

Kingborough Community Consultative Forum General Meeting

9.30am 4th March 2017
Civic Centre, Kingston

MINUTES

Present:

Initials	Organisation	Representatives present
KCCF	Kingborough Community Consultative Forum Executive	Wayne Burgess (Chair)
		Tony Ferrier (Secretary)
BBPA	Blackmans Bay Progress Association	Wayne Burgess
CALSCA	Coningham & Lower Snug Comm Ass'n	Mike Jackson
HPA	Howden Progress Association	Deborah Chadwick, James Fox
KCA	Kettering Community Association	Chris Ireland
KLGA	Kingborough Land Care Advisory Group	John Cox
KBCA	Kingston Beach Community Association	Rob Scallon
TCA	Taroona Community Association	Roger Kellaway
THSA	Taroona High School Association	Gina Hurn

Council: Mayor Steve Wass, Cr Flora Fox, Tony Ferrier (Deputy General Manager)

Apologies: Mark Florusse (BHCA), Peter Laud (KCA), Di Blackwood (FNB), June Walker (HPA), Cr Mike Percey, Cr Dr Graham Bury, Cr Richard Atkinson, Gary Arnold (General Manager)

Business:

1. Welcome (Chair)

Wayne Burgess welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Minutes of the General Meeting held 3 December 2016

It was agreed that the Minutes were an accurate account of the previous meeting.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

Chris Ireland reported on progress being made in discussions with Department of State Growth in addressing an unsafe bus stop at Kettering.

Council's opinion of the value of last year's combined Forum meeting and Council AGM was sought. Mayor Wass responded by saying that it went well and certainly stimulated more interest than previously in Council's AGM. There was a good attendance and this format appeared to be quite successful.

4. Report from Council

(a) Responses to Notices of Motion at Council's AGM (3 December 2016)

The AGM followed on after the last KCCF meeting. The following Notices of Motion were submitted by community members at the AGM.

Jill Hickie, 4 Devon Walk, Tarooma, President of the Tarooma Community Association, moved the following motion:

MOVED Jill Hickie
SECONDED Rob Crosthwaite

That Council write to the State Minister for Crown Land and Minister for Education requesting that the planning application for sub-division of 90 – 96 Channel Highway, Tarooma (the Education Department Land) be withdrawn until the government engages appropriately with the Tarooma Community.

Carried Unanimously

Council subsequently did write to the respective Ministers on 5 December 2016. The Minister for Education announced on 7 December 2016 that the development application for this proposed subdivision had been withdrawn.

Chris Ireland at 4 Oyster Court, Kettering moved the following motion:

MOVED Chris Ireland
SECONDED Peter Laud

That Council will strongly urge the State Government to consider traffic management and safety issues in Kettering when allocating the Bruny Island Ferry contract.

Carried Unanimously

Council subsequently did write to the Minister for Infrastructure requesting that traffic management and safety issues be considered when allocating the Bruny Island Ferry contract in future.

Rob Crosthwaite, 2512 Channel Highway, Lower Snug moved the following motion:

MOVED Rob Crosthwaite
SECONDED John Cox

That Council prepare a statement outlining the principles and guidelines and recommendations being, or to be, adopted by Council with respect to the financial management of the project located on the land now known as Kingston Park and that the statement be tabled at the next available Council meeting

Carried Unanimously

Council has subsequently issued such a statement and this was as follows:

“Council is managing the implementation of the Kingston Park Development Plan directly in order to ensure the desired public benefits and the high quality of infrastructure necessary to attract more private investment within central Kingston. Council’s aim is for this project to break-even financially, although this will rely on some external sources of funding. It is a stand-alone project that has separate financial accounts and is not being subsidised by general rates. All expenditure is to be obtained from internal and external loans and repaid once revenue is generated from the sale of land within Kingston Park. This approach will be further informed by the preparation of a Land Release Strategy early in 2017 that will assist in optimising revenue opportunities. Following this, a structured reporting format will

be developed that provides both the Council and the public with a fully transparent picture of the project's current financial situation and cash flow projections."

Council staff are currently compiling a Kingston Park Implementation Report. This will provide up-to-date information on the project's financial situation and the progress being made in regard to the various components of the project. It is proposed that this be updated and publicly released on a quarterly basis.

(b) Update on recent reviews relating to Local Government Reform

Tony Ferrier provided an update on the Greater Hobart feasibility study. The final feasibility report has now been completed by SGS consultants and was publicly released by the Minister a few days ago.

SGS reported that local government reform usually involves various forms of collaboration, mergers or boundary adjustments – in order to achieve operational efficiencies, improved service delivery, enhanced strategic capacity and greater advocacy. Efficiency savings from mergers often don't materialise and the benefits usually relate to improving the level of service. The report said that the focus in relation to local government reform is now not so much on reducing costs but on achieving better strategic outcomes for the community. A greater Hobart council would be able to best achieve these strategic benefits – particularly in regard to better planning for settlements, transport, tourism, social infrastructure etc. A Capital City Act would be required to recognise and make clear the relationship between the city government and the State government.

A detailed feasibility analysis was conducted by SGS that assessed the costs and benefits of different reform options – including five options – no change, merge all four councils, a strategic alliance between all four councils, a three council merger (excluding Kingborough) and a two council merger (Hobart and Glenorchy). It was felt that the benefits of any significant reform would not become apparent until after about 10 years. All of the four reform options will achieve significant financial benefits after a 20 year period – with the four council merger option clearly offering the largest benefit of \$19M per annum on average (the others were \$15M, \$13M and \$8M respectively).

Assumptions were made in the study, such as that efficiency gains would not be reinvested in service delivery improvements. It also assumes that there will be, in the longer term, wider cost benefits (for the broader community at large – not for the merged council) from transport savings (from consolidated urban growth), tourism yield for local businesses, and infrastructure savings (from consolidated urban growth) in particular – however it is not clear whether this major higher living density change can be guaranteed and how it necessarily translates to such large savings – noting that these savings are to be felt by the whole community, rather than the council.

A simple financial savings model (without considering the potential for wider community benefits) shows that (over 10 or 20 years) the only option that will result in cost savings is the two council merger (Hobart and Glenorchy) – with a saving of \$2.9M per annum on average. The other three will have net costs – the worst being the four council merger option with costs of \$0.9M per annum on average being incurred.

The conclusions were that the merger options entailing 4 and 3 councils will require rate increases in the early stages. All merger options are expected to result in service improvements. Local representation for merged councils will need to be protected by a ward system. The study is predicated on the fact that the main benefit of local government reform is in improved strategic capacity and decision making and this provides a bias towards a four council merger and the establishment of a greater Hobart council. SGS is

saying that the community will benefit the most if more councils merge – although it is noted that the four council merger will be the most difficult to create and will be the most complex to manage over time. Risks (and wider community rewards) diminish with less councils being involved in the merger. What is not taken into account is the possible advantages of some of the councils merging with councils that are not part of this study – such as Clarence with Sorell and Kingborough with Huon Valley. Other studies which explore these possible mergers should be considered alongside this SGS study.

The report does not include any specific recommendations but seems to favour the four council option. However the results of the report also support a strategy that involves a two council merger of Hobart and Glenorchy and for Clarence and Kingborough to explore other options with their other neighbouring councils. This would be supported by a strategic alliance between all four councils (with the land use, transport and tourism benefits it should bring) which could be empowered by the proposed Capital City Act. Based on the cost benefit modelling in the SGS report, this should achieve the best results for the councils and the broader community.

The south east feasibility study (Clarence, Sorell, Tasman, Glamorgan Spring Bay) was completed and released a few months ago. It established the fact that such an amalgamated council would provide clear financial benefits. It appears that Clarence Council would prefer this scenario than one involving a merger to create the greater Hobart council.

The situations in regard to Glenorchy and Huon Valley councils' Boards of Enquiries, appointment of Commissioners etc are as reported in the media – there is nothing further to add from Kingborough's perspective. Kingborough's discussions with Huon Valley Council in regard to resource sharing are ongoing.

The recent pronouncements by the Minister in regard to TasWater and the desire for this to be taken out of local government ownership are being resisted by both local government and the Board of TasWater. The loss of TasWater dividends would have a major impact on Kingborough Council's financial resources – the current contribution is \$1.85M and a known loss of \$0.6M next year has already been confirmed – and this will have a major impact in itself. The loss of any large amount of regular revenue will mean that Council will need to reduce services and look at rate increases. This is made worse by Council's existing large deficit that needs to be brought back into surplus in the next few years – there being of course a strategy in place to do this.

Mayor Wass commented on the better coordination that would come from a future Capital City Act and the need for Hobart City Council to reach out more to the outlying councils in solving some of the greater Hobart issues. John Cox asked about the possible problems that the lack of elected councils at Huon Valley and Glenorchy might cause in progressing merger talks. Mayor Wass said that the Commissioners could do some preparatory work, but the Minister has indicated that any mergers need to be decided by elected councils. Cr Fox commented on the fact that Kingborough had a Commissioner from 1960 to 1971 and that Commissioners could be in place longer than many anticipate.

Wayne Burgess said that the current report raised a number of complex issues to be considered. Gina Hurn said that most people want improved services and that larger councils may result in diminished services as felt by residents at a personal level. Mayor Wass commented on the need to address differences such as at Creek Road on the border of Hobart and Glenorchy where one side of the road receives a very different waste collection service to the other. He said the report assumes that the existing services provided by an existing council will not reduce once it is merged with another. He also said that it is very difficult to predict what the situation might be in 10 years, let alone 20 years, as the report has done.

Mike Jackson said that the future traffic problems may be very different in 20 years' time as a result of technology. There could be less traffic and less vehicle ownership. No-one is talking about the impact of driverless vehicles for example. He said that current conversations were just projecting the current problems into the future without considering the likely technological changes and opportunities. Mike also commented on TasWater issues and that it was unacceptable that Kingborough ratepayers have to pay for the water supply problems that exist elsewhere. In many cases these water problems are in places that are declining and do not need reticulated water. He noted that Coningham has tank water and yet places that are essentially just rural localities are being upgraded. No-one seems to be questioning this. Roger Kellaway agreed and said calling these places "towns" is incorrect. They don't need reticulated water and TasWater should be concentrating on sewerage issues more.

(c) Update on State Planning Reform

Council has continued to make a number of changes to the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 as a result of the Commission hearings in 2016. As well as this Council is reviewing existing Specific Area Plans (such as the Former Kingston High School Site – to be referred to as Kingston Park) and some local investigations have been recommended by the Commission for Margate and Neika.

The Kingborough Land Use Strategy (December 2013) is being reviewed in preparation for the need to prepare the Local Provisions Schedule (Zone maps, Code overlays, Specific Area Plans, local heritage list, specified departures etc). Particular attention is being given to the possible development new Specific Area Plans for Kingston Beach and Blackmans Bay. The former is to address inundation hazards and the latter is to consider special values in an area referred to as the Blackmans Bay Bluff. Council is also conducting a review of all places that should be included in a list of local heritage significance (with eventually the places of State significance being afforded protection under the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995*).

The most important recent development is the release of the final State Planning Provisions by the Minister. These are now available for public perusal – as well as the Planning Commission's report (following the hearings) and the Minister's response. For Council, the SPPs will now form the basis for the subsequent development of the Local Provisions Schedule. Very few of Council's original concerns with the draft SPPs have been addressed – see the very preliminary notes below and, in particular, the implications relating to each matter.

STATE PLANNING PROVISIONS

OUR ORIGINAL CONCERNS	SPP RESPONSE	IMPLICATIONS
Additional categories of General Residential Zone – allow for larger minimum lot sizes (draft was 450m ²) to enable a lower density	No change – the minimum lot size for this Zone remains as 450m ²	The Low Density Residential LDR Zone will need to be used more in urban areas to protect local character – including visual amenity on hillsides and skylines
Additional categories of Low Density Residential Zone – allow for larger minimum lot sizes (draft was 1,500m ²) to enable a lower density	No change – the minimum lot size for this Zone remains as 1,500m ²	Some areas of LDR will need to now be zoned Rural Living and a higher density in other LDR areas will change character and result in less vegetation on skylines (this Zone is not subject to Scenic Protection and Natural Assets Codes) – unit development is possible in this Zone
Additional categories of Rural Living Zone – allow	Additional categories have been included so	This is a good outcome as the new categories can be used to encompass all of the currently

for larger minimum lot sizes (draft was 1ha and 2 ha)	that it is now 1ha, 2ha, 5ha and 10ha	zoned Rural Living areas in the KIPS2015 and some areas that are zoned Environmental Living and Rural Resource
Setbacks for large agricultural buildings in the Rural Zone need to be increased to avoid conflicts with neighbouring residences	No change – setback remains as 5m	This will enable buildings that could be as high as 12m (permitted) or higher to be very close to a neighbouring residence (if that residence is already fairly close to the boundary)
Include a Stormwater Code – needed to assess impacts from large developments (eg commercial, parking areas, units, industrial)	No change – a Stormwater Code is not included and no adjustments have been made to relevant zones	Downstream impacts of such large developments cannot be assessed and developers cannot be required to upgrade infrastructure that is too small to cope with additional stormwater loads that are caused by their development proposal
Include an On-site Wastewater Code – needed to assess site limitations for new residences	No change – an On-site Wastewater Code is not included and no adjustments have been made to relevant zones	Wastewater issues are dealt with at the subdivision stage but there is no provision to assess the impacts on existing lots at the planning stage – it is assumed that this will be done as part of the building approval – but this could lead to situations where a residence is approved on a small lot that is later found to be unable to be serviced by an on-site system
Attenuation Code should apply to Industrial, Port & Marine and Utilities zones	No change – still does not apply to these zones	This prevents an assessment of external impacts where industrial developments are close to residential areas – eg Margate, Huntingfield, Browns Road, Electrona –there is a reliance on dealing with “nuisance” complaints under EMPCA once the activity is in place
Bushfire Prone Areas Code should require bushfire hazard assessments when assessing new developments	No change – a bushfire hazard management plan is only required for vulnerable and hazardous uses and at the subdivision stage	Bushfire plans are not required for new residences on existing lots in bushfire prone areas
Natural Assets Code should apply to all zones and should be consistent with related environmental legislation	No change – the Code only applies to priority vegetation in specific zones – not including the residential, business, commercial or industrial zones	Vegetation is not protected in zones that are designated for more intensive development, including Low Density Residential One change that addressed one of our concerns is that the Code no longer allows clearing up to 3,000m ² in the Rural Living Zone
Scenic Protection Code should apply to all zones	No change – Code only applies to the rural zones	The main concern is it not applying to LDR Zone and skylines or timbered backdrops around urban areas
Environmental Living Zone is deleted – need to issue guidelines on rezoning affected properties (that allow for larger rural residential lots)	No change – this Zone was effectively replaced by the Landscape Conservation Zone (though it has quite a different purpose)	The new categories of the Rural Living Zone may accommodate some of these existing areas but it will now be difficult to apportion the existing Environmental Living zoned areas to other zones (this zone provided a good fit with your typical “bush” blocks in Kingborough)

No provisions that enable potential noise impacts to be assessed as a result of a development proposal	No change – there are no zone use standards that specifically deal with noise – only hours of operation for business and commercial zones	This omission assumes that noise complaints will be dealt with under EMPCA as nuisances after the development is in place – there will be no opportunities to limit noise impacts during the planning assessment process – noting that many DAs currently generate objections based on potential noise impacts
Local Development Code – retain controls on the height of coastal development and extend to include residential areas	No change	This will enable development to occur up to 8.5m in height (as permitted) whereas we would contend that 5m should be the limit as it will not block views as much from land or water
Firm up Performance Criteria – so that they are not so vague and open to misinterpretation	No change	Our concerns have not been accommodated and there will be some future problems in interpreting criteria – such as the use of “having regard” where an application only needs to consider a matter without actually taking it into account in any serious way – future legal disputes will be difficult to resolve
SPPs need to be underpinned by clearly articulated policy positions	No change	This is an obvious flaw with the SPPs in that development controls are being put forward without a clear explanation of what they are aiming to achieve – that is, the policies that underpin them

OTHER ISSUES

Natural Assets Code – The TPC recommended that the Code be scrapped entirely and a new Code prepared – with regard being given to potentially different Codes being used for the specific issues, improving the overlay mapping, the scope of priority vegetation values, developing standards for building proposals and relating the Code to other relevant legislation to avoid duplication. This was rejected by the Minister who agreed to such modifications as – broadening the scope of priority vegetation, deleting the permitted allowance to clear 3,000m² in the Rural Living Zone, clarifying how the overlay maps are to be prepared and some detailed drafting changes.

Visitor Accommodation in a Dwelling – The TPC recommended a new exemption for ‘home stay’ allowing short term accommodation (if it has 4 bedrooms or less, with no limit on the number of nights) which would warrant re-exhibition prior to inclusion in the SPPs. This was rejected by the Minister on the basis that this would create a de-regulated system that was controlled only by the number of bedrooms. Changes have been subsequently made to the final SPPs to provide an exemption for ‘visitor accommodation’ in a dwelling (including a secondary residence) if it is the owner/occupier’s main place of residence and only let while the owner/occupier is on vacation, or if visitors are accommodated in not more than 4 bedrooms. ‘Visitor Accommodation’ is otherwise permitted in the residential zones. This change would appear to create much the same outcome as envisaged by the TPC without being re-exhibited.

Scenic Protection Code – The TPC recommended extending this Code to apply to the Low Density Residential Zone. This was rejected by the Minister on the basis that an “inappropriate” application of the Code could undermine the purpose of that Zone and that priority be given to the fact that such land has been specifically zoned for residential purposes.

Riverine Inundation Hazard Code – This is to be renamed as the Flood-Prone Areas Hazard Code as recommended by the TPC. A number of modifications have been made to the various hazard related Codes and the implications of these may need to be closely examined.

Chris Ireland asked whether a change of government would have much impact on these changes. The response was that there is now too much progress made and that, while there may be some greater willingness to listen to councils, it is likely that the current planning reform program would continue to be implemented.

Wayne Burgess commented that the recent changes to the Act were made with the support of Labor. However the Minister does have too much power and it is noted that many of the Commission's recommendations were dismissed. It is also still a major flaw in the process that there is no underlying policy framework that underpins the changes that are being made. As a result the performance criteria are often vague and much more open to future challenges in the courts. The concerns of councils are not being listened to. Nevertheless the release of the State Planning Provisions is a major milestone. Wayne noted the recent call from LGAT for assistance in preparing the planning schemes – particularly taking into account other planning workloads and for small councils that may not have full-time planning staff. Mayor Wass commented that Kingborough has had to devote one full-time planning officer solely to this planning reform work.

(d) Update on Kingston Park Development Plan implementation

Following the AGM a few months ago, Council is to prepare a Kingston Park Implementation Plan that will provide public information on the project and which will be updated on a quarterly basis. The initial report is being prepared and will contain details on the progress being made in regard to on-site construction (roads, services, Community Hub, public open space), the land release strategy, public communications, financial management Cash flow and borrowings) and project governance.

The design of the Community Hub is still being finalised in conjunction with the preparation of the development application (to be lodged soon). The initial design was presented at the Council's AGM and has received a good response. A number of detailed changes have been made. Council has submitted a grant application for \$2.8M with the Federal Government's Building Better Regions Fund.

The design of the Boulevard road has been finalised together with the complex arrangements associated with how the site will be properly serviced. The Boulevard has been designed by consultants Gandy & Roberts along the alignment shown within the Development Plan. The road reservation has been widened by a few metres to accommodate some roadside parking and a wider nature strip. A development application has been exhibited and a planning permit should be issued soon.

The Department of Health and Human Services have indicated to Council that the design of the proposed Kingston Community Health Centre is being finalised and that construction is envisaged to take place during 2018.

The design of the public open space area is one of the next tasks and this is likely to include a major children's playground – one that would be a real attraction and be a point of difference. Council is still considering the scope of this task and how it will best relate to the proposed development of surrounding areas.

To assist in this and the overall development of the Kingston Park site, Council has commissioned Navire consultants to prepare a Land Release Strategy. A Councillor workshop was held with these consultants earlier in February this year. They will act as Council's principal property advisor. Their advice will help in ensuring that Council will

obtain best value for money. They have confirmed that Council's overall approach is sound but that there are many complexities in urban renewal – "it is full of challenges and takes time – time that typically traverses political and property market cycles". The economic realities at Kingston need to be acknowledged though it was stressed that Council does have an opportunity to effectively create a new market for a higher density of development, supported by adjoining "seed/catalyst" projects (health centre, community hub, cafes, public open space, playground etc). It is also very important to have a planning scheme that reduces developer risk.

Navire identified the guiding principles for urban renewal at Kingston Park as being:

- (1) Developing a shared vision
- (2) Providing planning certainty
- (3) Delivering supportive infrastructure
- (4) Facilitating seed/catalyst projects
- (5) Having land control
- (6) Managing market conditions

The current situation is that a draft Land Release Strategy is being prepared and that as part of this process there may need to be changes to the original development plan and how the future development of the site is to be staged.

Gina Hurn commented that the children's playground at Kings Park, Perth was a good example of what could be included on Kingston Park. Cr Fox commented on the need to consider a public swimming pool on the site. John Cox said that Council should consider retaining ownership of land and leasing buildings on a commercial basis.

(e) Update on climate change, coastal hazards and emergency management initiatives

A number of such reports were considered at the December 2016 Council meeting and there has been some subsequent activity in this space. The reports were as follows:

- (1) Kingborough is Getting Ready – final report

In February 2015 Council obtained a grant (\$127K) under the Natural Disaster Resilience Grants Program Tasmania. A number of consultants were engaged to deliver aspects of this and Council staff were very actively involved. The various projects included:

- Torrens Community Capacity Toolkit

The Torrens Community Capacity Toolkit project was used to assist to assess and develop the capacity of residents and businesses to respond and recover from disasters. It was used in five communities (South Channel, Margate, Tarooma, Kingston/Blackmans Bay and Bruny Island). Each community had very different issues [n regard to population, settlements, geographic isolation, a history of disaster experience and access to new technology and communication networks.

The project provided a snapshot at a point in time to gain a sense of the level of preparedness for each community. It allowed strengths and weaknesses in preparedness to be recognised and recorded. Each community was then given a scorecard ranking which indicates areas that should receive attention. The average was 58 which indicates the need for action to enhance the resilience of the community to react to and recover from disaster situations. Most of the recommendations focused on information and communications, and specifically knowing where to access information all of which would enhance a community's sense of being connected and supported.

- Kingston Beach Integrated Climate Change and Natural Hazards Project

This report reviewed natural hazard and climate change issues at Kingston Beach. Nine risks were explored: bushfire; heatwave; tsunami; dam break; landslip; riverine flood; coastal inundation from sea level rise; storm surge and coincident flooding. The project examined how exposed the Kingston Beach assets (both structural and social) were to the identified hazards. The analysis ranges from current risks (2010) through to projected risks at the end of the Century (2100).

The report shows that Kingston Beach faces a range of current risks (many of which will be exacerbated by climate change). The most pressing current risks (e.g. those that may occur now) are bushfire (which is an all of Council issue) and riverine flood (with the risk most affecting Beach Road and parts of Balmoral Road). Climate change will increase risks and without action will affect the ability of Council and utilities to service the area – mainly due to increased riverine flood risk, coincident flood risk (with storm tide and sea level rise), increased bushfire risk and salt-water intrusion into the water table and sub-surface infrastructure (such as sewer and water pipework and telecommunications).

- Legal Commentary for Kingston Beach Adaptation Pilot report

This report supported the Kingston Beach Integrated Climate Change and Natural Hazards Project. It provided commentary and recommendations on legal matters associated with the Council's adaptation governance assessment. A recommendation was that the planning scheme needs to include the necessary provisions to improve resilience to natural hazards and climate change. It also recommended a decision making methodology that could be used to identify legal risks associated with climate change adaptation.

- Potential impacts of climate change on natural values on the Kingston Beach area

This also supported the Kingston Beach study and highlighted the future impacts on natural values. Due to the topography and geomorphology of the area, changes to groundwater, and exposure and formation of acid sulfate soils may be significant factors. Saltmarsh is likely to be particularly affected. *Eucalyptus ovata* forest is likely to be reduced under climate change. Action in the short term to assist transition to new areas, including areas not currently vegetated, may be important. Eight threatened species are identified as potentially occurring in the area and their habitat will be impacted on by future changes.

- Kingston Beach water table analysis

This also supported the Kingston Beach study and was implemented to help the Council flood modelers to gain a better understanding of the nature of the water table beneath Kingston Beach. The project included a bathymetric baseline study of Browns' River to determine the level of the river bed and water depth. The project also drilled initial boreholes to enable Council to undertake an ongoing analysis of the water table levels and quality over time.

- Bruny Island Hazard Communications and Vulnerability Assessment

This was undertaken to better understand and manage the unique issues associated with an island community – one that has a population of about 700 and yet receives about 120,000 visitors per year – with unprecedented growth in visitor numbers in recent years. There are a broad range of risks on the Island with the highest being bushfire risk. Other hazards included storm damage, heatwaves, flooding and Tsunami. Climate change is likely to exacerbate all of these challenges. Communication is a significant issue and there

is pressure placed on existing telecommunication networks, plus water security and robust electricity supply. The Island may well be underprepared should a large event occur.

There are three distinct community groups on the Island (permanent residents; “shack owners”; and visitors) and each require a specific communication approach and messaging – with this report recommending the best means of doing this. The rapidly growing visitor numbers and the relative isolation warrants focused attention, increasing the strain on Kingborough Council’s emergency management capacity.

- Kingborough Business Survey and Engagement

Local businesses were surveyed and again it was identified that the highest risk is bushfire, with approximately 90% of the population living in a bushfire prone area. The flood modeling of Kingston Beach has highlighted a risk that was only previously understood from anecdotal evidence. Bruny Island presents Council with an added complexity particularly in regard to emergency management – such as in helping local communities and businesses better prepare for and respond to hazards. Council is adopting a more considered approach to emergency management (including a number of internal staffing changes and planning responses).

(2) Kingston Beach Flood Study

A flood risk study has been completed for Kingston Beach. It provides a comprehensive assessment of the inundation risks from both coastal and riverine sources. A range of flood maps were produced under different scenarios, particularly in regard to coincident flooding – when there is the combination of high rainfall events in the catchment and coastal storm surges – with the impact increasing over time as the result of sea level rise. There will be instances when the same storm cell creates these coincident events and it was apparent that coastal and riverine inundation risks should not be examined in isolation at Kingston Beach. It is this coincident risk that is the unique feature of this flood risk study.

The results indicate that Kingston Beach will be subject to flooding between 2.6m to 3.3m AHD water levels during the peak 1% AEP coincident flood in the year 2100. This flood risk varies across the study area with lower lying areas backing onto Browns River being the most exposed to relatively higher velocities and water depths compared to higher ground along Osborne Esplanade. This is the worst case scenario examined in the flood study and it also provides others that are likely to have less of an impact.

A start has been made in considering future mitigation schemes that might reduce future risk. One option is to allow flood waters to pass more easily across the golf course by way of a new channel and to provide for a deeper opening of the Browns River mouth. On the basis of the flood study results, Council has endorsed the further development of a flood emergency plan for Kingston Beach and to further examine how different mitigation schemes might best protect Kingston Beach. It is also proposed to integrate the results of the flood study into the planning scheme, possibly by way of a Specific Area Plan.

(3) Climate Change Innovation Lab

Council has endorsed the establishment of a Kingborough Climate Change Innovation Lab at the Kingston Beach Community Hall. This is for an initial 2 year period and it will further reviewed during 2019.

The Lab is to be a particular place where researchers, Council, community and other stakeholders can come together to examine real-world examples of climate change impact and adaptation. The intention is to engage specialists that can deliver technical support and utilise particular tools and strategies for climate change adaptation. One aspect that

will be pursued is to explore different forms of communication, including the use of the arts community to help in communicating such a complex scientific and possibly confronting message. The Lab is to engage with and involve a broad range of other organisations and to seek external funding to pursue its objectives. The initial focus will be on this engagement and the identification of suitable partners. This will also help in directing future research, such as in case studies within Kingborough.

A subsequent report on the Climate Change Lab was presented to Council at its meeting on 27 February 2017 which provides an update on current progress.

(4) Climate Change Adaptation Partnership

Our Kingborough Mayor has signed a partnership agreement with the Mayor of the Whitsunday Council in Queensland. This agreement is to see the two councils cooperating and sharing information about their mutual experiences in dealing with climate change from a local government perspective. Both councils are more advanced in this area than most others and felt that there would be advantages in communicating more closely in regard to each other's work.

It was also noted that, at the 27 February meeting Council adopted a Kingborough Public Toilet Strategy. This consisted of a comprehensive audit of all public toilets and a prioritised capital works program for the next 10 years or so.

Rob Scallon commented that the flood maps are misleading because many people are interpreting them as being what will be a permanent situation in, say the year 2100. There needs to be a better appreciation of the fact that the maps represent the worst situation for what might be a very short time period and which might only occur on a very rare occasion (eg once in a hundred years). Without a better public understanding, the maps may be very misleading. Gina Hurn commented on how the increased risks will affect the ability to insure property.

Cr Fox commented on the draft Dog Management Policy and the fact that it too was dealt with at the 27 February council meeting. Council endorsed the public release of a draft Dog Management Policy. It is a legislated requirement that Council has such a Policy in place and the existing policy is overdue for review. This draft policy is open for public comment until 10 April. It includes restrictions on dogs being allowed on public beaches.

Comments from others were that there many examples of non-compliance. It was felt that Council's compliance officers need to carry out more patrols and be more proactive in the way that restrictions are enforced. Rob Scallon quoted examples of dogs off lead on the main Kingston Beach and the fact that signs are needed facing the beach as people walk south from the dog beach. He said that greater enforcement is needed to change the behaviour of dog owners. John Cox commented that, without enforcement, people are not taking any notice of the signs. Deborah Chadwick agreed that enforcement is needed to change behaviour and allowing dogs on to any beach must be treated as a privilege. It was noted that more than half of the workload of Council's four Compliance Officers relates to dog control.

A few commented that the feral cat problem was greater than dog issues and asked about what Council was doing in this regard. Council is coordinating a major cat management project on Bruny Island, where there are many other organisations involved and there is strong community support. A By-law is being prepared though this will focus mainly on domestic cats. Feral cats are being mainly addressed by Parks & Wildlife Service (though Council has in the past coordinated some feral cat capture programs).

John Cox said that Council's work in the climate change area is appreciated and is very commendable. Mayor Wass informed the members of his trip to Whitsunday to sign the partnership agreement (which was paid for entirely from his own funds). There was good media exposure while he was there and the two councils (though so physically separated) had many things in common. Whitsunday representatives will be visiting Kingborough in October this year. Gina Hurn said that Taroom High has a number of classes that would be interested in participating in such a visit.

Rob Scallon asked about the reported protocol between Council and State government in regard to the quick release of flood water in Browns River. This question was taken on notice (see below).

Wayne Burgess reported on the various matters dealt with by Council at its 27 February meeting and as to how they show the broad range of Council's responsibilities – particularly the quarterly reports from Environmental Services and Community Services. Wayne sought a response from Council on the recent newspaper article headed "Kingborough deeper in the red". Mayor Wass described how Council's deficit can be largely attributed to the need to account for the depreciation of assets (in order to fund their eventual replacement) and most recently in how the revised accounts have considered the componentisation of assets, particularly all council roads.

Mike Jackson said that Council has no borrowings and that this should be reconsidered. He said that it is only reasonable that Council borrow to fund urgently needed infrastructure now and that then the people actually using that infrastructure are paying for it. Borrowing should occur when interest rates are low.

5. Reports from Community Organisations

Deborah Chadwick said that Howden remains an internet black hole. She said that there would be local interest in the proposed heritage listings in Howden. Council's commitment to climate change is to be applauded. The foreshore walking track remains locally contentious.

Chris Ireland said that there is keen local interest at Kettering in the upgrade and development of walking tracks. Council has recently upgraded the track around Kettering Point to Trial Bay. There is also a nice walk below the park and it is possible to walk through the marina and there is a "bush garden". There is interest in creating a loop track from Trial Bay but it is too dangerous to walk back along the highway – but there is a proposal to create a grassy path parallel to the highway with only about 300 metres of substantial work to be done. This is to be taken up with Council officers.

Rob Scallon said that at the last KBCA meeting a number of questions were formulated for Council. Although taken on notice at the meeting, the questions are listed below together with a subsequent response:

1. We believe \$360,000 was set aside for upgrading Osborne Esplanade this financial year. How much of that will actually be spent in 2016/17? Given the state of Kingborough's finances, when does Council finally expect to complete the job? It's worth pointing out that the Esplanade was last upgraded in 1987 – that's 30 years ago.

Council has tendered the works for Kingston Beach along the Osborne Esplanade and also for a section of works in the adjacent Beach Road, and it is envisaged that the tender will be awarded shortly. At this stage Council intend to complete the construction this 2016/17 financial year – though it may well extend into the next. To complete the balance of the foreshore works only will require an injection of approximately \$1.3M and this will be put

forward for consideration in future budgets. The desire is to complete the foreshore works over a three year period but this will be dependent on funding being made available.

2. There's been conflicting advice about the importance of marram grass in protecting the seawall at Kingston Beach. If it serves a purpose, fine, but we believe it shouldn't be allowed to spread to the point where it's so prolific people avoid using those parts of the beach. Lately we've noticed that instead of pulling it out, there's been some raking or surface disturbance. Is this designed to retard growth and if so, what evidence do you have that it actually works?

The raking of the beach has been undertaken to control some of the outgrowths of marram grass and to remove some of the dead material. The marram grass does serve a purpose in terms of facilitating a sand buffer for the retaining wall and the intention will be to manage the growth rather than complete removal at this stage. The control measure required will be long term and will vary from raking to removal of sections and sifting (similar to the area that was treated on the northern side of the beach last year).

3. Twelve months ago we raised the issue of Council having to seek State Government approval to release water from Browns River if a sand bar develops and river levels rise. This process can take up to a week. Is the matter still being discussed or has it finally been resolved?

This matter has not yet been resolved and decisions will need to be made as to when and why Council would open the channel up. It seemed that the last time it was done was in order to prevent the inundation of low lying areas of the golf club, however this then resulted in a massive fish kill and odour issues. There is no legislated requirement for Council to ever open up the river mouth. It has been done historically by Council in response to requests from the golf club and local residents and to protect sewer pump stations. This has been an ad-hoc approach and has not considered the potential environmental damage. Council has sought a grant for a new flood gauge and flood warning system which will change its ability to manage the river mouth. Council will be notified in the next week or two about this grant. Regardless of this, Council is still looking at how an appropriate protocol can be developed.

4. Where is the new DA for the Surf Club/toilet block redevelopment on Osborne Esplanade? By commercialising the project Council has generated a lot of ill-feeling about the development, which has gone nowhere. An internal report says the current toilet block badly needs replacing - it's from another era and not a good look in what is a prime location. Updating community facilities like this is a core local government function, not chasing commercial operators who will simply walk away if the going gets too tough. Should that happen - and it looks increasingly likely - the Surf Club stands to lose the funding it's been promised but hasn't spent, and we're still no nearer to getting a new toilet block.

This DA has been received by Council and a request for further information has been forwarded from Council to the applicant. The applicant is currently finalising this information and, if necessary, making some changes to the proposal in order that it meets the planning scheme requirements. It is Council's understanding that this final information will be received very soon and, if satisfactory, the application will be publicly advertised.

Mike Jackson said that CALSCA strongly supports the number one priority Council has assigned to replacing the Coningham Beach public toilet as stated in the Public Toilet Strategy. CALSCA also wants road mirrors to be placed at a number of dangerous corners on Coningham Road – specifically at the Old Station road junction and at the jetty corner. A similar mirror has recently been placed at Kingston Town that works well – a response to this proposal is being sought. The most locally contentious proposal is one for a jet ski

business operating from Coningham Beach. A particular concern within the local community in this regard is that permission can be given to a business operating on a public place such as the beach without any prior public consultation.

Gina Hurn reported on the, now withdrawn, proposal to subdivide part of the Taroona High School property. The School Association was made to be the scapegoat in this matter and was misled by the Department. The School Association was not provided with the information to provide to the local community. She said the school itself is under considerable pressure with it operating at maximum capacity. She thanked Council for the \$5,000 grant as a contribution to the cost of installing outdoor fitness equipment.

Roger Kellaway thanked Council for writing to the Minister about the school subdivision proposal and the matter was quickly resolved. Work is being done in preparing a suitable master plan for the land in question. The TCA is urging IMAS, when constructing its pump station near the foreshore, to keep the public walking track for the longest time possible.

John Cox reported again on the need to address weeds along the edges of the Channel Highway in particular. Some work was done at Lower Longley but that job still needs to be finished.

James Fox referred to the proposed walking track at Howden and that this is a popular walk to Stinkpot Bay. The potential to make this a loop walk should be realised. The legal access is there but it is hard to identify. The HCA will continue to pursue this despite failing to obtain a grant. Cr Fox said that it may be possible to do some minimal work on the Crown land without further approvals, provided there is no digging or new signs.

6. Other Business

Mayor Wass said that NBN has reported that they should have complete coverage for the municipality by the end of April. He said that there will be NBN staff at the Love Living Locally event on 19 March who can answer questions.

7. Next KCCF Meeting

The next Forum meeting will be at 9.30am on 3rd June 2017. Subsequent meetings will be held on 2nd September and 2nd December 2017.

The meeting closed at 12.25pm.