

Minutes of the Meeting of the Glenorchy City Council held at the Council Chambers on Monday, 27 June 2022 at 6.00pm



Present (in Chambers): Alderman Bec Thomas (Mayor), Alderman Steven King (Deputy Mayor), Aldermen Melissa Carlton, Gaye Richardson, Angela Ryan and Kelly Sims.

Present (by video link): Aldermen Jan Dunsby and Simon Fraser.

In attendance (in Chambers): Tony McMullen (General Manager), Jenny Richardson (Director Corporate Services), David Ronaldson (Director Community and Customer Services), Emilio Reale (Director Infrastructure and Works), Tina House (Chief Financial Officer)

In attendance (by video link): Marian Maclachlan (Executive Assistant to the General Manager)

Leave of Absence:

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date: Monday, 6 June 2022

Purpose: To discuss:

- Greater Hobart Plan
- Final draft budget

The meeting was live streamed on Council's website, Facebook page and YouTube channel. The peak number of viewers watching the live stream 37 viewers.

The meeting began with a prayer by Reverend Rob Craft from Edge Anglican Network.

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.

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.00pm.

The Chair read a statement noting that the meeting would be recorded and live streamed to members of the public, and about work health and safety at the Council meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

Aldermen Peter Bull and Sue Hickey.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday, 30 May 2022 be confirmed.

That the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on Monday, 20 June 2022 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

None.

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 interests were declared.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Questions taken on Notice – Bill Dodd, Claremont
(received 26 May 2022)

As Glenorchy City Council considers making cuts to council services and initiative that many people rely on, it remains a fact that some businesses are not contributing their fair share of council rates.

In particular, rates calculations for businesses do not take into consideration whether or not the venue has poker machines. Venues with poker machines pay the same rates as those without, despite these machines greatly increasing annual profits. Inflated poker machine profits come at the detriment and destitution of many people in the community.

Q1. Will GCC consider applying differential rates for poker machine venues? This is a measure that is clearly provisioned in the Local Government Act. I recommend doubling the rates, as a statement of the GCC's long-standing stance against this harmful industry.

These revenues could fund a rates amnesty for venues that transition out of poker machines, a grants program for community-friendly activities and alternative revenue streams such as live music, pool tables etc, and bolster addiction and financial counselling programs.

While GCC has historically been an advocate against pokies, the community also needs and expects action on this issue. We cannot rely on State Government to act in the interests of our community on poker machines.

(This question was received after the deadline for inclusion in the May Council agenda).

A: Council adopted its rates and charges for the 2022/23 year at its Special Council meeting on 20 June 2022.

Unfortunately, given the late stage of the budget development process and the anticipated lead-time to effect change, it was not possible to give full consideration to this proposal for the 2022/23 year.

Council has a strong position on minimising harm to people with gambling problems, particularly those who are adversely affected by electronic gaming machines. This position is set out in Council's adopted "Statement of Commitment on Gambling".

Council's position is a "harm minimisation" position. Council also has as a key tenet of its Community Plan-endorsed strategic planning framework to be "open for business". It is Council's difficult role to balance sometimes competing objectives such as these for the good of the community.

Without downplaying the challenges, Council's best means of influence is through advocacy action with other concerned peak bodies to achieve beneficial change at a State level. This has been Council's consistent approach.

While the proposal for differential rates on poker machines venues has some superficial attractions, there are also some statutory difficulties which render it impracticable in the short term.

Rates are considered under the Local Government Act (s. 86A) to be a tax – and the value of rateable land is an indicator of the capacity of the ratepayer to pay rates for that land.

In practical terms, the Council relies upon the valuations provided by the Valuer-General in setting its rates. These, in turn, are based on defined "land uses".

Council may set differential rates (s. 107). However, it is restricted in the factors it can use in varying the general rate. One of the factors is land use – and these are defined as residential purposes, commercial purposes, industrial purposes etc. There does not appear to be a capacity under the Act to more precisely define land use, nor does the Valuer-General provide fine-grained valuations for such "sub-uses".

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Questions on notice – Brad McDougall, Claremont
(received 2 June 2022)

Q1. Did council consider tip vouchers / tickets for rate payers to use instead of scrapping the free rubbish weekends .. 2 vouchers or tickets per household would allow people to choose when they go alleviating the traffic build up on the one nominated day, alleviating changes to a specific date from weather factors and importantly relieves stress for the on-site workers. Would be a logical well thought through solution. An easy fix.

A: Yes and this option was discussed within the Proposed Waste Management Fees and Charges for 2022-23 report of 30 May 2022.

It is correct that this would alleviate many of the traffic, timing and safety issues associated with a free waste disposal weekend, however it would also result in significantly higher usage than the free waste weekend and subsequent costs. As such Council would need to recover the costs through increased fees and charges such as by increases to all kerbside waste collection fees. This would effectively result in all properties being charged for a tip voucher up front, regardless of whether it was used or not.

It is more appropriate that only those residents that wish to use the landfill pay for that service.

Q.2 I Implore council to delay any rate rise for at least this year. Ald Fraser, rightly, pointed out in the April meeting that almost half of the Glenorchy Municipality is already under mortgage stress. He also pointed out that rate rises over the last 10 years are around 47% ? .. with the projection of service rates to increase make no mistake at the far-reaching affect this will have. People already are choosing between paying bills and eating. Turning a heater on or staying in bed with an electric blanket on to keep warm. Whilst GCC have no say in petrol prices, tas water raising its prices, food etc etc rate payers and citizens need help. people are financially crippled and the flow on affects are unknown to local businesses in dollar terms. So will the council consider delaying any rate rise for this year or at a minimum only raise rates in line with real wage growth?

A: Council sets its rates and charges at its Special Council meeting on 20 June 2022.

Each year, Aldermen are highly conscious of the increasing cost of living and the pressures that this imposes on many ratepayers.

Aldermen have the difficult role of balancing the impact on ratepayers with Council's own rising cost of doing business and the need to ensure Council is financially sustainable in order to continue to provide vital services to the community.

This year's rate increase of 3.5% strikes that difficult balance and is affordable and responsible – particularly in the context of a CPI increase for Hobart (All

Groups) of 5.8% at the March quarter and a Council cost index of 4.06%.

In addition, Council has a Hardship Policy to assist members of the community who are doing it tough when it comes to rates, as well as offering a range of payment options, including direct debit to spread the load between rate instalments.

**Questions on notice – Robbie Fitzsimon, Montrose
(received 6 June 2022)**

Q1. What is this elected council currently doing to address the water damage originating from these improperly designed and built stormwater drains?

A: Council has issued a detailed letter to Mr Fitzsimon on the 14 June 2022, addressing the concerns with the design and construction of the open drain at Fosbrook Court. Unless evidence can be provided that the open drain is failing, Council considers the matter closed. Mr Fitzsimon is still free to pursue the matter with Council's insurer.

Q2. Has a date been set for when this will be rectified?

A: See above.

Q3. Has a budget been allocated to rectify these concentrating drains?

A: See above.

**Questions on notice – Bill Dodd, Claremont
(received 22 June 2022)**

The intercity cycleway is the backbone of our active transport network. However, the roads that intersect it become difficult to cross during peak hour. This is a real disincentive right when we most want to reduce traffic by supporting people to ride to school/work.

Q1. How many of the roads intersecting the cycleway currently have any traffic calming measures?

A. The majority of roads that the InterCity Cycleway crosses are arterial roads that take large amounts of traffic including large amounts of heavy and commercial vehicles. That makes the use of traffic calming such as speed humps inappropriate for those roads, including Albert Road, Hopkins Street, Sunderland Street, Derwent Park Road, Lampton Avenue, Elwick Road, Grove Road, Berriedale Road and Box Hill Road. The only road currently with speed humps is Riverway Road, as the amount and type of traffic using this road makes it suitable for traffic calming.

Q2. Will Council consider affordable upgrades such as speed bumps, road markings and give way signs to make the cycleway safer and ultimately reduce traffic?

- A. Council currently has no plans to provide speed humps on any of the other roads due to reasons outlined in the previous question. However, Council is constantly looking to improve the safety of the cycleway crossings in conjunction with Cycling South and the Department of State Growth. Council is currently designing improvements to the Sunderland Street and Berriedale Road crossings to make them safer for cyclists and pedestrians. This includes road markings and traffic islands. Vehicles will not be required to give way at the cycleway crossings due to the amount of traffic and impact that would have on the road network.

**Questions on notice – Michael Hangan
(received 23 June 2022)**

During the July 2021 by-election for Mayor and Councillor, candidates received a letter from the Planning Compliance Officer, outlining the requirements for elections signs under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme – Glenorchy (TPS) which had superseded the Glenorchy Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (GIPS).

The letter stated that election signs are subject to the provision of C1.0 Signs Code of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme – Glenorchy and unless exempt under certain circumstances, they may require approval. The definition of an election sign under C1.3 of the Codes is as follow:

Election Sign – Means an impermanent sign identifying candidates or promoting a political party for local, state or federal government elections.

For any election sign to be exempt it must:

- (a) Not encroach on any road or other public land;
- (b) Have a maximum area of 1.5m²;
- (c) Not be erected more than 8 weeks before the polling date; and
- (d) Be removed within 7 days after the polling date.

Furthermore, the following standards in C1.6.1 of the Code applies:

- (e) Must not be within 2m of the front boundary; and
- (f) One 1 sign per frontage

I understand that this matter is relating to the planning scheme, but the following questions affect all potential candidates at the upcoming Council Elections for

Glenorchy City Council. It was noted that compliance to this code was not followed at the recent Federal Government Election.

- Q1. Will the Glenorchy City Council Planning Compliance Office be enforcing the above requirements of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme – Glenorchy at the upcoming Council Election for Glenorchy City Council?**
- Q2. Will the Glenorchy City Council be issuing infringement notices for failure to comply with the Tasmanian Planning Scheme – Glenorchy?**
- Q3. If No to question 2 – Why?**
- Q4. What penalties apply for a breach of the code (1) Penalty points and (2) dollar amount?**
- Q5. Can it please be explained why C1.6.1 (e) has been included as part of the TPS – Glenorchy, as this will not allow any candidate to display signs within residential or commercial areas across the municipality – is this a way of trying to eliminate the display of election signs?**

A: Questions has been taken on notice.

Questions without notice – Bill Dodd, Claremont

This is about clarification around the proposal I put forward in relation to differential rates for poker machine venues – we are currently losing \$1.6M in poker machine venues every month. At present we have an affordability crisis and we also have our existing issues with poker machine venues, therefore I would like the Council to take on the proposal to making Council rates higher for poker machine to reduce their profitability and invest that revenue back into the community.

In the Local Government Act – it does state we can set a differential rates based on land use, non-use of land, locality of the land, any planning or in section (e) any other prescribed factor – therefore based on the Local Government Act is suggests we can nominate ‘any other prescribed factor’, as a venue or a premise who have poker machines and set a differential rate. These businesses are making obscene profits at the destitution and detriment of the community.

- Q1: Based on the Local Government Act and section (e) around ‘any other prescribed factor’ can’t Council set differential rates for businesses who have poker machines?**

A: [General Manager] Happy to explore and investigate the wording of ‘other prescribed factor’ further to see what options there are, but normally in legislation when they talk about prescribed, they mean prescribed in regulation, that is there is a further regulation beneath it, which sets out other factors. We will have a look at the regulations around the provisions in the Act and determine what has been prescribed.

Q2: Based on Council's 'Open for Business' goal - what is Council's preferred mechanism to reduce the number of pokies machines and gradually transitioning them out?

A: [General Manager] I believe it was a good observation about when these venues were closed during the pandemic, these funds that would normally be lost through gambling were reduced and those monies either stayed in people pockets or flowed elsewhere into the community. However, we can't be seen to be acting prejudicially in relation to different businesses and singling out one particular type of business for specific treatment given we are basically overseeing a tax regime. I am not taking away from the fact that electronic gaming machines have a significant adverse impact on our community.

[Mayor] Council has consistently advocated to the State Government for the removal of electronic gaming machines in a staged manner over time and we reinforced this position when we were asked to submit feedback on the Government's 'Future Gaming in Tasmania policy'. The Council remains committed to this position as we recognise the harm electronic gaming machines do to our community and will continue to advocate for them to be phased out over a period of time.

We appreciate your ideas on differential rating and will investigate further.

Q3. Is it necessary to introduce this measure at budget time, as part of the annual budget or can it be brought in at any time?

A: [Mayor] If the measure was to be introduced it would need to be introduced at budget time.

Questions without notice - Shane Alderton, Austins Ferry

I have some question in relation to Item 9 tonight on the Gambling submission. My concern is this submission primarily targets gaming machines. What are Council's view and policies are on other forms of gambling that are also doing serious harm to our community such as online gambling and the racing industry etc. Why hasn't the term of reference been broadened to include other types of gambling?

Q1: What is Council's position on online gambling and the racing industry gambling and do you intend to develop a similar policy such as Item 9 in relation to electronic gaming machines to address these other types of gambling that affect our community?

A: [Mayor] Yes, Council has been long standing advocates for the removal of electronic gambling machines from pubs and clubs over a period of time in a phased approach and our statement on gambling is specific to electronic gaming machines knowing that this particular form of gambling causes significant harm within our community and knowing that Glenorchy is referred to as the 'golden mile' because we have 240 machines across eight (8) venues and has highest loss of any municipality in Tasmania from that form of gambling, so Council has focused on specifically on pokies machines. We have also looked at what the government regulates and the 'Future Gambling' policy, that government policy

is specifically focusing on electronic gaming machines, but online gambling, the race industry gambling and other forms of gambling are outside of the government policy. Our advocacy has been in relation to electronic gaming machines as this has been the focus of government policy and because they are shown to cause the greatest harm within our municipality.

Q2: What systems are Council going to put in place once they take away poker machines to support addictive gamblers who move to other forms of gambling?

- A. [Mayor] There has been research conducted which has shown people do not necessarily transition from poker machines to other forms of gambling. Covid provided a good example where people did not have access to poker machines did not transition to other forms of gambling. Research has shown it is the addictive nature of the poker machines in relation to how they are programmed, the lights, the sound etc. and how this impacts on a person's brains which leads to addiction.

There are support services already in place to support people who are addicted to gambling – all forms of gambling. Our role at Council is not to duplicate or to provide support services, our role is about advocacy for the removal of poker machines and for the reasons I have outlined.

Q3. Are you aware there is clear evidence that online gambling jumped by 28% during Covid?

- A. [Mayor] No, I wasn't aware of that.

Questions without notice - Eddy Steenbergen, Rosetta

I would like to follow up on some matters which were discussed from the last Council meeting, the first one relates to the Greenshoots project.

Q1. Did Council decide to proceed with the Greenshoots project?

- A. [General Manager] The project is still in our Capital Works budget for 2022/23.

Q2. Did Council apply for a grant from the Tasmanian Community Fund?

- A. [General Manager] Council decided not to proceed with the grant application to the Tasmanian Community Fund. To clarify, the project is in our Capital Works budget for 2022/23, the grant application was for the three years of operational funding for the project and this application was withdrawn.

Q3. Did Council decided to go ahead with the Council services review?

- A. [General Manager] Yes

Q4. Did Council set a budget for the review?

- A. [General Manager] Council has directed me to undertake a targeted review of Council services which has commenced. Council has set a target for the review and also set an authorised payback period for that review.

Q5. When is the review scheduled to be finished?

- A. The review is taking place in two parts, the first part is in relation to some to immediate savings in our employee costs for the 2021/22 financial year and the second part is to be a further review activity in the 2022/23 year. I am in the process of announcing this second stage to staff and I would prefer to announce this to staff before announcing it to the public, which will follow shortly thereafter.

Q6. Is Council aware of Tasmanian Transport Museum plans to set up rail crossings between the museum and Berriedale Road, which includes Grove Road, will Council consider any traffic calming on that crossing?

- A. [Mayor] Council is aware of the Tasmanian Transport Museum's plan and our Director Infrastructure and Works and the Manager Infrastructure, Engineering and Design have had conversations with the Transport Museum on this matter and all the necessary discussions are taking place.

Q7. The Greater Hobart plan mentions 6,100 new dwellings to be built between now and 2050 – the total number mentioned for the City is the total number of current dwellings mentioned for the transit corridor – this is an incredibly ambitious target, what practical steps are being taken to achieve that ambitious target?

- A: [Mayor] The Greater Hobart plan has been developed by the four metro Councils and with the State Government. The next phase is to develop the implementation plan and work has commenced on the drafting of this plan which will provide the detail on how these targets will be achieved. This will also include how the four Councils work together and State Government, and most likely Federal Government and perhaps private investors.

[General Manager] As part of the Hobart City Deal, signed alongside with the three metro Councils, State Government and Federal Government to a range of initiatives back in 2018 to progress the activation of the transit corridor, and you will have seen in the media this has been progressing, with a lot of discussion around the future mode. It is still sitting with the State Government who have been doing further work on the condition of the corridor in terms of the bridges, crossings and the spatial parameters of the corridor, but another part of this work has been to look at a growth strategy for the corridor, which the Department of State Growth has progressed. This has been a high level piece of work which has identified the objectives for the transit corridor in terms of what is going to be built to ensure it is vibrant and liveable and also the suggestion that they need to look at potential demonstration sites. This is being managed by external consultants on behalf of State Growth.

The next piece of work is the detailed structure planning for the corridor which has not yet commenced, which will flesh out some of the issues around what can we actually achieve in terms of the ultimate dwelling yield.

Q8. When will the public learn about the next steps?

A: [General Manager] The Federal Government allocated \$25M towards the transit corridor which is required to be used for physical works. Part of this has been allocated to a condition survey which was completed by consultants on behalf of the Department of State Growth looking at structural issues e.g. bridges, rail condition, drainage etc. Work is still underway within State Growth.

In relation to the detailed precinct planning for the corridor, it is still to progress with the State and the Federal Governments. There is a three-year review of the implementation plan for the Hobart City Deal and these things will form part of this discussion. Given the change of government, we are expecting it will be completed by the end of the calendar year. Council will be pushing for the investigative work to be part of the next tranche of funding, so we can take the high level growth strategy work which is being done and start to ask very specific questions on how we make this happen. For example, what infrastructure works do we need to do to make sure we can support this level of development along the corridor, where is it best placed, located etc. so this will be next piece of work which needs to be undertaken.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

None.

COMMUNITY

Community Goal: "Making Lives Better"

8. ACTIVITIES OF THE MAYOR

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

Reporting Brief:

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

Resolution:

RYAN/KING

That Council:

RECEIVE the report about the activities of Mayor Thomas during the period from Monday, 23 May to Sunday, 19 June 2022.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. GAMBLING SUBMISSIONS - RESPONSIBLE GAMBLING MANDATORY CODE OF PRACTICE REVIEW AND GAMING CONTROL (COMMUNITY SUPPORT FUND) REGULATIONS 2022

File Reference: Gambling

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's endorsement of a submission to the *Responsible Gambling Mandatory Code of Practice* (the Code) review and to provide guidance and authorisation to the General Manager for a submission on the *Gaming Control (Community Support Fund) Regulations 2022*.

Resolution:

RYAN/KING

That Council:

1. ENDORSE the draft submission on the *Responsible Gambling Mandatory Code of Practice for Tasmania* and authorise the General Manager to make the submission.
2. AUTHORISE the General Manager to make a submission on the *Gaming Control (Community Support Fund) Regulations 2022* based on the information and positions set out in the report.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

10. 2022 VOLUNTEER AWARDS

File Reference: GCC Volunteer Awards

Reporting Brief:

This report outlines Council's 2022 recognition of volunteers in our community, in response to a request from Alderman Dunsby at the April 2022 Council meeting.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KING

That Council:

1. RECEIVE and NOTE the attached report on the 2022 Volunteer Awards and congratulate those volunteers recognised during the 2022 awards celebrations.
2. NOTE that the Glenorchy City Council Annual Plan 2022/23 contains an action to review all events and awards ceremonies that will include the review of Volunteer Awards and recognition.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

ENVIRONMENT

Community Goal: “Valuing our Environment”

11. GREATER HOBART PLAN

File Reference: Greater Hobart Act

Reporting Brief:

To enable Council to consider making comment to the Greater Hobart Committee on the draft Greater Hobart Plan which completed public consultation on 27 June 2022 after being granted a one-week extension.

Resolution:

FRASER/CARLTON

That Council:

1. NOTE the preparation and public notification of the draft 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan.
2. MAKE a submission to the Greater Hobart Committee on the draft Greater Hobart Plan in the terms set out in the “Comment” section of this report.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

12. NEW COUNCIL POLICIES

File Reference: Council Policies

Reporting Brief:

To present four new policies and associated guidelines to Council for adoption.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/RYAN

That Council:

1. ADOPT the Footpath Trading Policy and Guidelines in the form of Attachment 1 and 2
2. ADOPT the Mobile Food Business Policy in the form of Attachment 3
3. AUTHORISE the General Manager to approve Mobile Food Business locations, subject to any planning permit requirements detailed in Appendix 1
4. ADOPT the Nature Strip Policy and Appendix in the form of Attachments 4 and 5
5. ADOPT the Retaining Wall Policy and Technical Guideline in the form of Attachments 6 and 7.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

13. UPDATED COUNCIL POLICIES

File Reference: Council Policies

Reporting Brief:

To present one updated policy to Council for adoption and recommend the rescission of one policy.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That Council:

1. ADOPT the updated Advertising Devices on Council Property Policy in the form set out in Attachment 2, and
2. RESCIND the Disposal of Council Assets Policy in the form set out in Attachment 3.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. 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 18 May to 15 June 2022 and provide an update on external legal expenditure in accordance with the Ministerial Directions.

Resolution:

CARLTON/DUNSBY

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Procurement and Contracts Monthly Report for the period from 18 May to 15 June 2022.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

15. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORT TO 31 MAY 2022

File Reference: Corporate and Financial Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide the monthly Financial Performance Report to Council for the period ending 31 May 2022.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/FRASER

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the Financial Performance Report for the year-to-date ending 31 May 2022 as set out in Attachment 1.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Notice of Motion - Alderman Sims – Homelessness (submitted 9.52pm 21 June 2022)

SIMS/KING

That Council:

1. Establishes a formal proposal & terms of reference for a new homelessness advisory committee in aim of developing a homelessness policy that will collectively represent the current local homelessness crisis issues using an evidenced based, best practice, accurate and realistic approach.
2. Investigates the use of council owned and managed land and property for the purposes of directly supporting people experiencing homelessness in times of emergency, such as extreme weather conditions & higher than typical (peak) occupancy rates.
3. Commits to building better public awareness around the housing crisis and consulting with other Tasmanian and leading Australian Councils on the matter.
4. Explore the opportunity to, and feasibility of participating in a pilot project funded by the State or Federal government that will help to progress more meaningful and long-term action to address the homelessness crisis in our city and possibly state.
5. Writes to the relevant State and Federal politicians and the Prime Minister in advocacy of the issue and to request advice on how our specific council should address the current housing and homelessness crisis locally in consideration of the key issues, such as housing affordability and access.
6. Requests a further report of progress to be presented to Council at the 29 August 2022 Council Meeting containing work already completed and any future recommendations addressing the above outlined, as summarised below;
 - (a) Advisory committee proposal and terms of reference,
 - (b) The investigation of council owned/managed land and property,
 - (c) Commitment to building public awareness and consulting with councils,
 - (d) Explore pilot projects with all levels of government,
 - (e) Advocate and seek advice on the issue

The following procedural motion was moved:

RICHARDSON

To defer the Notice of Motion to the July Council meeting.

The procedural motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Ryan, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser and Carlton

AGAINST: Alderman Sims

The motion was CARRIED.

Resolution:

KING

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 Ryan, Dunsby, King, Thomas, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was closed to members of the public and the live stream was terminated at 7.51 pm.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

17. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Recommendation:

RICHARDSON/KING

That the minutes of the Council meeting (closed meeting) held on Monday, 30 May 2022 be confirmed.

Alderman Ryan left the meeting at 19:54 pm.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Ryan returned to the meeting at 19:55 pm.

18. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

None.

GOVERNANCE

Community Goal: “Leading our Community”

19. EXEMPTION TO EXTEND THE ASSET MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE AGREEMENT

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

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

Resolution:

KING

That the meeting be move back into open Council.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.13pm.

Confirmed,

CHAIR