

Kingborough



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

17 November 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
C317/20-2025	3 Apologies	1
C318/20-2025	4 Confirmation of Minutes	2
	5 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	6 Declarations of Interest	2
	7 Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C319/20-2025	8 Questions Without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1 ASU's Role in Council	2
	8.2 Code of Conduct Complaint against former Mayor Dean Winter	3
	8.3 Planning Department	3
	8.4 Cutting Trees for Firewood	3
	8.5 GIS Mapping	4
	8.6 Consultant Scope of Works	5
	8.7 Housing	5
	8.8 Consultant	6
	8.9 Zoning	6
	8.10 Review	7
	8.11 Modification to the Draft LPS	7
	8.12 Works at Piersons Point	7
	8.13 Safety on Tinderbox Road	8
C320/20-2025	9 Questions on Notice from the Public	8
	9.1 Zone And Code Overlays	8
	9.2 Residential Development in Landscape Conservation Zone	9
	9.3 Bushfire Risk Management	11
	9.4 Draft LPS	11
	9.5 Reduction of Bushfire Risk Under LCZ	12
	9.6 Landscape Conservation Zone Overlays	13
	9.7 Definition of Landscape Values	13
	9.8 Minimum Lot Sizes	14
	9.9 Trees and Overhanging Branches	14
	9.10 Consultant	15

Table of Contents

Item			Page No.
C321/20-2025	10	Questions without Notice from Councillors	15
		10.1 Local Provisions Schedule	15
		10.2 Candidate Statements	16
		10.3 Consultant	17
		10.4 Letter to the Tasmanian Planning Commission	18
		10.5 Feral Cat Management	19
		10.6 Aquatic Facility Steering Committee	19
C322/20-2025	11	Questions on Notice from Councillors	20
		11.1 Use of Poison	20
		11.2 Consultant	20
	12	Petitions still being Actioned	21
	13	Petitions Received in Last Period	21
	14	Officers Reports to Council	21
C323/20-2025		14.1 Local Government Amendment (Targeted Reform) Bill 2025	21
C324/20-2025		14.2 Project Delivery Review	21
C325/20-2025		14.3 Audit Panel Appointment	22
C326/20-2025		14.4 Annual Report 2024/25	22
C327/20-2025		14.5 Financial Report - October 2025	22
C328/20-2025		14.6 Appendices	22
	15	Notices of Motion	22
C329/20-2025	16	Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	22

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 17 November 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 G Cordover	✓
Councillor K Deane	✓
Councillor F Fox	✓
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

C317/20-2025

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor D Bain
Councillor A Midgley

C318/20-2025

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

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

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 19 held on 3 November 2025 be confirmed as a true record.

CARRIED

5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

Date	Topic	Detail
10 November	Risk	Workshop to confirm the key risks faced by Council and review Council’s risk appetite and maximum tolerable consequences.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C319/20-2025

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.

Mr Charles Biggins asked the following questions without notice:

8.1 ASU’s Role in Council

2026 is election year for local councils. Councillors are requested to sign a candidate's pledge of support to the Australian Services Union before coming to office. What role does the Australian Services Union play in the day-to-day governance of Kingborough Council?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

The Australian Services Union doesn't play a direct role in the governance of the organisation. We have an Enterprise Agreement with the union that governs some of the conditions through which we employ staff in the organisation.

8.2 Code of Conduct Complaint against former Mayor Dean Winter

In 2018, former Mayor Dean Winter was the subject of a code of conduct complaint by a member of the public following his public criticism of Council's enforcement officers relating to dog control. The former Mayor was also disciplined by the Labor Party as a direct result of his criticism of Council staff actions. Was the Australian Services Union involved in either the Code of Conduct complaint or the disciplinary action taken by the Tasmanian Labor Party?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I'm not aware of the nature of that Code of Conduct complaint or who was involved or party to it. We can take that question on notice as per any information that's available in the public realm.

Mayor:

Could I just add to that. I might suggest, because we wouldn't be able to find out that information about what occurred within the Labor Party, so you'd best direct that part of the question to the State Labor Secretary.

Mr Biggins:

We don't have any Labor Party members in Council at the moment?

Mayor:

You're asking about an administrative process of a political party and not all members of political parties would be aware of administrative processes and certainly not back to 2018. So that part of the question would be best directed to the State Secretary of the Labor Party.

8.3 Planning Department

Is it correct that Council is currently getting assistance from other council planning departments to complete their development application responsibilities, and is there currently any industrial action arising from Kingborough's planning department regarding work health safety complaints directed at the organisation of council?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I have written to other councils to see if they have any available capacity that they would be able to second into council to be able to provide some additional resourcing for Kingborough due to workforce demands within our planning area. In regard to industrial action, there's no industrial action that Council is currently relating to your question.

Ms Janet de Hoog asked the following question without notice:

8.4 Cutting Trees for Firewood

I asked this question at the last Council meeting and it was taken on notice, and it was not mentioned or addressed in any way in this agenda, so I'm going to ask it again. We currently cut dead trees and limbs on our 10-hectare property for firewood for our wood heater. At a recent TPC hearing, one of the Kingborough planners said that under the environmental living, owners can apply to Council to be able to cut firewood for their personal use on their private property. If our property is changed to LCZ, will we be able to continue to cut down trees on our property to use as wood for our home's wood heater?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Apologies for missing that part of the question. If you have an existing approval to remove firewood on your property, that will remain. Moving forward, regardless of zoning, you can apply to remove firewood on your land under the scheme and I suppose the other thing too is the normal exemptions and vegetation clearing exemptions apply to all zones under futures scheme.

Ms de Hoog:

If we had approval, we would need to apply for approval?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

If you have existing approval to do that, which you would need in all zones under the current interim scheme, then you can continue to do that, yes.

Ms Tamika Adkins asked the following questions without notice:

8.5 GIS Mapping

Did Kingborough Council rely primarily on aerial mapping and desktop GIS modelling without site verification or public consultation to determine the landscape values that underpin the local provision schedule nominations?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

My understanding is that it's been a hybrid. So yes, a lot of our overlays, particularly around vegetation, but other features are done by looking at GIS or satellite imagery. That's common across many organisations and councils to look at landscape values that way. We also have a lot of ground truthed data that's available to us over the years of having many, many surveys completed for various different reasons and to use that. So I couldn't categorically say that it is one or the other. I believe it's a hybrid of both.

Ms Adkins:

Aerial imagery provides a scientific baseline, but it must be supported by ground truthing and participatory mapping to capture how people value and interact with the landscape. So you may think you have already answered this, but were onsite inspections or field validations undertaken for all properties to confirm the findings from aerial mapping before finalising the LCZ boundaries?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

No, it was not.

Ms Adkins:

Without field validation, LCZ boundaries may not be evidence based in accordance with best practice landscape assessment methodology. How can Council ensure that the mapped landscape values accurately represent both the physical landscape and the community's relationship with it?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I would like to say we are undertaking a review of this, as you are likely aware, and so answering these questions ahead of that review is perhaps preempting an outcome. We are, as part of this review, looking at the methodology and ensuring that that methodology is robust and consistent. What I would say generally, though, is for organisations that have to undertake broad scale mapping of different values, it is quite common for not 100% of it, to be ground truthed. There are some practical limitations in being able to do that.

Mr Nicholas Booth asked the following questions without notice:

8.6 Consultant Scope of Works

Can the Council explain the scope of work or terms of reference for the consultation in relation to the consultation that's going to be done for the LCZ?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

The review scope of works has been developed in accordance with Direction 69 from the Commission. That direction did not request Council to specifically undertake consultation. However, we are very well aware that our community has a lot of concerns. So we are in the process of approaching or writing to the Commission to ask what we can and can't do as part of that review in terms of consultation.

Mr Booth:

Can Council also advise on what terms and conditions and remuneration for the consultants will be and whether the work will be tendered out if it's over \$250,000?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The terms and conditions are quite detailed, so I'm not in a position to be able to tell you those in detail. I can give you an overview in that the scope of works is to undertake the review as per Direction 69 of the application of LCZ in Kingborough in accordance with the section 8A guidelines, any relevant strategies and policies and information and submissions presented at the hearings to date. Then, additionally to that, a review of the Bruny Island SAP and the Bonnet Hill SAP and also seeking the views of elected members as well. In terms of the process, we have sought advice from our finance team and procurement team to ensure that the procurement is in line with our policies and we've actually gone beyond what is required for the estimated value. Yes, if it was to be over the \$250,000 mark, it would absolutely be in accordance with the policies and procedures for procurement.

Mr Booth:

Is it likely to happen?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I don't believe it's likely.

8.7 Housing

Given the current housing crisis, can the Council explain how the Council is doing more to speed up the current planning process rather than the apparent bottleneck that's been created by the planning department in its current state?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

As you're aware, we comply with our statutory timeframes for assessment processes. Of course, we do want to be improving on that when we can be and not waiting until the end. As previously alluded to by the CEO, we do have some resourcing constraints at the moment, so it is a little bit difficult for us to be making those improvements with those constraints and the staff are working very hard to keep on top of their workloads. However, moving forward, as part of our continuous improvement program, all areas of our organisation will have initiatives identified for efficiencies and our Planning and Development Services Department will be a team that we are focusing on as a priority.

Mr Booth:

Kingborough Council don't actually publish your time frames. How do we have a benchmark?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

They are actually published. Admittedly, they are a little difficult to find if you don't know what you're looking for. Under the LIST data, there is a database called the CDC database in which councils report all sorts of metrics through and they are published on the LIST website. If you would like information about that, we can provide where to find that.

Mr Richard Woolley asked the following questions without notice:

8.8 Consultant

In the letter that was distributed recently regarding the consultant that's to be employed to assess the landscape conservation zone, it states that there will be input from Council staff. I was under the understanding that the consultant would be employed to remove the input from the Council staff and oversee the project. So I'm just wondering how much input the planning staff will have with the new consultant when and if he or she is employed?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I think it's very reasonable that our staff have some input in terms of being able to brief the consultant once engaged, provide an overview of methodology used, as well as providing information about hearings to date and what the responses have been. So for this review to be done properly, staff will need to engage or liaise with the selected consultant to be able to provide them enough information to do the review.

Mr Woolley:

Who will oversee the independence of the consultant to ensure that the staff don't have the overriding input with the consultant, and we're back where we started?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The project has been overseen by the CEO and myself. Consultants have professional standards in terms of independence and will use those professional standards and processes to ensure they are providing an independent opinion and recommendations.

Mr Woolley:

So with that, we can guarantee the process will be completely independent and overseen by senior staff.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Yes, and we have actually developed an internal governance process for this project to ensure that happens.

Ms Karen Groves asked the following questions without notice:

8.9 Zoning

As witnessed in the Huon Valley LPS process, titles proposed for the LCZ that weren't included in a representation were still moved to the landscape conservation zone. If Kingborough's consultant does not recommend moving all proposed LCZ titles, including those that missed out on a representation, into the preferred rural living zone by default, the suggestion implicitly given in

direction 69, what responsibility will Council take to ensure an injustice does not occur for those families?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

The scope of works for the consultant is to consider primarily, in the first instance anyway, the properties that were proposed originally to go through into the PPZ and also all properties that were zoned landscape conservation. There's not a scenario where a property is not considered through this process. All properties that are proposed at this stage to move to landscape conservation will be part of the consideration through the consultant. Secondly, the implication of moving to the zone is that it's a change of zoning. It's not a fundamental change to the nature of the property, so therefore, Council has no direct obligation to those property owners in the case that the commission at the end of the process sees fit for a property to be zoned landscape conservation.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The Commission, after receiving the review from the consultant and considering it, will then determine consultation with affected landowners as well. So they will determine what they think is appropriate in terms of contacting landowners after that process is finalised.

8.10 Review

You've stated that the LPS consultant will be reconsidering the application of the LCZ and our Direction 69 asks that you consider the STRLUS Addendum SD1.3 supporting the consolidation and recognition of existing rural and environmental living communities by applying the Rural Living Zone. What other options will Kingborough be considering for those proposed for the LCZ if not the Rural Living Zone? And if there are no other options, why do we need a consultant to do this?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

That question is probably too difficult to answer because the review will determine that in terms of what the options are in accordance with each zone, the guidelines and how to apply the zone, STRLUS etc. So that will be for the review to determine.

8.11 Modification to the Draft LPS

In the LPS approval process, once hearings are complete, the TPC considers all evidence and decides if changes are needed to the draft. If the TPC decides that the draft LPS requires a substantial modification, the Planning Authority submits a new part of the draft LPS to the TPC and then it will go back to exhibition. Would you consider that moving all current ELZ or LCZ titles to the RLZ constitutes a substantial modification?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I'm not in a position to be able to answer that. That would be a question for the Planning Commission.

Mr Harry Hale asked the following questions without notice:

8.12 Works at Pierson's Point

There's a tennis court at Pierson's Point reserve and Council has spent a little bit of money on putting a new top on it and they put a new net. At the moment, the net needs some attention, and I'm wondering whether the Council would see their way clear to do something about doing some repairs to that. Also on Pierson's Point, there's a fortification there, which is very historic, and there's a very large gum tree growing right next door to it and causing a lot of damage to that fortification.

What needs to happen is the tree needs to be demolished and got rid of, and in return of that happening, obviously there'd have to be some more trees planted to make up for it. Would Council consider that because something needs to be done about it? Third thing, Council has thankfully, and appreciated by the public, put in a gas barbecue which is run free at a cost to the Council at Tinderbox and it would be nice to see a similar thing done at Piersons Point. Would the Council consider that for the future?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

In relation to the tennis court net, we can certainly have a look at the condition of that and whether that needs fixing or replacement. The tree in the reserve would need to be assessed in accordance with its condition and natural values and the question of a barbecue shelter would be one for our capital bid process for future budget consideration, but we can certainly add that to the mix.

Mr Ted Hale asked the following question without notice:

8.13 Safety on Tinderbox Road

At the last Council meeting, I raised some issues of safety along Tinderbox Road and there are some further issues I would like to raise. A few weeks ago, there was an incident where a car went over the bank and caught fire. I don't know any further details as to what happened with that, other than to know that it's in a very precarious position. The bend in the road just prior to where that just north of where that car went over is a very dangerous corner. The bitumen pavement goes virtually right to the edge of the bank, so if any car just there's a little bit going round that corner, they can be going off the side. Downhill there is a house below it and for a long time, it's been an urgent need to actually have barrier fencing around that corner. So the question is, is Council prepared to look at what is required there? There's a further safety issue further south from that point, where the road is suffering from subsidence on the lower side of the road and that it's heading towards actually giving way and sliding down into the valley next to it. I would suggest that remedial action to arrest that before it actually happens would be a good move. The third one, which I also raised at the last meeting, was to do with overhanging trees and the need for attention to trees, not just on Tinderbox Road, on all roads, but Tinderbox Road is particularly dangerous the way it is at the moment.

Director Engineering Services responds:

As per our response, I would like to understand the particular areas, the actual site specific. We did have one of our council officers go and drive that and we didn't identify any limbs that posed a hazard. They all seem to be healthy. But if you know or can direct us to exactly where you have concerns. Regarding the corner, we can get our roads engineer to have a look at the sight lines and the bitumen and pavement width at that section. The other one, the risk of land slipping onto the road, it would also be good if we could have a specific location.

C320/20-2025

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.

Mr Eugene Lehmensich submitted the following question on notice:

9.1 Zone And Code Overlays

For the second time on the record at Council meeting last night (3/11/2025), Council staff stated that the proposed new zone allocations and codes/overlays do not consider economic impacts for

ratepayers. This contradicts legislation outlined in LUPAA which states that under section 32.1(f), amendments to a planning scheme must: "...have regard to the impact that the use and development permissible under the amendment will have on the use and development of the region as an entity in environmental, economic and social terms." With the broad application of zones and codes that alter land use and increase administrative burden, there is undoubtedly environmental, economic and social (human) impact on the use and development of the region as an entity.

1. How does Council navigate and reconcile the conflict between this staff perspective and KC's legislated responsibility?
2. Should Council continue to view zone and overlay/code application as a purely academic translation without consideration of broad economic, social or environmental impact, is Council prepared to make reparation to ratepayers within the region who are negatively impacted by inconsiderate applications of the LPS?
3. What channels of appeal and or reparation exist to ratepayers should the TPC hearings not address the flaws in the draft LPS?

Officer's Response:

1. The preamble in the question refers to Section 32(1)(f) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* (LUPAA), which applies to planning scheme amendments under the former provisions of the Act. However, the implementation of the Draft Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme follows a different statutory process. The LPS is not subject to the same requirements as planning scheme amendments. Specifically, there is no general requirement to assess economic impacts during the LPS implementation process. Economic considerations may be used to justify the introduction of a unique local provisions (for example, through the introduction of a Specific Area Plan). In the absence of such provisions, broader economic impacts are not systematically considered as part of the LPS process.
2. The codes (the written part) are consistent across the state, and the majority of overlays (the maps that show where the codes may apply) are derived from statewide mapping. Where mapping is informed by local input, it must be applied in accordance with the State Government's Section 8A Guidelines for zone and code application. While the LPS process does not require economic, social or environmental impact assessments for the overlay mapping, the public hearing process along with independent assessment by the Tasmanian Planning Commission provides an important mechanism in the process to ensure accountability and responsiveness to community concerns.
3. A response to this question is provided under item 9.1 of Council's agenda of 3 November 2025.

Adriaan Stander, Lead Strategic Planner

Professor Michael Rowan submitted the following questions on notice:

9.2 Residential Development in Landscape Conservation Zone

1. Does the Kingborough Council Planning Authority Delegations Policy delegate to the CEO or other Council officer the power to 'refuse an application for use or development' other than an application for a use or development which is 'prohibited under the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 or the Kingborough Planning Scheme 2000 as applicable'?
2. Will this Policy remain in force when the Statewide Planning Scheme replaces the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015?

3. *If so, will any application for a residential development on a property zoned Landscape Conservation, which a Council officer acting with delegated authority has determined should be refused, be referred to the elected Council for decision?*
4. *In view of the level of concern in the community caused by suggestions that landowners whose properties are proposed to be zoned Landscape Conservation will not be able to build a home as they intended to do when purchasing the land, has Council considered what guidance councillors will require, and could be provided to landowners contemplating a development application, to give a definite interpretation to the many matters of judgement that are contained within the Landscape Conservation Zone Development Standards Performance Criteria such as: 'compatible with landscape values'; 'unreasonable loss of amenity'; 'impact on landscape values'; and 'detract from the landscape values'?*
5. *Where words that were used in the Development Standards for Buildings and Works in the Environmental Living Zone are also used or replaced with a common synonym in the Development Standards for Buildings and Works in the Landscape Conservation Zone, is it Council's understanding that such words are used with the same meaning so that, for example, it is Council's intention to interpret Sec 22.4.2 P5 of the Development Standards in the Landscape Conservation Zone Exterior building finishes must not cause an unreasonable loss of amenity to occupiers of adjoining properties or detract from the landscape values of the site or surrounding area, as having the same meaning as Sec 14.4.3 P2 of the Development Standards in the Landscape Conservation Zone Exterior building surfaces must avoid adverse impacts on the visual amenity of neighbouring land and detracting from the contribution the site makes to the landscape, views and vistas.*
6. *If so, what element if any, of the Development Standards for the Landscape Conservation Zone will make it problematic for Council to approve a residential development in that zone which would have been approved in the Environmental Living Zone?*

Officer's Response:

1. Yes, development permits made under Section 57 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 may be determined (either approved or refused) by delegated officers where there is insufficient time for Council to make a decision within the statutory timeframe, or where the applicant has refused or failed to agree to an extension of time.
2. The policy will be updated to reference delegations under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.
3. Refer to the above.
4. It is acknowledged that terms such as "compatible with landscape values" and "unreasonable loss of amenity" within the Landscape Conservation Zone are interpretive and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. This approach aligns with how the zone operates in other Councils that have already implemented it, with guidance and pre-lodgement advice available to assist landowners and the planning authority in applying the performance criteria
5. Where similar wording or synonymous terms appear in the Development Standards for Buildings and Works in both the Environmental Living Zone and the Landscape Conservation Zone, it can be interpreted that they reflect the same intention, even if expressed slightly differently. As the provisions of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme are written by the State Government, questions regarding the meaning or application of specific terms are best directed to the State Planning Office, which is responsible for the State Planning Provisions (SPPs)
6. The Landscape Conservation Zone provides a pathway for dwelling approvals. In many cases, the reasons for refusal are not related to the zone provisions themselves, but rather to issues such as access requirements or non-compliance with other parts of the planning scheme.

Adriaan Stander, Lead Strategic Planner

9.3 Bushfire Risk Management

What Council approvals – including planning – would be required in Kingborough by the owner of a block with substantial native vegetation to implement an indigenous cultural cool burn on their property?

Officer's Response:

Under the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015, undertaking an indigenous cultural cool burn would likely come under the natural and cultural values management use class and generally would not require planning approval provided the burn:

- is for the purposes of protecting, conserving or managing ecological systems, habitat, species, cultural sites or landscapes;
- does not involve the physical removal or clearing of native vegetation or impact high conservation trees; and
- does not adversely alter the structure and species composition of a native vegetation community.

However, there may be some additional qualifications which trigger the need for planning approval, for example where land is subject to Codes under the Planning Scheme including the Heritage Code or Contaminated Land Code.

Outside of the planning scheme, written authorisation or approval of Council may be required where land is subject to a Part 5 Agreement or covenant on the title.

To confirm whether a specific proposed burn on a specific property falls within the natural and cultural values management use class and does not require any planning or other approvals, it is recommended that individual landowners contact Council's Planning Department for advice.

Nikki den Exter, Environmental Planner

9.4 Draft LPS

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Ms Karen Groves** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

In the latest Mercury article on the LPS process, the Mayor stated 'I'm confident we can deliver an appropriate balance for our community'. The STRLUS also asks for balanced management of development with principles 4.2, including intergenerational and social equity. Yet the draft LPS and S35F reports seem to favour environmental protections, such as moving properties into discretionary zones, and extending overlays to protect landscape values. To ensure a balance, could you provide examples to us where the draft LPS has actively supported or protected the rights of ratepayers to maintain reasonable and continuous use of their properties across generations?

Officer's Response:

Council expects that most development applications will continue to be assessed discretely under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, as has historically been the case under the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme, regardless of the zoning. Although the planning scheme outlines permitted and discretionary uses in the land use tables for each zone, any application that does not meet the acceptable solutions in other parts of the scheme will require discretionary assessment. This also applies to properties affected by overlays, which is common in Kingborough due to the municipality's varied topography and significant environmental features.

Adriaan Stander, Lead Strategic Planner

9.5 Reduction of Bushfire Risk Under LCZ

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Ms Janet de Hoog** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Our family property is 10 hectares and is proposed by Council to be changed to landscape conservation zone with a new planning scheme. If the property is changed to LCZ, will we be able to continue to sensitively burn to manage the weeds and reduce the bushfire risk?

Officer's Response:

The exemptions and approval pathways for weed management and bushfire under the State Planning Provisions do not vary substantially from the Kingborough Interim Scheme, regardless of zoning, with both schemes including front-end exemptions relating to weed management and bushfire hazard reduction. These exemptions mean that weed management and/or bushfire hazard reduction are generally exempt from requiring planning approval provided:

- weed management activities (including use of burning as a weed management method where appropriate for the species and location) are limited to the removal or destruction of declared weeds or environmental weeds listed under a strategy or management plan approved by a council and do not otherwise destroy or impact native vegetation, involve soil disturbance or alter the topography of the land; and
- burning for bushfire risk is undertaken in accordance with a bushfire hazard management plan approved as part of a use or development or a plan for fire hazard management endorsed by the Tasmania Fire Service or Council, for example as part of the TFS strategic hazard reduction program.

Where the burning does not meet the exemptions, undertaking burning which also has benefits for weed management and/or hazard reduction has the potential to come under the natural and cultural values management use class and generally would not require planning approval regardless of zoning, provided the burn:

- is primarily for the purposes of protecting, conserving or managing ecological systems, habitat, species, cultural sites or landscapes;
- does not involve the physical removal or clearing of native vegetation or impact high conservation trees; and
- does not adversely alter the structure and species composition of a native vegetation community.

However, there may be some additional qualifications which trigger the need for planning approval, for example where land is subject to Codes under the Planning Scheme including the Heritage Code or Contaminated Land Code.

Depending on the specifics of your property and the nature of the activity, it is recommended that you consult with Council first to confirm whether approval is required. Council's Natural Areas and Biodiversity are also available to provide weed management advice.

More detailed information on weed management, bushfire and the requirements of the planning scheme is also available on Council's website.

Nikki den Exter, Environmental Planner

9.6 Landscape Conservation Zone Overlays

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Ms Tamika Adkins** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Landscape conservation zone was introduced to protect areas of high scenic value and environmental value, which I support in principle. However, the way it's currently being applied or proposed to be applied, especially when combined with biodiversity or scenic overlays and SAPs, means that most development applications, even for minor residential or rural buildings, default from permitted to discretionary. And this creates significant barriers for ordinary landowners. additional time, consultants' reports, the visual ecological bushfire reports, and often the addition of a binding part five agreement. Given that the landscape conservation zone already includes stringent controls on vegetation clearance and development visibility, what is the planning justification for applying additional overlays that trigger discretionary assessments for otherwise low impact or permitted uses? In other words, how does Council ensure that cumulative regulatory laying is proportionate to the actual landscape values present on each property and not simply a duplication of existing LCZ provisions?

Officer's Response:

The Planning Authority will address detailed responses regarding the zoning methodology, alternative zoning options, and any points of divergence through its formal submissions and evidence presented at the Local Provisions Schedule (LPS) hearings conducted by the Tasmanian Planning Commission. This process ensures that all matters are considered transparently, placed on public record, and assessed in accordance with the Section 8A Zone Guidelines, the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy, and relevant State Policies. Additionally, Council has recently resolved to engage an independent planning consultant to undertake a review of the application of the Landscape Conservation Zone in Kingborough. Both the Council and the Commission will evaluate all materials tabled during the hearings, including information provided by the community and the independent consultant. Any revised recommendations will be supported by evidence and presented as part of the hearing process prior to a final decision being made.

Adriaan Stander, Lead Strategic Planner

9.7 Definition of Landscape Values

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Ms Tamika Adkins** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

The term landscape value is repeatedly used across reports, zoning rationales and officer assessments as justification for both the application of the LCZ and for requiring that discretionary uses demonstrate compatibility to those values. However, neither of the State planning provisions nor the Kingborough local provision schedule provide a clear or measurable definition of landscape values. Councillors have previously confirmed the lack of definition. Without a clear definition, both applicants and assessors are left to interpret landscape values subjectively, and that introduces inconsistency and certainty in the assessment process. So LCZ specifically requires that discretionary use must have regard to the landscape values of the site and surrounding area. But if those values aren't defined, applicants can't reasonably demonstrate compliance and councils can't objectively determine it. So my question is, how can a development application be assessed as compliant with landscape values when the term is not clearly defined or consistently applied within the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, the State planning provisions or Council supporting documentations?

Officer's Response:

The term '*landscape values*' appears in the Landscape Conservation Zone provisions and must be considered when assessing several standards within the Zone. However, the Tasmanian Planning Scheme does not provide a formal definition of this term. Guidance on interpretation is discussed in Council's Supporting Report for the draft Local Provisions Schedule (LPS), available on Council's website. An independent review is currently being commissioned to examine the application of the LCZ in the draft LPS, including the methodology for interpreting '*landscape values*'. It is important to note that many terms within the Tasmanian Planning Scheme are undefined and still require consideration during application assessments. In such cases, planning staff rely on their expertise, established planning principles, application materials and relevant planning case law to ensure consistent and informed decision-making.

Adriaan Stander, Lead Strategic Planner

9.8 Minimum Lot Sizes

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Ms Tamika Adkins** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

The minimum lot size is 50 hectares, which is 140-something acres. With a potential reduction to 20 hectares in limited circumstances, it's a fundamental component of LCZ and reflects the zone's intended purpose, which is to manage large, predominantly undeveloped landscapes with limited subdivision potential. Applying landscape conservation zone to existing smaller rural or semi-rural lots is inconsistent with the zone purpose statement under the State Planning Provisions, which states, 'LCZ is intended for large areas of contiguous natural landscape rather than fragmented or semi-developed blocks'. We have so many smaller properties that already sit within the rural living zone and are further constrained by overlays and subcategories which already ensure careful management of vegetation and landscape characters. Rezoning smaller properties to LCZ therefore offers little or no addition to conservation benefit, but significantly increases regulatory burden, preventing reasonable subdivision, triggering more discretionary applications, and reducing land value use and flexibility. Why is Council proposing to apply LCZ to land parcels that do not meet the minimum lot size requirement of the zone, and how can these smaller properties be assessed under a zone whose minimum area standards they cannot meet?

Officer's Response:

As noted in previous questions and answers, an independent review of the application of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) is currently being commissioned. In accordance with the direction issued by the Tasmanian Planning Commission, this review will be guided by the Section 8A guidelines, relevant strategies and policies (including STRLUS), and evidence presented during the hearings to date. A key objective of the review is to identify and apply alternative zones to properties currently proposed for LCZ where appropriate. The findings of the review will be submitted to the Commission for consideration as part of the hearings and the subsequent decision-making process.

Adriaan Stander, Lead Strategic Planner

9.9 Trees and Overhanging Branches

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Mr Ted Hale** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

There's been discussion or points raised about fire safety to do with trees. And I highlight probably Tinderbox Road is a really good example. The recent winds we had, I'm aware of two large trees

that came down across Tinderbox Road. But there's a very large amount of overhead branches, many of which are dead and quite heavy, which are inevitably going to hit the road. So what is Council's policy about clearing overhead, because there's certainly a potential for a fatal accident and major problems if that's not attended to?

Officer's Response:

Council routinely removes dangerous trees or limbs from the roadside with an average annual expenditure of \$205k (\$40k YTD in 2025 FY). Dangerous trees are either identified by crew inspections or reports from members of the community.

An inspection of Tinderbox Road has been undertaken and whilst there were some sections of the road with overhanging branches, these were not dead or dying. If there are specific trees that are causing concern, it is recommended that the specific location be reported to Council for assessment.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.10 Consultant

At the Council meeting on 3 November 2025, **Mr Marcus Redeker** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

With progression on the independent consultant, did we say mid next week we would be finding out an outcome for that?

Officer's Response:

The formal request for proposals closes on 17 November 2025, and the assessment process will be treated as a priority. Council has sought advice from its Finance and Procurement team to ensure that the selection process is robust and fully compliant with Council's policies and procedures.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

C321/20-2025

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 Glade-Wright asked the following questions without notice:

10.1 Local Provisions Schedule

I note that there are many codes and overlays. Some of these include the Natural Assets Code, the Scenic Protection Code, codes for bushfire, landslide and erosion, waterway and coastal protection overlays and overlays for vegetation and biodiversity. So my question is, given the zone purpose of the rural living zone provides for residential use or development in a rural setting where existing natural and landscape values are to be retained, and given there are several codes and overlays which provide environmental controls, what is being protected in the rural living zone which is being protected in the landscape conservation zone?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

That's a very complex question. And you're right, many codes apply across our municipality and often multiple on a particular property. So each property is different in terms of what is being protected and what is not. So some properties may not have any of those codes applying. Some may have two, three or more, depending on the features of the land. What is being protected is outlined in the zone, its purpose itself, landscape conservation. So it is the landscape values that is not specifically referenced in the other zones or the natural values overlay.

Cr Glade-Wright:

If we proposed that more of our environmental living zones shift to rural living zone, given rural living zone D provides for minimum lot sizes of 10 hectares, why would overdevelopment be a concern?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I would just like to provide some clarification to the previous question. It's around the extent and significance of those landscape values in terms of the zoning and what its purpose is to protect.

The difference between the zoning for landscape conservation value, landscape conservation zone and rural living zone is different. So rural living D is 10 hectares, but there is rural living A, B and C - one hectare, two hectares and five hectares. It would then depend on which zone is applied, which subcategory is applied. For example the logical conclusion is that if Rural Living A is applied, then the potential subdivision lot size is much smaller, therefore it would be quite different. In terms of your point around Rural Living D, that is still a smaller size than landscape conservation zone. I'm not saying either is right or wrong, but that just is the difference between the lot sizes. When there is greater subdivision potential, then you will have increased densification in a particular area, potentially and if, for example, people are putting a dwelling on that, there is a level of clearing that needs to occur, not just for the dwelling itself but also for the bushfire management area, which would apply generally to most of our municipality. So there is a difference in terms of the potential impacts that apply in rural living versus landscape conservation zone has. Again, it depends on the suitability of that particular area and property as to whether it's categorised to landscape conservation or rural living.

Cr Glade-Wright:

What are the environmental controls that are deemed necessary to be included in specific area plans that are not provided for in codes and overlays?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

The specific controls, and this is difficult for me to answer on the spot without the particular wording of each SAP before me, they're not just rural living zone or landscape conservation zone. There are other zoning in those areas and those particular SAPs have local values or landscape values that is being proposed. But again, particularly the Bonnett Hill and the Bruny Island SAP is being reviewed. I don't want to talk with certainty about the outcomes of that, however, there are particular landscape values in all of those SAP areas that may not be protected due to that other zoning that applies that is not rural living or landscape conservation.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

10.2 Candidate Statements

There was a question by Mr Biggins around the ASU statement and he mentioned that candidates are required to sign it. Could you clarify if it's required or requested that candidates sign?

Mayor responds:

It's requested.

Cr Antolli:

Thank you. So it's not required.

Mayor:

No.

10.3 Consultant

Mr. Woolley was asking questions about independence of the consultant from planning staff, and I think that was relatively well answered. Is that process going to be led by the consultant or advised by the consultant? Who is the lead and who's in charge and who's answering to whom?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

The process is procured by Council, so Council owns the process. However, the consultant is being contracted to lead a review of that process. As part of that there is an expectation that that consultant will be relying upon and having inputs from all the information gathered thus far through the process and the insights about what has happened so far. There's a lot of information that would be lost if staff were not involved in that process in any way, so the expectation is that they are providing input. In terms of the accountability behind that, ultimately that sits with me around making sure that that's a fair, unbiased process and that we're delivering the best possible outcome at the back end of it.

Cr Antolli:

And if the CEO could maybe help the community know and understand the oversight that the planning authority has with regards to your interaction with the consultant, if you could give some clarity to the community, maybe some comfort to the community that it's actually the planning authority that is overseeing the process, delegating to yourself.

Chief Executive Officer:

Through the process and through the Notice of Motion that came in, and the consequential resolution of Council, ultimately that report is produced and will come back to Council for its approval before it goes back to the Tasmanian Planning Commission. So that is something that is done through me in order to enact that resolution of Council. But you're right, the Council and acting as the Planning Authority, ultimately has the oversight that it will come back through this group for approval before it goes back to the Planning Commission.

Cr Antolli:

Could you update the community on where we're at with the whole process, the tendering, the consultant who's been chosen, if anybody, and how is the process of choosing the finalised consultant, how is the planning authority involved in the choice, or is it you that's just making the choice on your own?

Chief Executive Officer:

The tender process closes today, so we haven't got a preferred contractor at this point, but we are in receipt of applications to that process, tenders to that process. From there, there'll be a panel produced which will then assess the validity of those applications using both price and non-price attributes to consider the relative merits of the tenders that we've received. From that point we'll produce a memo with recommendation that'll be sent to Councillors as the planning authority to

review all the materials received and the recommendation and then ultimately following on from that point we will appoint a contractor to it. The reason that we have done it that way is because of timing. Ultimately, we want to be able to appoint this role as fast as possible. So we will do that in our offline process at this point. If there are concerns from Councillors about that, we will look at a more formal mechanism to conveying to Council in order to discuss and appoint that contractor.

Cr Richardson asked the following questions without notice:

10.4 Letter to the Tasmanian Planning Commission

Last meeting, Cr Antolli followed up on a question from Cr Deane relating to Council writing to the TPC and advocating for the allowance of late submissions for people who did not know that their property was going to be zoned to LCZ. I just wanted to follow up, has that happened as yet?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

Yes, a letter has been sent to the TPC. I've also had informal conversations with them about the fact that this was coming to make sure that they were ready to respond, so I would expect a response to come back from them sometime soon.

Cr Richardson:

And in those informal conversations, was there any indication on which way that might go?

Chief Executive Officer:

There was no direct indication of the response. There are various things at play. Obviously, there's the Council response to the direction 69 that we've received and understanding the context of the work that has been done there. Additionally, there were directions issued to third parties that submitted a number of representations on behalf of other property owners. And there is work being done around the response of those property owners to the to the representations provided by a third party. There's some complexity in that, which they indicated, but they didn't give me a steer of exactly what the response would say.

Cr Richardson:

What is the intended process that we'll follow once we receive the reply to that letter? How will we publicise its contents?

Chief Executive Officer:

In the first instance, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, my understanding is would publish the letter that they have received from me and would publish the response that they send back to me. It will be publicly available in that way. Additionally, depending on the outcome of it, there might be actions that then become incumbent on Council in order to enact whatever the response is. The answer is, it depends a little bit on what the information is, but my understanding is that that information will be published on the Tasmanian Planning Commission website.

Cr Richardson:

And would it be fair to assume that, regardless of the outcome, we will find some way to communicate that to the public?

Chief Executive Officer:

Yes, acknowledging that it's not our decision around supplementary public consultation on the process at this stage, and the previous indications from the commission had been that the exhibition period was closed. There weren't further representations that were being accepted at this stage. If

there was a change from that status quo, we would absolutely be communicating that to the community.

Cr Cordover asked the following questions on notice:

10.5 Feral Cat Management

Is Council is in a position to increase the scale and scope of our feral cat trapping operations to the extent necessary to make a meaningful impact in reducing the feral cat population in Kingborough? Anecdotally, there's just so many more sightings of feral cats now, particularly in our rural and regional areas. If members of the community are willing to have their private property used for cat trapping purposes, is there an online form on our website or is that something that we're doing call outs to the community to ask them to offer their land for cat trapping? Or are we at a point in terms of capacity where if a thousand people say, you can come and trap on my private land, are we in a position to accommodate those requests?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I'm not actually sure of the answer to that in terms of our capacity. We obviously have limited resourcing across our organisation for various risks and threats, particularly in our natural areas team, and we are having to balance managing different values, risks and threats at any one time. We do have a robust cat management program and a lot of work has been put into education, awareness, trapping, working with other agencies on that. I would have to consult with the team as to whether we put that type of initiative in place as to whether we could manage that or not. We will have to take that on notice.

Cr Cordover:

My follow up open-ended question is it would help strategically, from a kind of councillor perspective, to have the knowledge about what threshold of feral cat trapping is actually meaningful. So if we're just taking out 16 cats at a time when I can walk around Allen's Rivulet and I can probably find 16 feral cats running around Allen's Rivulet, how meaningful is the cat trapping that we're currently undertaking and what are the benchmarks that we're trying to achieve? On Bruny Island, trapping 16 cats is material, that does make a big difference. Having a bit more information around what counts as success for our cat trapping program would be really interesting to me.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I agree that would be good information to have. I would say some of the biggest impact we have is through education and awareness of responsible cat ownership as well.

Cr Deane asked the following question without notice:

10.6 Aquatic Facility Steering Committee

Last year, Council formed an aquatic facilities steering committee, and as part of the work that they've done, in support with staff at the end of last year, applied for a federal grant to help us to further explore the possibility of a pool or an aquatic facility. It's coming up to a year and given the fact that we were hoping for a response, either yay or nay in the first half of the year, I was wondering, Mayor, whether you or the CEO might on behalf of the committee, write to the Minister for an update so that we might be able to progress with our work? I note today there was a press release with the Minister and our local member, Julie Collins, that \$4.8 million have been given to Clarence and Hobart City for consultation and design work for two other projects, yet we seem for a far less amount have been bypassed. A formal update would be fantastic.

Mayor responds:

Yes, I can do that.

C322/20-2025**11 QUESTIONS ON 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.

11.1 Use of Poison

At the Council meeting held on 3 November 2025, **Cr Antolli** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

This one that came up in the newspapers on the weekend about a poison known as 1080, which is used to handle rodents, animal infestation etc. Is that a poison that we use in Council and do we have a position on that if we do?

Officer's Response:

1080 is permitted for use on a range of pest animals in Tasmania. The decision to use 1080 rests with the relevant land management authority, its use must be justified by a demonstrated need within that control program. Current Council programs do not demonstrate this need, as 1080 would not be effective or appropriate given species targeted, alternative options or the context of the program and activities.

Council recognises that 1080 remains an important tool in certain invasive species management contexts, including targeted feral cat control. Council works collaboratively with a range of agencies that undertake invasive species management and acknowledges that, from time to time, these agencies may need to apply 1080 in a highly controlled and targeted manner to achieve control program objectives.

Council's pest and invasive species control programs currently involve the following:

Rodent control - 1080 is not utilised by Council. Where rodenticides are used, Council also avoids the use of Second-generation Anticoagulant Rodenticides (SGARs) to minimise the risk of secondary poisoning to native wildlife and domestic animals.

Cat Management - 1080 is not part of Council's Cat Management Program, which focuses primarily on community education and humane trapping. Where cats are trapped and a field assessment cannot be undertaken (for example, via microchip detection), they are taken to a cat management facility or veterinarian for further assessment. If assessed as feral, humane euthanasia is undertaken by the facility or vet in accordance with associated animal welfare and ethics standards.

Deer Management - Local Councils have not yet been charged with the responsibility of on ground deer control in Tasmania, with current control activities being led primarily by regional deer control officers. Established programs have demonstrated that, with low bait applications rates and methods used in modern day operations, 1080 has limited impact on deer populations unless other food sources are scarce.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

11.2 Consultant

At the Council meeting held on 3 November 2025, **Cr Midgley** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

With the engagement of the consultant in review of the LCZ and the provision of the draft local provisions schedule, is there any mechanism for landowners who have not previously provided a representation to do so now?

Officer's Response:

This matter is not currently within the scope of the review. The review must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Direction 69, and the Commission has advised that no further representations can be accepted. Careful consideration will be required to ensure the review complies with both of these requirements.

Council will need to seek advice from the Commission on whether the review could incorporate input from landowners who have not previously made a representation. It should also be noted that the review must be completed in a timely manner to allow hearings to resume in 2026; therefore, the scope must remain achievable.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

12 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

A report on the petition headed 'Installation of Footpaths and Upgrades on Cleburne Street, Kingston' will be provided at a future meeting of Council.

13 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

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

14 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C323/20-2025**14.1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT (TARGETED REFORM) BILL 2025**

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

That Council:

1. Endorses the positions outlined in this report as Kingborough Council's formal response to the Draft Local Government Amendment (Targeted Reform) Bill 2025; and
2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to submit the Council's response to the Office of Local Government.

CARRIED

C324/20-2025**14.2 PROJECT DELIVERY REVIEW**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council notes the findings of project reviews of the Summerleas Road Underpass and the Main Street Kingston Bus Stop and notes the improvement plans underway within the Engineering Department.

*Cr Richardson left the room at 6.52pm
Cr Richardson returned at 6.54pm*

CARRIED

C325/20-2025**14.3 AUDIT PANEL APPOINTMENT**

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

That Mr Paul Viney be re-appointed to the Audit Panel as an independent member for a period of four years expiring in January 2030.

CARRIED

C326/20-2025**14.4 ANNUAL REPORT 2024/25**

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

That Council endorse the attached Annual Report 2024/25.

CARRIED

C327/20-2025**14.5 FINANCIAL REPORT - OCTOBER 2025**

Moved: Cr Mark Richardson
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council endorses the attached Financial Report as at 31 October 2025.

CARRIED

C328/20-2025**14.6 APPENDICES**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

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

CARRIED

15 NOTICES OF MOTION

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

C329/20-2025**16 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

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

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

Open Session of Council adjourned at 7.07pm

Public Copy

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 7.10pm

C330/20-2025

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane
 Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

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 7.11pm

.....
 (Confirmed)

.....
 (Date)