

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Monday, 26 July 2021 at 6.00pm**



NOTE: Due to social distancing restrictions around COVID-19, members of the public were not permitted to attend the meeting. The meeting was live-streamed for members of the public on Council's Facebook page.

Present (by video link): Aldermen Bec Thomas (Mayor), Peter Bull, Melissa Carlton, Jan Dunsby, Simon Fraser, Sue Hickey, Steven King, Gaye Richardson and Kelly Sims.

In attendance (by video link): Tony McMullen (General Manager), Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Director Community and Customer Services), Sam Fox (Director Strategy and Development, Emilio Reale (Director Infrastructure and Works), Bryn Hannan (Executive Officer), Tina House (Chief Financial Officer), Trevor Boheim (Coordinator Planning Services), Paul Garnsey (Manager Development), Marian Maclachlan (Executive Assistant to the General Manager)

Leave of Absence:

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date: Monday, 28 June 2021

Purpose: To discuss:

- Citywide Flood Study result

Date: Monday, 5 July 2021

Purpose: To discuss:

- Aldermanic discussion

Date: Monday, 12 July 2021

Purpose: To discuss:

- Tasmanian Police COVID activities update

Date: Monday, 19 July 2021

Purpose: To discuss:

- Tolosa Park Master Plan Review
- Showcase Moonah Evaluation
- Ambulance Tasmania proposal

The peak number of viewers watching the live stream of the meeting on Facebook was **44** viewers.

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.11 pm.

The Chair acknowledged and paid respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the original and traditional owners and continuing custodians of the land and their elders, past, present and emerging.

1. APOLOGIES

Alderman Angela Ryan

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

SIMS/RICHARDSON

That the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on Monday, 21 June 2021 be confirmed.

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday, 28 June 2021 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

ABSTAINED: Alderman Hickey

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

The Mayor welcomed Alderman Hickey to Council.

4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION

The Chair asked if any Aldermen had, or were likely to have, a pecuniary interest or a conflict of interest in any items on the Agenda.

No pecuniary interests were declared.

Alderman Hickey noted that she was a paid board member of OneCare.

Alderman Richardson noted that she was a board member of OneCare and of YMCA.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

None.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

**Questions on notice – Eddy Steenbergen, 128 Marys Hope Road, Rosetta
(submitted 4 July 2021)**

My questions relate to the intersection of the Brooker Highway and Duncan Street and Foreshore Road. Council has already committed to constructing a skateboard facility and the Glenorchy Playspace close to the intersection. Many regard the intersection as dangerous, an accident waiting to happen. On one corner is Montrose Bay High School and the attendant staff, student and parent traffic. On another corner is the soon to be upgraded community park with a car park to be doubled in size. On another corner is light industry including bus, logistics, and other transport services. Cars, trucks of all sizes, and buses regularly cross the intersection from every direction. The intersection is the only cross-road on the entire Brooker Highway without a roundabout or traffic lights. This is unacceptable.

Q1. Does Council acknowledge the increased danger resulting from the upgraded community park and increased traffic volumes?

A: Council acknowledges the Brooker Highway crossing at this intersection is potentially dangerous, and that any increase in traffic using the crossing is likely

to exacerbate any danger. However, Council would not proceed with any construction work on the proposed Playspace until all reasonable measures to adequately mitigate any increased risk had been investigated and/or implemented.

Q2. What has Council done to mitigate current danger or future increased danger?

A: The Brooker Highway is a State Highway which is owned and managed by the Tasmanian Government. Council has raised the intersection safety concerns with the Tasmanian Government on many occasions and will continue to lobby for safety improvements.

Q3. Has Council considered nominating the intersection for the Australian Government Black Spot Program? If not, why not?

A: Because the Brooker Highway is a State Highway, Council is not eligible to nominate it for a Black Spot project (the rules of the program mean Council can only nominate roads which it owns and manages under this program). The Tasmanian Government would be required to nominate it for Black Spot or other funding as appropriate. Council would support application lodged by the Tasmanian Government for funding to improve safety at this intersection.

Q4. Has Council lobbied the state government to nominate the intersection for the Australian Government Black Spot Program? If not, why not?

A: Council has raised the issue of safety at this intersection with the Tasmanian Government on numerous occasions and will continue to do so. Council has not formally requested that the State Government lodge a Black Spot Program application, however it is likely that this has been discussed informally at the officer level.

Q5. Did Council consider making traffic in the expanded PlaySpace car park one-way, utilising a new exit at the southern end? If not, why not?

A: The State government does not allow any new vehicle accesses onto the Brooker Highway, so this option was not considered.

**Questions on notice – Shane Alderton, 296 Main Road, Austins Ferry
(submitted 23 July 2021)**

I am seeking a response to the following questions during Public Question Time.

Q1: My first Question relates to Item 21 the Tolosa Park Masterplan being discussed in Closed Council.

As the Community is a Major Stakeholder and will potentially be impacted by any Decisions made relating to the Tolosa Park Masterplan can Council please explain why this item is being discussed in Closed Council instead of Open Council?

A: This item is being discussed in Closed Council, at this time, due to the Commercial in Confidence costings from the urban design architect which are still under review due to the design drawing still being draft concepts plans.

The draft Master Plan concept before Council tonight is based on all of the information collected from the community from past community engagement sessions, surveys and public forums. Council is being asked to consider the draft for in principle approval so that the design can be progress towards a firmer final design. This will enable more accurate costings to be completed. The final design will still have to come back to Council for final approval.

Q2: My Second Question relates to Item 21 the Tolosa Park Masterplan being discussed in Closed Council.

As the Community has clearly stated during the recent Election Campaign that Community Engagement along with Openness and Transparency is an Important Issue will Council be providing a Press Release or Media Statement on Item 21 the Tolosa Park Masterplan at the conclusion of the Closed Council Meeting?

A: Council will be releasing project update status reports soon after the July Council meeting.

However, as mentioned in your previous question this is not the final design of the Tolosa Park Master Plan, it is approval of a milestone to help progress with moving towards final design and more accurate costings. The final design approval will be coming back to Council for consideration and most likely in Open Council.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

None.

COMMUNITY

Community Goal: “Making Lives Better”

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

Reporting Brief:

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

Resolution:

KING/DUNSBY

That Council:

RECEIVE the announcements about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Tuesday, 22 June to Monday, 19 July 2021.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. OUTCOME OF 2021 MAYOR AND ALDERMAN BY-ELECTIONS

File Reference: 2021 By-Election

Reporting Brief:

To report on the outcome of the by-elections held in June and July 2021 to fill the vacant Mayor and Alderman positions on Glenorchy City Council.

Resolution:

KING/BULL

That Council:

1. NOTE the results of the 2021 Glenorchy By-Elections, as published in the Certificate of Election (Attachment 1), and
2. ACKNOWLEDGE the making of the respective declarations of office under section 321(3) of the *Local Government Act 1993* of:
 - a) Mayor Bec Thomas on 23 July 2021, and
 - b) Alderman Sue Hickey on 22 July 2021.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

10. INVESTIGATION INTO THE DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL LAND 137 HOWARD ROAD, GOODWOOD (GOODWOOD PARK)

File Reference: Disposal of Council Land 2021

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council commences investigations into the potential disposal of Council land at 137 Howard Road, Goodwood.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/FRASER

That Council:

1. ENDORSE the commencement of initial investigations into the potential disposal of 137 Howard Road, Goodwood (Title Ref: 133497/1) (**the Land**) and direct the General Manager to undertake a community engagement process, and
2. DIRECT the General Manager to provide a further report to Council summarising the results of the community consultation process and identifying any specific concerns about the disposal of the Land and recommending whether or not to commence the formal disposal of public land process under s. 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

11. INVESTIGATION INTO THE DISPOSAL (LONG-TERM LEASE) OF COUNCIL LAND AT 4 AND 8 ALCORSO DRIVE, BERRIEDALE (GLENORCHY CITY BOWLS CLUB AND GLENORCHY CITY TENNIS CLUB)

File Reference: Disposal of Council Land 2021

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council commences investigation into the potential disposal (long-term lease) of Council land at:

- 4 Alcorso Drive, Berriedale to its current tenant, the Glenorchy City Bowls Club, and
- 8 Alcorso Drive, Berriedale to its current tenant, the Glenorchy City Tennis Club.

Resolution:

KING/RICHARDSON

That Council:

1. APPROVE the commencement of initial investigations into the potential disposal (long-term lease) of 4 and 8 Alcorso Drive, Berriedale (Title Ref: 139511/1) and direct the General Manager to undertake a community engagement process, and
2. DIRECT the General Manager to provide a further report to Council summarising the results of the community consultation process and identifying any specific concerns about the disposal of the Land and (recommending whether or not to) seek to proceed with a statutory s. 178 disposal process for long-term lease of the identified parcels.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

12. ESTABLISHMENT OF TARGETED REFERENCE GROUP - DOG MANAGEMENT POLICY REVIEW

File Reference: Dog Management Policy

Reporting Brief:

To recommend Council establishes a targeted reference group to assist with the upcoming review of its Dog Management Policy 2017.

Resolution:

FRASER/DUNSBY

That Council:

1. NOTE that Council's current Dog Management Policy is due for review in February 2022.
2. ENDORSE:
 - (a) the establishment of a Dog Management Policy Review Targeted Reference Group (TRG) to assist Council with the review of the policy, to be in place until the review is complete and a reviewed Dog Management Policy is adopted, and
 - (b) the terms of reference for the TRG in the form of Attachment 2.
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to advertise for the three community representative positions on the TRG and appoint the successful nominees.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

13. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT POLICY

File Reference: Council Policies

Reporting Brief:

To recommend that Council:

- (a) adopts a new Stormwater Management Policy to ensure changes in stormwater behaviour and quality resulting from development are appropriately managed when the *Tasmanian Planning Scheme Glenorchy* commences operation, and
- (b) rescinds the existing ‘Stormwater Property Connections Policy’, ‘Stormwater Run Off Management Policy’ and ‘Building Over or in Close Proximity to Council Stormwater Systems or Within Service Easements Policy’.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That Council:

- 1. ADOPT the Stormwater Management Policy, in the form of Attachment 1
- 2. RESCIND the Stormwater Property Connections Policy
- 3. RESCIND the Stormwater Run Off Management Policy, and
- 4. RESCIND the Building Over or in Close Proximity to Council Stormwater Systems or Within Service Easements Policy.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. QUARTERLY REPORT - QUARTER 4 2020/21

File Reference: Corporate Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the Quarterly Report for the quarter ending 30 June 2021.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/CARLTON

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE Council's Quarterly Report and Quarterly Annual Plan Progress Report for the quarter ending 30 June 2021.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

15. DELEGATIONS - TASMANIAN PLANNING SCHEME

File Reference: Delegations

Reporting Brief:

To update delegations for senior planning staff to enable decision making once the new *Tasmanian Planning Scheme Glenorchy* comes into effect.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/FRASER

That Council:

1. DELEGATE Council's relevant functions and powers under sections 56, 57 and 58 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA)* to the positions of:

- Coordinator Planning Services
- Senior Statutory Planner, and
- Senior Strategic Planner,

as follows:

Section	Power	Condition
Section 56 (1A) and (2)	The power to amend or refuse to amend a permit	Unless the proposed amendment relates to an aspect of the use or development which was the subject of, or imposed as a result of, representations.
Sections 57(2) and (6)	The power to determine applications for discretionary permits.	Only in the following circumstances: 1. If the time in which the planning authority must grant or refuse a permit will expire prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Glenorchy Planning Authority, and the applicant has refused to grant an extension to that time period. 2. Where use or development is prohibited. 3. Where an application for a permit is made for the demolition of a building.

		4. Where an application for permit is made and for which no representations are received and regardless of whether formal comments have been provided by the Regulated Entity pursuant to section 56Q of the <i>Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008</i>, for the following uses and developments: (a) Single dwellings in the General Residential, Inner Residential, Low Density Residential, Environmental Living, Landscape Conservation Zone, Environmental Management, Rural Resource, Rural, Future Urban and Particular Purpose Zone 1-Urban Growth Zones. (b) Ancillary dwellings in the General Residential and Inner Residential zones. (c) Use and/or development of a heritage place, precinct, significant tree or place of archaeological potential listed in the Heritage Code in the planning scheme or a Place on the Tasmanian Heritage Register (except where estimated cost of development exceeds \$500,000). (d) Variations to development standards for all residential development, except for variations to car parking requirement. (e) Subdivisions creating five (5) lots or less, and boundary adjustments. (f) Discretionary signs. (g) Additional vehicular accesses to road frontages where the Development Engineer has recommended approval. (h) Minor additions, carports and garages for existing Multiple Dwellings provided no new dwellings are being created. (i) Any vegetation removal requiring planning approval under any Code in the planning scheme. (j) Single dwellings within the area
--	--	---

		affected by the Blacksnake Rural Village Specific Area Plan. (k) Fencing for use and development in the Local Business, General Business, Central Business, Commercial, Light Industrial, Community Purpose and Utilities zones. 5. Multiple dwellings to maximum of four dwellings in the General Residential and Inner Residential zones. 6. New development or Change of use and/or extension of existing buildings where the estimated cost of development does not exceed \$500,000 except where the development is an existing non-conforming use or (is enough) the applicant is disputing a requirement for the provision of cash in lieu of car parking.
Section 57(3)	Authority to provide notice of an application for discretionary permit.	Nil.
Section 57 (5)	The power to extend the advertising period for a planning permit application.	Nil.
Section 57(6)(b)(ii)	The power to enter into an agreement in writing with the applicant pursuant to Section 57(6)(b)(ii) of the <i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993</i> to extend the period past 42 days to enable the authority to make a decision.	Nil.
Section 57(6A)	Authority to negotiate an extension of time for determination of a permit application.	Nil.
Section 57A(4)	The power to determine whether or not the planning authority agrees to	Nil.

	mediation.	
Section 58	The power to determine applications for other permits.	Regardless of whether formal comments have been provided by the Regulated Entity pursuant to Section 56Q of the <i>Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008</i> .
Section58(2A)	The power to agree to and extend other permits.	Nil.

2. NOTE that the above delegations supersede the delegations given by Council at its meeting on 28 June 2021.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

16. PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS - MONTHLY REPORT

File Reference: Procurement

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to procurements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts for the period 16 June to 13 July 2021 and provide updates on other relevant procurement matters.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/BULL

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Monthly Report for the period from 16 June to 13 July 2021.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Answer to question taken on notice – Alderman Dunsby (28 June 2021)

By-election costs

Q. What is the cost of the by-election to Glenorchy City Council?

A: The Tasmanian Electoral Commission has advised that it estimates the final cost of the by-election will be between \$3.00 and \$5.00 per elector.

There were 33,366 electors enrolled in Glenorchy for the by-election, meaning the cost is estimated to be between \$100,098 and \$166,830.

Answer to question taken on notice – Alderman Sims (28 June 2021)

Residential parking permits

Q. Does Council provide residents with on-street residential parking permits in Council limited areas?

A. Council does not currently provide residents with on-street parking permits. The issue of residential permits was raised in the [Glenorchy City Council Parking Strategy 2017-2027](#) which included an action to “Explore the options for ‘Residential Parking Permit Schemes’ and develop a procedure for implementing, if it is feasible and cost effective” (see clause 5.2 on page 16). A review of the Parking Strategy has commenced, which may ultimately recommend this action continues to be progressed, or is altered or removed.

Q. What the barriers are to exploring this policy or model in our Council precinct?

A. The feasibility and cost effectiveness of implementing a residential parking permit schemes would need to be investigated. This would include looking at the number of requests Council has received to see if such a scheme would benefit those requesting it and/or if there are other options available such as removing the time limit parking restriction in some residential areas. Parking permits schemes are generally implemented in areas where there is time limited parking and no-long term parks nearby, and where residents there is limited available off-street parking available for vehicles (for example, inner city residential areas with higher density living).

A permit scheme would also require new administrative processes to be implemented internally with costs and likely a fee charged to residents for the permit.

Questions on notice – Alderman Fraser (submitted 13 July 2021)

Planned ecological (low level) burning

Q. I recently joined a local community group along with GCC's Adam Muyt, to help remove non-native grass from a nature reserve in West Moonah. Hand weeding has its place in weed management, however native vegetation also relies on regular fire to regenerate and to control the spread of weeds. Is there merit in conducting some low level burns in our urban woodland areas and does the Council have any plans to do so in the future?

A: Council prioritises its resources and budgets to reducing bushfire risk at a landscape scale based on risk assessments undertaken jointly by Council and the Tasmania Fire Service (TFS). The two objectives which set out how Council prioritises works are noted in the attached as listed below:

1. To minimise the impact of major bushfires on human life, communities, essential and community infrastructure, industries, the economy and the environment. Human life will be afforded priority over all other considerations.
2. To maintain or improve the resilience of natural ecosystems and their ability to deliver services such as biodiversity, water, carbon storage and forest products.

Noting that these two objectives align with the *Tasmanian Vegetation Fire Management Policy* that ensures all agencies, land managers, and landowners within Tasmania are working to achieve the same outcomes.

Ecological burning (as Alderman Fraser notes above) meets the secondary objective. At this point in time, Council has no plans to undertake solely ecological planned burns within the next 4-5 years. It is, however, worth noting that planned fuel reduction burns do have ecological benefits. The most recent planned fuel reduction burn conducted jointly by Council and TFS within Wellington Park Fire Management Units 8 and 11 included a section of grassland.

Developing an ecological planned burning program is one of the priorities under Council's Bushfire Mitigation Portfolio which was established in early 2017, however this is on hold until higher prioritised risk reduction works are undertaken.

TOLOSA PARK MASTERPLAN

This item is included in the open Council minutes by virtue of the following resolution made in relation to Item 21 (Tolosa Park Masterplan), considered in closed Council.

That Council:

6. *RELEASE a statement explaining the decision Council has come to in relation to the draft Tolosa Park Masterplan in open Council.*

Draft Tolosa Park Masterplan concept

During the closed part of the Council meeting, Council considered a draft Tolosa Park Masterplan concept. The area covered by the Masterplan concept is the decommissioned dam wall, reservoir and adjacent areas.

The draft Masterplan concept was prepared based on all the information collected from the past community engagement sessions, surveys and public forums.

After considering the item and recommendations, Council endorsed the draft Masterplan concept 'in principle' and approved the ongoing partnership with TasWater to develop detailed designs based on the Masterplan concepts.

The detailed designs will include initial delivery plans, a more detailed cost estimate for the decommissioning of the dam infrastructure and other agreed works to fulfil the initial stage of the Masterplan concepts.

The final design proposal will be the subject of secondary approvals at a later stage. It is intended that consideration of the agreed final proposals, would take place in an open Council meeting.

Resolution:

KING/BULL

That the meeting be closed to the public to allow discussion of matters that are described in Regulation 15 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to the public and the live stream terminated at 7.04pm.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The meeting resumed at 7.05pm

18. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

BULL/DUNSBY

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Monday, 28 June 2021 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

ABSTAINED: Alderman Hickey

The motion was CARRIED.

19. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

None.

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).

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: “Valuing our Environment”

21. TOLOSA PARK MASTER PLAN

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)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal) and (2)(g) (Information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the Council on the condition it is kept confidential).

22. CONTRACT 0820 (RESPONSIVE SUPPLY OF ASPHALT) AND CONTRACT 0821 (ASPHALT WORKS AND BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT RESURFACING)

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)(d) (Contracts and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal).

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

Resolution:

FRASER/KING

That the meeting be moved back into open Council.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Dunsby, Hickey, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.15 pm.

Confirmed,

CHAIR