



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

18 August 2025

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	Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians	1
	2	Attendees	1
C215/14-2025	3	Apologies	1
C216/14-2025	4	Confirmation of Minutes	2
	5	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	6	Declarations of Interest	2
	7	Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C217/14-2025	8	Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1	Section 35 Report	2
	8.2	Private Land Reserves	3
C218/14-2025	9	Questions on Notice from the Public	5
	9.1	Fencing and Boundaries	5
	9.2	Biodiversity Offset Contributions	6
	9.3	Local Provisions Schedule	6
C219/14-2025	10	Questions without Notice from Councillors	7
	10.1	Aquatic Centre	7
	10.2	Snug Clean Air Community Project	8
	11	Questions on Notice from Councillors	9
	12	Petitions still being Actioned	9
	13	Petitions Received in Last Period	9
	14	Officers Reports to Council	9
C220/14-2025	14.1	Annual Plan 2025/2026	9
C221/14-2025	14.2	Collaborative Network of Southern Tasmanian Councils	10
C222/14-2025	14.3	Risk Management Policy	10
C223/14-2025	14.4	Public Interest Disclosures Policy and Procedures	10
C224/14-2025	14.5	Appendices	10
	15	Notices of Motion	11
C225/14-2025	15.1	LGBTIQA+ Communities	11
C226/14-2025	16	Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	11

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 18 August 2025 at 5.30pm

WELCOME

The Chairperson declared the meeting open and welcomed all in attendance. The Chairperson made a statement in terms of Section 8 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025* and advised that audio recordings of Council meetings are made publicly available on Council's website and are live streamed on YouTube.

1 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.

2 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 M Richardson	✓
Councillor C Street	✓

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer	Mr Dave Stewart
Director People & Finance	Mr David Spinks
Director Engineering Services	Mr Craig Mackey
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Ms Deleeze Chetcuti
Communications Lead	Ms Sam Adams
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton
Senior Customer Service Officer	Ms Portia Jones

C215/14-2025

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor F Fox
Councillor A Midgley

C216/14-2025**4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

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

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 13 held on 4 August 2025 be confirmed as a true record.

CARRIED**5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING**

Date	Topic	Detail
11 August	AFL High Performance Centre	Discussion on the land allocated for the AFL Training and Administration Centre and options relating to potential land transfer.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C217/14-2025**8 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 Natisha Knight asked the following questions without notice:

8.1 Section 35 Report

The planners who prepared the Section 35, the people who made those responses, are they made public? As in the names of the planners who responded to the 35F report?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I can't tell you off the top of my head if it's in the actual report, the authors. However, if you were to look at the agenda where the section 35F report was tabled, the associated Council report has the names of the planning manager and our strategic planner who compiled the report. But I also would like to note that that report was also reviewed by our relevant members of the Executive at Council as well. Various staff reviewed individual representations including the authors of the report.

Ms Knight:

If the recommendations in the 35F report differs from Council policy, does that override the policy?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

That's difficult to answer without knowing the specifics of potentially what the policy relates to, that you're asking about. The recommendations have to be in accordance with the guidelines provided by the State for drafting the section 35F report and applying the zoning codes and SAPS for the new scheme in our draft LPS. I'd have to either take it on notice or know more specifics about your question.

Ms Knight:

It's just about rural zoning, being able to build under rural zoning, it states that it needs to be accessed by a publicly maintained road. On Crown land, it states that, under my understanding, that you cannot build, because that's not fronting publicly maintained road. However, in the response to my submission, I'm stated that all you need is access to the property.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I'll have to take that one on notice.

Ms Knight:

Changing from environmental to rural zoning. So we're moving from a a zone that is not discretionary to a discretionary zone. Why is that not being taken into consideration with the change of zonings?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The zones that we apply under the draft LPS are from the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, Council did not draft the requirements of the zones. Our role in drafting the LPS is to apply the zones through the municipality in consideration of representations received during the exhibition period, but also in accordance with guidelines and direction from the State Planning Office and the Planning Commission. I imagine, and again, I haven't got the detail in front of me, the discussions that you refer to were considered, but we are also encouraging our community members who have concerns and who made a representation to go to the hearings and present those concerns to the Commission. You will then have further opportunity to provide the rationale why it is a concern to you, and the Planning Commission will then make a decision based on all matters that are relevant.

Mr Charles Biggins asked the following questions without notice:

8.2 Private Land Reserves

Council already acknowledges on their website the creation of a private land reserves via a network of land under voluntary conservation covenants. Does the advertised private land reserve system include the 52 parcels of private land under conservation covenants due to part 5 offset agreements?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I don't believe it does, but I'll have to take that on notice to seek clarification.

Mr Biggins:

Will land under landscape conservation zoning and under the protection of the trees on private land by law and subject to the biodiversity offset provisions have more or less environmental protection than land currently under a conservation covenant?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

That would depend on the requirements of the particular conservation covenant.

Mr Biggins:

Is the extension of Council's private land reserves across another 1,500 properties using a combination of landscape conservation zoning, the trees on private land by-law and the biodiversity offset policy for the benefit of the general public, and if not for the public's, then whose benefit is Council doing it for?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I just have to seek clarification of the question. Are you asking that our reserve network is utilising those 3 mechanisms for protection?

Mr Biggins:

Obviously they are for protection.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

Of our Council natural reserves or?

Mr Biggins:

No for private land.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The planning scheme, zones and codes apply a level of protection. We also then have our offsetting policy which operates separately from the scheme, but relates to when there is vegetation clearing of high conservation value trees and for clarification, the bylaw is still a draft bylaw at present, so is not in place.

Mr Biggins:

The actual question was for whose benefit are these measures being taken, these conservation measures being taken? Is it for the general public, and if not for the general public, for whose benefit are these conservation measures being taken?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The conservation measures are being taken to protect environmental values within our municipality where appropriate and in terms of the offset policy, that is a Council endorsed policy that I believe has had some consultation over the years, so it is representing the community and for their benefit.

Mr Biggins:

So just to confirm, these measures are for the benefit of the general public.

Chief Executive Officer:

Can I just make an additional comment here, we are talking about a few different things here. For example, a conservation covenant is around the protection of private land for the good of the environment, as something that's undertaken by private landholders. The zoning under the planning scheme is a different thing altogether. The reason we have a planning scheme is to ensure that right across the municipality, whether it be in urban areas, in the middle of a township like Kingston or whether it be in our rural communities that development is undertaken in a way that preserves the amenity of the environment, our built environment, our natural environment and creates a balance. It also does things like stops urban sprawl going beyond things like the urban growth boundary and other elements like that. So there's a number of reasons why we have a planning scheme. The protection of our values, whether they be from a livability perspective or from an environmental perspective, are some of the things that are undertaken there. So they're both from an individual benefit for private landholders, but also for a benefit of the wider community. For example, you want to know that what your neighbors doing is in keeping with the nature of the land around you and the development that you

can undertake on your land as well. So there's a variety of both private benefit and public benefit associated with these various controls over land development.

C218/14-2025

9 QUESTIONS ON 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.

9.1 Fencing and Boundaries

At the Council meeting on 21 July 2025, **Mrs Erica Roberts** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

According to the Fencing and Boundary Act, residents shall remove vegetation around their fencing. I'd like to also draw your attention to the fact that under the Forest Protection Act, there are exemptions that allow or permit responsible persons to remove potentially dangerous, large native eucalypts from areas around their infrastructure. Furthermore, under the occupational Health and Safety Act, all responsible persons have a responsibility, a duty of care, to remove hazardous or potentially hazardous material from their property to the maximum extent reasonably practical. How is this conflict going to be resolved? Is it going to be resolved in favour of the provisions of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the Fencing and Boundaries Act and the TPA exemptions, or is Council going to create a new prohibition and force us to increase and develop the fire fuel load on our properties and endanger ourselves, our assets and our industries?

Officer's Response:

All legislation needs to be complied with. Where more than one Act is applicable, ascertaining the meaning and effect of each Act is needed.

- The *Boundary Fences Act 1908* primarily relates to the repair and erection of boundary fences.
- The *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* regulates use and development within the municipality, which includes the removal, destruction or lopping of trees (works).
- The *Forest Practices Act 1985* regulates forest practices on both public and private land.
- The *Work Health and Safety Act 2012* creates a nationally consistent framework to secure the health and safety of workers and workplaces.

An exemption to remove a native tree under one piece of legislation does not provide an exemption under others.

The Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 contains exemptions for vegetation removal relating to safety, bushfire hazard and the maintenance and or construction of boundary fences. Where there is no exemption and an application is required for vegetation removal, the vegetation removal will generally be approved where it is demonstrated to be reasonable and meets the applicable scheme requirements.

Council does not have any proposals to change the exemptions in the current or future planning scheme related to vegetation removal or introduce new prohibitions which will force landowners to increase the fire fuel load on their land.

Tasha Tyler-Moore, Manager Development Services

9.2 Biodiversity Offset Contributions

Mr Nathanael Elcock submitted the following questions on notice:

Kingborough Council have been successfully implementing a range of offset options for over 20 years:

1. *For the same time period used to attain those numbers, how many private landowner applicants were there that contributed to these figures? Please provide the adjusted numbers to reflect the impact on private landowners.*
2. *For the same time period used to attain the above numbers, how many private landowner applicants and figures of financial and land in ha were considered for a contribution for an offset contribution that contested the proposal?*
3. *For the same time period used to attain those numbers, what was the single highest private landowner contribution request either accepted, contested or pending payment/transfer of land in conjunction with a development application for a dwelling?*

Officer's Response:

1. Over the period from 2010-2024:
 - a. 532 applicants whose development or tree removal were on private land contributed a financial biodiversity offset to the Kingborough Environmental Fund. Financial offset contributions can be accessed on Council's website: [KEF ContributionsReconciliation table 2025.pdf](#)
 - b. 57 applications for development on private land resulted in a Part 5 Agreement as the offset.

NB: Developments/works that occurred on private land was used as a surrogate for *private landowner applicants*.

The range of development types that occur on private land is hugely varied. Therefore these offsets relate to a broad range of development and works including commercial developments, subdivisions, unit development, quarry developments, visitor accommodation, single dwellings, private education infrastructure and retirement villages.

Biodiversity offsets in these figures also apply to both development and works approved through the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme and Council's by-laws.

2. Five applications involving a financial contribution or on-site offset via a Part 5 Agreement were contested through an Appeal during this period. Of these appeals, two (2) related to financial offsets and three (3) related to Part 5.
3. The highest offset contribution for a development application for a dwelling was \$16 500 for a house, shed and roading through bushland. The mean financial offset across all of the development types is \$2355.

The single largest area protected under a Part 5 Agreement as on offset for a single dwelling was 11.5 hectares, with the average area protected for a single dwelling being 2.3 hectares.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

9.3 Local Provisions Schedule

Ms Jo Landon submitted the following question on notice:

1. *Could Council please provide details of all the differences between the draft Local Provisions Schedule that was submitted to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in December 2019, and the*

draft Local Provisions Schedule that was submitted to the Tasmanian Planning Commission in February 2020?

2. *On page 10 of the s35F Report, it states that one of the key themes in representations was opposition to Kingborough Council's Biodiversity Offset Policy; how many representations opposed this policy?*
3. *The s35F Report also states that the Biodiversity Offset Policy "is mainly a Council matter as it is only referenced in the proposed new SAPs and can be applied even if not specifically referenced in the planning scheme"; could Council please explain how the policy could be applied without being referenced in the planning scheme?*
4. *The public exhibition period of the draft Local Provisions Schedule officially closed on 9 December 2024; how many representations were received up until 9 December 2024?*
5. *On what date did Council stop accepting late representations?*
6. *How many late representations were received between 9 December 2024 and the date Council stopped accepting late representations?*

Officer's Response:

A full response to the above questions will be provided on the next Council meeting Agenda.

Tasha Tyler-Moore, Manager Development Services

C219/14-2025

10 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 Cordover asked the following questions without notice:

10.1 Aquatic Centre

Please may we have an update on the workings of the Aquatic Facility Steering Committee and what progress has there been and what kind of time frames are we looking at for more public reporting on that?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

Council has a committee that is assisting in our investigations into the feasibility of an aquatic centre for Kingborough. One of the key steps that the committee has taken, has been to assist Council in preparing an application to the precincts partnership program, it's a federal government funding program, and that funding application aims to provide funding assistance to do planning work associated with a potential aquatic facility. That has been in for many months now and we are awaiting an official outcome of that. Pending the outcome of that will then determine what work the committee is able to do going forward, but at this stage we're in a bit of a holding pattern waiting for an official word on that particular grant program.

Cr Cordover:

Can we have some assurance that even if the funding isn't forthcoming, that there will still be progress on planning for an aquatic facility in Kingborough?

Mayor:

We don't have anything else budgeted in this financial year that I'm aware of. Mr Smee?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

Providing an aquatic facility in Kingborough is a huge challenge and the committee have been appraised of all of the issues associated with the massive challenge that we have going forward in terms of being able to progress capital funding and then in order to develop a concept that minimises the operational impact of an aquatic facility on Council's expenditure. I don't want to provide any false hope that there is going to be something happening anytime soon because there is a huge challenge ahead of us and at this stage we don't even know if it's feasible. The brief given to the committee was to investigate the feasibility to determine if there is a model that could be feasible for Council to pursue and that work is ongoing. But at this stage there is a commitment from committee members that they will continue to chip away at this, but there is also a realisation that this is a huge mountain to climb and it will take a considerable amount of time and it's going to take external funding for it to be able to become a reality.

Cr Cordover:

I've long advocated to kind of hypothecate funding so that we're putting aside money, almost a sinking fund, if you'll pardon the pun, for saving up money to put towards an aquatic centre? Is that something that the working group has been considering and is that something that, even if the grant funding doesn't come through or federal government funding doesn't come through, is that something that Kingborough Council is actively considering? That is, putting aside money bit by bit over a long period of time in order to fund an aquatic facility?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

I'm aware that that particular proposal has been floated in Council's budget discussions. It's not something that Council has made a commitment to. The committee are looking at all potential options. It could be something that is recommended, but we are talking a development that will need tens of millions of dollars and I don't think Council putting aside half a million dollars is going to make any real impact on our ability to fund this project going forward. As I said previously, it's going to require a substantial amount of external funding.

Mayor:

If I can just add to that, perhaps to put it into context, the report that the Glenorchy City Council received earlier this year for a replacement for the Glenorchy pool, suggested that if they wanted a 50 metre outdoor pool and then a smaller indoor pool, I'll repeat that, a 50 metre outdoor and then an indoor aquatic centre along with some gym facilities, that was in the order of \$80 to \$85 million for an outdoor pool and that is a substantial commitment and I would probably expect that for that amount of money, and for our climate, that our residents would want an indoor pool. The cost is certainly a significant issue, not only in the development but also in the annual running costs, because there are, as our CEO is well aware from his previous positions that he's held where he has managed aquatic facilities, the ability of an aquatic facility of any kind, no matter how many bells and whistles you put on it, to actually make money is very, very limited. I think I was told there's only one pool in Australia that actually makes money. It would incur substantial loss. I think we estimated around \$300,000 a year loss, because of the running costs associated.

10.2 Snug Clean Air Community Project

Can Council officers please provide an update on any current strategies or programs addressing wood smoke pollution in our municipality, particularly in areas like Snug and advise on how Council could collaborate with or support innovative community led awareness projects such as the recent Snug 2025 Clean Air Initiative, which I only became familiar with recently. Basically, they're using LED lights to light up the tree at the Snug school and it's directly correlated with the air quality. So if air quality is of a certain amount, then the tree lights up a certain colour, and if the air quality is better then it lights up a

different colour. So it's a really cool community project and I was just wondering whether Council is going get involved in that in any way?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Thank you for sharing. It sounds really interesting and valuable. It's something that we can talk to our environmental health team about potentially becoming involved. I'm not aware of any specific initiatives we've undertaken this year, but we do from time to time awareness campaigns around wood smoke and community health, but we will look into the program.

Cr Cordover:

Do we see the value in linking together different community groups and the preface to that question is that I only found out about this Snug 2025 community project through the really wonderful Snug Beach walk and talk that took place where our natural areas biodiversity team was talking about coastal erosion and climate change. And on that walk it brought together people from all around Snug and that's how those community groups got together. Are we gonna look to doing more community projects through the NAB that that bring people together like that?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

Absolutely and it's a model we've been looking at for various areas, not just for natural areas, another really good example is our emergency management in terms of facilitating and helping develop a framework for our communities to connect so they are more resilient for the changes we'll be facing as communities for climate events. But also connecting our community who would like to work together for environment initiatives, community health initiatives. Yes, absolutely, it's a model that we are going to try and use more and more.

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions on notice from Councillors.

12 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

There are no petitions still being actioned.

13 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

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

14 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C220/14-2025

14.1 ANNUAL PLAN 2025/2026

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

Cr Richardson left the room at 5.58pm
Cr Richardson returned at 6pm

That in accordance with Section 71 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, Council adopts the Annual Plan for the 2025/26 financial year and instructs the Chief Executive Officer to:

- a) Make a copy of the Annual Plan available for public inspection at the Civic Centre and on Council's website; and
- b) Provide a copy of the Annual Plan to the Director of Local Government and to the Director of Public Health.

CARRIED

C221/14-2025

14.2 COLLABORATIVE NETWORK OF SOUTHERN TASMANIAN COUNCILS

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Council endorse participation in the Collaborative Network of Southern Tasmanian Councils, which would be supported through Regional Development Australia (Tasmania) and replace the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority.

CARRIED

C222/14-2025

14.3 RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Council approve the updated Risk Management Policy 3.10.

CARRIED

C223/14-2025

14.4 PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURES POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That Council adopt Policy 1.4 *Public Interest Disclosure Policy* and the *Public Interest Disclosures Procedures Manual*.

CARRIED

C224/14-2025

14.5 APPENDICES

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

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

Cr Antolli left the room at 6.22pm

Cr Antolli returned at 6.23pm

CARRIED

15 NOTICES OF MOTION

C225/14-2025

15.1 LGBTIQA+ COMMUNITIES

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Kaspar Deane

Kingborough Council notes:

1. that our community is more inclusive and accepting because of the Kingborough Council's [LGBTIQA+ Engagement Report](#) and [LGBTIQA+ Action Plan 2023-2025](#)
2. resolves to sponsor the following motion to be put to the 2025 LGAT General meeting:

That:

- (a) *Members of LGAT note the importance of fostering inclusion and equal opportunities for LGBTIQA+ people*
- (b) *LGAT works with the State Government and organisations like [Equality Tasmania](#) and [Working It Out](#) to support and encourage councils to connect with, and act in support of, their local LGBTIQA+ communities.*

In Favour: Crs Paula Wriedt, Clare Glade-Wright, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Mark Richardson and Christian Street

Against: Cr Aldo Antolli

CARRIED 7/1

C226/14-2025

16 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That in accordance with the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025* Council, by absolute majority, move into closed session to consider the following items:

Confirmation of Minutes

Regulation 40(6) *At the next closed meeting, the minutes of the previous closed meeting, after any necessary correction, are to be confirmed as the true record by the council or council committee and signed by the chairperson of the closed meeting.*

Applications for Leave of Absence

Regulation 17(2)(i) *applications by councillors for a leave of absence*

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

Cr Richardson left the room at 6.53pm

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 6.53pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 6.57pm

C227/14-2025

Moved: Cr David Bain
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

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

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6.58pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)