



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

16 September 2024

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
C260/17-2024	4	Apologies	1
C261/17-2024	5	Confirmation of Minutes	2
	6	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
C262/17-2024	7	Declarations of Interest	2
	8	Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C263/17-2024	9	Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	9.1	112 Tinderbox Road	2
C264/17-2024	10	Questions on Notice from the Public	6
	10.1	Suncoast Headlands Walking Track	6
C265/17-2024	11	Questions without Notice from Councillors	8
	11.1	Bus Stop, Channel Highway	8
	11.2	Mary's Grange	9
	11.3	State Budget – Emergency Services Hub	9
	11.4	Kingston Bypass/Algona Road Upgrade	10
	11.5	Channel Highway/Beach Road Intersection	10
	11.6	Pets in an Emergency Signage	11
	11.7	Compostable Dog Poo Bags	11
	12	Questions on Notice from Councillors	11
	13	Petitions still being Actioned	11
	14	Petitions Received in Last Period	11
	15	Officers Reports to Council	12
C266/17-2024	15.1	Payment of Councillors Expenses and Provision of Facilities Policy 2.1	12
C267/17-2024	15.2	Resolutions from the Disability Inclusion & Access Advisory Committee	12
C268/17-2024	15.3	Kingborough Community Grants	12
C269/17-2024	15.4	Financial Report - August 2024	12
C270/17-2024	15.5	Appendices	13
	16	Notices of Motion	13
C271/17-2024	17	Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	13

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 16 September 2024 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 K Deane	✓
Councillor F Fox	✓
Councillor A Midgley	✓
Councillor M Richardson	✓
Councillor C Street	✓

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer	Mr Dave Stewart
Director People & Finance	Mr David Spinks
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Engineering Services	Mr David Reeve
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Ms Deleeze Chetcuti
Media & Communications Advisor	Ms Sam Adams
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton

C260/17-2024

4 APOLOGIES

Councillor G Cordover

C261/17-2024**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.16 held on 2 September 2024 be confirmed as a true record.

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

Date	Topic	Detail
9 September	Integrated Transport Strategy	A presentation on the proposed strategy for ensuring the efficient movement of people and goods via improved transport accessibility and connectivity.

C262/17-2024**7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The CEO declared an interest in the report in closed session headed 'Chief Executive Officer's Performance Review and Key Performance Indicators'.

8 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C263/17-2024**9 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC**

Council has determined that questions on notice or questions taken on notice from a previous meeting should not contain lengthy preambles or embellishments and should consist of a question only. To this end, Council reserves the right to edit questions for brevity so as to table the question only, with some context if need be, for clarity.

Ms Valeska Winter asked the following questions without notice:

9.1 112 Tinderbox Road

My questions are following on from my questions on notice. Could you confirm what action has been taken by the planning authority to address the failed landscaping at the site following my request for investigation and action on 28 May.

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

We would need to take that on notice. I only deal with the property aspects of that matter.

Ms Winter:

If Council was not unclear about the correct location of the Suncoast Headlands track, why did the Planning Officer report for the recycled water treatment plant development application include incorrect information about the location of the track, including a map?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

There were departments in Council that were clear in relation to the correct alignment, but clearly not every staff member in Council was aware and, for example, planners who rely on what is on title, and what was on title, as you are aware, was incorrect and that was what clearly the planners have relied on. My answer referred to the fact that certainly from a property department perspective the alignment was known.

Ms Winter:

If Council wasn't unclear about the correct location of the track, why did it take weeks of correspondence between residents and Council including us providing Council's information back to you, to eventually concede that we were actually correct about our understanding of where the track was located.

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

There has been unimpeded public access across the TasWater land and that has meant that the public have been able to walk across what would have been the correct alignment of the track. Had TasWater sought to restrict access to the easement only, this issue would have come to light a lot earlier, but clearly with the passage of time and the fact that there has been unimpeded public access, the public have walked over what would be the correct easement that then becomes assumed that it is the easement and hence the confusion it caused.

Ms Winter:

I still don't feel like that's totally answered my question because my question is why did it take so much correspondence and communication from residents back to Council, including providing copies of council documentation back to you, for you to confirm that we were correct?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

It has taken correspondence between Council staff, between Council departments and with TasWater to unravel what has happened with this and that took some time. Clearly, not everyone in Council has been privy to the history of this and it did take some time to get the people with the correct answers to provide the correct information. The process of determining the correct information, yes, did take some time. As to why, I suspect it's because that the right people needed to be asked the right questions.

Ms Winter:

Based on the responses to my questions on notice, I understand when the land was sold, Council updated their records and their systems with information about the correct location of the track, and I understand from the responses that planning officers referred not just to the land title, but apparently referred to the information held in Council records about the location of the track. Therefore I'm wondering why I had a direct response from planning officers that also incorrectly claimed the route that the community use was simply there from historic use and it's traversing private land?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

It's difficult for me to comment on what might have transpired with staff that aren't in my department. Certainly the confusion in relation to the alignment of the track comes from when you view the title and there is a easement on title that was put in the wrong location and that would

have been the starting point for any planning officer reviewing the matter would be to go with what has been put on title. But I can't comment on individual emails or comments that have been made on the matter.

Ms Winter:

At question 8 on my questions on notice I'd asked for specific information about what involvement Council had, for example, installing the fencing, signage and ensuring the walking track location was safe for public use. Could you confirm any specific actions that Council actually took separate to what TasWater did?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Very difficult given that we're talking about actions that happen some seven years ago now, and staff that may have been involved, who are no longer here. But certainly in answering that question, the investigation that I did indicated that staff met with TasWater, there was discussion around the temporary fencing that would be put up in relation to the what was supposed to be a temporary alignment of the track and there has been more recent discussion with TasWater in relation to correcting what was clearly an incorrect alignment of the track.

Ms Winter:

Question 10 was in relation to how the walking track location actually does appear in the correct location as it's used on the LIST map. Would you please confirm specifically what information was provided by Council in order to update the LIST map?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Council's GIS system links to LIST map, so our GIS officer would have provided that information that then gets reflected in this map.

Ms Winter:

Who holds the delegation to maintain Kingborough Council's municipal map under Section 208 of the *Local Government Highways Act 1982*?

Director Engineering Services responds:

My understanding is that would be with the CEO who holds that delegation, but I would probably err on the side of caution and take that one on notice.

Ms Winter:

When selling the parcel of land at 112 Tinderbox to TasWater why was the decision made to sell the entire parcel rather than actually subdividing most of it to sell and keeping the sections related to the Suncoast dog park and the Suncoast Headlands walking track?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Obtaining the whole title was TasWater's preference and it was to do with being able to maintain a buffer zone between the plants and adjoining residences and, I guess, being able to control that particular aspect. If it was owned by TasWater, then they would ensure that that buffer zone could be maintained. If it was owned by others, Council included TasWater didn't have that same level of surety. My recollection is that was their reasoning for wanting to obtain the whole title.

Ms Winter:

Could I just clarify, when you talk about buffer zone, is that in terms of the required attenuation zone or are you talking about a different buffer?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

It may be a statutory one. It was to maximise the amount of land available between the treatment plant and neighbouring residences. At the time I do recall that being described as a buffer, whether that's a statutory buffer or not, I couldn't say.

Ms Winter:

When assessing and approving a development application in an instance such as this one that has happened where unfortunately Council have relied on incorrect information from within their own records, not due to a mistake by the applicant or intentional misleading, what options are there available to Council to address this?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

It's a difficult question to answer. There are obviously some processes here that could be improved, but in saying that, the processes aren't necessarily all those that Council have control over. As I've indicated before, the registration of the easement on title was done by TasWater without reference to Council. Had there been a requirement for Council to sign off on the easement that ultimately was in our favour, it would have been then picked up that actually this easement is in the wrong location. But TasWater were able to do that without there being a requirement in that process for Council to provide any validation of the alignment of the easement. That's certainly one element of the process that there's an opportunity for improvement, but it's one that currently sits with the Land Titles Office rather than Council to improve.

Ms Winter:

If Council as the planning authority are aware that the granting of a permit will actually result in the breach of conditions for another active planning permit at the same site, would you still usually approve the planning permit?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

It's a hypothetical question. The planning permit or the planning application was assessed based on the known detail on the title at the time. Had the title shown a different easement, it's quite conceivable that TasWater and the developer could have come to Council and there could have been a discussion around relocating that easement, for example, but I guess we're getting into a debate that's purely hypothetical.

Ms Winter:

I'm aware that minor amendments can only be approved if it does not change the use or development for which the permit was issued other than a minor change to the description or use of the development, or if it does not cause detriment to any person. What does Council consider something to be a detriment to any person? How do you determine whether it causes a detriment? And if you could provide some examples on what Council considers to just be a minor change to the description or use of a development?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

In terms of determining the detriment to any person for a minor amendment, it depends on the particular amendment applied for and the situation or the potential impacts that it might have to surrounding land owners. And it's also made in reference to the particular parts of the scheme that apply for that minor amendment. So it's hard to answer that in a categorical way. In terms of minor amendments that we would consider fairly typical for example, it might be amendment to design, it might be a facility that has certain operating hours might apply to extend those operating hours, extensions to buildings etc.

Ms Winter:

And how do you determine whether something would cause detriment to any person?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

It would be in relation to the use and enjoyment generally to the the adjoining properties, would be a key consideration. So for example, if a change to the activity was to create higher levels of noise for extended hours we would consider that, for example, potentially a detriment to the use of enjoyment of that property. Other examples might be fettering access and that type of thing. So there's many, many different examples and it really depends on the particular section of the planning scheme that we are looking at as well.

C264/17-2024**10 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC**

10.1 Suncoast Headlands Walking Track

Ms Valeska Winter submitted the following question on notice:

1. *Could you please detail the actions Council has taken since being made aware of the breaches of planning permit conditions for DA-2016-423 and breaches to the contract of sale conditions for 112 Tinderbox Road, including the failed landscaping that was required to effectively screen the sewerage treatment plant from residents and users of the walking track, and the creation of the easement for the Suncoast Headlands walking track in entirely the wrong location to what was required?*
2. *As part of the disposal of Council land at 112 Tinderbox Road to TasWater, the contract of sale stated TasWater would undertake a land survey, following which Council would not object to the location of the right of carriageway for the Suncoast Headlands walking track subject to it being in substantially the same location as shown on the Public Access Map. Did Council receive a copy of the land survey?*
3. *As part of the process for Land Titles Office to register the easement for the Suncoast Headlands walking track on the land title for the benefit of Council:*
 - a. *Did Council grant consent for the right of carriageway to be recorded on their land by making their sealed plan available to the Land Titles Office?*
 - b. *What notice, if any, did Council receive from either Land Titles Office, TasWater or any other party confirming the easement had been registered against their land title?*
4. *Following the disposal of Council land at 112 Tinderbox Road, what steps did Council take to record and ensure all relevant departments were aware of the correct location of the Suncoast Headlands walking track – both the temporary location and permanent location after the construction period completed?*
5. *When responding to resident objections about the impact of DA-2023-174 Recycled Water Treatment Plant on the Suncoast Headlands walking track, what processes did Council undertake to determine the correct location of the walking track?*
6. *Why do Council's maps included in Dog Management Policy and Tracks and Trails Strategy reflect the incorrect location of the Suncoast Headlands walking track, in a location similar to what was supposed to be the temporary location, not the final location?*
7. *How has it occurred that Council themselves were unclear about the correct location of the walking track, if the location is clearly reflected on a Public Access Map that was included in*

the development application, approved planning permit and the contract of sale for the land when it was disposed of?

8. *I am aware Council had a level of involvement in the realignment of the Suncoast Headlands walking track to the temporary and permanent locations. Could you please confirm specifically what involvement Council had with realignment of the walking track, both before and after the construction period for TasWater sewerage treatment plant expansion? For example, installing fencing, signage and ensuring the walking track location was safe for public use.*
9. *How has it occurred that Council themselves were unclear about the correct location of the walking track, given the location is clearly reflected on a Public Access Map that was included in the development application, approved planning permit and the contract of sale for the land when it was disposed of?*
10. *If Council maps do not show the correct location of the walking track, and the easement registered on the Land Title is substantially in the wrong location, how did it eventuate that the LIST map was updated correctly and shows the exact alignment of the track as it is used by the public?*
11. *Recently TasWater as the owner of the land undertook some essential tree removal and maintenance works for safety purposes. Prior to the works commencing, was Council aware that community access to the walking track would be completely closed off for 2 days for public safety, with no way to pass through?*
12. *Given the importance of balancing public safety while also seeking to maintain public access to the popular walking track, could Council discuss this further with the land owner to ensure in future there are some agreed processes in place as an alternative to closing access to the site in its entirety, and provide the community with advanced notice if closure is required for safety reasons?*
13. *When approving DA-2023-174 Recycled Water Treatment Plant, why was no consideration given in the planning officer report or planning permit conditions to how the developer would be required to maintain public safety and access to the Suncoast Headlands walking track while construction works occur on the site?*

Officer's Response:

1. Council has engaged with TasWater in relation to the location of the easement for the walking track and has obtained agreement that the error will be rectified.
2. No.
3. a) The easement was created after the land had been transferred to TasWater. The process of registering the easement on title did not require reference to Council.
b) Nil.
4. The details of the contract of sale, including the respective locations of the temporary and permanent walking tracks, were recorded in Council's central records system.
5. Liaison between staff from various departments, review of the property title and reference to Council records.
6. The map contained in the Dog Management Policy was prepared for the 2018 policy and reflected the temporary alignment of the track at the time. This map was replicated when the policy was updated in 2023. There is no map of the Suncoast Headlands Track in the Tracks and Trails Strategic Action Plan.

7. Council is not unclear on the correct alignment of the walking track, although the registration of the easement on title in an incorrect location by TasWater has created some confusion. The fact that the public have enjoyed unimpeded access through the land since the time of transfer has meant that the error was not picked up until brought to Council's attention as a result of the recent development application.
8. Council staff met with representatives of TasWater onsite both before and after the sewerage treatment plant expansion.
9. As above.
10. LIST maps are updated using information provided by Council.
11. Council was advised by TasWater of the planned tree maintenance. This advice indicated that the walking track would remain open during the works, with traffic management in place.
12. TasWater engaged with Council and indicated that residents would be letterboxed prior to the work being undertaken. It is considered that these processes were appropriate for the situation.

Daniel Smee, Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services

13. Site management during construction is typically dealt with under the building approval and is managed by the building contractors during the development phase. There is legislation that controls requirements of safety on buildings sites.

Tasha Tyler-Moore, Manager Development Services

C265/17-2024

11 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

Council has determined that questions on notice or questions taken on notice from a previous meeting should not contain lengthy preambles or embellishments and should consist of a question only. To this end, Council reserves the right to edit questions for brevity so as to table the question only, with some context if need be, for clarity.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

11.1 Bus Stop, Channel Highway

I noticed that some people this week were using or sitting at the bus stop on the Channel Highway that is currently not in use. Is the bus stop now operational for use?

Mayor responds:

No, it is not. They were just sitting there.

Chief Executive Officer:

As recently as today, I've had correspondence with the general manager from the Department of State Growth. We have had feedback through from the operators and the next stage will be spending time on site with them to make sure that together we understand what the calibration of the bus stop is, what their operational requirements will be at that site so that there can be no further debate about what's right or wrong, and then we'll be moving to final delivery of minor changes at that site to make it operational. So we're getting close.

Cr Antolli:

And for the record, Council is confident that the delays have nothing to do with Council, they have to do with Metro bus internal deliberations. Is that fair?

Chief Executive Officer:

I would not like to say that we don't have any responsibility as part of this process. However, it's clear that there has been some difference of opinion about what has been agreed in the past. There were some the designs that went through the Department of State Growth these were the designs that were delivered, that they agreed to at the time. However, how fully we consulted with all parties including the operators through that process, obviously, if that had been as fulsome as as potentially we could have done, we might have been able to mitigate some of the challenge here. But I think we did, in good faith, deliver the design that we had agreed with Department of State Growth for that bus interchange. Since then we had feedback that it didn't quite work for the operators, so we are looking to mitigate that, but I wouldn't completely say that we have no responsibility in that process.

Cr Antolli:

So we have no responsibility and I don't want to rehash scrambled eggs that we've gone through, we were contracted by DSG to build that bus stop and therefore are we responsible to be consulting with all the stakeholders or is DSG responsible as the head to the contract?

Chief Executive Officer:

DSG contract the operators to deliver the bus services at that site. I would say the primacy of that relationship lies with them. However, we maybe could have asked the question whether or not they had fully consulted with their operators as part of their process.

Cr Deane asked the following questions without notice:

11.2 Mary's Grange

Could we get an update on how the nursing home redevelopment is coming along?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I will have to take that on notice. I don't have the specific timeline in relation to its assessment, but I believe it's well underway and in its final stages.

11.3 State Budget – Emergency Services Hub

In relation to the State Budget that was handed down last week, and the commitment to the emergency services hub. Could you update the community on where any potential locations or the progress of that?

Mayor responds:

We're still waiting on some detail from the State Government in relation to the allocation of those funds. In the budget last year the State Government had provided some funding for a business case around the development of an emergency services hub that would incorporate not only police, fire and ambulance, but the SES as well. It was good to see that they initiated that, have been looking at sites and as you would be aware, Council had previously determined that it would be possible for that to be built on the site of the current works depot. We haven't heard anything further from the State Government recently because the amount of money that was in last year's budget was only for the business case and I'm interested to see what that \$15million that has been

allocated in the budget would be funding because you might recall that Council made a decision that we could not fund ourselves, the move of our works depot down to Baretta, and that there was substantial funding that would be required to undertake that move. \$15million is not sufficient to relocate the depot and to build the emergency services hub. I will be reaching out to Minister Felix to ask for confirmation on what that funding would cover and any expected time frames.

11.4 Kingston Bypass/Algona Road Upgrade

Has there been any conversations with State Growth as to a new start date so that we can give some assurance to residents that the project isn't disappearing and that it actually is going to go ahead and maybe when?

Director Engineering Services responds:

I had a meeting with State Growth and the consultant today. It is still going ahead and will advance. The design is expected to be completed by December with the viewpoint that they'll be looking at tendering the project probably towards March or so next year. They did have to go through a process with some of the threatened vegetation, so they needed to get some federal approval for that. That's probably caused a few delays in terms of their start date for the project.

Cr Deane:

And just to clarify, are we're still talking about duplication all the way from the roundabout up to the Gronigen underpass and upgrades to the roundabout as well. Nothing's changed in that respect?

Director Engineering Services:

Yeah, that's correct. The actual design itself hasn't changed too much. Most of the discussion I had today was more to do with the active transport links. So that's all looking very positive as well. So yes, it's all going ahead.

Cr Street asked the following question without notice:

11.5 Channel Highway/Beach Road Intersection

Recently there was an accident at that intersection where I'm told somebody travelling in the far left hand lane who was travelling through the intersection north towards Hobart, has been in the left hand lane and attempted to cut across in front of traffic that was travelling in the middle lane, which can only go straight ahead and caused quite a major accident. The point has been raised with me by somebody who was in the vicinity of that accident at the time that it happened, is that that left hand lane does not appear to actually serve any real purpose because the other side of the intersection goes to one lane within 50 meters or so of the intersection. Have we ever looked at that intersection and whether that's an appropriate method of traffic flow there? And if we haven't, what is the process for doing that?

Director Engineering Services responds:

I'm not so sure whether we've actually looked at it before. I know we have looked in general terms, particularly when we were doing some of the Kingston Park works and also the Channel highway work, but to the specifics of that small left hand lane, your're right, it does end fairly quickly. I'll make a physical note put that on the list to investigate and see whether or not we do need to continue with that or not, and I can provide some feedback to Councillors.

Cr Glade-Wright asked the following question without notice:

11.6 Pets in an Emergency Signage

I was down at Dru Point over the weekend and I noticed some signs up on the fence regarding the management of pets in an emergency and I was just wondering what that's all about and if this is a new initiative of Council?

Mayor responds:

Council received a grant from the State Government and has worked in conjunction with the RSPCA to let pet owners know what to do in the event of an emergency, particularly if you have to evacuate. After the the Huon Valley bushfired in 2019, after our staff had gone down to help out, there were some lessons learned there about people having to evacuate and not being prepared to go to an evacuation centre because they didn't want to leave their homes without their pets. The campaign has been designed around some posters that are going up at our dog exercise areas and also on the wheelie bins around the dog poo bag dispensers, we've got information online and we've produced some brochures with important steps that you can take to be ready to evacuate with your pet in the event of an emergency.

Cr Midgley asked the following question without notice:

11.7 Compostable Dog Poo Bags

Are we doing any comms around the fact that we've got compostable dog poo bags and that you can put them in your Fogo bin?

Director Engineering Services responds:

I've misunderstood the question. Is this when they're picking them up from the dog dispensers?

Cr Midgley:

Yes. What is the communication plan around getting people to understand what to do with the compostable dog poo bags?

Director Engineering Services:

Not at the moment but I'm happy to take that on notice and have a look at it.

12 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

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

C266/17-2024**15.1 PAYMENT OF COUNCILLORS EXPENSES AND PROVISION OF FACILITIES POLICY 2.1**

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council approves the updated Policy 2.1 *Payment of Councillors Expenses and Provision of Facilities Policy* as attached to this report.

CARRIED

C267/17-2024**15.2 RESOLUTIONS FROM THE DISABILITY INCLUSION & ACCESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council

- (a) Notes the minutes of the Disability Inclusion and Access Advisory Committee.
- (b) Approves the amendments to the DIAAC Action Plan as attached to this report.
- (c) Authorises the Chair of the DIAAC to write to the Minister of Community Services, Minister for Small Business and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Disability Services, raising the safety concerns around door-to-door fundraising and sales in Tasmania, especially for vulnerable community members.
- (d) Authorises the Chair of the DIAAC to write to the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Disability Services and all other parties represented in the State Parliament to raise the issue of the lack of availability of wheelchair accessible taxis.

CARRIED

C268/17-2024**15.3 KINGBOROUGH COMMUNITY GRANTS**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council approve the allocation of \$21,550 in grant funding under the Community Grants Program, as outlined in Attachment II)

CARRIED

C269/17-2024**15.4 FINANCIAL REPORT - AUGUST 2024**

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That Council endorses the attached Financial Report as at 31 August 2024.

CARRIED

C270/17-2024**15.5 APPENDICES**

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

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

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no Notices of Motion received.

C271/17-2024

17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

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

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*

Current Court Matters

Regulation 15(2)(i) *relating to actual or possible litigation taken, or to be taken, by or involving the council or an employee of the council.*

Chief Executive Officer's Performance Review and Key Performance Indicators

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

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 6.52pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 7.11pm

C272/17-2024

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

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
Current Court Matters	Noted
Chief Executive Officer's Performance Review and Key Performance Indicators	Approved

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 7.12pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)