

**Minutes of the Meeting
of the Glenorchy City Council
held at the Council Chambers
on Monday, 27 August 2018 at 6.00 p.m.**



Present: Aldermen K. Johnston (Mayor), M. Stevenson (Deputy Mayor), P. Bull, M. Carlton, J. Dunsby, S. Fraser, S. King, G. Richardson, K. Sims and B. Thomas.

In attendance: Mr. T. McMullen (General Manager), Mr. T. Ross (Director, Infrastructure and Works), Mr. S. Scott (Acting Director, Corporate Governance), Mr. D. Ronaldson (Acting Director, Community, Economic Development and Business), Mr. P. Garnsey (Acting Director, Environment and Planning), Mr. B. Hannan (Acting Manager Governance and Risk), Mr. B. Richardson (Acting Chief Financial Officer), Mr. J. Sudgen (KGV Project Manager)(for Item 18) and Mrs. J. King (Mayoral and Executive Support Officer).
Mr. B. Cassidy (Page Seager)(for Item 18)

Workshops held since last Council Meeting

Date:	Monday, 6 August 2018
Purpose:	To discuss: • Derwent Estuary Program presentation • Glenview Korongee Development • DEC update
Date:	Monday, 20 August 2018
Purpose:	To discuss: • Aldermen's Tour

Fourteen (14) members of the public attended the open part of the Council meeting.

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.00 p.m.

The Chair acknowledged and paid respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the traditional and original owners and continuing custodians of the land.

The meeting began with a prayer from Mr. Kazi Sabeer, President, Tasmanian Muslim Association.

The Chair read the following two statements:

Statement 1:

In relation to the Audio Recording of the Council Meeting under regulation 33 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* and Council's 'Audio Recording of Council Meetings' Policy.

Statement 2:

In relation to Work Health and Safety at the Council meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

None

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution:

CARLTON/RICHARDSON

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday, 30 July 2018 be confirmed.

That the minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on Monday, 20 August 2018 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

FOR: Aldermen Bull, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, 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 in any items on the Agenda.

Alderman Stevenson foreshadowed that he would be tabling a letter received from the Integrity Commission at Item 15.

Mayor Johnston declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item to be tabled by Alderman Stevenson and advised that she would leave Chambers while it was discussed.

5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Darrell Vincent – Berriedale

Mr. Vincent raised the issue of Council's dog registration fees, and noted that Council's fee for late payment of registration was significantly higher than for Clarence and Kingborough Councils.

Q: Can Council reduce the amount of the late payment fee for dog registrations?

[Extract from written response provided to Mr Vincent by Mayor Johnston]

A: I acknowledge that some of Council's registration and overdue fees are higher than some other Councils in Southern Tasmania (though I add, however, that some are also lower).

The reason that Council's dog registration fees are generally at the higher end of the scale is the high dog population in Glenorchy. The Glenorchy Municipality has one of the highest rates of dog ownership per capita in the country. This results in a need to employ a team of four full-time animal management staff to ensure that adequate compliance with dog management regulations is achieved and that the high dog population does not adversely impact on the safety and amenity of the local community. By comparison, I understand that Hobart City Council (which has fewer dogs per capita) employs only one full-time animal management officer.

The high dog population and consequent pressure on Council to ensure its adequate management is also the reason for the setting of overdue fees for late registration. To properly manage the dog population, Council must maintain appropriate and up to date records of dogs in the municipality. Failures to renew or register animals impacts Council's ability to adequately manage the dog population which has negative impacts on the community

Accordingly, Council sets its overdue fees to encourage owners to renew their registration by the due date (31 July each year). Council also provides multiple reminders of imminent registration due dates, including sending out bulk SMS messages approximately one week before the due date. I understand that there is also some leniency provided for late payments if the dog owner can provide a satisfactory reason for the delay.

Kaye Smith – Glenorchy

Mrs. Smith referred to the ABC's 'War on Waste' program and noted that it's presenter, Craig Reucassel, was a guest speaker at the recent Local Government Association of Tasmania conference. Mrs. Smith noted that at all Council meetings, Aldermen and Staff are provided with bottled water.

Q: What does Council do with the bottles after Council finishes with them, and why can't Council set an example by using jugs instead?

[Extract from written response provided to Mrs Smith by Mayor Johnston]

A: I acknowledge your concerns about the environmental impacts of bottled water and the need for Council to set an example about appropriate waste management. I am pleased to advise that from the 27 August 2018 Council meeting onwards, Council will no longer provide Aldermen with bottled water and will revert to the use of jugs.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

Bob Holderness-Roddam – Austins Ferry

Q: Regarding the petition which is currently circulating requesting a change from fortnightly to weekly rubbish collection, what is the current life expectation of the Glenorchy tip site?

A: [Mayor] The current life expectancy of the Jackson Street tip site is until approximately 2020 (i.e. in two years).

Q: Following on from that question, what are the options available to Council when the tip site is closed?

A: [Mayor] In the 2018/19 budget, Council has approved funding to look into the feasibility of a range of options in respect to Council's waste management in the future. These options include developing a waste transfer station and extending the life of the tip by lining an additional cell. Neither of these options is cheap. Council staff are working through them in detail so that Council can make a decision about the most appropriate way forward.

Q: Have there been any audits carried out of rubbish placed in rubbish bins (as opposed to recycling bins)?

A: [Mayor] Council conducts regular audits of rubbish collected in our kerbside collection services, and this has helped inform our Waste Management Strategy.

Geoff Lucas, Granton

Q: Why did Council 'invoice' ratepayers \$2.8m to repay a Federal Government grant for the Derwent Park Stormwater Harvesting Project?

A: [Mayor] The \$2.8 million figure in the 2018/19 budget that you are referring to is a contingency fund. It is not just for the Derwent Park Stormwater Harvesting project, but rather for a number of known liabilities that were present at the time we set the 2018/19 budget. Costs related to are legal liabilities (as a result of legal action), the KGV project and the Derwent Park Stormwater scheme are all included in that contingency budget, on the basis that they may fall due during the 2018/19 financial year.

The Derwent Park Stormwater Harvesting Project received grant funding of \$9.1m from the Federal Government, and had a total value of \$21 million. Under terms of the grant deed, if Council turns the system off within 10 years (which we have), we are required to notify the Federal Government and potentially pay back the full grant amount. Council has made strong representations to the office of Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources (David Littleproud) explaining that whilst Council was continuing to operate the re-use component of the scheme, Council was suffering a significant financial loss which put us in hardship on an ongoing basis. It was effectively costing Council three (3) times as much to produce each liter of water than we were selling it for.

The \$2.8 million is a conservative figure that Council put in place to consider what our liabilities might be for the 2108/19 financial year. We are at risk of having to pay back the loan amount to the Federal Government despite having a compelling argument about why we shouldn't.

Q: The potential amount that you would have to pay back to the federal government (\$9.1m) seems to align with the sale of the DEC. Is there a link between the two?

A: During Council's budget deliberations, we considered future asset sales, but we did not bank on those asset sales as part of our budget. As you would be aware, we require a purchaser and agreeable terms for any asset (including the DEC) so our budget is not reliant on the sale of the DEC.

Q: Why are you telling everyone that you are saving Glenorchy from insolvency when the Auditor General's Report indicates that there was an underlying surplus ratio of 1.1% for 2016/17 and a ratio of -0.8% (which is very close to surplus)?

A: Council has had a track record of operating deficits, and we have a structural deficit issue which we have had for a number of years. The Auditor General's report highlights that over the past 10 years we have had consistent deficits which has caused harm to our financial position. This has been one of the main reasons that we have drawn down on our cash reserves. Council has addressed this through the rate revenue increase in its 2018/19 budget.

Q: Will Council consider, at this meeting, moving a motion to reverse the 12.5% rate revenue increase?

A: Council adopted its 2018/19 budget at its June meeting. Rates notices were issued in July and the first rates instalment was due on 15 August. Council is not in a position to be able to reverse its decision on rates.

Q: Can I have a list of what the \$2.8m contingency is for?

A: [Mayor] The \$2.8 million contingency is in place for a number of issues. Council is not able to disclose the exact details of some of those. I have identified a number of projects (KGV and the Derwent Park Stormwater Harvesting and Reuse Scheme) that are included in that contingency, but there are other legal issues that Council is facing as a result of past conduct, the details of which cannot be disclosed.

[General Manager] In respect to Council's 2016/17 operating result, the work done under the CT Management process was narrowing the gap, but we have been left with picking up the pieces after that project. We are also dealing with the issues noted by the Mayor in relation to the Derwent Park Stormwater Scheme (which was losing \$500,000 per year) and the KGV Sports and Community Hub project which has cost Council around \$1m over and above its projected total. These costs, and the redundancies following the 2015 management restructure have been running down Council's cash balance.

When we did the modelling under our long-term financial management plan it became clear that Council would run out of cash in the next 2 years. This information was presented to the community very openly as part of the community budget briefing. Council's approach in this budget process has been very open and transparent.

We will provide a more fulsome written response to your questions.

Alderman Stevenson left the meeting at 6.40 p.m.

Alderman Stevenson returned to the meeting at 6.41 p.m.

Regina Share – 9 Trevatt Court, Lutana

Q: It is my impression that the increase in rates is because of what went on in the previous Council. However it now appears that this is a more widespread and complex financial problem, which is not spoken of. Is this correct?

A: [Mayor] There are a number of reasons for the rate revenue increase. We have a structural deficit issue where we have been running deficit budgets for a long period of time. This has whittled down our cash reserves over time to a point where we faced a dire financial situation. That structural deficit issue has been known at Council for a long time. The Board of Inquiry Report highlighted that, particularly over the last term of Council, Council has failed to deal with those issues. Additionally, because of decisions made by previous Councils (including contractual and legal decisions) we now find ourselves in a position where we have to rectify the structural deficit. We also have to pay some urgent bills, and have ongoing legacy issues, such as the ongoing community subsidy that we need to provide in respect of operating the KGV facility.

This Council took the view that we need to deal with those structural deficit issues, be financially responsible and ensure we have the resources to keep Council viable into the future.

Q: It seems that there has not been a wide dissemination of the historical reasons for these rate increases?

A: [Mayor] As the General Manager noted earlier, we have done everything we can to get this information out into the community. Our Community Budget Briefing which was held at the Moonah Arts Centre had over 150 attendees and provided a detailed explanation (with graphs and projections) of all the financial parameters that we were working in. A full video recording of the Community Budget Briefing is available on Council's website, as well as copies of our budget documents.

We understand that the issues around the budget and Council's finances are particularly complex, but we have done all that we can to ensure that the community has been provided with that information.

James Bryan – 14 England Avenue, Montrose

Q: I believe that many people in the community think that part of the 12.5% rate increase is due to the expenses from the Board of Inquiry of \$877,000. Many people believe that that \$877,000 has to be repaid this year, which would be approximately 2.2% of that 12.5%. How much of that \$877,000 was paid last year, how much is going to be paid this year and what is the continuing payment?

A: [Mayor] \$877,000 is the total bill for the Board of Inquiry. When that bill was initially sent to Council there was a requirement to pay it back within 3 years. Through negotiations with the Minister, that time period has been extended to 5 years.

Last financial year we paid \$216,000, leaving a balance of \$661,000. That amount is payable over the next four financial years, including this one [Note: this amounts to approximately \$165,000 per year].

Q: At last Monday's Special Council Meeting we were advised that the value of the DEC had been decreased from \$32m to \$18.6m approximately. Would the Mayor and Aldermen sell their house at less than valuation?

A: [Mayor] To clarify, the \$18.6m figure that was discussed at the last Council meeting was a valuation for the purposes of depreciation, and was not a market valuation.

Q: There was an ABC Report last week in which Justin Hickey indicated that if Council refused to sell the DEC they would approach the State Government.

A: [Mayor] The article, by Chris Rowbottom of the ABC, reported on a number of things said by Mr Hickey. This Council will not be bullied into selling under any terms. We will make a decision in the best interests in the community. We will take an offer received from any purchaser, a valuation, and the community's interests and submissions into consideration in dealing with any offer.

Mr Hickey did state that he would engage the State Government if he was not happy with Council's decision. Mr. Hickey knows full well that this Council has already engaged the State Government in this process because the DEC is a regionally significant entertainment facility and it is our view that the State Government ought to be briefed about discussions and plans that we might have and participate in those discussions because it affects not only Glenorchy residents but the whole state. So the State Government is already involved and Mr Hickey is very well aware of that.

Also, to correct the record, in that article Mr Hickey suggested that I had withheld information about the draft Heads of Agreement with his organisation to Council.

In-fact, Council was provided with that information at its July meeting. At this stage Council is still gathering information and has an appeal process to wait out before we can take any further action. We will take whatever steps are necessary should we decide to continue our negotiations with Mr Hickey.

Q: It is not clear to people that there are three rates that are paid for the use of the DEC. There is a commercial fee, a community fee and a fee paid by the Glenorchy City Council. For example, the Astley Room costs \$880 for commercial use, \$550 for not-for-profit community organisations and the Glenorchy City Council pays \$350 per day. This suggests that the DEC has strong community use and is a valuable asset and that there isn't anything similar in Glenorchy?

A: [Acting Director, Community, Economic Development and Business] There are a range of rates that are available on the DEC website (and are publicly available). Those rates are structured in a way so that we can maximise the dollar value that we can get out of the commercial and corporate entities that hire the venue and try to balance that with other community groups who try and access it. We will provide more accurate statistics to you about the amount of use for commercial purposes versus community uses.

Janiece Bryan - Montrose

Q: In relation to the other assets associated with the DEC sale, in addition to the building value, what are the ratepayers receiving for the significant amount of land (approx. 19 acres with 1,000 car parks), the business operation, the expensive electronic equipment and the quality furnishings. Can you confirm that the valuation quoted last Monday (\$18.6m), is inclusive of land, furnishings, etc?

A: [Mayor] The \$18.6m figure is the figure for depreciation and accounting purposes. It is not the value of the DEC if you were to sell it on the market. There are a range of methodologies available to value the land, chattels etc and Council is in the process of gathering that information at the moment to arrive at a figures that might be reasonable if the property was placed on the market.

Q: Why has the figure for depreciation reduced from \$864,000 last financial year to \$186,000 this financial year? Why has there been a sudden drop of close to 80% and shouldn't this mean that the \$864,000 quoted for last year should be revised?

A: [Mayor] We have recently been advised by the Auditor General's office that there has been a change in the methodology to be used for depreciation in relation to the concept of 'economic obsolescence'. Essentially this means that while the building might be able to house 5,500 people, the capacity we use it at is considerably less, and the average event attendance is around 2,000 people.

We therefore have an obsolescence value of approximately 3,500 people, and if we were to replace the venue we would likely replace it with an asset that would hold approximately 2,000 people rather than 5,500.

The other reason for the drop in depreciation is that some of the assets in the DEC have reached the end of their usable life and have been written-off for depreciation purposes.

Q: Why are we are still quoting a figure of \$864,000 for depreciation in the media?

A: [Mayor] The \$864,000 figure was the depreciation figure for the last financial year. That figure has certainly been reported widely in the media, despite our Council report (which was publicly available) clearly stating that the projected depreciation this year is \$189,000. We have provided this information to the community and the media, but unfortunately we can't control what the media reports.

Q: The \$234,000 loss that was recorded in the annual report included \$414,000 spent on materials and contracts related to the installation of the sports floor for basketball (\$211,035) and a contract for technical and production services. In addition, all we can see is a \$377,000 drop in revenue last financial year since the Hobart Chargers started using the DEC. If we take out the funds spent by ratepayers on basketball and the drop in hire chargers, then the DEC would have made a profit of approximately \$557,000 last year. The Council needs to explain. If the hire charges with the Hobart Chargers were commercial charges, we need to know the details of the contract that was signed with them.

A: The question was taken on notice to allow for further investigation and verification of the figures that Mrs. Bryan presented. A written response will be provided.

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

None.

COMMUNITY

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR

File Reference: Mayoral Announcements

Reporting Brief:

To receive the announcement of events by the Mayor.

Resolution:

BULL/SIMS

That Council:

RECEIVE the announcements about the activities of the Mayor's office during the period from Tuesday, 24 July 2018 to Monday, 20 August 2018.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

9. OWNER'S CONSENT FOR PLANNING PERMIT APPLICATION AT 131A ALLUNGA ROAD, CHIGWELL

File Reference: PLS43A-18/01

Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's consent, as the owner of land, to the making of a planning permit application to allow for the establishment of a services easement over land owned by Council at 131A Allunga Road, Chigwell (the North Chigwell Sports Ground).

Resolution:

FRASER/RICHARDSON

That Council:

1. CONSENT, as the owner of land, to the making of a combined planning scheme amendment and planning permit application by Johnston McGee & Gandy Pty Ltd, on behalf of Wilson Homes and the Catholic Church Trust over land which includes 131A Allunga Road, Chigwell (**Council Land**), on the basis that the Council Land is only included in the application to the extent that it is required for the purposes of an easement, and
2. AUTHORISE the General Manager to take any steps necessary give effect to Council's resolution in paragraph 1 (above), including by signing any required documentation.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

10. ANNUAL REPORT ON CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS - 2018 FINANCIAL YEAR

File Reference: Complaints

Reporting Brief:

To provide the annual report to Council on the number and nature of complaints received against Council for the 2017/2018 financial year, as required under section 339F(5) of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

Resolution:

FRASER/SIMS

That Council:

- (a) RECEIVE and NOTE the 2017/2018 Annual Report on Customer Complaints, and

- (b) REQUIRE a report on the customer complaints data updated on a quarterly basis.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

GOVERNANCE

11. CORPORATE REPORTING: GENERAL MANAGER'S OVERVIEW AND DIRECTORATE SUMMARIES

File Reference: Corporate Reporting

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the Quarterly General Manager's Overview Report for the quarter ending 30 June 2018.

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/FRASER

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the General Manager's Overview, the Directorate Summary and the Quarterly Annual Plan Progress reports for the Quarter ending 30 June 2018.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

12. MINISTERIAL DIRECTIONS - MONTHLY REPORT

File Reference: Ministerial Directions

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of the progress towards completing the action items out of the Ministerial Directions Implementation Plan for the period ending 15 August 2018.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/STEVENSON

That Council:

NOTE the progress satisfying the Ministerial Directions in the form of Attachment 1 as at 15 August 2018.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

13. PROCUREMENT EXEMPTIONS - MONTHLY REPORT

File Reference: Procurement

Reporting Brief:

To inform Council of exemptions that have been applied to the procurement requirements under Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts for the period 20 July to 14 August 2018.

Resolution:

STEVENSON/BULL

That Council:

RECEIVE and NOTE the monthly Procurement Exemptions Report for the period from 20 July to 14 August 2018.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

14. ACTIONS LIST (OPEN COUNCIL MEETING): UPDATE REPORT

File Reference: Actions List - Council Meetings

Reporting Brief:

To provide Council with the Actions List (Open Council Meeting), updated following the Council meeting on 30 July 2018 and recommend that Council resolves to remove monthly action list updates as a standing agenda item.

Resolution:

DUNSBY/KING

That Council:

1. NOTE the progress of the items on the Actions List (Open Council Meeting) as updated, following the 30 July 2018 Council meeting
2. RESOLVE that the *Actions List (Open Council Meeting): Update Report* and the *Actions List (Closed Council Meeting): Update Report* will no longer be standing items on future Council agendas, and that officers are no longer required to update the open and closed actions lists
3. NOTE that management will continue to monitor the progress of actions arising from resolutions of Council using its InfoCouncil application, and
4. REQUIRE an update every six months (beginning in December 2018) on the progress of actions arising from resolutions of Council.

Amendment

CARLTON/KING

Replace paragraph 4 with the following:

4. HOLD a workshop to determine how Council wishes to receive information from the action tracking system including the frequency of updates.

The amendment was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The amendment became part of the motion

Amended motion:

That Council:

1. NOTE the progress of the items on the Actions List (Open Council Meeting) as updated, following the 30 July 2018 Council meeting
2. RESOLVE that the *Actions List (Open Council Meeting): Update Report* and the *Actions List (Closed Council Meeting): Update Report* will no longer be standing items on future Council agendas, and that officers are no longer required to update the open and closed actions lists
3. NOTE that management will continue to monitor the progress of actions arising from resolutions of Council using its InfoCouncil application, and
4. HOLD a workshop to determine how Council wishes to receive information from the action tracking system including the frequency of updates.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

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

Question Without Notice – Alderman Richardson

Q: Does Council have a whole-of-Council policy on recycling and reducing waste? If not, can we develop one?

A: The question was taken on notice.

Alderman Stevenson left the meeting at 7.48 p.m.

Alderman Stevenson returned to the meeting at 7.49 p.m.

Question Without Notice – Alderman Dunsby

Q: Can we please receive an update on the proposed skate park near the KGV/YMCA precinct?

A: [Director, Infrastructure and Works] Council was investigating constructing a community park with some skate facilities in that location, however found that there were some difficulties with that particular site. So we are currently reviewing it as part of a broader look at the CBD along with other projects. The CBD Revitalisation Committee is meeting to discuss that and other projects next Wednesday (5 September 2018) and can provide an update after that.

Q: Are that State Government funds provided for that project still available?

A: [Director, Infrastructure and Works] My understanding is that yes, they are.

Alderman Johnston declared a non-pecuniary interest in a letter to be tabled by Alderman Stevenson and left the meeting at 7.50 p.m.

Alderman Stevenson took the Chair.

Alderman Stevenson tabled a letter received from the Integrity Commission on 27 August 2018 in relation to an anonymous complaint made about Mayor Johnston regarding the proposed disposal of the Derwent Entertainment Centre. The letter advised that the Integrity Commission had investigated and dismissed the complaint.

KING/RICHARDSON

That Council RECEIVE and NOTE the letter from the Integrity Commission to Alderman Stevenson received on 27 August 2018.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

Alderman Johnston returned to the meeting at 7.55 p.m. and resumed the chair.

15.1. QUESTION ON NOTICE - ALD. DUNSBY: TAXI PARKING OUTSIDE NORTHGATE SHOPPING CENTRE

File Reference: Questions on Notice

Reporting Brief:

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

Question on Notice:

Many people have expressed concerns that taxis are waiting in the parking bays to the rear of the taxi rank, thus precluding on-street parking access to other road users. These parking spaces are often required by people who are unable to navigate the escalator from the lower car park, or who wish to make a quick transaction in the area. On two recent personal observations, both mid afternoon, six of the eight parking bays were occupied by taxis. I believe this is a common occurrence.

Can Council please advise:

1. Do parking officers have any jurisdiction to prevent the taxis parking in these spaces?
2. Could consideration be given to moving the taxi rank back, so that it occupies the last few current parking bays?

Answer:

Q: Do parking officers have any jurisdiction to prevent the taxis parking in these spaces?

A: [Acting Manager, Governance and Risk] It is a legislative anomaly that Council's parking officers can instruct taxis parked in those spaces while not displaying a 'not for hire' sign to move on but do not have any powers to issue them with an infringement notice. Council officers are therefore restricted in their ability to take any direct action to address this problem.

Q: Could consideration be given to moving the taxi rank back, so that it occupies the last few current parking bays?

A: [Director, Infrastructure and Works] We will provide Aldermen with a plan showing the changes that are proposed to be constructed to this area as part of the CBD revitalisation project. There is a focus on improvements to the taxi rank and on accessibility in that area.

Alderman Fraser left the meeting at 8.01 p.m.

Alderman Fraser returned to the meeting at 8.03 p.m.

Resolution:

KING/STEVENSON

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, Thomas, Dunsby, King, Stevenson, Johnston, Richardson, Fraser, Carlton and Sims.

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

STEVENSON/KING

That the Chair adjourn the meeting under regulation 13(1)(b) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* for a short break.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.04 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8.16 p.m.

CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

16. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES (CLOSED MEETING)

Resolution:

RICHARDSON/KING

That the minutes of the Council Meeting (Closed Meeting) held on Monday, 30 July 2018 be confirmed.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

17. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

GOVERNANCE

18. KGV SPORTS AND COMMUNITY PRECINCT - BUILDING DISPUTE STATUS UPDATE

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

19. AUDIT PANEL MINUTES AND CHAIR'S REPORT: 3 MAY 2018

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).

20 ACTIONS LIST (CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING): UPDATE REPORT

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

Alderman Sims returned to the meeting at 9.27 p.m.

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

STEVENSON/THOMAS

That Council accept the tabled 'Council Electricity Supply Contract' report under regulation 8(6) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED by absolute majority, as required under regulation 8(6).

22. COUNCIL ELECTRICITY SUPPLY CONTRACT

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)(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).

KING/FRASER

That Council move into Open Council.

The motion was put.

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

AGAINST:

The motion was CARRIED.

The meeting closed at 10.37 p.m.

Confirmed,

CHAIR