our natural environment and created open spaces will be inviting places to be.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community.

Strategy 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency.

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

Strategy 4.3 Build strong relationships to deliver our communities' goals.

Strategy 4.3.1 Foster productive relationships with other levels of government, other councils and peak bodies to achieve community outcomes.

Valuing our Environment

Objective 3.2 Manage our natural environments now and for the future.

Strategy 3.2.1 Identify and protect areas of high natural values.

Strategy 3.2.2 Encourage access to and appreciation of natural areas through the development of trail networks and environmental education.

Reporting Brief:

To provide an update to Council on the activities of the Wellington Park Management Trust (**Trust**), appoint a Member and Deputy Member to represent Council on the Trust, and note the Memorandum of Understanding (**MoU**) to continue Council's support for the Trust.

Proposal in Detail:

Background

Wellington Park (**the Park**) is managed by the Wellington Park Management Trust. Established by the *Wellington Park Act 1993*, the Trust represents the collective interests and aspirations of the landowners, stakeholders and visitors of the Park, and co-ordinates management to protect Park values.

The Constitution and membership of the Trust are specified in the Act and include Hobart and Glenorchy City Councils, Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service, the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, TasWater and Tourism Tasmania.

Council maintains a single member on the Trust and a deputy member that fills in when the member is not available.

In February 2018, Council nominated Alderman Melissa Carlton to the Wellington Park Management Trust and Alderman Carlton was subsequently appointed as a member of the Trust by the Minister. Council's Director Infrastructure and Works, Ted Ross, was appointed as the deputy member.

Memorandum of Understanding

Council and the Trust have been working closely together to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which sets out the agreement between the Trust and Council in relation to how we will work together to manage the Park's values. The draft MoU is [Attachment 1](#).

The MoU would initially be for a period of three years through to June 2023. The draft MoU outlines what each of the parties is currently doing in terms of resourcing commitments to manage the Park, and details how the parties will work together to implement the Wellington Park Management Plan and other strategies.

Update on Activities of the Trust

The focus of the Trust over the past 12 months has been the development of a Visitation and Recreation Strategy for the Park.

The purpose of this Strategy is to identify the visitation and recreational needs and opportunities that can be sustainably provided in the Park and provide recommendations and actions to realise these opportunities for the next 10 years.

While the Park has been somewhat resilient to increased use, there are signs such as high visitation to the pinnacle area and increasing use of mountain bikers and other recreation users, that there will be pressure from increasing use going forward.

Opportunities to better understand what is happening within the Park and guide its sustainable use through adaptive management principles are core to the strategy.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted on the ability to engage with the community on the Strategy, there has been significant online engagement during this period. A draft Strategy is due to be released in the first half of 2021 for further community comment.

At a special meeting of the Trust in December 2020, the Masterplan for the Glenorchy Mountain Bike Park at Tolosa Park was considered and endorsed. Mountain bike trails on the lower foothills of the mountain within City of Hobart were also approved at this same meeting. The Masterplan was endorsed by Council at its meeting in October 2020.

The Trust has also continued to undertake its normal regulatory and strategic activities and Council has supported this through our contribution of several officers to the Park's Management Advisory Committee.

Membership of the Trust

Alderman Carlton's term of appointment by Council as its representative on the Trust will expire on 31 December 2020. The Director Infrastructure and Works, Mr Ross', term will end with his resignation from Council on 25 December 2020.

The nomination and appointment process to determine Council's representative for the rest of the term of the current Council is set out in Council's Committee Nominations policy (**the Policy**). By convention, Council has elected an Alderman to represent it on the Trust.

Council has previously appointed a single Alderman as a member of the Trust, and a member of Council's management team as deputy. Council may also resolve to elect a second Alderman as its deputy representative.

Notice to Aldermen calling for nominations

In accordance with clause 5 of the Policy, a Notice was circulated to Aldermen on 8 December 2020 (**Notice**) calling for nominations to Wellington Park Management Trust. A copy of the Notice is [Attachment 2](#).

Nominations received

No nominations were received for the vacant position on the Trust.

In the absence of any pre-nominations, it is recommended that Council seeks nominations (by resolution) from the floor at the December Council meeting.

Procedural Requirements

Clauses 5(7) and (8) of the policy set out the process for appointing nominees for committees, as follows:

- (7) *Where the number of nominees for a position does not exceed the number of positions available, the Council will decide the nominees in accordance with its ordinary meeting procedures.*
- (8) *If the number of nominees for a position exceeds the number of positions available:*

- (a) *a ballot will be held to select the nominee or nominees, and*
- (b) *once the result of the ballot is determined, the chair will call for the nomination to be confirmed in accordance with Council's ordinary meeting procedures.*

In accordance with the above, a ballot will be required if there is more than one nominee for the position on the night.

If a ballot is required, ballot papers will be distributed to Aldermen and will be destroyed as soon as practical after the conclusion of the meeting.

Information about the Trust

The following information about the Wellington Park Management Trust is provided below, as required under the Policy:

Wellington Park Management Trust

Committee type	External body (as defined in the Policy)
Committee composition	Under section 10 of the <i>Wellington Park Act 1993 (WP Act)</i>, the Trust consists of – (a) the chairperson (appointed by the Minister), and (b) the Director-General of Lands or a person nominated by the Director-General, and (c) the Director of National Parks and Wildlife or a person nominated by the Director, and (d) the chief executive officer of Tourism Tasmania or a person nominated by that chief executive officer, and (e) two persons nominated by the Hobart City Council, and (f) a person nominated by the Glenorchy City Council, and (g) a person nominated by the Hobart Regional Water Board.
No. of Aldermanic positions available	1 committee member, 1 proxy and/or deputy (subject to Council resolution) Note: • The WP Act requires Council to nominate 'a person' to the Trust. Council is not required under the Act to appoint an Alderman and may instead elect to nominate a Council employee as its representative. Council has previously appointed an Alderman to the committee and a member of the management team as a deputy. Council may also resolve to appoint an Alderman as a deputy rather than a Council employee. If Council resolves to do this, it is proposed that the Alderman appointed as proxy is instead appointed as deputy. • The appointment of Council's nominee to the Trust is subject to confirmation by the Minister. • It should be noted that the Director Infrastructure and Works has resigned effective from 25 December 2020, meaning that the deputy committee member position will also be vacant from that date.

Wellington Park Management Trust

Meeting frequency	As required. The Trust typically meets approximately once every 3-4 months.
Ex-officio appointments	n/a
Proposed term of appointment	The balance of the term of the current Council.
Role and purpose of Committee	The Wellington Park Management Trust is a statutory body established under the <i>Wellington Park Act 1993</i> to oversee and administer the Wellington Park Management Plan. The Trust meets when required to transact business, generally around 5 times per year. The functions of the trust are set out in section 11 of the Act, as follows: (a) to provide for the management and maintenance of Wellington Park in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which it is set aside; (b) to give effect to any management plan in force for Wellington Park; (c) to prepare plans with a view to their submission to the Governor for approval as management plans for Wellington Park and to keep under review the provisions of management plans; (d) to ensure that any development undertaken in Wellington Park is consistent with the purposes for which it is set aside and with any management plan; (e) when required to do so by the Minister, to advise on any development proposed for Wellington Park; (f) to carry out, or arrange for the carrying out of, research and other activities that appear to it to be desirable in connection with the administration of this Act; (g) to be the managing authority of Wellington Park; (h) to perform such other functions as are imposed on it by or under this or any other Act.
Nature of duties to be undertaken	The duties of a committee member, including (but not limited to): • attend briefings from Council officers in respect to matters before the Trust; • attending meetings of the Trust, and • discharging the roles and functions of the Trust.
Extent of delegated authority	No delegated authority.

Appointment of Council staff member

Council has previously appointed an Alderman to the Trust, and a member of the management team as deputy. However, the Wellington Park Act does not require that Council appoints an Alderman as its representative on the Trust. Any person may be nominated.

Council may therefore determine that it does not intend to make an Aldermanic appointment to the Trust and resolve accordingly.

The appointment of Council's nominee to the Trust is subject to confirmation by the Minister.

Council's Committee Nominations and Appointments Policy does not apply to a situation where a Council staff member is to be appointed as a representative on an external body. Compliance with the policy's requirements for nominations to external bodies (which only apply to Aldermen and independent persons) is therefore not required.

Council may opt to either appoint an Alderman or Council staff member to the position of deputy.

Council's approval of a Council staff member nomination would therefore be sought on the basis that Council's committee's framework contemplates, more broadly, that Council has oversight of and formally approves its nominees for positions on external bodies.

Ultimately the Minister (on the recommendation of the Trust itself) would need to approve a Council staff appointment as Deputy if Council resolves as recommended.

If Council wishes to appoint a staff member, it is proposed that the Manager Property, Environment and Waste, Alex Woodward, be nominated.

Recommendations

Consistent with previous practice, this report recommends that Council appoint at least one Alderman as its representative on the Trust. In accordance with clause 5(8) of the policy, if Council resolves to appoint an Alderman to the Trust and there is more than 1 nominee, a ballot will be required to determine the nominee.

If a ballot is held, it is recommended that the first placed candidate be appointed as nominee for the member role, and the second placed candidate as the nominee for the deputy role.

Consultations:

Aldermen
Executive Leadership Team
General Manager Wellington Park Management Trust

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Financial

Council's contribution to the cost of managing the Trust activities as outlined in the MoU is \$35,191 excluding GST.

This is subject to an annual CPI increase.

Human resources

Council officers including members of the environment unit and bushfire unit regularly work within the Park and are members of the Management Advisory Committee (**MAC**). They are available to provide advice to members of the Trust.

Risk management

Risk Identification	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation In adopting the recommendation Council is committing the ongoing support for the Trust both financially and with resources. This has a minor impact on Council's budget.	Minor (C2)	Unlikely (L2)	Low (4)	Council continues to participate and report on activities of the Trust ensuring that we are providing the community with value.
Do not adopt the recommendation If Council does not appoint Aldermen to the Mount Wellington Management Trust: - Council will be in breach of the Policy and various legislative requirements, and - Governance control will be less effective and Council's ability to discharge its statutory functions will be jeopardised. The above would represent a significant regulatory and policy breach.	Major (C4)	Unlikely (L2)	Medium (8)	Council makes considered appointments to the various committees in accordance with the procedural requirements set out in this report.
Council may seek to vary the recommendation including the amount of financial resources provided to the Trust that is set out in the MoU. This would impact on the regulatory functions provided within the Park and collaboration between parties	Minor (C2)	Unlikely (L2)	Low (4)	Council could consider alternative arrangements to provide regulatory functions within the Park.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:Community consultation

Council will continue to promote the community engagement associated with the development of the Visitation and Recreation Strategy.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the information contained in this report around the activities of the Wellington Park Management Trust and the work jointly undertaken by Council and the Trust, including the draft Memorandum of Understanding in Attachment 1

It is further recommended that Council seeks a mover for a motion to the effect that, either:

- Council resolves to appoint an Alderman as its nominee for the member role on the Trust and a second Alderman as its nominee for the deputy member role, or
- Council resolves to appoint an Alderman as its nominee for the member role on the Trust and a member of Council's Management Team as its nominee for the deputy member role (with the recommendation being that Alex Woodward, Manager Property Environment and Waste is nominated).

Council will also need a further resolution to appoint the successful nominees or candidates, including to reflect the results of a ballot if a ballot is required.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 Draft MOU between GCC and Trust



12. BUSHFIRE MITIGATION STRATEGY 2020-2030

Author: Coordinator Bushfire Management (Rob Whittle)

Qualified Person: Director Infrastructure and Works (Ted Ross)

ECM File Reference: Bushfire Unit

Community Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

We will be a progressive, positive community with strong council leadership.

Making Lives Better

We value our aboriginal communities' culture and heritage.

Valuing Our Environment

We will value and enhance our natural environment.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interest of our community

Objective 4.2 Prioritise resources to achieve our communities' goals

Objective 4.3 Build strong relationships to deliver our communities' goals

Action 4.1.2.04 Ensure we are prepared for disaster and maintain Emergency Management Strategies

Valuing Our Environment

Objective 3.2 Manage our natural environments now and for the future

Strategy 3.2.1 Identify and protect areas of high natural values

Strategy 3.2.2 Encourage access to and appreciation of natural areas through the development of trail networks

Action 3.2.1.01 Manage the fire risk in the city's bushland reserves

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council endorses the *Glenorchy City Council Bushfire Mitigation Strategy 2020-2030* and note the funding requirements for consideration in future budgets.

Proposal in Detail:

The draft Glenorchy City Council Bushfire Mitigation Strategy 2020-2030 (**BMS**) is presented to Council for consideration as Attachment 1 to this report.

The BMS is the first bushfire management strategy that has been prepared for bushfire-prone vegetation managed by Glenorchy City Council. Reducing the risk to life and property is the overriding priority in the BMS, as it is in all bushfire strategies. Council acknowledges that bushfire safety is a shared responsibility between government, agencies and other stakeholders.

The proposed BMS would allow Council to mitigate bushfire risks efficiently, effectively and consistently in a coordinated approach within the Hobart Fire Management Area (**HFMA**) through the Hobart Fire Management Area Committee (**HFMAC**) based on the principle that bushfires do not stop at cadastral boundaries.

The development of the draft BMS has included extensive stakeholder consultation, including feedback from the public. The draft BMS was also formally noted by the HFMAC at its meeting on 19 October 2020.

There are 10 Fire Management Areas (**FMA**s) in Tasmania with boundaries drawn based on bushfire risk and topography, largely aligning to local government boundaries. Fire Management Area Committees (**FMA**Cs) provide a forum for effective bushfire risk management for FMA's through a consistent, comprehensive and collaborative approach. The Glenorchy Local Government Area (**LGA**) sits in the HFMA.

The principal aim of the BMS is to bring together a range of stakeholders that manage land use across the State, to work together to effectively manage vegetation fuels for the mitigation of bushfires.

In accordance with the *Fire Service Act 1979 (the Act)* Council's responsibilities and obligations include:

- to nominate a representative to sit on the local Special Fire Area Committee (HFMAC) (section 55)
- to take all reasonable precautions to prevent any fire lit on their property from spreading to adjoining land (section 63)
- to take diligent steps to extinguish or control any unauthorised fire on their property during a fire permit period, and to report that fire to the Tasmania Fire Service (**TFS**), or the Police (section 64)
- to "*cause the formation in its municipal area of such fire breaks as it considers necessary or desirable to arrest the spread, or to facilitate the suppression of, fires*" (section 56)
- to deal with a fire danger which Council has been notified of under section 49 within such reasonable period of not less than 30 days as is specified in the notice, as if that fire danger were a nuisance under the *Local Government Act 1993*.

Council's Bushfire Mitigation Team

To deliver and adaptively manage the BMS, Council has a Bushfire Mitigation Team comprising of:

- Coordinator Bushfire Management – Rob Whittle

- Representative sitting on HFMAC – Rob Whittle
- Bushfire Mitigation and Biodiversity Works Planner – Dr. Lisa Cawthen, and
- Bushfire Mitigation Works Officer – Scott Byers.

The size and intensity of a bushfire relates directly to the presence or effectiveness of bushfire risk reduction treatments and perpetual maintenance. Risk reduction treatments in the BMS include:

- community education and engagement coordinated through the TFS
- planned burning
- hazard management areas/defendable spaces consistent with Australian Standard 3959 – 2018 - Construction of building in bushfire-prone areas.
- fuel breaks consistent with the TFS Fuel Break Guidelines
- fire trails, and
- mechanical vegetation thinning.

Draft Bushfire Mitigation Measures Bill

To enhance Tasmania's bushfire preparedness, the Tasmanian Government is proposing to introduce a new legislative framework to support bushfire mitigation in Tasmania, through the proposed *Bushfire Mitigation Measures Bill* ([Attachment 3](#)). If adopted by Parliament, the Bill would trigger an amendment to the BMS. The BMS has been designed to pre-empt the passage of the bill in order to streamline any future amendments that the enactment of the bill as law would entail.

Consultations

Aldermen and Council's Executive Leadership Team were provided with a comprehensive briefing of the BMS in March 2020. Following the briefing, members of the executive were provided with more detail in respect to the funding requirements. Various tours of parts of the HFMA managed by Glenorchy have been conducted, with key decision-makers, including those involved with emergency management.

Formal consultation for the draft BMS has included HFMAC members, HFMAC observers/subject matter experts, and industry professionals. Those involved include:

Position	Organisation
Manager Bushland	City of Hobart
A/District Officer (Hobart)	Tasmania Fire Service
Councillor	Brighton Council
Fire and Bushland Vegetation Management Coordinator	Clarence City Council
Operations Manager	Derwent Valley Council
Manager Environmental Services	Huon Valley Council

Position	Organisation
Fire Management Officer	Kingborough Council
Assistant Manager, Fire Management	Sustainable Timber Tasmania
Fire Management Officer	Parks and Wildlife Service
Manager Wellington Park Management Trust	Wellington Park Trust
First Officer, Mt Nelson	Tasmania Fire Service
Regional Environmental Officer	Department of Defence
HFMAC Representative	TasWater
HFMAC Representative	Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association
Section Manager	Private Land Conservation Program (DPIPWE)
Regional Leader South	TasNetworks
Planning Officer, Bushfire Risk Unit	Tasmania Fire Service
Community Development Coordinator, Community Fire Safety	Tasmania Fire Service
Community Development Officer, Community Fire Safety	Tasmania Fire Service
Community Engagement Officer, Bushfire Risk Unit	Tasmania Fire Service
Regional Burn Coordinator, Bushfire Risk Unit	Tasmania Fire Service
Executive Officer, State Fire Management Council	Tasmania Fire Service
Fire Management Planning Officer	Tasmanian Fire Service
Planning & Assessment Officer	Tasmanian Fire Service
Project Officer	Tasmanian Fire Service
Strategic Risk Assessment Coordinator	Tasmanian Fire Service
Group Officer, Derwent Group of Brigades	Tasmanian Fire Service
Planning Coordinator	Tasmanian Fire Service
Spatial Analyst	Tasmanian Fire Service
Fire Planning Officer	Parks and Wildlife Service
Technical and Extension Officer	Wine Tasmania
LGAT representative State Fire Management Council	Glamorgan Spring Bay Council
Program Leader Fire and Biodiversity	City of Hobart

Position	Organisation
Natural Resource Planning Officer	Clarence City Council
Coordinator Community Planning and Engagement	Glenorchy City Council
Executive Officer	Glenorchy City Council
Coordinator Planning Services	Glenorchy City Council
Heritage Officer	Glenorchy City Council
Bushfire Mitigation and Biodiversity Works Planner	Glenorchy City Council
Acting Environment Coordinator	Glenorchy City Council
Manager Property, Environment & Waste	Glenorchy City Council
Manager Works	Glenorchy City Council
Director Infrastructure and Works	Glenorchy City Council
Operations and Maintenance Supervisor	Glenorchy City Council

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Financial

Reducing the risk to life and property is the overriding priority of Council's Bushfire Mitigation team. The team applies a risk-based planning approach, based on principles from ISO 31000:2018 and the Tasmanian Emergency Risk Assessment Guidelines. This approach allows Council to manage bushfire risks efficiently, effectively and consistently by considering what Council is currently doing to mitigate bushfire risks, whether that is adequate, and if and where Council needs to improve. This approach is based on the principle that bushfires do not stop at cadastral boundaries.

If identified risks are not treated effectively or holistically there is the potential for loss of life and impact to critical community infrastructure resulting from future bushfire events. Additionally, seasonal weather restrictions can create the potential for works to be carried over to following years (for example, the impact climate change has on the number of days on which it is suitable to conduct planned burns).

The ongoing reduction in bushfire risk requires maintaining a constant mosaic of fuels at different stages since planned burning and mechanical treatments throughout the landscape. This mosaic requires an ongoing long-term commitment.

The estimated investment required in bushfire mitigation works is in the order of \$300,000 per annum, or \$3 million over the next ten years.

In the current financial year, \$170,000 was allocated as part of additional stimulus funding to undertake a range of works within Wellington Park and other bushland reserves.

Council's ongoing financial investment in bushfire mitigation will need to be considered and assigned priority along with other proposed works as part of the considerations for Council's 2021-22 budget.

Human resources

Strategic works are undertaken by Council Officers in Council's Bushfire Mitigation Team as part of their normal duties, which would continue if Council were to adopt the BMS as recommended.

Future human resources required to achieve the outcomes in BMS will depend on the financial resources that Council commits to bushfire mitigation activities in its next budget.

Risk management

Risk Identification	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation	Moderate (C3)	Possible (L3)	Medium	Council considers funding requirements for the implementation of the BMS as part of its 2021-22 budget, based on a business case to be submitted as part of the budget process.
Council is unable to commit adequate resources to fully enact and achieve the objectives set out in the BMS, leading to a need to re-assess the BMS and (potentially) increasing the bushfire risk to the Glenorchy municipality				
Do not adopt the recommendation	Major (C4)	Likely (L4)	High	- Council's Bushfire Mitigation Team continues to implement actions and activities contemplated in the draft BMS using available resources and planning. - Council articulates concerns about the draft BMS and considers a revised BMS at a future Council meeting.
Council's ability to mitigate bushfires threatening the municipal and greater Hobart area will be less effective due to the absence of the overarching strategic document to guide future activities, leading to an increased bushfire risk to Glenorchy and surrounding areas.				

In addition, the following detailed bushfire risk assessments for Glenorchy and the HFMA have been prepared and tabled below as part of the research and development stage of the BMS:

Risk Assessment:	Undertaken By:	Objective:	Attachment to Council Report:
Phoenix RapidFire Fireshed Report	TFS	Assessment of potential bushfire risk and risk treatment planning at landscape level	Attachment 2
Bushfire Risk Assessment Model (BRAM)	Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service	Assessment of strategic level bushfire risk, and elements driving actual risk	Available upon request

Risk Assessment:	Undertaken By:	Objective:	Attachment to Council Report:
HFMAC Bushfire Risk Register	TFS	Prioritisation of bushfire risk reduction treatments at both state and HFMA scale	Confidential – not attached

The following works and actions have also been completed by Council staff to treat bushfire risk potential on Council managed land:

- mechanical treatments including mulching vegetation adjacent to fire trails and at strategic locations to form fuel breaks, establishment of hazard management areas and asset protection zones
- planned fuel reduction burning
- fire trail reinstatement/maintenance/upgrade
- community education and awareness, and
- Upskilling existing Council Operations and Maintenance staff.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Community consultation

Public comments on the development of the BMS were invited through:

- a series of face to face “Walk and Talk” events in bushland areas
- written mailouts to households in bushfire-prone areas
- an online survey.

Members of the public were offered direct contact via email or phone to Council’s Coordinator Bushfire Management.

Public relations

As part of the Strategy, Council will continue to work with the Tasmania Fire Service and other agencies to undertake bushfire mitigation measures. At the same time, it is important for the community to be bushfire ready and as part of this Council encourages people in bushfire-prone areas to develop a bushfire plan.

To do your 5 minute bushfire plan get on to the Tasmania Fire Service website <https://bushfire.tas.gov.au/> or call 1800 000 699 for further information.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. ENDORSE the draft *Glenorchy City Council Bushfire Mitigation Strategy 2020-2030*
2. NOTE the future priority consideration of funding requirements as part of 2021-22 budget process

Attachments/Annexures

- 1** Glenorchy City Council Bushfire Mitigation Strategy 2020-2030



- 2** Phoenix RapidFire Fireshed Report



- 3** Fact Sheet - Bushfire Mitigation Measures Bill



- 4** Glenorchy City Council Bushfire Mitigation Policy



GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

13. INFRINGEMENT DEBT COLLECTION

Author: Manager Customer Services (Robbie Shafe)
Reporting Officer (Allan Wise)

Qualified Person: Director Corporate Services (Jenny Richardson)

ECM File Reference: Centralised Debtors Project

Community Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

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

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

- Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community
- Strategy 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency
- Strategy 4.2.3 Maximise regulatory compliance in Council and the community through our systems and processes

Reporting Brief:

To propose the implementation of an additional debt recovery process prior to unpaid infringements being lodged with the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service.

Proposal in Detail:

Background

At the meeting on 27 April 2020, Council considered the status of unpaid infringements dating back to 1996 and resolved to undertake a wide range of actions, including write-offs and a commitment to improving the collection process for future infringement recovery.

One of the Report recommendations adopted by Council was to:

“ENDORSE the investigation of an alternative collection process that engages an external debt collection agent prior to lodgement with MPES and request a future report detailing the feasibility of such an arrangement.”

The following proposal is put forward as an additional step in the existing collection processes.

Over the past six-months, a substantial amount of work has been undertaken by the Centralised Debtors Project to investigate and resolve unpaid infringements.

This has included taking proactive action to write-off old and uncollectable infringements, and reconciling the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Services (**MPES**) database with Council's Infringement database and monitoring the collection status of new infringements.

The above initiatives, combined with Council's support for the recommendations in the April report, has contributed to a reduction in unpaid infringements by 41% in number and 33% in value as follows:

Details	Total Number	Total Value
Infringements owing April 2020	7,636	\$1,008,101
Infringements owing November 2020	4,498	\$677,146
Reduction	3,138	\$330,955

In order to consolidate the gains made to date and to implement further improvements to the infringement collection process, the benefits of engaging an external debt collection agency (**Agency**) are being considered.

This would add an additional collection step, commencing after reminders have been issued and before the infringement is lodged with MPES.

The current timeline for recovery of infringements is:

	Month 1	Month 2 to Month 5	Month 6 Onwards
			
WHO	GCC	GCC	MPES
TASK	Issue infringement and allow statutory 30 day limit for payment or appeals	Issue reminder	Lodged with MPES at which point Council has no further involvement in collecting the infringement
ACTIONS	Apply provisions of GCC Enforcement Policy 2018	Resolve disputes and discuss payment options	Collection process in order of: -Demand for payment of infringement and lodgement fee -Enforcement Order -Enforcement Sanctions

The proposed timeline for infringements which are standard in nature and not in dispute would be as follows:

	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3 to Month 4	Month 5	Month 6 Onwards
WHO	GCC	GCC	AGENCY	GCC	MPES
TASK	Issue infringement and allow statutory 30 day limit for payment or appeals	Issue reminder and allow further 30 days for payment	Refer to Debt Collection Agency	Unpaid infringements returned from Debt Collection Agency and prepared for lodgement with MPES	Lodged with MPES at which point Council has no further involvement in collecting the infringement
ACTIONS	Apply provisions of GCC Enforcement Policy 2018	Resolve disputes and discuss payment options	Collection process in order of: SMS and/or Email Request Letter Demand Letter Phone Contact Tracing SMS and/or Email	Quality assure offender and infringement information	Collection process in order of: -Demand for payment of infringement and lodgement fee -Enforcement Order -Enforcement Sanctions

There is a six-month window between the infringement being issued and the deadline for lodgement with MPES. The current process of issuing only one reminder in the six-month window and taking no other proactive collection steps in the interim leaves a substantial amount of dormant time.

The engagement of an Agency, which would operate on a 'no win-no fee' basis, would ensure that two-months of the six-month window is used to proactively take collection action for recovery of the unpaid infringement.

In order to determine the potential number of infringements that might be referred to an Agency, it is necessary to first analyse how many infringements did not pay within 30 days of our reminder. These would be referred to the Agency for the two-month period leading up the lodgement with MPES.

The following analysis looks at the five-year period 2015 to 2020 as this provides a firm basis to calculate future numbers:

¹ Year	Number of Reminders Issued	Number Paid Within 28 Days	Number Eligible to Send to Agency
2015/16	2014	658	1356
2016/17	2593	825	1189
2017/18	2406	804	1210
2018/19	2551	864	1150
2019/20	2158	650	1364

¹A five-year period is provided in order to provide a firm basis for the estimate

The next step in the analysis is to calculate how many of the “*eligible to send to agency*” numbers would be likely to pay the Agency as a result of the additional collection process. This would be the combination of:

- (a) those that normally pay after 28 days but before MPES lodgement, plus
- (b) those who would have otherwise been lodged with MPES, but have now paid due to the additional collection process:

Year ¹	Estimated Number Lodged with Agency	Paid After 28 Days but Before MPES Lodgement	Number Avoiding MPES Lodgement ²	Number Successfully Collected by Agency	Remaining Number Lodged with MPES
2015/16	1356	71	424	495	861
2016/17	1189	138	346	484	705
2017/18	1210	144	351	495	715
2018/19	1150	91	349	440	710
2019/20	1364	96	418	514	850

¹A five-year period is provided in order to provide a firm basis for the estimate

²Assuming a 33% successful collection rate by the Agency

The cost of implementing the additional Agency collection process is based on a percentage of the amount paid, not the number of unpaid infringements lodged. In effect, this is the ‘no win-no fee’ arrangement.

The average infringement amount for 2020/21 to date is \$78.00. Based on an average of 500 successful collections per year at a commission rate of 27.5%, the annual out-of-pocket cost is estimated to be around \$10,000 based on the 33% Agency successful collection rate.

The current MPES lodgement fee is \$48.60 which avoids a cash outlay by Council of around \$24,000 if 500 additional infringements are collected by the Agency within the six-month timeframe.

It must be noted that using an Agency is not a substitute for using MPES, but instead is complimentary to the collection process. The legislation is clear that MPES is the ‘enforce’ in collecting unpaid infringements. Councils and Agencies can ‘collect’ an unpaid infringement but are precluded from taking any form of legal action.

The following table provides examples of the cost of each service:

Example Infringement (number issued YTD 2020/21 for this amount across all infringement types)	Infringement Amount	Agency Commission (payable by GCC upon successful recovery)	MPES Lodgement Fee (payable by GCC on lodgement but returned upon successful recovery)
Exceeding Time Limit (1508)	\$43.00	\$11.83	\$48.60
Disobey Loading Zone (743)	\$86.00	\$23.65	\$48.60
Disobey No Parking Sign (146)	\$129.00	\$35.48	\$48.60
Fail to Register Dog (211)	\$172.00	\$47.30	\$48.60
Dog Attack -non-serious injury	\$344.00	\$94.60	\$48.60
Dog Attack - serious injury (3)	\$688.00	\$189.20	\$48.60

It is important to note that Agency debt collection works on a “no win-no fee” basis, whereas MPES requires an “up-front” lodgement fee with no surety of recovery. In effect, Council is investing in an immediate annual reduction of an estimated 500 unpaid infringements that will otherwise have become the responsibility of MPES.

In summary, the full-year financial implications of this proposal are:

Collection Source	Benefit (b)/ Drawback (d)	Commission	Lodgement Fee	Recoverable
Agency	(b) Infringements finalised earlier (b) Cash in bank (b) Offender may avoid MPES action (d) Unrecoverable expense	\$10,725	\$0	\$0
MPES	(b) Enforcement abilities (b) Recoverable expense (d) No recovery action until after the sixth month (d) No surety of timely recovery	\$0	\$24,300	\$24,300

There are hardship safeguards within the Agency and MPES debt collection processes. The offender is able to negotiate with the Agency an extension of time or part payments provided the amount is paid in full within the 60-day timeframe. In the event the infringement is ultimately lodged with MPES, they have similar opportunities for negotiated part payments.

Summary

It is recommended Council endorse the use of an external debt collection agency in order to provide an additional collection process prior to lodgement of unpaid infringements with MPES.

The initial term of the appointment will be for a period of two years after which an internal review can be undertaken to assess the results based upon actual outcomes.

The successful Agency will be appointed in accordance with the procurement rules contained in our Code for Tenders and Contracts.

Consultations:

Chief Financial Officer
Manager Customer Services
Executive Leadership Team

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Human resources

There are no material human resource implications. Management of the infringement collections process, including referrals to an Agency, would be managed by officers within the scope of their normal duties.

Financial

The financial implications are limited to the commission paid to the external debt collection agency and the reduced cash outlays paid to MPES as detailed in the proposal.

The average infringement amount for 2020/21 to date is \$78.00. Based on an average of 500 successful collections per year at a commission rate of 27.5% and success rate of 33%, the annual additional expense is estimated to be around \$10,000.

Risk Management

Risk Identification	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation An Agency is unable to achieve significant improvement in collections, resulting in lost time and effort from Council officers in administering the external debt collection process.	Insignificant (C2)	Rare (L2)	Low	Actively monitor agency progress and review process if not effective.
Do not adopt the recommendation Infringement recovery is less optimal due to the lost opportunity to utilise the first two months of the recovery period to attempt to collect the infringement amounts, leading to increased longer-term costs in referring items to MPES that could have been recovered,	Minor (C2)	Likely (L4)	Medium (8)	Other means of encouraging offenders to pay infringements on time (such as improved communication) are explored by officers.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:Community consultation

Community consultation was not required or undertaken.

Public relations

There are no material public relations implications.

Recommendation:

That Council:

APPROVE the use of an external debt collection agency for recovery of unpaid infringements after initial Council action to recover the debt and before submission to the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

14. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 30 NOVEMBER 2020

Author: Chief Financial Officer (Tina House)
Qualified Person: Director Corporate Services (Jenny Richardson)
ECM File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

Community Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

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

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

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading Our Community

Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community

Strategy 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency

Objective 4.2 Prioritise resources to achieve our communities' goals

Strategy 4.2.1 Deploy the Council's resources effectively to deliver value

Reporting Brief:

To provide the monthly Financial Performance Report to Council for the period ending 30 November 2020.

Proposal in Detail:

Council's Financial Performance Report (**Report**) for the period 1 July to 30 November 2020 is Attachment 1.

The Report highlights that Council's year-to-date actual operating result is \$784k better than the budgeted position¹. The improvement on the budgeted position is the net result of a \$630k increase in revenue and \$154k less in expenditure.

The forecast end-of-year operating result at 30 June 2021 is currently \$171k worse than the budgeted position, being the net result of an \$844k increase in revenue and an \$1.016m increase in expenditure.

1. Operating result excludes capital revenue and net gain/(loss) on disposal of assets

Budget Update

The budget report considered by Council on 15 June 2020 indicated the Budget and Long-Term Financial Management Plan would be reviewed again in August 2020 and January 2021 to ensure that Council is able to adjust its budget settings, if required, in response to any unanticipated changes in operating context given the current dynamic environment.

Council previously considered a budget report update at its meeting on 31 August 2020 and will be presented with a further budget update report at its January 2021 meeting.

The January 2021 report will contain revised revenue and expenditure estimates which will eliminate many of the variances reported to Council in this financial performance report.

Revenue

Revenue is \$630k or 1.3% above budget.

There are major contributors to the positive variance which will maintain that status through to 30 June 2021. There are currently no external influences identified which would cause this to change. Of particular note are the following:

Planning application fees

New development within the municipality continues to generate additional planning application revenue, however there is a commensurate demand on resourcing levels.

Property lease, licence and hire fees

The budget adopted by Council allowed for near zero revenue, however the subsequent re-opening of facilities has seen unbudgeted revenue being received.

Operating grants

The Glenorchy Jobs Hub project (phase 1) has, to-date, received grant funding of \$231k with a further \$98k to be received as milestone payments.

A new five-year grant funding agreement has recently been entered into for Full Gear Motorcycle Safety program, resulting in \$59k being received for year one.

Expenditure

Expenditure is \$154k or 0.6% below budget.

The expenditure bottom line is very much on budget, however there are some individual items of which Council should note:

Employee Costs

Employee costs are currently \$183k under budget. However, the monthly result is largely dependent on unforeseen items such as staff turnover, leave taken and workload demand.

Materials and Services

There are many supplier variances relating to either differences in the budgeted timing of payments or the late lodgement of invoices for payment. These will resolve themselves over time, however they do contribute to actual versus budget variations in the meantime.

Non-Operating – Capital Revenue

Revenue is \$84k or 29% above budget.

A progress payment of \$50k has been received from the Roads-to-Recovery program for the Howard Road reconstruction project.

A National Blackspot program funded project to upgrade parts of Barossa Road/ Nagle Place in Glenorchy has been completed, for which Council has claimed \$34k.

Non-Operating - Net Gain/(Loss) on Disposal of Assets

The disposal of assets currently records a net loss of \$3.769m.

The sale of the Derwent Entertainment Centre (DEC) to the State Government has been completed. The DEC was purchased in 1996 from the State Government for \$1, so the sale back to the State Government for \$8m represents a very good investment return to our community. The DEC book value for accounting purposes was \$12.5m, but it is important to note this amount is not to be taken as a market value.

After performing the required accounting adjustments encompassing disposing of the DEC at book value, recording the sale price and allowing for sale costs, there is a net loss of around \$4m in the Council accounts.

As many in our community are aware, the DEC was in desperate need of critical works in order to bring the facility up to modern day standards. Council was not in a position, now or in the future, to fund these works. In addition, the operating costs were increasing to unsustainable levels with no scope to generate commensurate levels of revenue.

The State Government has committed to investing \$68m in revitalising the DEC and surrounding area with an additional projected \$150m to \$200m investment in the Wilkinsons Point area. This development will increase Council's rate base, thus generating additional rate revenue, as well as eliminating the burden of maintaining an underperforming asset.

Capital Works

Council's year-to-date Capital Works expenditure is \$4.361m or 20% of the annual budget of \$21.717m.

Recurrent capital works are progressing despite an ongoing need to rearrange the timing of works due to procurement requirements and contractor availability.

Grant funded capital works involve substantial amounts of funding for one-off works not normally undertaken by Council. The long lead-time in planning and constructing these may result in much of the expenditure occurring in the last quarter of the year.

All of the grant funded recreation projects have fallen short of their projected cashflow in the 2020/21 financial year. This is due to a number of factors. The primary reason has been the slow progression of the funding agreements being executed with the Australian Government. It had been anticipated earlier in 2020 that the funding agreement for North Chigwell/KGV would have been executed, which would have resulted in greater expenditure on that project than has currently occurred, however the parties are still negotiating the final sign-off of the funding arrangements.

Also of note is the fact that the Australian Government grants are retrospective, meaning that Council needs to spend at least 30% of the total project cost before it can make a claim.

Specific project cashflow drivers are detailed below:

Montrose and Giblyns Playspaces

To date, only design work for the 2 new playspaces has been undertaken. This has resulted in limited cashflow on these projects given that the bulk of the costs are incurred in the construction phase. It is anticipated procurement will commence in early 2021, with the work to commence at Giblyns Reserve in March or April 2021. This would mean limited cashflow outwards for the 2020/21 financial year with most of the \$3.4m being expended in 2021/22 financial year. As noted above, Council would need to expend 30% of the grant funds before being able to make a claim.

Eady St Amenity

As with the Playspace projects, only design work on the Eady Street facility has been carried out this year. A number of factors, including significant design changes, have delayed the project. Regular payments to the designer have been outgoing. Development approval and procurement is expected to start in early 2021, with construction expected to commence in March 2021. Regular cashflow is forecast to commence in June 2021. This would mean limited cashflow outwards for the 2020/21 financial year with most of the \$1m being spent in 2021/22. Under the terms of the grant Council will need to expend 30% before being able to make a claim.

2020/21 Northern Suburbs Football

No cashflow action has taken place with this project as any expenditure undertaken before a funding agreement is signed is considered to be an ineligible expense and is to be avoided. It is anticipated that a funding agreement will be signed in early 2021. Planning would then be undertaken for the first six-months of 2021. This would mean a small expenditure of approximately \$40,000. At the same time, procurement for the KGV football upgrade would see some expenditure, in the range of \$100,000, in June 2021. The majority of cashflow is likely to occur in the 2021/22 financial year for both the North Chigwell and KGV components of this project.

COVID-19 Response

The initial concentrated expenditure on new COVID-19 mitigation activities has tapered off as the immediate response to the pandemic moves to a more 'business as usual' and 'watch and act' focus.

Summary

Further information on Revenue, Expenditure, Capital Works and COVID-19 Response figures are in Attachment 1 of this report.

Consultations:

General Manager

Executive Leadership Team

Officers responsible for Capital and Operational Budget reporting

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Financial implications are set out in the body of this report and in Attachment 1.

As this report is for receiving and noting only, no risk management issues arise. Risks associated with Council's financial expenditure and sustainability were managed through the process for developing Council's annual budget and are monitored through ongoing reporting on Council's Strategic and Key Operational risk register.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Community consultation was not required due to the regular and operational nature of this report. There are no material public relations implications.

Recommendation:

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 30 November 2020 in the form of Attachment 1.

Attachments/Annexures

1 Attachment 1 - Financial Performance Report to 30 November 2020



15. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS - MONTHLY REPORT

Author: Manager Corporate Governance (Tracey Ehrlich)

Qualified Person: Director Corporate Services (Jenny Richardson)

ECM File Reference: Procurement

Community Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

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

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

Leading our Community

Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community

Strategy 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency

Strategy 4.1.3 Maximise regulatory compliance in Council and the community through our systems and processes

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to procurements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts for the period 17 November to 10 December 2020 and to provide updates on other relevant procurement matters.

Proposal in Detail:

Exemption Report

Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts (**the Code**) has been made and adopted by Council as required under section 333B of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

Under clause 10.2 of the Code, the General Manager is required to provide a regular report to Council on exemptions that have been authorised to the procurement requirements under the Code. Clause 10.2 relevantly provides:

*In accordance with Regulation 28(j), the General Manager will establish and maintain procedures for reporting to Council **at the first ordinary meeting of Council after the event** in relation to the procurement of goods and/or services **in circumstances where a public tender or quotation process is not used**. Such report will include the following details of each procurement:*

- a) a brief description of the reason for not inviting public tenders, or quotations (as applicable)*
- b) a brief description of the goods or services acquired*
- c) the approximate value of the goods or services acquired, and*
- d) the name of the supplier.*

For the period from 17 November to 10 December 2020 there was one (1) exemption to Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts. The exemption relates to a contract to undertake road pavement deflection tests granted to Pitt & Sherry Ltd. Pitt & Sherry is the sole company in Tasmania with the required equipment to undertake these tests. The value of the contract is \$30,260 as detailed in Attachment 1.

The contract sum is accounted for in budgeted operational expenditure.

Expenditure on External Legal Services

For the month of November 2020 there were no external legal expenses.

Consultations:

Executive Leadership Team
Senior Legal Counsel
Accounts Payable Supervisor

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Human resources

There are no material human resources implications.

Financial

The report identifies \$30,260 in budgeted operational expenditure that has been approved.

Risk management

As this report is recommended for receiving and noting only, no material risk management issues arise. Risks around procurement are monitored and reported on a continuous basis as part of standard processes and procedures.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Community consultation was not required or undertaken. There are no material public relations implications.

Recommendation:

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Monthly Report for the period from 17 November to 10 December 2020.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 Procurement Exemption 17 November to 10 December 2020



16. UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

Author: Manager Corporate Governance (Tracey Ehrlich)

Qualified Person: Director Corporate Services (Jenny Richardson)

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:

Leading our Community

Objective 4.1 Govern in the best interests of our community.

Strategy 4.1.1 Manage Council for maximum efficiency, accountability and transparency.

Reporting Brief:

To present three updated policies to Council for adoption.

Proposal in Detail:

All policies adopted by Council are reviewed cyclically. The ordinary review period for Council policies is four years after adoption, however policies may be reviewed earlier if it is appropriate to do so, for example if there are changes to a relevant governing act.

This report presents the following three updated policies to Council recommended for adoption:

- Street Lighting policy
- Short-Term Parking Permits for Persons with a Disability policy, and
- Fire Hazard Abatement Notices policy.

Street Lighting policy

The Street Lighting policy was adopted by Council at its meeting on 15 March 2016 and has been reviewed having reached the end of its 4-year cycle.

- Attachment 1 is a copy of the current policy showing with tracked changes
- Attachment 2 is a copy of the recommended updated policy.

The changes to the policy are a result of technical updates to the relevant Australian Standard, AS/NZS 1158. The updates to the Standard have been under review

(including consultation) since 2019, however, were not formally adopted in the Standard until mid-2020. The review of the policy was intentionally delayed until the updates were finalised. The updates included amended technical specifications for product performance and enhanced safety requirements for street lighting.

Short-Term Parking Permits for Persons with a Disability policy

The Short-Term Parking Permits for Persons with a Disability policy has been reviewed, having reached the end of its current cycle. The policy was originally adopted by Council at its meeting on 19 December 2016.

- Attachment 3 is a copy of the policy showing tracked changes from the current version
- Attachment 4 is a copy of the recommended updated policy.

The policy is substantially unchanged from the original version, with only minor changes made to clarify the language used and assist with the policy's interpretation.

Fire Hazard Abatement Notices Policy

The Fire Hazard Abatement Notices policy was adopted by Council at its meeting on 26 September 2016. It has now been reviewed having reached the end of its current four-year cycle.

- Attachment 5 is a copy of the policy showing tracked changes from the current version
- Attachment 6 is a copy of the recommended updated policy.

The policy is substantially unchanged from the original version with only minor changes made, to clarify the language used and assist with the policy's interpretation.

Consultations:

Public Compliance Coordinator
Corporate Governance
Director Community and Customer Services

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

There are no material human resources or financial implications.

Risk Identification	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation	M	L	L	

Risk Identification	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
None of the recommended updated or new policies represent any significant departure from established practices or statutory requirements. There is a chance that procedural difficulties may be identified once they are implemented, leading to operational inefficiencies.				Responsible officers continue to monitor compliance with policies and ensure that any amendments are made in a timely manner, as required.
Do not adopt the recommendation	Minor (C2)	Likely (L4)	Medium (8)	Council officers are instructed to review the policies and implement any changes requested by Council as soon as practicable.
Governance administration would be less optimal due to the presence of outdated and less effective policies.				

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Nil.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. ADOPT the updated Street Lighting policy in the form of Attachment 2
2. ADOPT the updated Short-Term Parking Permits for Persons with a Disability policy in the form of Attachment 4, and
3. ADOPT the updated Fire Hazard Abatement Notice policy in the form of Attachment 6.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 Street Lighting policy 2016 Tracked Changes



- 2 Street Lighting policy 2020



- 3 Short Term Parking Permits for Persons with a Disability policy 2016 Tracked Changes



- 4 Short Term Parking Permits for Persons with a Disability policy 2020



- 5 Fire Hazard Abatement Notice policy 2016 Tracked Changes



- 6 Fire Hazard Abatement Notice policy 2020



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

17.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN DUNSBY: DISABILITY-INDICATED PARKING IN GLENORCHY CBD

Author: Executive Officer (Bryn Hannan)
Qualified Person: General Manager (Tony McMullen)
ECM File Reference: Notices of Motion

Reporting Brief

To consider a notice of motion by Alderman Jan Dunsby submitted in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 16(5) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

Motion:

That the time allocated for parking on disability-indicated spaces in the Glenorchy Central Business District be increased to a minimum of one hour.

That the times that the limitation applies on disability-indicated spaces mirrors that of regular parking in the area.

Rationale

Disability-indicated parking that has been installed throughout the upgrade of the Glenorchy Central Business District is currently marked for 30-minute parking, and with no restrictive times that it is not in force, meaning it applies as a constant.

For some people who require use of such parking, much of that time is taken up with getting equipment (such as wheelchairs or other mobility aids) to and from the vehicle, leaving very little time to undertake their required activities (e.g. banking, medical, postal or shopping).

Regular parking in the area is for 15-minute duration, but has time limitations when it applies. These time limitations are not indicated on the disability designated signs, meaning that the 30-minute limit applies at all times and users are breaching the regulations for overstaying, even during the evening or on Sundays.

The inequity of this current situation appears to be in breach of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* and needs rectification.

Officers' Response

A response is being investigated and prepared and will be provided in writing prior to the Council meeting and tabled at the Council meeting.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

18. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on 30 November 2020 be confirmed.

19. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

20. AUDIT PANEL MINUTES

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).

21. GENERAL MANAGER'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW 2019-20

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)(a) (Personnel matters, including complaints against an employee of the Council and industrial relations matters).

22. GLENORCHY DISTRICT FOOTBALL CLUB LEASE

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)(b) (Information that, if disclosed, is likely to confer a commercial advantage or impose a commercial disadvantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposes to conduct, business) and (2)(c) (Commercial information of a confidential nature that, if disclosed, is likely to: prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it; confer a commercial advantage on a competitor of the Council; or reveal a trade secret) and (2)(i) (Matters relating to actual or possible litigation taken, or to be taken, by or involving the Council or an employee of Council).

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

ATTACHMENT 1

Document (11/12/2020) prepared and submitted by:

J. FOLEY

PO Box 1005

Chigwell, Tasmania, Australia, 7011

To:

T. McMullen (acting in capacity of current General Manager – Glenorchy City Council)

PO Box 103

Glenorchy, Tasmania, 7010



Cover document begins- **Purpose – Submission of questions for consideration at ordinary meeting of council – 21 December 2020 [open section]**

1. Find attached list of questions to be submitted to 21 December 2020 GCC ordinary meeting.
2. Glenorchy City Council has previously declined to provide any answers to questions submitted at the 30 November 2020 by this author.
3. Please regard this as a request to provide answers to the previously submitted questions [30 November 2020]. These questions are asked in an attempt to form an understanding of the possible reasons relating to catastrophic organisational failure [2016-2017] which, in part, resulted in a financial penalty being imposed upon the Glenorchy ratepaying community – 12.5% 'failure' tax - and ongoing reputational damage to the municipality that continues to shake the confidence of the business/investor community.
4. This matter has been referred to the Tasmanian Minister for Local Government [M. Shelton acting in capacity December 2020].
5. In the interest of probity, specifically issues relating to the regulatory framework within which this sector of government operates in Tasmania, the matter has also been drawn to the attention of relevant Division of Local Government and relevant LGAT.
6. A reminder that the message to a ratepayer – motivated to understand the underlying drivers of dysfunction that has resulted in staggering monetary losses, and missed investment opportunities 'delivered' by this entity historically – to shut up and go away just confirms fears that dysfunction is the default position being assumed - *again*. This inability and refusal to accept historic due diligence responsibility must drive actions that call to investigate the reasons around those losses and the responsibility associated with these many historic failures that have caused so much continuing damage to the city of Glenorchy in Tasmania.
7. Historic failures must be understood in historic context. If you do not understand this then one only has to look at the current '*Inquiry under section 143 of the Casino Control Act 1992 (NSW)*' currently being conducted by the Hon PA Bergin SC (capacity Commissioner) and the withering comments from Commissioner Bergin in relation to sub-optimised organisations that refuse to look back to gain an understanding of why and how the conditions that manifest failure have been curated and if not successfully remediated will continue to damage an organisation that in effect normalises a state of operational 'wilful blindness' as an essential part of a continuing culture of dysfunction.
8. As you would be aware supporting documentation driven by the '*GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL (DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLORS) ACT 2017 (NO. 48 OF 2017)*' [http://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/tas/num_act/gccoca201748o2017533/] - in this instance the signed '*Statement of Expectations*' executed 16 April 2018 page 3 of 13 - the role the '*ratepayer*' was expected to play was made specific in relation to a model of participatory democracy that appeared to form part of this overall '*process*'.

9. "...In this document, the term 'community' has been broadened from the Local Government Act definition 3 to mean: • ratepayers – owner-occupiers, investors and businesses,... 3 Section 3 of the Local Government Act defines 'community' as 'the community of a municipal area'"(p.3 of 13).
10. This document specially notes on page 9 of 13:

Standard	Expectations
Maintaining high ethical standards	The Mayor, General Manager and Aldermen will (collectively): • be familiar with, endorse and comply with relevant legislation, Council's Aldermanic Code of Conduct and Council policies • act in the best interests of the community • display integrity and impartiality in their decision making • lead by example • ensure that Council decisions and actions are transparent and accountable • review Council's Code of Conduct within three (3) months of an ordinary election (as required by the Local Government Act), and • abide by the eight (8) principles of good governance, as established in the <i>Good Governance Guide</i>².

Finally, to be made real 'good governance' relies upon legislative compliance. Any and all risks associated with 'deviation' therefore should be clearly understood to lie within a liability associated with the decision makers tasked by position to comply and enforce lawful behaviour on behalf of the Glenorchy community.

This time around as a ratepayer I have taken the implications for active participation in associated 'Dismissal Act' documents very seriously.

When an organisation that I am in part responsible/forced to provide a revenue stream for, fails to behave in a transparent and ethical manner [refuses to answer questions about its own performance and culture] the future does not look bright.

I do not have the luxury or legislative mechanism to divest an interest in this organisation therefore I am compelled to proceed.

If the issues around the 'wastage' of millions and millions and millions of dollars in public money will not move an increasingly dysfunctional and irresponsible level of government to change it remains unclear exactly what it will take to motivate and initiate *real change*.

It is disappointing but not unexpected to be faced with the same organisational *lack* – lack of transparency/ accountability/ risk management/ governance/ audit/ - that drove an intervention that promised to rehabilitate and repair.

Ratepayers were encouraged and lead to believe that they would see and experience an organisational culture that worked hard to understand and recognise the historic drivers of failure and dysfunction, so as to recognise and not repeat them. Ratepayers invested their good faith in an apparent reform process that for all intents and purposes had the mechanism auspiced by the operational elements of S 10 of the 'Dismissal Act' to suspend and override all accepted democratic norms, mores, traits and mechanistic principles.

It is unusual that a level of government whose major revenue stream is dependent upon the continuing provision of public money appears to lack even the most basic level of curiosity as to why, historically so many things, in fact the majority of responsibilities have failed so spectacularly and publicly over an extended period of time.

Real reform is driven and informed by an historic understanding of failure.

It is not apparent what conditions exactly it will take for ratepayers to finally get an ethically and probity oriented return on their forced investment, but one thing is certain at the close of 2020 – we have *drifted* very, very far from that course and the future again seems very bleak and dark indeed.

 END.

Attached:

List questions submitted to 21 December 2020 Glenorchy City Council meeting (open)

Questions submitted to GCC ordinary meeting 21 December 2020 (Covid 19 protocol means no members of the public to attend) by J.Foley, (residential address previously supplied) Chigwell, Tasmania, 7011.

1. Is GCC (whole) aware of the due diligence construct – “No history. No memory. Equals ALL RISK”? What this means is that when an organisation refuses to (or cannot) answer questions about its own past performance and organisational arrangements then investors (in this case ratepayers) tend to end up bearing all risks (costs) when (usually not if but when) things go wrong. Historical due diligence is a compliance requirement when taking up a position on a board – corporation – other entity. It is assumed that all members of elected were either provided with or requested a briefing in relation to this task in 2018. Is this assumption correct?
2. The act of Tasmanian Parliament titled ‘GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL (DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLORS) ACT 2017 (NO. 48 OF 2017)’ [http://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/tas/num_act/gccoca201748o2017533/] has a section 10 (ten) ‘Application of certain laws’ which states that all residents and ratepayers in the Glenorchy municipality and in fact at that point all Tasmanians had a tranche of basic democratic rights and principles ‘suspended’ until the expiration of the Act, S 12, on the 1 (first) December 2018:

(1) The rules of natural justice do not apply in relation to the taking of any action under this Act or the taking of any action, in accordance with this Act, under the Local Government Act 1993 .

(2) Despite any other Act or law, the Minister is not required to provide his or her reasons for making a decision, or taking any action, under or in accordance with, or for the purposes of, this Act.

(3) The Judicial Review Act 2000 does not apply in relation to a decision made by the Minister under this Act.

Did any member of elected seek independent legal advice regarding the range of risks [intended to unintended] this may have generated prior to signing the ‘Statement of Expectations’?

3. In 2018 a range of entity GCC organisational materials “Statement of Expectations” [explicit], “Ministerial Directions” [implied] as an example specifically and apparently deliberately identified the category of ‘ratepayer’ as existing in relation to the presumptive expectation that unless ratepayers became more active in monitoring and questioning and otherwise playing an *active* oversight role then when/if this organisation (GCC) again failed then again the Glenorchy ratepayer would be financially punished and made liable [MPES enforce provisions activated] for costs associated with its failure. Obviously, there were elements of disingenuity attached to this as there were no active mechanisms constructed or made available for this to occur other than to rely again on elected organisational elements to act as the means by which ‘in the best interest’ of the Glenorchy ratepaying community could be enacted and achieved. Because (for whatever reasons) the 2018 iteration chose and it was a choice not to open previously closed practices of GCC organisational structures – workshops, special committees and so on – then ratepayers are again left financially exposed to potential entity GCC failure. That is the organisational structure was shaped it in such a way that actively operates to deliberately prevent a ratepayer from monitoring performance. However perhaps this assumption appears naive to expect that a Glenorchy ratepayer will passively accept financial liability again for known high risk activities that fail. For example the risks associated with issuing a document co-located simultaneously as a submission-prospectus in an apparent at arm length .com structure may have been comprehensively workshopped by a range of relevant professionals with relevant experience, however, because this [2018] iteration of entity GCC has chosen with deliberate intent to censor or deny by failing to disclose that information to the ratepayer - the ratepaying community who it is assumed can be forced to mitigate liability for yet another risk gone wrong when it has no understanding of either the range of risks involved or the liability lines should a high risk strategy fail may prove to be a belief that may prove difficult to

establish and substantiate at some relevant future point. For example - Why has it taken over 2 (two) years to formulate a document and undergo a process to activate the formulation of a 'risk appetite' statement when a competent, compliant oriented organisation knows that it is a high-risk activity to operate without one?

4. In refusing to answer any questions (this author) submitted at the November 2020 meeting my assumption is that current iteration is unable to provide any corporate knowledge about an apparent transfer of at least \$5 (five) million (AUD) in an asset base from the then Tasmania state government to the Glenorchy City Council in and around the year 2000 evidenced by and detailed in documents "PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT GOVERNMENT OF TASMANIA AND THE GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL 2000" – and redraft in 2002.
[http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/48683/Glenorchy_Bilateral_PA_re-evaluated.pdf] . Can you confirm that this is correct?
5. Is there any 'awareness' of the importance of and the link between root cause analytic and historical due diligence within entity GCC? Again – in 2015 (resource previously provided) when Magistrate Daly communicated to 2014 - 2016 iteration GCC that the GPA could not then meet the compliance requirements around enforcement in relation to the authorisation of the planning schemes, please identify the matter in which Magistrate Daly made this ruling (?)/communication? Again - was the risk assessment and matrix 'reliable'?
6. When GCC answers are provided why isn't the relevant member of council providing the answer/responses and their position clearly identified so that submitters can have confidence in the information being provided? Other Tasmanian councils provide their ratepayer base with an organisational mechanism in which the responding officer also declares that they are free from any conflicts or interests that may or would actually or appear to operate to impact their responses. Why doesn't GCC identify who is answering and if they are doing so free from any conflicts that could impact either the actual provision or the issues around the appearance of conflict that could impact information and issues contained in the answer?
7. The now disbanded 'Precinct System' was estimated to have cost Glenorchy ratepayers at least \$4 (four) million (AUD) in 2007 – resource previously provided. Is the current iteration of GCC claiming to have no knowledge in relation to the identification and provision of the total amount 'spent' on the former 'precinct system' [2000 to disbandment]?
8. Were there provisions/policy/rule/reporting management requirement in place to protect 'attributable knowledge' [widest possible interpretation in relation to risk to ratepayer requested please] from leakage or slippage in the apparent co-briefs shared between GCC to precinct?
9. What was or is 'Program 400'?
10. Which organisational stream had and has oversight for 'Program 400'?
11. How many (number) dot com's (.com) have Glenorchy ratepayers now 'accrued'?
12. What are the efficiency gains (if any) for structuring the business in this way?
13. For each dot com (.com) identified which stream within entity GCC has operational oversight and reporting responsibility?
14. On 'futureglenorchy.com.au' under "'Growing Glenorchy' – CITYLINK RAIL", - there appears to be a 'document' that is identified as a 'submission' ["SUBMISSION TO THE AUSTRALIA GOVERNMENT MARCH 2020"] on the cover but appears to become a 'prospectus' ["This prospectus outlines

opportunities for investment in CityLink Rail. This is your invitation to get on board and help create a Glenorchy we can all be proud of!".p.1]. ASIC (Australian Securities and Investment Commission - <https://asic.gov.au/regulatory-resources/fundraising/lodging-prospectuses-and-other-disclosure-documents/>) has certain requirements that must be met if indeed this 'document' is a 'prospectus' as it is deliberately and intentionally marketed as. If it is an actual prospectus it is required to be filed and registered with the provision of relevant disclosure documents. If it isn't then this must be remediated as it could be seen as false – deceptive to misleading marketing. This appears to be a very high-risk strategy with any non-compliance being able to be directly passed to the ratepayer if there are, again, regulatory failures within GCC organisational practice.

15. Who is the audience this submission/prospectus is aimed at? If the intent is to attract investors and 'investment' how will this be managed? A prospectus can be an invitation to invest - that is ultimately transfer funds, so is this the intended aim of this document? Which stream has oversight?
16. 'CITYLINK', 'CityLink', 'Citylink', have a range of ABN – ACN attached. Please identify the one this document has an association with. How, when and where were ratepayers informed of this association?
17. What business structure does 'Future Glenorchy' take? It creates an impression that it is an entity that sits alongside the 'Glenorchy City Council' rather than being a part of it. That is 'Future Glenorchy' [design by 'MDW Creative' along with 'Activity City'] appears to have its own graphic identity, its own website and a range of intended service provisions – for example "Open for Business Review' proffers the development of a range of "...client-centric, concierge approaches for major developers.". [This 'concept' appears to be under 'active' development as reported in the RDA Tasmania, Local Government Economic Development Network meeting minutes relating to Thursday 28th August 2020.]
18. For example - *"Since 2017, Richmond Valley Council has offered an innovative service for residents and businesses interested in building or developing property in the Richmond Valley. The Development Concierge is a complimentary service and the main goal is to make planning and development in the Richmond Valley a pleasant experience, by providing a guide to Council's development review, approval and permitting processes."* <https://richmondvalley.nsw.gov.au/building-and-planning-services/development-concierge/>
However, this service is identifiable as one provided and provisioned and delivered via the Richmond Valley Council - richmondvalley.nsw.gov.au. - by an identified council officer. Why have Glenorchy ratepayers appeared to have developed a number of dot com (.com) e-infrastructure that again appears to be a high-risk exercise in layering, confusion inducing overlap, branding fracture and double coverage. Where is the reputational enhance and efficiency gains for ratepayers in their organisation investing ratepayer money in structuring the business this way? NOTE: in constructing the answer you may find it useful to review the questions I have previously submitted [November 2020] in relation to the operation of a range of services provided by a highly reputable Australian company TechnologyOne Ltd (ASX:TNE) which entity GCC appear to have had a range of difficulties in 'getting things to work'.

Note – none of the questions relating to herbicide usage by entity GCC submitted in November 2020 can be constructed as having 'historic' dimension. They relate to current practice and therefore relate to the period 2018 to current. Unless your position is that 2018 – 2019 - 2020 are now too far in the past for you to construct competent, meaningful, informational rich responses regarding organisational practice can you clearly indicate and continue to reject providing 'answers' to those questions. Please regard this as a request to resubmit those questions with the following as additional; -

Are relevant risk managers within entity GCC currently actively monitoring the activities around the current class action to actions regarding 'Roundup' and Glyphosate? Are the possibilities regarding the potential restriction of uses including the banning of usage of herbicide for cosmetic purpose in public places and the restriction of product 'sale' being monitored and mapped with a range of organisational responses to be implemented including costings being clearly articulated, identified and communicated via organisational means especially in emergent risk briefing structures and mechanisms?

Ends.

COPY