

Kingborough



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

21 August 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	
C255/16-2023	5	Confirmation of Minutes	2
	6	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
C256/16-2023	7	Declarations of Interest	2
	8	Transfer of Agenda Items	2
	9	Questions without Notice from the Public	2
C257/16-2023	10	Questions on Notice from the Public	2
	10.1	Browns River Bridge	2
	10.2	Significant Tree Register	3
	10.3	Kingston Beach Flood Study	3
C258/16-2023	11	Questions without Notice from Councillors	5
	11.1	Road Line Markings	5
	11.2	Events held on Municipal Roads	5
	11.3	Road Markings	6
	11.4	Leslie Vale Quarry	6
	11.5	Temporary Food Stall Fees	7
	11.6	Local Government Review	7
	11.7	Esplanade, Margate	9
C259/16-2023	12	Questions on Notice from Councillors	10
	12.1	Policing Parking on State Roads	10
	12.2	Bike Racks, Blackmans Bay	10
	13	Officers Reports to Planning Authority	11
C260/16-2023	13.1	DA-2023-142 - Development Application for Extensions and Alterations to Dwelling at 47 Nebraska Road, Dennes Point.	11
	14	Petitions still being Actioned	13
	15	Petitions Received in Last Period	13
	16	Officers Reports to Council	13
C261/16-2023	16.1	Short Stay Accommodation	13
C262/16-2023	16.2	Development Services Quarterly Report	14

Table of Contents

Item			Page No.
C263/16-2023	16.3	Longley Reserves Recreation Master Plan	14
C264/16-2023	16.4	Private Works Policy 1.22	14
C265/16-2023	16.5	Kingborough Community Awards Selection Committee	15
C266/16-2023	16.6	Financial Report - July 2023	15
C267/16-2023	16.7	Appendices	15
	17	Notices of Motion	15
C268/16-2023	18	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, 21 August 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:

General Manager	Mr Gary Arnold
Acting Chief Financial Officer	Mr Tim Jones
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Engineering Services	Mr David Reeve
Acting Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Ms Heather Salisbury
Manager Environmental Services	Ms Liz Quinn
Acting Manager Development Services	Mr Andy D'Crus
Team Leader Statutory Planning	Mr Tim Donovan
Media & Communications Advisor	Ms Sam Adams
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton

4 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

C255/16-2023

5 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
 Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No.15 held on 7 August 2023 be confirmed as a true record.

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

Date	Topic	Detail
14 August	Kingborough Draft LPS	Presentation and discussion of the Special Area Plans that have evolved through the post lodgement conference's held with the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

C256/16-2023

7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Gary Arnold declared an interest in the reports headed 'General Manager's Performance Review' and 'General Manager's Contract'.

8 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

9 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions without notice from the public.

C257/16-2023

10 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

10.1 Browns River Bridge

Mr Roger Tonge submitted the following question on notice:

The existing bridge spanning Brown's River is, as acknowledged by Councils Director of Engineering Services, to be structurally sound and in good condition. Can Council therefore provide ONE logical reason why it is to be demolished and in the words of a surveyor working on the proposed new bridge "Taken to the TIP".

Officer's Response:

Referring to a previous response on this matter of 4 July 2022, asset replacement decisions are based on serviceability considerations which take into account a number of factors including condition, capacity, functionality and aesthetics. Capacity and functionality are two key drivers for exploring future replacement of this bridge.

David Reeve, Director Engineering Services

10.2 Significant Tree Register

Mr Roger Tonge submitted the following question on notice:

When Council nominated trees of significance to be included in the registry, particularly those on Osborne Esplanade, two eucalypts were omitted and listed for removal due to age and or infestation, which could cause injury to pedestrians in their vicinity. Council has advised that one of the two, that is the tree in the centre of the lawn fronting the new toilet block on Osborne Esplanade is to be imminently removed.

Could Council please advise when it is intended to remove the second tree identified as a potential risk to public safety, that being the eucalypt at the southern end of the junction of Osborne Esplanade and Victoria Street.

Officer's Response:

The listing of thirteen blue gums on Osborne Avenue in 2022 on the Significant Tree register includes the tree referred to by Mr Tonge above. There are two gum trees in this vicinity, opposite 19 and 20 Osborne Esplanade, and both are listed as Significant as part of the broader group (TRN 2021-3). This can be seen on the data sheet for this listing which can be found here <https://www.kingborough.tas.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/TRN-2021-3-1-of-2-1.pdf>

The white gum outside the Kingston Beach toilets was nominated for the Significant Tree Register but not listed by Council due to concerns about its condition and landscape life.

The blue gum opposite 19 Osbourne Esplanade is being actively assessed and managed as it has shown signs of stress. Council removed deadwood from this tree as recommended by an arborist assessment conducted in April this year.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

10.3 Kingston Beach Flood Study

Mr Roger Tonge submitted the following question on notice:

At the Council meeting held on Monday 7th August 2023, The "new" Kingston Beach Flood Study was presented to Council. It contains some fascinating information that will be of significant interest to property owners and no doubt their insurers.

In 2016 Council instigated a similar study conducted by Council staff. The conclusion of that study was that at least 250 properties in Kingston Beach would be prone to flooding. This new investigation conducted by WMA Water, a nationally recognised consultancy specialising in flood plane management has determined that at least 150 properties identified as flood prone in the Councils 2016 study are now no longer at risk of inundation.

The initial 2016 study caused significant concern and stress to many people in respect of potential property insurance issues and the possibility of inundation. That was not helped when staff placed pictures in the window of the Kingston Beach Hall, depicting houses being constructed on floating pontoons, the Councils vision of the future of Kingston Beach. In addition new planning requirements were introduced requiring new buildings to be elevated above ground level at significant additional cost.

As a result of this study, will Council

- A. Provide a blanket apology to the residents and ratepayers of Kingston Beach for any stress caused as a result of the Council initiated 2016 study?*
- B. Will Council now modify its building and planning approval process to reflect the conclusions of this latest study?*
- C. Will Council undertake to promulgate the details of this latest study to the people of Kingston Beach by having a question and answer day at the Kingston Beach Hall?.*
- D. Does Council now accept that it was unwise in hindsight to undertake the “in house study” in 2016 and that matters such as the 2016 study are beyond the scope of Council staff and its amenities.*

Officer's Response:

As outlined in the recent report to Council on potential flooding for Kingston Beach, the review of the 2016 study was initiated because:

- The tools and processes to estimate rainfall and flooding have changed significantly since the 2016 study (ARR 1987 to ARR 2019)
- Climate change predictions on catchment flooding have been updated (ACECRC 2010 to UTAS 2020).
- It would provide a clearer direction of the required future works for Council to progress forward.

The 2016 flood report was not wrong it was just based on the available information at the time, as information changes reviews are undertaken as is the case here. Fortunately, in this case, this has provided information that suggests less properties are likely to be impacted in major flood events.

The information from the latest report will be uploaded onto Council's website and there will be a consultation plan developed to discuss the findings with stakeholders.

The building and planning process will always take into account what is the most up-to-date information in determining any decisions or conditions that are required for development and this will be the case with the information from this updated report.

David Reeve, Director Engineering Services

C258/16-2023

11 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

Cr Cordover asked the following questions without notice:

11.1 Road Line Markings

In relation to Redwood Road, Dennison Street and Maranoa Road, what is the date for proposed line marking and could it please be re-iterated to me again what that relationship is with the State Government when it relates to municipal roads and why there is such a delay with line markings? But specifically now it's been brought to my attention that Redwood Road and Denison Street and Maranoa Road are really at a point where there's concern around safety because of a lack of line markings.

Director Engineering Services responds:

Most councils believe that the responsibility sits with State Growth and by tradition, State Growth has been putting money into line marking for all roads across the State, whether they be state highways or local government roads. It's not one that has been sorted out to the satisfaction of both parties, even though it has been raised a number of times and it will be raised again at the next general meeting of LGAT. We have put forward all those particular roads for consideration by State Growth, but they weren't funded in the latest round of line marking. In terms of these particular roads, I'm happy to chat with our roads engineer, particularly in terms of their immediate safety concerns, as to whether or not it's something that we need to look at addressing ourselves.

Cr Cordover:

In lieu of getting the lines actually marked, if there seems to be ongoing difficulties getting that done in a timely way, would we consider as Council to put up street signage or safety signage or some kind of other mechanism to help encourage driver awareness of staying on the left side of the road?

Director Engineering Services:

In a word, no. Line marking has its own particular purpose, and that's just to provide guidance for for motorists so that they can traverse an area safely. It's not normally replaced with signage. Signage would be something you might use on a temporary basis associated with road works or something of that ilk, but not in this particular case.

11.2 Events held on Municipal Roads

Targa Tasmania is going ahead in April of next year and I've looked at the map and it doesn't look like Targa is going on any Kingborough roads, but somebody asked the question, what relationship would Council have with the State Government if Targa or a similar event takes place on Council roads, what arrangement do we have with the State Government or the event operator, such as Targa, to prepare, upgrade and repair where necessary municipal roads before and after such an event? What do we do to ensure that the community is safe and also has roads that aren't unnecessarily damaged by an event?

Director Engineering Services responds:

Certainly Targa has been down in Kingborough before, so they would normally come through us in terms of identifying the route that they wish to use, in which case we'd make some comments back as to whether that would be appropriate or not appropriate. In terms of damage to any infrastructure that's to be covered by their own insurances. For example, if a car ran off the road and took out a

section of guard rail, then the insurances would cover the cost of repairing that guard rail. The wear and tear on the actual surface of the road is negligible, so that's not really so much of an issue, it's more to do with where a vehicle might lose control and actually damage something on the side of the road.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

11.3 Road Markings

I would like to continue the line of questioning on the road marking situation for Redwood Road and Dennison Street and I have brought this up myself. I'm not actually clear why it hasn't been done. So there's this dispute between funding, it is a Council road and given that it's not a DSG road, why hasn't it been line marked out of Council's maintenance budget and it's been unlined for quite a while?

Director Engineering Services responds:

It's an anomaly, that's the bottom line. It was raised previously probably going back to about 2016 by the Audit Department, so by custom and tradition the Department of State growth has always managed line marking, not only DSG roads, but also on local government roads across the state, not just Kingborough. Even though it has been brought back to the attention of the State Government on more than one occasion, it's not been one that has been resolved. It's certainly the discussions we've had because they are looking at reviewing their legislation and we have brought this up in some of the officers discussions to say this is still a cantankerous sore that we've never managed to put to bed. It's certainly the motion we intend to put to LGAT and we will provide some sort of response from other councils as well, which will in turn give us something to go forth with. For example, if there was not support around the table from the other Councils, we would probably need to make some decisions on how we might manage our own network. Bearing in mind it is unlikely to change that the State Government will fully fund all the line marking across the state, so then that would be up to Council to make a future decision on. Would need to step through that discussion with LGAT first and then that might in itself prompt a further report to Council. In terms of the two roads that you've mentioned and as I mentioned to Cr Cordover, I'm happy to have a look at that with our roads engineer and see whether there's anything we can do in the short term.

Cr Glade-Wright asked the following questions without notice:

11.4 Leslie Vale Quarry

On behalf of the Safety Committee who met this afternoon, we're just interested in getting an update on the proposal at the Leslie Vale quarry, what is actually proposed there in terms of its extension and how the the traffic may be impacted?

General Manager responds:

Hazel Brothers are currently in the final stages of an EPA process. That has involved the opportunity for public submissions and as a result of that, once that process is completed, it's my understanding that Hazel Brothers have flagged their intention to lodge a development application with our our planning team. They haven't done so as yet.

Cr Midgley asked the following questions without notice:

11.5 Temporary Food Stall Fees

Has there been a change in application fees for temporary food stores? I've heard previously that there was no fee and now there's a \$20 fee for each event?

Manager Environmental Services responds:

Yes, you are correct. There has been a change to the fees that went through with the new fees when it came to council and it is \$20 for a temporary food licence.

Cr Midgley:

If an organisation has a monthly event and they have to do an application every month and pay the fee, is there any way that those organisations can just pay an annual fee on that rather than having to do the paperwork every month?

Manager Environmental Services responds:

I'm not aware of the details, so I'm happy to take it on notice, but there's definitely an annual fee, but I would think that it would end up costing more.

Cr Deane asked the following questions without notice:

11.6 Local Government Review

At the Council meeting held 17 July, Council endorsed a submission to the future of local government review which supported the removal of Tarooma and Bruny Island from Kingborough. As part of that process, the report that we endorsed acknowledged that this would lead to an annual loss of revenue to Council around \$4.7 million per annum. Could you potentially outline what cost benefit analysis was done and presented to Councillors on the impact of not just that lost revenue but the wider picture before making that submission to the local government review?

General Manager responds:

The resolution of Council was to support scenario two in the southern shore, and in the report that Council considered to reach that conclusion, it was suggested that if that were to be pursued, that investigation into potential annexation of Tarooma and investigation into the potential establishment of the Bruny Island Governance Board should form part of that moving forward. The body of the report also highlighted that given the compressed time frame of the Local Government Review Board, it had not been possible to undertake detailed financial analysis, including cost benefit analysis, and that would be work that would be undertaken should the proposal gather momentum.

Mayor:

And if I could add to that in the presentation that the General Manager and I made to the review board last Wednesday when we did talk about this issue, I did highlight that we only had rough cost estimates and raw data because of the time considerations, but that I believe that if it was something that the government was going to entertain, then they would need to do the underpinning work, but also consider a transitional package to offset against that loss of revenue so that it's phased in and it's not in one hit. Even for a larger council in a relatively stable financial position such as ours, that would be a lot to absorb in one go. There seemed to be an acknowledgement that that would be something that could possibly be entertained.

Cr Deane:

I think it's important if you could outline what is envisaged moving forward, because a lot of people don't engage too deeply in the fact that there was a short time frame that the turn around time from the board was pretty tight and we weren't able to complete that modelling. To ease some concerns or queries in the community, could we outline what is going to be happening moving forward in those two scenarios.

Mayor:

We don't know because it's entirely up to the review board of what they recommend to the State Government and then what the State Government decides to do with it is entirely up to them. They may accept some of the recommendations of the board. They may not. They might provide some incentives for councils to go through a transition process. They may not. They've already ruled out the compulsory amalgamation which is disappointing for us given that we supported scenario two that would involve the partnership between ourselves and the Huon Valley. Had that occurred or if that does occur, that would obviously offset the loss of income and revenue if we were to lose Tarooma and Bruny Island. Unfortunately I think one of the difficulties in the compressed time frame of the process has been, we don't have the time to do that work. We are at the mercy of whatever the State Government decide to do, but the message we've all been giving is that anything that does happen there needs to be a lot of work done on that transition. It's not going to be something that you could bring in a year's time. There would have to be, I imagine, a significant period of work to try and make everything work effectively under new redrawn boundaries, if that was the case. Interestingly, since we last discussed this when we made the decision in the report, I've received and I believe all Councillors have, a letter from the Tarooma Community Association supporting the proposal that Tarooma move to Hobart City and they outlined a number of reasons as to why they believe it would be appropriate. They've put in a submission to the review board as well. They see Tarooma as an extension of Sandy Bay, and they believe that going there would also follow their patterns of work and sport and shopping that are all going that direction rather than coming over Bonnet Hill and coming to Kingston. I've also had a meeting with the Bruny Island Community Association who have also indicated their support for a Board of Governance and to not be part of Kingborough Council and longer. So it seems that in terms of the representative associations and those areas, they are in favour of what we have proposed. But like I said, we're now in a situation where we rely on, firstly, the recommendations of the board and then what the State Government will do with them.

Cr Deane:

I appreciate that we've had some supportive correspondence from both those representing organisations, but given that we've put that submission through, we have to assume then that that hopefully that proceeds. Would there be anything done prior to that decision? Would we go out to consult beyond just the community association representatives and would we present any community engagement prior to making or proceeding with that?

Mayor:

The short answer would be no, because we wouldn't know what we would be presenting. We don't know what the final decision of the board and what the final decision of the government would be. So we'd be confusing people by going out and saying, well, this may happen and this is what it would look like. You don't go out and engage on hypotheticals like that. I don't think that that's in the interests of anybody because we don't know what sort of time frame they might lay out, and we will need to have the time to do the work as to whatever scenario they come up with. Interestingly enough, I note in the reports that have come from the Local Government Review Board, the level of interest by members of the community in Kingborough on local government reform is exceptionally low. I think there were 8 individual submissions from members of the community in Kingborough who have had lots of opportunities to comment on any aspect of local government reform and unless you work in it, it's not a very sexy topic, it's not very engaging, and I think that there's a lack of interest,

and that is despite us having really tried to get the community to have their say. In the initial stages, the Local Government Review Board even had pop up sessions at Channel Court and was trying to engage people. For whatever reason, it seems to be in the small communities that people the community have engaged, and I guess they're the small ones where they think they're going to be under threat of amalgamation and so they've had town hall meetings and they've written submissions, but on a whole here they haven't.

Cr Deane:

So just to clarify, until we hear from the Board or from the government we won't be doing any engagement with the community or we won't be seeking any engagement with the local councils, whether that would impact, for example, Hobart City Council, where it might impact, we just wait and see at this point?

Mayor:

We do have to wait and see because I think to do anything other than that would be very confusing because we really wouldn't know what we were presenting on. It's my understanding that the Local Government Review Board will provide their report to the government on the 31st October and then the government is looking to make a reasonably quick response. But I think given the proximity by then to Christmas, I think we're talking early next year before we have any sort of solid understanding of where all of this would be headed.

Cr Richardson asked the following questions without notice:

11.7 Esplanade, Margate

At the southern end of the Esplanade in Margate, not the Dru Point end, but the other side, that provides a linkage between the walking track from Bundalla Road around to Dru Point and the road that goes through there is narrow and there are no markings or anything on that road. What, if any, plans have we got in the pipeline to augment or upgrade that road?

Director Engineering Services responds:

Certainly nothing in our 5 year plan do anything on that particular road. The latest work we did down there was to do with protection of the road from the sea. But we haven't got any other particular plans to do anything, but happy to have a look at it.

Cr Richardson:

What would be the best way to formalise having a look at that? Is that something that you can undertake based on this or is it something else that we should?

Director Engineering Services:

No, that's fine. If it's to do with the serviceability in terms of people being able to access it, whether it be for walkers, whether it be for vehicles, whether it be for the condition of the road, we can assess that based on the merits. If it's deemed to be something that's of consideration, we can put that through our capital works process.

C259/16-2023

12 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

12.1 Policing Parking on State Roads

At the Council meeting held on 7 August 2023, **Cr Street** asked the following question without notice to the General Manager, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Could Council staff please explain the arrangements for Council officers policing parking matters on State roads?

Officer's Response:

The Transport Commission authorises Council officers under Section 43H of The *Traffic Act 1925*. This authorisation allows officers to issue Traffic Infringement Notices for those offences under Part 12 of the *Road Rules 2019*. There are no limitations, via the Transport Commission's authorisation or the Road Rules, regarding officers issuing Traffic Infringement Notices on State roads (for Part 12). Council staff do not actively police parking on State roads but will respond to complaints as needed.

Scott Basham, Manager Legal & Property

12.2 Bike Racks, Blackmans Bay

At the Council meeting held on 7 August 2023, **Cr Midgley** asked the following question without notice to the General Manager, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

I noticed yesterday when I went to park my bike at Blackmans Bay beach near the restaurant precinct area that the bike racks have been removed. There has been some planting and other works there and I'm wondering if the bike racks will be replaced?

Officer's Response:

It is intended to re-instate the bike racks.

David Reeve, Director Engineering Services

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 5.55pm

13 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

C260/16-2023

13.1 DA-2023-142 - DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO DWELLING AT 47 NEBRASKA ROAD, DENNES POINT.

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That the extensions and alterations to dwelling at 47 Nebraska Road, Dennes Point be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Except as otherwise required by this Permit, use and development of the land must be substantially in accordance with Development Application No. DA-2023-142 and Council Plan Reference No. P1 submitted on 5/05/2023.

This Permit relates to the use of land or buildings irrespective of the applicant or subsequent occupants, and whoever acts on it must comply with all conditions in this Permit. Any amendment, variation or extension of this Permit requires further planning consent of Council.

2. To reduce the spread of weeds or pathogens, all machinery must take appropriate hygiene measures prior to entering and leaving the site as per the Tasmanian Washdown Guidelines for Weed and Disease Control produced by the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment.

Any imported fill materials must be from a weed and pathogen free source to prevent introduction of new weeds and pathogens to the area.

3. All works within the Waterway and Coastal Protection Area must be undertaken generally in accordance with the "Tasmanian Coastal Works Manual" (DPIPWE, Page and Thorp, 2010).
4. The stormwater runoff from all concrete, paved, or otherwise sealed areas must be contained within the property or discharged to a Council approved discharge point. All works in relation to the discharge of stormwater must be completed to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services.
5. Erosion/siltation infiltration control measures must be applied during construction works to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.

ADVICE

- A. In accordance with section 53(5) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* this permit lapses after a period of two years from the date on which it is granted if the use or development in respect of which it is granted is not substantially commenced within that period.
- B. The approval in this permit is under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and does not provide any approvals under other Acts including, but not limited to *Building Act 2016*, *Urban Drainage Act 2013*, *Food Act 2003* or Council by-laws.

If your development involves demolition, new buildings or alterations to buildings (including plumbing works or onsite wastewater treatment) it is likely that you will be required to get

approvals under the *Building Act 2016*. Change of use, including visitor accommodation, may also require approval under the *Building Act 2016*. Advice should be sought from Council's Building Department or an independent building surveyor to establish any requirements.

- C. The developer should obtain a Plumbing Permit for the development prior to commencing construction.
- D. A drainage design plan at a scale of 1:200, designed by a qualified Hydraulic Designer, showing the location of the proposed sewer and stormwater house connection drains; including the pipe sizes, pits and driveway drainage, must be submitted with the application for Plumbing Permit.
- E. Large areas of glazing have the potential to present a collision risk to bird species and therefore have the potential to adversely impact on environmental values. Buildings are deemed to have been designed and constructed to reduce the bird collision risk if the glazed surfaces do not result in corner windows or sightlines through buildings from window to window and meet any of the following:
- the glazed surface does not have a total surface area of greater than 2m²;
 - the glazed surface is treated to include permanent visual markers or muted reflections, the purpose of which must give them the appearance of an impenetrable surface. Such surfaces may include any one of the following types of treatments:
 - the use of low-reflectivity glass (0-10%);
 - films, coatings, fritted glass, or permanent screens; or
 - the glazed surface is installed at a minimum of 20 degrees from vertical, angled in at its base to reflect the ground.

The document '*Minimising the swift parrot collision threat – Guidelines and recommendations for parrot-safe building design*' (WWF 2008) offers a number of practical solutions and is available from Council.

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox, Amanda Midgley, Mark Richardson and Christian Street

Against: Cr Gideon Cordover

CARRIED 9/1

PLANNING AUTHORITY SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed at 6.11pm

14 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

There are no petitions still being actioned.

15 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

At the time the Minutes was compiled no Petitions had been received.

16 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C261/16-2023

16.1 SHORT STAY ACCOMMODATION

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli
Seconded: Cr Mark Richardson

That Council advocates to the Tasmanian Government for more active monitoring and regular reporting on the impacts of short stay accommodation on long-term rental markets across Tasmania.

Amendment:

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council considers differential rating for land used as short-stay accommodation in Kingborough in the 24/25 budget.

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Cr Cordover be allowed a further minute to complete his contribution.

In Favour: Crs Clare Glade-Wright, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox, Amanda Midgley and Christian Street

Against: Crs Paula Wriedt, Aldo Antolli, David Bain and Mark Richardson

CARRIED 6/4

The amendment was then put.

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

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

LOST

The substantive motion was then put.

CARRIED

C262/16-2023

16.2 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

Cr Richardson & Cr Antolli left the room at 7.06pm

Cr Richardson returned at 7.08pm

Cr Antolli returned at 7.09pm

That the development services quarterly report be noted.

CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7.15pm

Meeting recommenced at 7.24pm

C263/16-2023

16.3 LONGLEY RESERVES RECREATION MASTER PLAN

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

That Council endorses the Longley Reserves Master Plan dated 16 June 2023 as prepared by Inspiring Place consultants, subject to an annotation being provided to the final report to indicate that the proposed horse float parking area will only be progressed in the event that the North West Bay River Trail is extended to Longley Park.

Amendment:

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

To add a further sentence to the motion:

Until the trail is built, Council will give consideration to rehabilitating the area and installing bollards in Key 1 on Map 3, pending budgetary considerations.

CARRIED

The motion was then put.

CARRIED

C264/16-2023

16.4 PRIVATE WORKS POLICY 1.22

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

That Council adopts the draft Private Works Policy 1.22 as attached to this report.

CARRIED

C265/16-2023

16.5 KINGBOROUGH COMMUNITY AWARDS SELECTION COMMITTEE

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

That the matter be discussed.

CARRIED

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

That Council appoints the following three Councillors to assist the Deputy Mayor in the assessment of candidates for the 2023 Kingborough Community Awards.

1. Cr Antolli
2. Cr Bain
3. Cr Midgley

CARRIED

C266/16-2023

16.6 FINANCIAL REPORT - JULY 2023

Moved: Cr David Bain
 Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council endorses the attached Financial Report as at 31 July 2023.

CARRIED

C267/16-2023

16.7 APPENDICES

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

That the Appendices attached to the Agenda be received and noted.

CARRIED

17 NOTICES OF MOTION

At the time the Minutes was compiled there were no Notices of Motion received.

C268/16-2023

18 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley
Seconded: Cr Kaspar Deane

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*

Tender Assessment - TS3253 Snug Foreshore Toilet (Replacement)

Regulation 15(2)(b), and (2)(d) *information that, if disclosed, is likely to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting, or proposes to conduct business, and contracts, and tenders, for the supply and purchase of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.*

General Manager's Performance Review

Regulation 15(2)(a) *personnel matters, including complaints against an employee of the council and industrial relations matters.*

General Manager's Contract

Regulation 15(2)(a) *personnel matters, including complaints against an employee of the council and industrial relations matters.*

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND 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 8.17pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 8.58pm

C269/16-2023

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
Tender Assessment - TS3253 Snug Foreshore Toilet (Replacement)	Tender awarded to Channel Construction Pty Ltd for \$223,183.02 excl GST
General Manager's Performance Review	Endorsed
General Manager's Contract	Endorsed

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 8.59pm

.....
 (Confirmed)

.....
 (Date)