

Kingborough



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

3 April 2023

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
	4	Apologies	1
C96/6-2023	5	Confirmation of Minutes	2
	6	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
C97/6-2023	7	Declarations of Interest	2
	8	Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C98/6-2023	9	Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	9.1	Kingston Park Office development	2
	9.2	Southern Tasmanian Industrial Land Strategy	3
	9.3	Gemalla Road	3
	9.4	Industrial Zoning and Local Employment opportunities	4
C99/6-2023	10	Questions on Notice from the Public	4
	10.1	Biodiversity Overlay	4
	10.2	Tender AB2223 - Kingston Wetlands	5
	10.3	Tender AB2212 - Kingston Main Street Upgrade	5
	10.4	Tender AB2121 - Snug Tiers Road Construction	5
	10.5	Enforcement of the Building Act	6
	10.6	Climate Change	6
C100/6-2023	11	Questions without Notice from Councillors	8
	11.1	Emergency Management Review	8
	11.2	Review of LCZ Properties	8
	11.3	Change of Speed Limit	9
	11.4	Commencement of Works at Huntingfield	9
	11.5	KWS Financial Report	10
	11.6	Draft Budget	10
	12	Questions on Notice from Councillors	10
	13	Petitions still being Actioned	10
	14	Petitions Received in Last Period	10

Table of Contents *(cont.)*

Item		Page No.
	15 Officers Reports to Council	11
C101/6-2023	15.1 Decision to correspond with owners and occupiers of land within Kingborough about the public exhibition process for the move from the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 to the Tasmanian Planning Scheme	11
C102/6-2023	15.2 Minister's Proposal to Make Amendments to the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy	13
C103/6-2023	15.3 Addressing Councillor Misconduct and Merit Based Recruitment in Councils	13
C104/6-2023	15.4 Mt Royal Reserve	14
	16 Notices of Motion	14
C105/6-2023	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	14

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 3 April 2023 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	✓
Councillor C Street	✓

Staff:

Acting General Manager	Mr David Reeve
Executive Manager Governance & Community Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Dr Samantha Fox
Manager Development Services	Ms Tasha Tyler-Moore
Strategic Planner	Mr Adriaan Stander
Media & Communications Advisor	Ms Sam Adams

4 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

C96/6-2023

5 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
 Seconded: Cr David Bain

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No.5 held on 20 March 2023 be confirmed as a true record.

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

Date	Topic	Detail
27 March 2023	Southern Waste Solutions	Presentation from CEO and Board Secretary on current and proposed activities of Southern Waste Solutions
	Draft Budget	Discussion held on 5 year capital works program

C97/6-2023

7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cr Bain declared an interest in the report headed "Minister's proposal to make amendments to the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy".

8 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C98/6-2023

9 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr Charles Biggins asked the following questions without notice:

9.1 Kingston Park Office development

I noted with interest at the last Council meeting approval for a new development in the heart of Kingborough Park was passed. The multi-use complex was being praised for the much needed employment opportunities for office and retail workers living in the Kingborough area and potential reduction in the southern outlet traffic congestion. My question is, does facilitating employment opportunities within Kingborough and reducing traffic on the southern outlet rate high with the Council's aims and objectives?

Manager Development Services responds:

I don't have a specific comment about reduction of traffic on the southern outlet into the city, but I can comment about increasing of job opportunities within the municipality. It is a planning principle and a principle of good planning under the strategic plan that we have good planning principles,

and encouraging businesses to operate within our municipality is great for other businesses that lean on it. Opportunities for employment, services to be provided to our community and certainly they all build together to make a better community. We would like to encourage further commercial development within our municipality.

9.2 Southern Tasmanian Industrial Land Strategy

The Southern Tasmanian Industrial Land Strategy 2013 identified future industrial land to meet Kingborough's need for the next 30 years. The potential areas identified in the report for rezoning were 37 hectares at Leslie Vale and another 16 hectares at Maddocks Road, Huntingfield. Can you please detail what actions have been taken in the Kingborough municipality in the 10 years since the Industrial Land Strategy 2013 to secure industrial land for this municipality for the next 30 years?

Strategic Planner responds:

It's difficult to answer in terms of what has happened in the last 10 years, but as part of our work that we are doing as part of the Greater Hobart strategy and the three-year plan, one of the actions in that plan is to identify additional industrial land and employment land. It's action within that document. The approach that Council took was not necessarily just to look at industrial opportunities in Kingborough, but also to identify land for that purpose in the greater context of the Greater Hobart area.

9.3 Gemalla Road

Gemalla Road in Margate was previously zoned industrial and rezoned residential around 2015 with the transition to the Kingborough Interim Planning scheme. This happened at a time when an existing business was looking to expand into an adjacent warehouse, but because of the changes, was forced to apply for rezoning of the warehouse back to residential, a process that turned out to be costly and difficult, that the expansion never happened and the business partnership subsequently folded. Since 2013 has the total area of land zoned for industry in Kingborough reduced or expanded?

Strategic Planner responds

I'll try and answer that question as I don't have any figures in front of me to say whether it's reduced or not, but I can certainly say that it definitely did not increase in that time. Council haven't rezoned any additional industrial land that I'm aware of. It's something that we've identified through the work that we've done through the Greater Hobart plan, that there is a need for industrial land and we need to undertake those studies and the studies won't necessarily just look at the need for industrial land in Kingborough, it is also a question about where do we provide that land within Kingborough or somewhere else in the Greater Hobart area.

Mr Biggins:

Could you take that on notice, regarding whether, since 2013, Kingborough's industrial land has either reduced or expanded?

Mayor:

Yes, we will take that on notice.

9.4 Industrial zoning and local employment opportunities

If a young Kingston High School leaver wants to take up a trade in one of the many occupations classified as light industry, where are they going to get an apprenticeship? Has the lack of industrial zoning in this municipality condemned young people to a long commute via the southern outlet and Brooker Highway to Glenorchy and Brighton municipalities where the majority of land zoned for industry is located? How can Kingborough Council claim to be facilitating local employment opportunities where no additional industrial land was nominated in the current local provision schedule?

Strategic Planner responds:

In terms of the LPS, the intent was not necessarily to look at industrial land. If the intent was to look at additional industrial land, it should have been supported by a study of some sort. We don't have that study, so essentially what we've identified once again similar to the previous questions, is we understand there is a need for that and therefore we need to undertake that study. In the Kingborough Land Use Strategy of 2019 it was identified as a project for Council, but subsequently we've also started working on the Greater Hobart Plan, where we've carried that action over through to that part of it. It's also worth to note that we also need to have regard to the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy, so it is not just merely a case of Council identifying in industrial land, it will need to meet the requirements of that land use strategy. That is why we thought it would be appropriate to include that as part of that Greater Hobart work, but also to work with the state Planning Office to identify areas that would be appropriate for industrial development.

C99/6-2023

10 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

10.1 Biodiversity Overlay

At the Council meeting on 20 March 2023, **Mr Charles Biggins** asked the following question without notice to the General Manager, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Is the Council in the business of assessing the biodiversity value of private property in house? Does Council have the qualifications and professional indemnity insurance to be providing that kind of information or environmental service?

Officer's Response:

It is an applicant's responsibility to submit documentation addressing the relevant Scheme requirements in relation to their proposal, which may include Natural Values Assessments. Council Officers assessing a Development Application (DA) undertake assessments against the relevant Clauses of the Planning Scheme, including the Biodiversity Code. The assessments draw on the Officers expert knowledge in addition to the supporting documentation submitted with the application. As Council is required to form its own view of whether a proposal complies with the Scheme requirements, Council's assessment may differ from the assessment undertaken by consultants acting on behalf of the applicant.

All officers within the planning area hold relevant tertiary qualifications for their role.

Tasha Tyler-Moore, Manager Development Services

10.2 Tender AB2223 - Kingston Wetlands

Mr David Grace submitted the following question on notice:

On the 6/2/2023 Council awarded a tender AB2223 at the Wetlands.

Question:

- (1) What was the tender for?*
- (2) Who was the tender awarded to and the cost as it was not noted in the Council minutes?*

Officer's Response:

No tender was awarded at the Council meeting on 6 February 2023 in relation to the Kingston Wetlands.

Daniel Smee, Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services

10.3 Tender AB2212 - Kingston Main Street Upgrade

Mr David Grace submitted the following question on notice:

On the 19/12/2022 Council awarded a tender AB2212 Channel Highway Kingston to Black Cap up to \$4,086.31m in principle.

Question:

What does in principle mean:

Officer's Response:

In principle means that Council agrees to the fundamental terms of the tender, with the finer details of the contract to be subject to further clarification and negotiation.

Daniel Smee, Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services

10.4 Tender AB2121 - Snug Tiers Road Construction

Mr David Grace submitted the following question on notice:

Could the Director Engineering please provide the residents with an update of the matter raised on the 20/2/2023 and when did Council follow up the further discussions with the property owners regarding the storm water runoff or will Council be installing curb guttering on both side of the road. Cr. Cordover raised what the extra cost would be. I have not yet seen this come back to Council could you advise?

Officer's Response:

In addition to the response which was provided to Council at the meeting of 20th February 2023, Councils Project staff have spoken directly with a number of residents regarding the nature and scope of the work. Specifically in regard the question, this has included explanation on the reasonings and cost considerations for provision or otherwise of Kerb and Gutter only along the top side of the road. In that regard, the Kerb provides separation between the road and footpath and caters for longitudinal drainage flow on the upstream side of the road. Drainage along the upstream side of the road is necessary to prevent overland sheet flow of water across the road surface. This need is not the case on the downstream side, where the kerb would serve primarily a cosmetic purpose.

The cost of providing kerb and gutter on the downstream side of the road and associated subsidiary works necessitated, is estimated in this instance to be \$200K.

David Reeve, Director Engineering Services

10.5 Enforcement of the Building Act

Professor Michael Rowan submitted the following question on notice:

I refer to the answer to my question on notice of 16 January 2023 concerning the ethics training of staff involved in decision making covered by the Council's Enforcement Policy, confirmed as accurate on 26 March, and also to the recent media coverage of Tasmania's homelessness crisis, and ask:

- 1. How has the homelessness crisis changed the ethical considerations of Council staff in making decisions about whether to enforce the building act in relation to people found to be living in premises for which they do not have an occupancy permit?*
- 2. What process does Council use to discover whether a person found to be living in premises for which they do not have an occupancy permit will become homeless if they vacate their property following an order from the Council to do so or in fear of same?*
- 3. If Council does not have such a process, on what evidential basis do Council staff exercise their ethical judgement in applying the Enforcement Policy in relation to the Building Act?*
- 4. If Council does have such a process, how many people have been made homeless by Council's enforcement of the Building Act or the threat of such enforcement in the last two years?*

Officer's Response:

Answer to 1-3.

Where enforcement action may require a person to change their current accommodation by seeking alternative housing arrangements, Council works with Tasmania Police and Housing Connect which is a collaboration between Anglicare, Catholic Care, Colony 47, Hobart City Mission, and the Salvation Army. Council also proactively provides information to people at risk of homelessness (or suffering homelessness) regarding urgent access to housing support, seeking housing assistance, and crisis and transitional accommodations services.

Answer to 4.

Council has no reports of homelessness resulting from enforcement action.

Tasha Tyler-Moore, Manager Development Services

10.6 Climate Change

Professor Michael Rowan submitted the following question on notice:

I refer to the answer to my question without notice of 7 November 2022 in relation to whether Council considers the carbon footprint of proposed capital works, and the answer given that this is 'something that can certainly be considered in the future', and also to the recent Synthesis Report which completes the 6th Assessment Report issued by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and in particular to the statement by the UN secretary general Antonio Guterres, that 'This report is a clarion call to massively fast-track climate efforts by every country and every sector and

on every timeframe. Our world needs climate action on all fronts: everything, everywhere, all at once'. I ask:

What is Kingborough Council's response to Report and Secretary General's statement, and in particular, will Council immediately:

- 1. Use its best endeavours to calculate the carbon emissions resulting from all Council actions and in particular all capital works with a view to seeking low emissions options for all activities?*
- 2. Use its best endeavours to calculate the carbon emissions likely to be caused by proposed developments, with a view to assisting applicants for development to find low emissions options for their proposals?*
- 3. Consider the likely carbon emissions associated with a proposed development which might on other grounds be refused planning permission, such that the low carbon emissions of the proposed development might be judged to outweigh other factors which otherwise would lead to planning permission being refused?*

Officer's Response:

1. The carbon and energy footprint of Council's activities from 2019/20 to 2021/22 has recently been completed through the Southern Councils' Climate Collaboration. This profile will be presented to Council in late April 2023. A collaborative approach means that Councils are using a common and consistent methodology and can work together to find local solutions. A carbon calculator has been developed by the Collaboration to allow Councils to update their emission profiles. The footprint covers operations that Councils are directly responsible for and are significant sources of emissions. This includes use of fuels, electricity at Council sites, public lighting assigned to Council and waste that is managed by Council (including kerbside waste).

Council does not currently include emissions generated in the provision of goods and services (such as the construction of infrastructure). These 'third party' emissions could be included, however, many providers of materials and services do not have relevant data, and the additional Council resources required to obtain required data would be significant. In addition, as local governments purchase a diverse range of goods and services, there would need to be engagement with numerous providers to calculate these emissions. In summary, this is not a simple or inexpensive task.

Reducing Council's greenhouse gas emissions through the use of low emitting materials in our works program is important. However, in a resource limited scenario, Council will currently make a bigger impact by focussing on reducing emissions from the largest emission sources, predominantly waste. This will be done by targeting initiatives and incentives to reduce waste and diversion of material into landfill. In the absence of any waste reduction and in response to a growing population, Council emissions are projected to reach 7300 tonnes CO₂ by 2035.

Climate action at Council occurs across the organisation and comes in many forms. Council is committed to work on mitigating greenhouse gas emissions, but just as importantly, if not more so for local government, is adaptation. As an organisation, Council needs to work towards building climate-resilient communities and assets, to manage risks and reduce our vulnerability, as well as be ready to harness potential opportunities.

2. Whilst this proposal has merit, Council does not currently have the resources required to calculate the carbon emissions from developments. The expertise required to deliver this service would be external to Council and therefore would be delivered as a fee for service. In addition, the time to consider the likely emissions from a proposed development would be in the design stage, which most often occurs well before a development is submitted to Council as Planning Authority. Council could work with industry to provide educational material to

developers on low emission materials and practices. There are some requirements in the current planning and building regulations that do require energy efficiency standards which act to reduce future emissions from the home from heating and cooling.

3. Under the current Interim Planning Scheme, and the incoming Tasmanian Planning Scheme, instruments of the State Government, there are no provisions to consider carbon emissions as part of a planning application assessment. Environmental sustainability through design and materials are considered through the planning process in other jurisdictions in other States of Australia.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

C100/6-2023

11 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

Cr Cordover asked the following question without notice:

11.1 Emergency Management Review

In the Mayor's diary, can we please have a bit more information about the emergency management review and subsequently anything corresponding to climate related risks specifically.

Mayor responds:

This is a review that has been jointly done between Huon Valley Council and ourselves. It's being done by Alicia Lees, who has run workshops with Council and as part of that, both myself and the substantive general manager, Mr Arnold, were interviewed in half hour interview as stakeholders involved to get our feedback on how we viewed our Council as how we operate within the emergency management space. I believe the time frame for that review was about mid-year that would be completed and that the idea of it was to see if there was some learnings from it, any identified gaps and where we could improve. The initial discussion that I had in relation to this, as we all saw and we had the presentation at our workshop a few weeks ago, that what we're actually doing in this space is quite significant and as a Council, given we're one of the few ones that have staff actually working specifically on both emergency management and recovery, that we are well ahead of some of the other councils, but it always pays to see where we're at. I'm sure that it will be made available to councillors when it's completed.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice

11.2 Review of LCZ Properties

Could Council update us as to where we are at in the review of the LCZ properties and how many currently have been rezoned out of LCZ?

Strategic Planner:

I'll start off by saying it's a slow process. I get that question from a lot of members of the public. Since the LCZ information sessions, I've been meeting with people and trying to give people a bit of overview of the LCZ, so that's taking up most of my time. In terms of numbers, it's something that I will have to bring back to the chambers. I do think it's probably appropriate to also mention that even if Council staff suggest some changes to landscape conservation zone, it's ultimately the Tasmanian Planning Commission that will make those decisions. Potentially it could be one of two things: it could be that the Commission agree with what Council suggests, or it could be that they will most probably want us to do some additional changes. So if we provide numbers, maybe just for future reference, it is really the numbers that we suggest, but there could be additional changes that the Commission may require or some of those that don't agree with.

Cr Antolli:

In your guesstimate, how far through the process do you think you are?

Strategic Planner

I would have liked to sit here today and tell you that we're getting to the end of it, but we're not. The last time that question was asked in the chambers, we talked about that we've identified around 300 properties that we want to have a look at. At that point in time, it was quite obvious that those 300 properties that we want to have a look at. We are working slowly through the areas, so we're not keeping numbers as we go through it. I guess the process that we follow at the moment is to have a look at specific localities where we can see where we will have a concern, but also where we would like to have a re-look at landscape conservation zone. To answer your question, I think we're still in the early parts of those changes and I would be reluctant at this point in time to provide those numbers. Once we've submitted our response back to the Commission that would most probably be a more appropriate time to ask that question.

Cr Bain asked the following questions without notice:

11.3 Change of Speed Limit

Around August 2022, the previous Council passed a notice of motion to write to State Growth requesting that they consider making all of Redwood Road 50 kilometres an hour. Have we had any updates on that request?

Acting General Manager responds:

Yes, we have heard back from State Growth and they are amenable to that. There is another one they are considering at Woodbridge and at this stage, we have yet to get a full response.

Cr Bain:

What is the process is from here and what have State Growth agreed to?

Acting General Manager:

They've agreed to the consideration of making the entire road 50kms/h, so it's a matter of getting the signage in there and letting people know there's been a change in the speed limits in those areas, which will happen imminently.

11.4 Commencement of Works at Huntingfield

Is there any further information about the Channel Highway roundabout and the slip lane that is able to be shared? Also is it Council's expectation that the roundabout slip lane will be completed prior to that first stage being opened?

Acting General Manager responds:

Not at this stage. The works are more tied up with the Huntingfield housing. The roundabout and the slip line are separate, so that's yet to be finalised.

Mayor:

The last time I enquired with the State Government, they hadn't indicated when it would proceed. I did ask at a Greater Hobart Mayors Forum when we had Department of State Growth representatives there and they indicated there had been some delays. They are still holding the

line that it was actually this Council that's caused the delays because of the conditions we put on the permit, but we weren't able to get any time frame.

Cr Midgley asked the following questions without notice:

11.5 KWS Financial Report

The notes regarding the financial report state that for November there was a loss and it was \$53K worse than budget and there was reasons as to why such as operations, loss of income from the shop, and the public waste bin contract, and then there was also noting the cost of the disposal of green waste and the transport levy etc. It normally seems to be tracking a lot better and I haven't seen any figures like this before and I'm wondering what the future prediction looks like and if we have any concerns or anything to note?

Acting General Manager responds:

The main issue is with the green waste. What is happening is that we are probably a little bit light on in terms of what our current fees are for what we are getting in and that's causing us a bit of a negative on the financials. It's not one that can't be rectified and would be intended to be rectified when we put up the new fees and charges for next year to allow for that, to make sure that we're getting cost recovery on that item. Some of the other issues, such as the transport index, we are expecting that to stabilise a little bit. There was quite a large hit in that area, it affected not only KWS but Council as well. The predictions are that that will stabilise in the next financial year.

11.6 Draft Budget

Could we have an understanding of what that consultation looks like and if the Kingborough Community Forum members will be also emailed and anything else that you or staff might like to add about that?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

We have, as you know, put information up on the website, including a survey, and we have posted that through Facebook and we will be doing the usual media releases and media announcements through traditional and digital media. We are looking to e-mail out to the Kingborough Community Forum and let them know as well what's happening and certainly would like to talk through with forum members, those priorities that they had put forward to make sure that they're aware of how they feed into that budget process.

12 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

At the time the Minutes was compiled there were no Questions on Notice from Councillors.

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

C101/6-2023**15.1 DECISION TO CORRESPOND WITH OWNERS AND OCCUPIERS OF LAND WITHIN KINGBOROUGH ABOUT THE PUBLIC EXHIBITION PROCESS FOR THE MOVE FROM THE KINGBOROUGH INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2015 TO THE TASMANIAN PLANNING SCHEME**

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That Council resolve to notify the Kingborough public about the upcoming statutory public exhibition period of the draft LPS by:

- a) Undertaking the Statutory notice requirements outlined in section 3.1 of this report;
- b) Undertaking the non-statutory notification tasks and undertake supporting information sessions outlined in section 4.2 of this report; and
- c) Including a notification in the June/July Council rates notices that public exhibition of the LPS will occur in the near future and provide direction as to where they will see notification of its commencement and where they can access more information about it.

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Kaspar Deane

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

CARRIED

*Meeting adjourned at 6.08pm
Meeting resumed at 6.15pm*

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That this matter be discussed.

CARRIED

Amendment:

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli
Seconded: Cr Christian Street

That Council resolve to notify the Kingborough public about the upcoming statutory public exhibition period of the draft LPS by:

- a) Undertaking the Statutory notice requirements outlined in section 3.1 of this report;
- b) Undertaking the non-statutory notification tasks and undertake supporting information sessions outlined in section 4.2 of this report; and

- c) Including a notification in the June/July Council rates notices that public exhibition of the LPS will occur in the near future and provide direction as to where they will see notification of its commencement and where they can access more information about it.
- d) If the option outlined in c) above is not available at the time of the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) announcement, then direct mail will be sent to all owners.

Moved: Cr Christian Street
 Seconded: Cr Mark Richardson

That the amended motion now be put.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Amanda Midgley, Mark Richardson and Christian Street

Against: Crs Clare Glade-Wright and Flora Fox

CARRIED 8/2

Substantive Motion:

Moved: Cr Christian Street
 Seconded: Cr Mark Richardson

That Council resolve to notify the Kingborough public about the upcoming statutory public exhibition period of the draft LPS by:

- a) Undertaking the Statutory notice requirements outlined in section 3.1 of this report;
- b) Undertaking the non-statutory notification tasks and undertake supporting information sessions outlined in section 4.2 of this report; and
- c) Including a notification in the June/July Council rates notices that public exhibition of the LPS will occur in the near future and provide direction as to where they will see notification of its commencement and where they can access more information about it.
- d) If the option outlined in c) above is not available at the time of the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) announcement, then direct mail will be sent to all owners.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Kaspar Deane, Mark Richardson and Christian Street

Against: Crs Clare Glade-Wright, Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

CARRIED 6/4

C102/6-2023**15.2 MINISTER'S PROPOSAL TO MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE SOUTHERN TASMANIAN REGIONAL LAND USE STRATEGY**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council:

- a) Note the Minister for Planning's proposal to change the mapped boundary of the UGB, and a text amendment to policy SRD 2.12 of STRLUS, which relates to the consideration of urban zoning for land adjacent to, but beyond the boundary of the UGB.
- b) Support in principle the part of the proposal that aims to fix genuine anomalies in the UGB (including the area identified at Spring Farm Estate) and:
 - i. recommend that the tidy up of the anomalies should only deal with those situations where the urban UGB do not align with the underlying zoning or established urban use of land.
 - ii. recommend that the parcels of land that go beyond genuine anomalies, be considered under the standard process to amend the UGB or as part SRD 2.12 which provides broader strategic consideration.
- c) Support the proposed changes to SRD 2.12, but that the Minister be requested to consider the following changes to the wording:
 - i. change the wording to "does not constitute a significant increase in land zoned for urban purposes in the municipality, and
 - ii include an additional criterion under (b) to ensure that any changes to the UGB through SRD 2.12 also have regard to housing land and supply data at a municipal level. This will ensure that the integrity of the UGB is maintained and that considerations under SRD 2.12 are based on evidence of need to guide planned sequenced growth.
- d) The Minister provides support for land release at Margate and Snug as part of the request to amend SRD 2.12 of the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy. Alternatively, that the Minister consider the inclusion of these properties as anomalies should he continue to pursue the Identified Sites process for similar 'anomalies' at Sorell and Brighton.

CARRIED

The Mayor vacated the chair and the Deputy Mayor assumed the chair at 6.54pm

C103/6-2023**15.3 ADDRESSING COUNCILLOR MISCONDUCT AND MERIT BASED RECRUITMENT IN COUNCILS**

Moved: Cr Paula Wriedt
Seconded: Cr Christian Street

That Council resolve to provide a submission to the Office of Local Government indicating support for the proposals outlined in each discussion paper.

CARRIED

The Deputy Mayor vacated the chair and Mayor assumed the chair at 6.59pm

C104/6-2023**15.4 MT ROYAL RESERVE**

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

- a) That Council allocates \$179,000 towards the upgrade of Mt Royal Park from the proceeds of sale of 41 Hiern Road, with the balance funds being placed in the Public Open Space account.
- b) Council holds a workshop on priorities for future playground upgrades.

Cr Richardson left the room at 7.13pm

Cr Richardson returned at 7.14pm

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no Notices of Motion received.

C105/6-2023**17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

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*

Kingston Main Street Upgrade - Contract Variation

Regulation 15(2)(d) *contracts, and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.*

CARRIED BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

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

Open Session of Council adjourned at 7.27pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 8.01pm

C106/6-2023

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli
 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	Approved
Applications for Leave of Absence	Approved
Kingston Main Street Upgrade - Contract Variation	Approved

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 8.02pm

.....
 (Confirmed)

.....
 (Date)