

# Kingborough



## COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

5 December 2022

*These Minutes are provided for the assistance and information of members of the public, and are a draft until confirmed as a true record at the next Ordinary Meeting of Council.*

# Kingborough Councillors 2022 - 2026



**Mayor**  
**Councillor Paula Wriedt**



**Deputy Mayor**  
**Councillor Clare Glade-Wright**



**Councillor Aldo Antolli**



**Councillor David Bain**



**Councillor Gideon Cordover**



**Councillor Kaspar Deane**



**Councillor Flora Fox**



**Councillor Amanda Midgley**



**Councillor Mark Richardson**



**Councillor Christian Street**

# Table of Contents

Item	Page No.	
Open Session		
1	Audio Recording	1
2	Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians	1
3	Attendees	1
C467/23-2022	4 Apologies	1
C468/23-2022	5 Confirmation of Minutes	2
	6 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	7 Declarations of Interest	2
	8 Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C469/23-2022	9 Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	9.1 Biodiversity Offsets	2
C470/23-2022	10 Questions on Notice from the Public	4
	10.1 Responsible Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking at Council	4
	10.2 Bushfire Readiness	4
	10.3 Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme	5
	10.4 Bushfire Readiness	7
C471/23-2022	11 Questions Without Notice from Councillors	8
	11.1 Line Markings, Redwood Road	8
	11.2 Auburn Road	9
	11.3 Playground, Electrona	9
	11.4 Pontoons	10
	11.5 Reconofelt	10
	11.6 Container Deposit Scheme	10
	11.7 Plastic Milk Bottles	10
	11.8 Public Transport, Spring Farm & Whitewater Park Estates	11
	11.9 Huntingfield Park and Ride	11
	11.10 Youth Action in Kingborough	11
C472/23-2022	12 Questions on Notice from Councillors	12
	12.1 Climate Action	12
	13 Petitions still being Actioned	12
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period	12

## Table of Contents *(cont.)*

<b>Item</b>		<b>Page No.</b>
	15 Officers Reports to Council	12
C473/23-2022	15.1 Kingborough LGBTIQ+ Action Plan	12
C474/23-2022	15.2 Unauthorised Vegetation Damage Signage Policy Review	13
C475/23-2022	15.3 Tinderbox Beach Erosion Management - Community Consultation Report	13
C476/23-2022	15.4 Kingston Beach War Memorial	14
C477/23-2022	15.5 LGAT General Meeting Motions	14
	16 Notices of Motion	15
C478/23-2022	16.1 Communication of Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), Specifically the Landcape Conservation Zone (LCZ)	15
C479/23-2022	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	16

Public Copy

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council  
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston  
Monday, 5 December 2022 at 5.30pm

## 1 AUDIO RECORDING

---

The Chairperson declared the meeting open, welcomed all in attendance and advised that Council meetings are recorded and made publicly available on its website. In accordance with Council's policy the Chairperson received confirmation that the audio recording had commenced.

## 2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL CUSTODIANS

---

The Chairperson acknowledged the traditional custodians of this land, paid respects to elders past and present, and acknowledged today's Tasmanian Aboriginal community.

## 3 ATTENDEES

---

### Councillors:

Mayor Councillor P Wriedt	✓
Deputy Mayor Councillor C Glade-Wright	✓
Councillor A Antolli	✓
Councillor D Bain	✓
Councillor G Cordover	✓
Councillor K Deane	✓
Councillor F Fox	✓
Councillor A Midgley	✓
Councillor M Richardson	✓

### Staff:

General Manager	Mr Gary Arnold
Director Engineering Services	Mr David Reeve
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Dr Sam Fox
Manager Environmental Services	Ms Liz Quinn
Media & Communications Advisor	Ms Sam Adams
Communications & Engagement Support Officer	Ms Bianca Kleine
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton

**C467/23-2022**

## 4 APOLOGIES

---

Councillor C Street

**C468/23-2022****5 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

Moved: Cr Flora Fox  
Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 22 held on 21 November 2022 be confirmed as a true record.

**CARRIED****6 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING**

---

28 November - Sportsground User Fees

**7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

---

There were no declarations of interest.

**8 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS**

---

There were no agenda items transferred.

**C469/23-2022****9 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC**

---

**Mr Charles Biggins** asked the following question without notice:

**9.1 Biodiversity Offsets**

*What was the legal advice given to Council in 2004, and more recently with the formation of the Biodiversity Offset Scheme, that led to the belief that an environmental offset and now a biodiversity offset scheme could legally be administered by a local Council?*

**General Manager responds:**

Thank you for the question. My colleague, Ms Quinn, may wish to elaborate further on the response, but let me start by saying that under the Local Government Act all 29 Councils in Tasmania are entitled to charge fees or charges.

**Manager Environmental Services:**

In 2004, Council was part of a regional consultation in the southern region of Tasmania because there are a number of southern Councils who wanted to look at biodiversity offsetting in local government through that regional group, which was run through the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority. The Councils went to the State Government which was DPIWPE at the time and advocated for the department to take on biodiversity offsetting. At that time they weren't interested in doing that, they were interested in developing their own policy but were very happy for Council to develop theirs. We also worked with the forest practices authority at the time and they also had their own policy but were encouraging of Council to develop ours. Both of those organisations have had input into Council's policy, they are aware of it. The department, in the most recent

review of the policy, had input into the policy and provided feedback on it. We haven't sought legal input into the policy as Council hasn't believed that it was required.

**Mr Biggins:**

*As only the States and Commonwealth have the authority to levy new taxes and they make no claims that the biodiversity offsets are not a tax, how does Kingborough Council's offset payments differ from a State or Commonwealth tax?*

**Manager Environmental Services:**

Council is of the belief that our offset policy does not use taxes. A biodiversity offset, as you would be aware under the policy, is not a tax. It is a fee that is set by Council and that is how it is named in the policy. It appears we have a difference of opinion about whether the financial offset is a fee. I would also like to point out that financial offsets are the absolute residual amount of a biodiversity offset and the hierarchy in our policy sets out, as is most common in most biodiversity offset policies, that biodiversity offsets are best when they are on site, because they are supposed to match value for value, what is supposed to be very similar in value, like for like. A focus on the fee part, on the financial offset, seems interesting to me given that biodiversity offsetting in Kingborough is really about onsite offset, if not onsite, then off site and financial offsets are only used for that residual amount that is left over, and that is what our policy states must be the case, that they must be part of an offset package.

**Mr Biggins:**

*In the formation of the new Biodiversity Offset Policy, there is reference to consultation with experts in the field. Who are the experts that were consulted with the formation and content of the wording of the policy?*

**Manager Environmental Services:**

It is not a new policy, it was a review of the existing policy that occurred. Biodiversity, as you know, has been undertaken in Kingborough for a very long time, quite successfully. In the most recent review, Council consulted with technical experts in the field which were predominantly ecological specialists/consultants that work with the policy on a day to day basis with Council, and also the State Government and the Forest Practices Authority. I don't have the full list of who they were but if we can take that on notice we can potentially provide that to you.

**Mr Biggins:**

*Has any consideration been given to including bushfire mitigation works as a necessary stewardship expense that would need to be accounted for when protecting biodiversity assets for perpetuity? Are landholders hosting biodiversity offsets made aware of their liabilities under the Fire Act to mitigate the risk of fire on their property and from spreading to their neighbours?*

**Manager Environmental Services:**

One part of the biodiversity offset program in Kingborough is about private land conservation. It's about looking for properties in Kingborough and land holders who are interested in entering into a conservation covenant under the Nature Conservation Act. It is the State Government therefore who negotiates that conservation covenant and the plan that goes with it, so it would be within that conservation management plan, which is a statutory document, which would say whether fire and clearing could be used on that parcel. Generally conservation covenants, as you might know, are not places close to residential areas or don't generally have a dwelling in them. They are usually on a large property. As you would also know, fire is really important for native vegetation in Tasmania. We would encourage landowners to do low intensity burns if that was something that was required. Council is not against fuel reduction. Vegetation clearing, of course, would not be undertaken in a conservation covenant, but if it needed a fuel break for some reason, then that would be negotiated with the landowner, usually by the State Government at the time of the conservation covenant going on the title.

C470/23-2022

## 10 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

---

### 10.1 Responsible Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking at Council

At the Council meeting on 21 November 2022, **Mr Michael Rowan** asked the following question without notice to the Acting General Manager, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

*Noting that the Council itself is the employer of the staff of the Kingborough Municipal Administration, but under the Tasmanian Work Health and Safety Act 2012, an elected member of the local authority does not in that capacity conduct a business or undertaking. Who carries the responsibility under that Act that arises from being a person who conducts a business or undertaking?*

#### **Officer's Response:**

The General Manager is the responsible officer.

*Gary Arnold, General Manager*

### 10.2 Bushfire Readiness

**Mr Charles Biggins** submitted the following question on notice:

*Further to my Questions Without Notice, KC Council Meeting 21 Nov 22, item 9.3 Bushfire Readiness :*

*The following Questions on Notice relate to the Risk Statement and Treatments that Council have been held responsible for in the "Register of risks and treatments strategies" of the Kingborough Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMP), "KC 03.01, There is a risk of bushfire causing damage to residential, rural, commercial and community properties and assets and human life".*

*The following Treatments are amongst the stated Responsibility of Council :*

- "enforcement of abatement notices"*
- "maintain firebreaks (autumn/winter)"*
- "ensuring ongoing maintenance of fire-protection zones around dwellings"*

*The Timeframe for all of the above Treatments is listed as "Ongoing", which is further defined in the MEMP as "Ongoing: continuously monitor the adequacy of existing arrangements to mitigate the risk, or as described in the table"*

*Can you please report on the above Treatments that have been prescribed to Council and who's adequacy has been continuously monitored as per the MEMP.*

- 1. the number of Fire Abatement Notices issued over the last year and the total area abated.*
- 2. are the Councils own firebreaks maintenance to the TFS guidelines for FireBreaks.*
- 3. the number and frequency of compliance checks of fire protection zones around residential, rural, commercial and community properties.*

**Officer's Response:**

1. Concerning fire risk on private land, between 28 November 2021 and 28 November 2022, Council has issued 20 abatement notices pursuant to the *Local Government Act 1993*. Council does not record the total area of private land abated.

The issuing of abatement notices is not necessarily indicative of good fire risk reduction practices. In accordance with Council's endorsed Fire Risk Abatement Policy, Council undertakes a proactive and reactive fire risk reduction campaign leading up to, and over the duration of the fire season (approximately October to March each year, subject to environmental factors). Council's proactive activities consists of early engagement with land holders who have known historic fire risk, or strategically assessed fire risk. This allows landowners to take early action and abate fire risk prior to the height of the bush fire season. Council officers conduct inspections of historic and strategic fire risk throughout the fire season, and maintain dialogue with landowners in order to sustain reduced fire risk. Over the previous fire season (21/22) and the current fire season (22/23) Council has issued 130 proactive advice notifications.

2. Council maintains its fuel breaks twice per year during the bushfire season (November to March).

The breaks are maintained to the TFS recommended bushfire fuel management standard but not necessarily to the widths derived from using the TFS Fuel Break Design tool. Many of Kingborough Council's bushland reserves are narrow and linear and do not lend themselves to application of the TFS Fuel Break Design Tool. As stated in the TFS Fuel Break Guidelines 'Fuel break specifications calculated by the design tool will not guarantee life or property protection in all bushfire scenarios, and therefore cannot be relied upon as the only means for managing bushfire risk'.

Additionally, fuel breaks in some reserves are maintained in accordance with fire management plans written by fire practitioners specifically for that reserve.

Council's bushfire officer conducts inspections of all breaks before and after maintenance is conducted each bushfire season.

3. Council does not provide a comprehensive property inspection service but reactively responds to community or officer initiated fire risk concerns, within its available resources.

*Meg Lorang, Bushfire Management Officer*

*Scott Basham, Compliance Coordinator*

**10.3 Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme**

**Ms Jo Landon** submitted the following question on notice:

1. *On page 20 of the meeting agenda of 21 November 2022, the officer's report refers to "the proposed urgent amendment". However during the discussion in the meeting the Manager Development Services explained that they were not seeking an urgent amendment, just the normal amendment. Please could you clarify whether or not Council sought an urgent amendment? Is the request being processed as an urgent amendment?*
2. *If an urgent amendment was either requested by Council or deemed appropriate by the TPC, why was it considered urgent?*
3. *If the amendment hasn't been deemed urgent, why is Council seeking to avoid the 28 day minimum public exhibition period?*

4. *The dispensation of the public exhibition requirement removes the opportunity for the community to comment on those revised policies, before the new versions become incorporated documents and part of the planning scheme.*
5. *Did the latest or earlier versions of the Kingborough Biodiversity Offset Policy and the Kingborough Public Open Space Policy go out for community consultation at any point? If so please could you share the reports.*
6. *The changes to the two policies aren't all of just a clerical nature, there are some important changes to the guidelines and procedures, including new terms and increased cost of offsets. In the discussion at the meeting it was stated that the content of the policies would not be considered a relevant matter and could not be commented on in a representation at the public exhibition stage. Is that correct? If the content of the revised policies isn't considered relevant at the public exhibition stage, what aspects of the amendment are considered relevant during the public exhibition stage?*
7. *By incorporating the revised policies into KIPS 2015, does this mean that these policies will automatically transfer to the LPS in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme without opportunity for public feedback?*

\* Paragraphs numbered for ease of reference

#### **Officer's Response:**

1. As per the Council Agenda report (21 November 2022) the request to initiate a Planning Scheme Amendment was not applied for as a s30IA of the former provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* (LUPAA), 'Urgent Amendments of an Interim Planning Scheme'. The Amendment was made under s34(1)(b) of the former provisions of LUPAA.
2. Not applicable, the request to initiate was not an 'urgent amendment'.
3. Paragraph 7.2 of the report to Council outlined the reasons that may be put forward to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC). However, in addition to that, it was suggested by the TPC that a request to dispense the public exhibition period could be made, given the nature of the amendment, however they noted that the request would need to be considered. To further expand on the reasons in the report, we advise that given that the policies already exist and are referenced in the Scheme, it is deemed that the public exhibition would serve no real purpose. It is important to understand that the amendment and the public exhibition would not be considering the content or effect of the Policies – it only considers the applicable referencing within the Scheme. The reason is that the Policies and their content and application sit outside the Planning Scheme and their link and reference has already been approved by the State Government (even without the amendment).
4. Neither of the two policies were subject to formal public consultation when they were reviewed, however Council did undertake consultation on the review of the Biodiversity Offset Policy in 2022 with experts, including independent consultants, Government agencies and NGOs and their feedback was integrated into the revised Policy. Council's Agenda of 15 November 2021 and 15 August 2022 provides an overview of the revisions made.

The previous update of the policies in the Planning Scheme took place in 2020 and it was subject to public exhibition as per the statutory requirements. The planning scheme amendment was initiated on 9 June 2020. The amendment was subject to public consultation for 28 days between 17 June 2020 to 15 July 2020. Only 1 submission was received from TasWater, indicating no objection. The TPC requested re-exhibition of the planning scheme amendment to ensure that the public is made aware of the content of the policies (and other documents that were being updated in the scheme). The second round of public exhibition occurred between 23 September 2020 and 18 November 2020. No submissions were

received as part of the second round of exhibition. The TPC's decision as consideration of the scheme amendment is available on the [Austlii website](#) (external link).

5. Incorporating the most recent versions of the policies in the Planning Scheme does not give the policies effect, however it gives Council head of power to pull up the policies when considering planning applications and issuing development permits. Representations on the policy content is likely to have little purpose as it has already been endorsed by Council.
6. As per the above, there is considered to be no reason, hence why Council requested a dispensation of the exhibition requirements. The final decision about the exhibition requirements will be made by the TPC.
7. No. Council will have to formally request that the most recent version of the incorporated list (where appropriate) be transferred to the LPS. The LPS will be subject to public exhibition and that will include the opportunity to comment on the use of any incorporated documents in the new scheme.

*Tasha Tyler-Moore, Manager Development Services*

#### **10.4 Bushfire Readiness**

At the Council meeting on 21 November 2022, **Mr Charles Biggins** asked the following question without notice to the General Manager, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

*Regarding Kingborough's Bushfire Readiness, can you please detail Council's own Bushfire Mitigation Program – budget, hectares of fire breaks maintained, the kilometres of fire trails maintained, the kilometres of rural roadside vegetation cleared to an emergency evacuation standard?*

#### **Officer's Response:**

##### **Background to bushfire risk mitigation on Council owned or managed land**

The total land area of the Kingborough Municipality is 72000 hectares. Of this, Council owns/manages a total of 650 hectares of bushland. This is 0.01% of the total Kingborough land area.

Council owns additional bushland adjoining Wellington Park land (approx. 2000 ha) which is managed by City of Hobart.

Including the Wellington Park land managed by the City of Hobart the total 2650 ha land area owned by Council as a proportion of total Kingborough land area is 0.03%

The vast majority of the municipality is held in private ownership.

##### **Bushfire Mitigation Program**

Council has a Bushfire Risk Reduction Strategy for Council owned and managed land, together with an Implementation Plan to guide mitigation activities outlined in the Strategy. Council also has several bushfire related policies, reserve fire management plans and a set of Standard Operating Procedures for conducting burning on Council land.

Council undertakes bushfire mitigation activities in its reserves on an annual basis with breaks and trails being maintained twice throughout the bushfire danger period each year (usually November to March).

Council's Bushfire Officer regularly attends Regional Fire Management Area Committees (Southern and Hobart FMAC's). FMACs provide a forum for a range of land management

stakeholders (TFS, PWS, local government, TasNetworks, STT etc) to work together to manage bushfire fuels for the mitigation of bushfire risk.

### **Bushfire Mitigation Program Budget**

The annual budget for Council's Bushfire Mitigation Program is \$135k excluding the salary component.

### **Hectares of fire breaks maintained**

Council maintains 15 fuel breaks. The purpose of fuel breaks is to provide an area of reduced fuel which is designed to reduce the intensity of a fire next to assets.

The width of each break varies from reserve to reserve making a precise calculation of their area difficult. A reasonable estimate would be 6.5 ha.

Council also manages 4 Hazard Management Areas (HMAs) with a total area of 1 ha. These are areas directly adjacent to assets which are maintained in a low fuel state throughout the fire season (i.e., grass cut short).

### **Kilometres of fire trails maintained**

Council maintains a total of 3.4 km of fire trails.

### **Kilometres of rural roadside vegetation cleared to an emergency evacuation standard?**

Council does not currently manage any roadside vegetation for fire. A bushfire roadside risk assessment has recently been conducted for Council's roads network, using grant funding obtained under the Natural Disaster Risk Reduction Grants Program. The roads risk assessment (due for finalisation at the end of the year) will prioritise roadside locations that may require mitigation work.

There is no emergency evacuation standard for roadside vegetation clearing. Construction of new roads in bushfire prone areas, such as new subdivisions, are required to comply with strict design standards for bushfire safety. The Tasmania Fire Service has recently released guidelines for Roadside Management for Bushfire Risk Mitigation. At a minimum TFS recommends vegetation adjacent to roads should be managed to the following standards:

- Horizontal clearance of 2 meters either side of the carriageway
- Vertical clearance of 4 metres above the carriageway and roadsides.

*Meg Lorang, Bushfire Management Officer*

## **C471/23-2022**

### **11 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS**

---

**Cr Cordover** asked the following questions without notice:

#### **11.1 Line Markings, Redwood Road**

*It's come to my attention that the line markings on Redwood Road between Redwood Village and Algona Road have become faded or they are no longer visible, especially on the bends. This may be dangerous as cars tend to take a direct line and sometimes they end up crossing onto the wrong side of the road. Does Council have a plan to repaint the line markings on the road?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

Council doesn't have a plan to remark those. It's not Council's responsibility, it's the Department of State Growth's responsibility. Each year they come back to Council and ask for particular candidates which we put forward. It would be fair to say that we have more candidates than they have the ability to fund. I'm not sure off the top of my head whether this is one that was put forward. Generally our list is reasonably long but I'm happy to chase that up.

**11.2 Auburn Road**

*Cars are parking on both sides of the street causing motorists to sometimes cross onto the other side of the road to avoid parked cars and the issue is, according to the constituent who I spoke with, particularly acute near the crest at the southern end of Auburn Road. There are concerns also about the Metro bus passengers eggressing safely. Has Council considered options to make this road more safe?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

It is a project that is sitting in our 5 year plan to completely reconstruct Auburn Road and it is currently being designed this financial year. But in terms of the immediate safety issue, yes, we are aware of the fact that there have been some more cars that have been parking in Auburn Road, not all the time, but on occasions. We are in the process of having discussions with some of the residents in that area and we will be looking at putting some further controls in to try and control those vehicles, particularly where they are getting near to the bend which is closer to Tanina.

**Cr Cordover:**

With those further controls, is it too early to say roughly what they might be? Are they traffic calming or are they potentially parking restrictions or what might they look like?

**Director Engineering Services:**

They will be either parking restrictions or potentially may be some repainting of the line. There is a white line there and because it's a relatively narrow road, that will effectively preclude people from parking in that dangerous area.

**11.3 Playground, Electrona**

*To cater for the growing population in Electrona, has Council ever considered creating a play space in the wedge of land south of Dixon Street near Peggy's Beach?*

**Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:**

We do indeed own land in that area that could potentially be used for playground development. I would have to say that it is not something that we have looked at in detail. As you are aware we have recently done a playground audit that has identified that the majority of our existing playgrounds need upgrading before we look at new ones. The development of the Ashton Denehey Park was in part predicated on use by Electrona residents and similarly the replacement of the Snug foot bridge so residents from Electrona could get to Ashton Denehey Park to utilise that playground was a consideration there. To answer the question, yes, it is a consideration for us but it would be a longer term rather than a short term one.

**Cr Glade-Wright** asked the following questions without notice:

#### **11.4 Pontoons**

*I was receiving some reports that there were some mischievous young people who were swimming out to yachts in Snug and causing a bit of damage out there. There was a suggestion that we could put a pontoon down there and I was wondering, who looks after those pontoons and how much do they cost and have we considered one for Blackmans Bay and Snug at all?*

**Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:**

I am aware about 10 years ago there was a pontoon proposed at Snug. I'm not aware that we have ever proposed one at Blackmans Bay. There are issues in relation to the need to have them in a sheltered spot because otherwise they are very difficult to anchor and they also do provide liability issues for Council. As to what they cost, Mr Reeve might be able to help on that.

**Director Engineering Services:**

I think we are talking about \$50,000 or so per pontoon, so they are not cheap, and neither of those feature on our short term plans.

#### **11.5 Reconofelt**

*I note that the red cycle soft plastics has recently ceased, which was terrible to hear, but it did make me think about the Reconofelt. Do they collect soft plastics from Tasmanians or where is that made? Would Council be able to collect soft plastics and send it to their Reconofelt factory?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

Effectively, where they get the additive which they put into their normal mix to make Reconofelt is through a few different sources, but their factory for making it is in Sydney. If you like, the additive is very similar to lots of pellets and yes, there have been some issues that have been publicised with the red cycle but that's not impacting in terms of production of Reconofelt for our roads.

#### **11.6 Container Deposit Scheme**

*What is Kingborough's involvement in this scheme? Do we have locations identified?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

It is still going through a process at the moment where they are finalising the scheme. They have advertised for people who could run the scheme, I believe they have just extended that out into the New Year. We have had some discussions with at least one potential provider of those services of possible locations but that won't be finalised until the decision is made on the final network provider when we will have some further discussions.

**Cr Fox** asked the following question without notice:

#### **11.7 Plastic Milk Bottles**

*I was told over the weekend that plastic milk bottles are no longer being used in the recycling system because people aren't washing them, and if they aren't washed the bacteria becomes so putrid in them that they contaminate the furniture that is made with the plastic and the odour is so bad that it doesn't disappear, even when they have been melted and made into furniture. Therefore, the recycling people are no longer collecting them. Is that an urban myth or is it a reality?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

I'm not really sure about that one, it hasn't come to my attention before. As far as I know, they were still collecting plastic milk bottles but I'm happy to chase it up with our collector to see whether that is the case or not.

**Cr Fox:**

They may well be collecting them but they may not be using them. That's my concern.

**Cr Bain** asked the following question on notice:

**11.8 Public Transport, Spring Farm & Whitewater Park Estates**

*Several meetings ago I think you spoke about a conversation you had with Minister Ferguson about the lack of public transport service in these areas and Minister Ferguson requested that you send through details of many people reside in these sub-divisions. I'm just wondering if that letter has been sent or not?*

**Mayor responds:**

I can't remember the outcome of this. It wasn't as simple as finding that information, it was going to have to be a combination of our rates department and also our planning department and I don't think I've seen the figures for that yet.

**General Manager:**

I concur, I haven't seen the figures from that but we will take it on notice and follow it up.

**Cr Bain:**

I've been receiving a lot of emails from residents who have written to the State Government about this issue and within the reply from the State Government, the State Government are saying are saying that these sub-divisions are a long way from built out, completed. I think it is important that we get a message to them that they are pretty full. Can we also add that there are no State Government contracted school buses servicing the area and there are a lot of families there.

**Mr Midgley** asked the following questions without notice:

**11.9 Huntingfield Park and Ride**

*I was informed that the bicycle area had been locked and I checked on two occasions and it was locked. Do we know any details about why it has been locked and if not, can we please follow up?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

I don't know the answer to that but I will follow it up.

**11.10 Youth Action in Kingborough**

Do we have any updates as regards to if this group is still occurring and how its going?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

I'll have to take it on notice.

**C472/23-2022****12 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS**

---

**12.1 Climate Action**

**Cr Cordover** submitted the following question on notice:

*Are there any updates regarding Council's role supporting the Kingborough Resilience Working Group to promote a safe, sustainable and resilient community through practical planning for risk mitigation preparedness and recovery as mentioned on page 24 of the Annual Report? It said in the Annual Report that this is ongoing as opposed to on target.*

**Officer's Response:**

The Community Resilience Working Group was disbanded a number of years ago as it was difficult to attract membership. Instead work is done with individual community groups or special interest groups as this has proven to be far more effective in engaging community members. For example, the most recent activity was an emergency preparedness session for horse owners at the Huntingfield Pony Club. Whilst information helped horse owners prepare their animals for evacuation information was also shared about how to prepare yourself and your family (understanding risk, emergency warnings etc).

*Belinda Loxley, Emergency Management Coordinator*

**13 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED**

---

There are no petitions still being actioned.

**14 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD**

---

No Petitions had been received.

**15 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL**

---

**C473/23-2022****15.1 KINGBOROUGH LGBTIQA+ ACTION PLAN**

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That Council endorse the *Kingborough LGBTIQA+ Action Plan 2023-2025*.

Moved Cr Cordover

Seconded Cr Fox

That Cr Midgley be allowed a further 3 minutes to complete her contribution.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox, Amanda Midgley and Mark Richardson

Against: Cr Aldo Antolli

**CARRIED 8/1**

Moved: Cr Cordover  
 Seconded: Cr Fox

That Cr Antolli be allowed a further 3 minutes to complete his contribution.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox and Mark Richardson

Against: Crs Clare Glade-Wright, Kaspar Deane and Amanda Midgley

**CARRIED 6/3**

The motion was then put.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

Against: Crs Aldo Antolli and Mark Richardson

**CARRIED 7/2**

**C474/23-2022**

**15.2 UNAUTHORISED VEGETATION DAMAGE SIGNAGE POLICY REVIEW**

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright  
 Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That Council endorses the revised Unauthorised Vegetation Damage Signage Policy 5.7 as attached to this report.

*Cr Midgley left the room at 6.41pm  
 Cr Deane left the room at 6.43pm  
 Cr Midgley returned at 6.43pm  
 Cr Deane returned at 6.44pm*

**CARRIED**

**C475/23-2022**

**15.3 TINDERBOX BEACH EROSION MANAGEMENT - COMMUNITY CONSULTATION REPORT**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox  
 Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That the results of the community engagement in relation to shoreline management at Tinderbox Beach be received and noted.

That future budget bids for landscape planning and beach access improvements are considered by Council.

**CARRIED**

*Meeting adjourned at 6.59pm  
 Meeting resumed at 7.08pm*

**C476/23-2022****15.4 KINGSTON BEACH WAR MEMORIAL**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli  
Seconded: Cr David Bain

That:

- (a) Council advise the Kingston Beach RSL Sub Branch that it supports the installation of a new war memorial at Kingston Beach, with a sandstone panel design being the preferred option;
- (b) An allocation of funding be included for consideration in the 2023/24 Capital Works budget to cover the cost of the foundations and installation of the memorial.

**Amendment:**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover  
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

By replacing (a) with:

That Council advise the Kingston Beach RSL Sub Branch that it does not yet support the proposal for the installation of a new war memorial at Kingston Beach as currently proposed, and will seek feedback from Council's Urban Planner and further consultation with relevant stakeholders.

In Favour: Crs Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

Against: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Kaspar Deane and Mark Richardson

**LOST 3/6**

The motion was then put.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Kaspar Deane and Mark Richardson

Against: Crs Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

**CARRIED 6/3**

**C477/23-2022****15.5 LGAT GENERAL MEETING MOTIONS**

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright  
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That the matter be discussed.

**CARRIED**

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright  
 Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Council advise the Mayor regarding voting at the upcoming LGAT General Meeting as follows:

LGAT General Management Committee Casual Vacancy	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DD <input type="checkbox"/>
Timing of Council Meetings	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Affordable Housing	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DD <input type="checkbox"/>
Review of Property Agents and Land Transactions Act 2016	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DD <input type="checkbox"/>

**CARRIED**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli  
 Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Workplace Health and Safety Review of Elected Representatives Yes  No  DD

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Kaspar Deane and Mark Richardson

Against: Crs Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

**CARRIED 6/3**

**16 NOTICES OF MOTION**

**C478/23-2022**

**16.1 COMMUNICATION OF LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE (LPS), SPECIFICALLY THE LANDCAPE CONSERVATION ZONE (LCZ)**

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane  
 Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

That Council, in response to the concerns that have been raised by some in the community, host a drop-in session for people interested in, or concerned about, the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) that is being introduced as part of the incoming Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

The drop in session is to be open to anyone within the municipality that is interested and it is to be promoted via traditional and social media and be hosted in early 2023.

The drop-in session will provide an opportunity for residents to ask specific questions relating to the LCZ and how it may affect them or the properties around them. In addition to the opportunity for enquiry and discussion, information to be made available at the sessions is to include:

- a) An overview of the LCZ;
- b) A fact sheet answering common LCZ-related queries;
- c) Information about the current process and timeframes for transitioning to the TPS;
- d) A guide for how to make a submission to the TPC once the LPS is advertised.

*Cr Antolli left the room at 8.41pm  
 Cr Antolli returned at 8.43pm*

**CARRIED**

**C479/23-2022****17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION**

---

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That in accordance with the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* Council, by absolute majority, move into closed session to consider the following items:

**Confirmation of Minutes**

Regulation 34(6) *In confirming the minutes of a meeting, debate is allowed only in respect of the accuracy of the minutes.*

**Applications for Leave of Absence**

Regulation 15(2)(h) *applications by councillors for a leave of absence*

**Acquisition of Right of Way for a Shared Pathway Connection**

Regulation 15(2)(f) *proposals for the council to acquire land or an interest in the land or for the disposal of land.*

**CARRIED**

In accordance with the Kingborough Council *Meetings Audio Recording Guidelines Policy*, recording of the open session of the meeting will now cease.

Open Session of Council adjourned at 8.50pm

**OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS**

**OPEN SESSION RESUMES**

Open Session of Council resumed at 8.56pm

**C480/23-2022**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox  
 Seconded: Cr David Bain

The Closed Session of Council having met and dealt with its business resolves to report that it has determined the following:

Item	Decision
Confirmation of Minutes	Confirmed
Applications for Leave of Absence	Approved
Acquisition of Right of Way for a Shared Pathway Connection	Acquisition Approved

**CARRIED**

**CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 8.57pm

.....  
 (Confirmed)

.....  
 (Date)