

# Kingborough



## COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

19 January 2026

*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

<b>Item</b>		<b>Page No.</b>
<b>Open Session</b>		
	1 Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians	1
	2 Attendees	1
C1/1-2026	3 Apologies	1
C2/1-2026	4 Confirmation of Minutes	2
	5 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	6 Declarations of Interest	2
	7 Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C3/1-2026	8 Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1 Algona Road Shared Path	2
	8.4 DA – Adelong Drive	3
	8.5 Outcome of 2023 AGM Motion (Kirkpatrick)	3
	8.6 Motions Moved at Annual General Meetings	4
	8.7 Zoning	6
	8.8 Bushfire Mitigation	7
	8.9 Blue Markings, Kingston Beach	9
	8.10 Fire Risk on Roads	9
	8.11 Bruny Ferry	11
	8.12 Percentage of Community For and Against LCZ	11
	8.13 Independent Consultants	12
	8.14 Silverwater Park	13
	8.15 Decision Making	13
C4/1-2026	9 Questions on Notice from the Public	14
	9.1 Publication of Consultants Reports	14
	9.2 Consultants	15
	9.3 Lost Property	16
	9.4 Property Values	16
C5/1-2026	10 Questions without Notice from Councillors	16
	10.1 Digitising Annual Reports	16
	10.2 Rural Roads	17
	10.3 Ownership of Sandfly Road and Old Huon Highway	17
	10.4 Bushfire Risk Mitigation	17
	10.5 Cat Management, Huntingfield Development	18

## Table of Contents

<b>Item</b>		<b>Page No.</b>
	11 Questions on Notice from Councillors	18
	12 Officers Reports to Planning Authority	19
C6/1-2026	12.1 Request for Consent to Build Outside the Building Envelope on CT 179428/5 at 14E Bonnie Vale Drive, Howden	19
	13 Petitions still being Actioned	20
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period	20
	15 Officers Reports to Council	20
C7/1-2026	15.1 AGM Motion Response: Review and Withdrawal of Council's Biodiversity Offset Policy	20
C8/1-2026	15.2 Annual General Meeting Notice of Motions - Change of Zoning for draft Local Provisions Schedule	21
C9/1-2026	15.3 Audit of Delegations	22
C10/1-2026	15.4 Draft Electoral Reforms Bill	22
C11/1-2026	15.5 Disability Inclusion & Access Advisory Committee Community Nominations	22
C12/1-2026	15.6 Financial Report - December 2025	23
C13/1-2026	15.7 Appendices	24
	16 Notices of Motion	24
C14/1-2026	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	24

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council  
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston  
Monday, 19 January 2026 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 F Fox  
Councillor A Midgley  
Councillor C Street

## Staff:

Chief Executive Officer  
Director People & Finance  
Director Engineering Services  
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services  
Director Environment, Development & Community Services  
Manager Environmental Services  
Communications Officer  
Executive Assistant

Mr Dave Stewart  
Mr David Spinks  
Mr Craig Mackey  
Mr Daniel Smee  
Ms Deleeze Chetcutt  
Ms Liz Quinn  
Mr Stuart Heather  
Mrs Amanda Morton

C1/1-2026

## 3 APOLOGIES

Councillor M Richardson

C2/1-2026

#### 4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

---

Moved: Cr Flora Fox  
Seconded: Cr David Bain

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 22 held on 15 December 2025 be confirmed as a true record.

**CARRIED**

#### 5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

---

Date	Topic	Detail
12 January	2026 Priorities and Operational Update	Discussion on the annual priorities and an operational update

#### 6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

---

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

---

There were no agenda items transferred.

C3/1-2026

#### 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 Mark Donnellon** asked the following questions without notice:

##### 8.1 Algona Road Shared Path

*The Algona Road shared path feasibility study has \$50,000 budgeted and unspent. What external work is remaining on this and why is it not completed yet?*

**Director Engineering Services responds :**

I can't fully assist on that, but I can take that on notice and provide a response.

##### 8.2 AFL High Performance Centre

*There's an item listed for AFL High Performance Centre, a non budgeted expense of \$300,000 on page 44. It's my understanding that the Council isn't paying for any part of the AFL High Performance Centre. What does this expense relate to?*

**Chief Executive Officer:**

The AFL High Performance Centre project is being done on a cost recovery basis with the State. We have had an arrangement where our staff are seconded technically into the State Government to be able to fund the payroll and things like that. However, there has been a piece of time where that has not been cost recovered as yet, but that is something that we still need to address. So it's a timing issue.

**8.3 Street Lights and Power**

*There's an item for street lights and power of \$130,000. Don't private developers and TasNetworks cover the cost of streetlights? How did this become an expense for Council?*

**Director Engineering Services:**

I'll also have to take that one on notice.

**Chief Executive Officer:**

I can add some context and we'll still take it on notice. There's a mixed ownership model with the street lighting that we have across the municipal area. Some street lights are owned by the State Government through TasNetworks and others are directly owned by us. There is responsibility from Council for the electricity that powers those and we have sought last year through a bulk procurement using local government across the State to get the best possible rates for the funding of power into those, so making sure that we're getting the best possible rate for that expenditure, but we'll take the detailed answer on notice.

**Ms Chrissy Ford** asked the following question without notice:

**8.4 DA – Adelong Drive**

*I live in Tonic Hill Court. There's a proposal going on there for a multi dwelling at 16 Adelong Drive. you. My question is, I've been on tender hooks since the 13<sup>th</sup> December with the letter in my letterbox, how is it progressing and when do we get a date of what will happen? I'm very stressed about it.*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

I'm sorry to hear that it's causing distress for you. I can't answer that right now without looking into our system. But I will endeavour to reach out tomorrow to provide you with an update.

**Ms Tamieka Adkins** asked the following questions without notice:

**8.5 Outcome of 2023 AGM Motion (Kirkpatrick)**

*At the 2023 AGM, Miss Georgina Kirkpatrick moved a motion intended to discourage Council from rejecting or disregarding consultancy reports that have been requested by Council and commissioned by landlords, solely because Council did not agree with the consultants recommendations. What action did Council take in response to this AGM motion and what was the final outcome?*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

I believe we provided a response to a similar question, potentially in an agenda last year or maybe the year before. But in summary, we held a workshop with elected members and presented to them why technical reports are requested, including environmental reports and why, at times planning staff may not be satisfied with a report and it can be for various reasons. There might be errors or incorrect

methodology used, plans don't align etc. Obviously in those instances we will ask for them to be amended. In the instance where we potentially disagree with the recommendation, the outcome there was that staff were to escalate that to the director, being myself and then, if needed, the CEO to determine whether we should be requesting further information to address our concerns.

**Ms Adkins:**

That was 2023. When was that workshop held?

**Mayor:**

My recollection would have been that it was early in 2024 because we have to respond to notices of motion in a timely way. We have to bring them on to the agenda.

**Ms Adkins:**

It was actually October 2024 is my understanding and I just wanted to hear whether that was right or not from Council.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

I will have to take that on notice. It potentially was later in the year.

**Ms Adkins:**

What was the reason for such a long delay? I mean, this was unanimously passed and we still don't know if the motion has been passed through Council. What was the actual outcome? Is it still being workshopped? Has anything been documented on it? Mrs Kirkpatrick's DA is still not approved and I understand that's still going through, but I'm just wondering why it's taken 2 years to have a motion finalised or discarded.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

My understanding and recollection, and I can go back and look at the various correspondence and documentation on this, is that it is finalised.

**Ms Adkins:**

So there has been a motion passed through Council that included her suggestion on the motion that she actually passed. The motion passed by her that was unanimously supported by the floor, has been workshopped. The outcome of the workshop was what, is my question?

**Mayor:**

It should have come back to Council as I can't recall, so we'll need to take that part of the question on notice to make sure that we have closed the loop on that because as you're aware, under the Local Government Act, we need to report back on any motions that are passed at the AGM.

**Mr Charles Biggins** asked the following questions without notice:

**8.6 Motions Moved at Annual General Meetings**

*Why did Council not engage with Georgina Kirkpatrick at any time during the 10 months between the December 2023 AGM and the October 2024 workshop to clarify the intent of the motion from the floor and to assist with any rewording that may follow?*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

I don't believe we felt it was necessary, but I'll have to take that on notice.

**Mr Biggins:**

At the Council meeting that followed the AGM in December 2023, it was articulated by Councillors, including Cr Antolli and others that supported the intent of the motion and assurance was sought that the mover of the motion would be consulted prior to or during the workshop process. Why hasn't a revised motion from the October 2024 workshop based on the intent of the 2023 AGM motion found its way to this Chamber? It's been 15 months since the motion was workshopped and 25 months since the AGM Motion was unanimously passed.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

As previously indicated and I apologise, I can't recall the specific details of correspondence or dates of workshops etc we will take that on notice so that we can provide a comprehensive response.

**Mayor:**

Can I just add to that, one of the questions that you asked was why hadn't Council returned a revised motion similar to the one that was brought by the member of the community to the Chamber, it's not our responsibility under the Act to do that. A motion that is passed at an AGM, we can't amend the wording of that motion to have it read differently, is the advice that I've received.

**Mr Biggins:**

That was the conversation at the December 2023 Council meeting the last Council meeting for 2023. Those points as you rightly said, were brought forward, that's why Councillors sought assurance at that Council meeting that the mover of the motion would be consulted as Council workshopped the intent of this motion.

What confidence can Kingborough ratepayers have that their attendance at a Council AGM, for which only ratepayers and residents can move motions from the floor or vote on a motion moved from the floor and their subsequent participation in the legislative function of Council's body corporate functions is going to be acted on in a timely and effective manner?

**Mayor:**

Certainly, we strive to ensure that we're meeting our statutory obligations as outlined in the Local Government Act and following last year's AGM very quickly within the first available meeting to provide a timetable of when the items that were raised at the AGM in December last year would be responded to. Some of those issues do take quite significant time to work through and provide advice, and it may be that there are workshops that are required so that Councillors fully understand all the issues prior to voting on the motions that have been put forward. We certainly do strive to do it in the most timely way that we can, but we also need to ensure that our staff are able to prioritise resources where they are needed and, as we know, we have been fairly stretched across the organisation over the last 12 to 18 months as matters have arisen in the planning area.

**Mr Biggins:**

Please acknowledge that the optics of this are not good, that a motion moved unanimously at an AGM, is then discussed at the following Council meeting, and it's agreed upon that it will be workshopped, and then that workshop doesn't take place for almost 10 months and there's no correspondence with the mover and the motion, and a report from that workshop doesn't even find its way back to the chamber. The optics are not good, regardless of what legal minimum requirements you may have. Could we please for the benefit of the community, have some acknowledgement.

**Mayor:**

We will check the flow of that motion through the Council and through our processes, as Ms Chetcuti has said. If there has been a significant delay, I acknowledge that that is not something that I believe meets the standards of service that the community would expect, so I'd be disappointed if it hadn't

come back through here, but we will double check to ensure that we can provide some information and I believe that Ms Chetcuti might have some cause she's waving at me.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

I have just looked through our agenda items that there was a report that went to Council on this AGM motion and that was on the 18<sup>th</sup> December 2023.

**Mr Biggins:**

Yes, that is the Council meeting that followed the AGM of 2023 where the Councillors discussed the motion and agreed to take it to workshop. It went to workshop, there was no follow up with the mover of the motion, there was no report back to the Chamber.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

The recommendation in that report was that processes for application assessment, including review of proposed plans, be continued in the same manner and the mover of the motion be advised of Council's decision. Now my understanding is that the recommendation ended up being that there was a workshop to review the process, and we would advise. And so that was deferred as well.

**Mr Biggins:**

Yes 10 months later.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

I can't recall whether the recommendation was that it needed to come back to Council.

**Mayor:**

This is becoming a back and forth, which is not the purpose of question time. I think, so that we've all got some clarity and we have the facts before us before discussing this any further, we will, as undertaken by Ms Chetcuti, we will get this answered on notice and then if you have any further questions in relation to it, we'd welcome those at a following Council meeting.

**Mr Joel Hodson** asked the following questions without notice:

**8.7 Zoning**

*I have a question on notice from 20 October last year that hasn't been answered regarding performance criteria within the LPS regarding building access to roads across a number of zones. Following on from that, I contacted property services at Parks and Wildlife Service, who are responsible for Crown roads. They informed me there is a work around, but it involves an owner purchasing the road effectively rather than a leasehold as is currently acceptable. But I'm not sure what Council's position on this is? The information I got from property services was that a number of other councils have decided to just ignore that performance criteria and I'm not sure how that's possible in a legislative document, and I'm not sure what this Council's opinion or what you're planning on doing regarding this?*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

We are aware of this matter and we did include some commentary in our report to the Planning Commission about this particular requirement and the complexity that it entails. They are provisions of the State Planning Provisions. Council and the Planning Authority don't have direct influence of what is or is not in those planning provisions. We do provide feedback through the review process which we have done and I believe other councils have done so as well. What we are going to do, hopefully in the next couple of weeks, is to liaise with other councils that have already implemented the Tasmanian Planning Scheme and have a discussion about how they are approaching this matter

and also seeking some advice from the State Planning Office as well, so that we can provide our applicants and land owners some advice around how it could be applied or should be applied and what Kingborough's thoughts are in terms of how we might be looking at that in future assessments. Noting that we're not there yet and we do need to comply with the scheme as it is written, but we are endeavouring to find out some more information so that we can provide guidance.

**Mr Hodson:**

How peoples zone will impact whether they can meet this criteria or not, the advice that I've seen and the advice that I've received from the State Planning Office and from property services, are very conflicting in nature. How do I have faith that what happens with zoning changes is not going to impact what I can currently do on my property as it stands or what my neighbors can do, or if my neighbor purchases the land, if this is the path we have to take, my neighbor purchases the land and puts up a boom gate up and no one can access it because they own the road. It's a pickle and it's a pickle that can be solved through zoning currently. So I wonder if Council is looking at the application of those zones and whether this obvious solution in rural living zone will fix this issue?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

In terms of how we apply zones in the draft LPS, that's not a specific consideration that we are directed to consider in our recommendations to the TPC. I don't believe it is a direct consideration for the TPC either in their decision making. However, if that is presented as evidence at the hearings, it can be thought about in terms of the suitability of zoning.

**Ms Alison Rogers** asked the following question without notice:

**8.8 Bushfire Mitigation**

*I've just come back from holidaying through Victoria and South Australia and saw first hand some devastating situations and also the trepidation of people in surrounding areas that were on watch during the most recent Victorian fires. I think it's well documented now that we are at a risk here in Kingborough and indeed in other municipalities in Tasmania and I think there's a little bit of confusion out there still. The reason why I'm asking it here is to have it on record in the meeting rather than people having to individually turn up at the Council to ask the question in relation to what people can actually do on their own property at the moment to reduce fuel loads and hazards and and to mitigate their risk? Obviously, in the planning scheme, there are some exemptions in relation to what people can and can't do on their property in relation to the removal of vegetation to protect their home from any bush fire scenarios. The reality is right now that if something was to start within the region, that it could be quite devastating. Is there something that the Council can produce, whether it's on your website or in some other thing, that can maybe clarify what people can actually do and the reason why I'm asking that is that when we did attend a cool burning workshop recently with Jason Smith, the people in the workshop realised that there's a lot of work that needs to be done to reduce their hazard on their property at the moment. There are a lot of sticks, dead, bark, everything on the ground and one of the comments that we made is that people need to pick up sticks for the next probably 10 or 20 years to actually reduce that risk. But then someone came back at me and said, but we can't pick up sticks because we can't interrupt any habitat. So I wanted to get clarity around that, because I think there's a little bit of misinformation out there in relation to what people can and can't do and I think it would actually help people to be a little bit more proactive in that area to protect everybody if we could get some clarity around what can and can't be picked up and removed in order to protect people's homes from bushfires?*

**Mayor responds:**

Your suggestion of a some sort of resource in relation to bush fire risks and how it relates to the planning setting is already on our website. There's a fact sheet that's been up there for quite some time and in the past when we've been asked this question in the Chamber, we have directed people to have a look at that because what that clearly says is that the zoning changes within the incoming

planning scheme will not change the risk of bush fire and does not directly limit your ability to manage bush fire risk. But what I'm hearing from what you're saying is there's confusion as to how that actually translates on the ground for people, so that's something that we would need to look at to provide additional information so that we can ensure that what is available for people to do, they're aware of it. Ms Chetcuti, did you want to add anything to that?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

No, not specifically. I think it's better done through communication, so rather than answering on the spot so that it's absolutely accurate, comprehensive and clear. So we will take a look at that.

**Ms Rogers:**

My second question is related to that in as far as what is Council doing in relation to bush fire mitigation? We have seen a Mayor of a nearby municipality in the news of recent times purporting to say that they are the most prepared municipality and the most proactive municipality in relation to bush fire mitigation and hazard reduction. What is it that the Kingborough Council are actually doing to ensure that we have safe roads to escape should a situation arise, and also what's happening on Council owned land, not crown, but council owned land, but also in consultation with the government in relation to crown land that is also in the municipality, that may pose a risk?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

I'll start with the first part of the question, which related to what we're doing in terms of preparedness. So first of all, we do have a lot of information on our website about what Council's role is and how you can engage with us and different organisations about household preparedness or property preparedness. We have participated in and delivered different programs around our municipality in all the different areas. In terms of running information sessions, usually that will involve having the TFS, the SES there as well, and residents of the area can go along and attend and learn about what they can do for their property as well as some really practical tips and provision of lists, for example, what to have prepared in your home. We also participated in a really successful program called Sparking Conversations which was in partnership with Hobart City, and that was a very successful program and through that and other programs, residents were able to have their property assessed for bush fire risk and some tailored advice provided around what they can do to help. We're continuing with that programming and we try to look at the different areas in our municipality. We try to target it to more vulnerable areas in terms of bush fire risk, but I suppose other risks too if we're doing it in terms of flood preparedness etc and we continue to partner with the key agencies and organisations to do that. In terms of overall municipal preparedness in terms of infrastructure and roads, we maintain our roads to standard. In terms of our own land, we manage that in accordance with our requirements and risk to ensure that our own reserves are not posing an unreasonable risk to our municipality either being an ignition source or something that might contribute further to a bush fire in the area. Council itself is not the main fire agency. There are three in Tasmania, but we do sit on various committees and formal forums where we are consulting with those agencies and align our planning according to the State fire risk planning.

**Ms Rogers:**

Just to finish off on that, you're satisfied that your program in terms of your roads are at a point where if a fire was to break out this weekend that that road is not posing a risk in terms of branches and trees coming down over the road that are already hanging over the road?

**Manager Environmental Services:**

It's unfortunately not reasonable to not have risk, so risk is something, of course, that we all know that we live with all the time and so at Council, as with most organisations, we're not aiming for no risk or safe. We're aiming to lessen risk. And that's what we do through our bush fire management program. I definitely want to acknowledge that there is risk out there and that is not something as we know as we've seen as you say in Victoria and other places that we can mitigate. We can do what we can to build our resilience and prepare. In terms of our road program, we've assessed risk across our road

network and looked at where those evacuation routes are likely to be, and we're working through a program of works to reduce risk, but you can imagine that will take a long time, a lot of resources. The key message in road usage is leave early. That is the State Government's, the Tasmanian Fire Services message, is to leave early, it's not to wait until the road is on fire because, as you can imagine, that is way too late. I really want to be clear that Council's message is in line with the Tasmanian Fire Service, which is to leave early.

**Ms Alison Rogers** asked the following question without notice:

**8.9 Blue Markings, Kingston Beach**

*I was in Kingston Beach today and we've had a number of people that have approached us to indicate that it is wearing off already, even though it is a new application. We have blue stuff all the way up and down roads, on the footpaths and in gutters, in grates on gutters, and I have photographs if you want to see those. I know that some advice that got given on social media was that this epoxy resin product is safe and non-toxic and doesn't dissolve in water. However, these have made it to our drains and now will go out into our waterway. I'm just wondering what research has been done that the Council relied on in relation to this product in the waterway, and if a fish ingests it, what is it doing to our marine life?*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

I can't probably give you the depth of response that you're asking for there in terms of any impact on marine life. What I can confirm is the safety sheet is an inert recycled glass, so it has no toxic harm or otherwise to marine life or to the environment. I do acknowledge and I walk down there routinely myself that there is some residual glass fragments that have made their way to the footpath. We've sent the street sweeper down there on a couple of occasions and it's quite natural that it will shed some of that material as it settles in. I have also noticed that there is a small section that probably needs repair but I will also commit to sending down the crews again to remove any of the residual stuff off the footpaths.

**Mayor:**

Can I add to that. We have used this product before but it's because it hasn't been in blue it's not as obvious where it is, but a section of road that we used is used it on is the corner of Maranoa Road up there near Calvin School because in wet whether because of the the slope of the road when we redid it, we applied that Omnidrip surface to that because it does provide an added level of safety in terms of if cars need to stop suddenly there's less skidding and because, like Kingston Beach, that is a an area where there are vulnerable road users, young students from the school. So we trialled it up there and that has been very successful. It did have stuff that came off the top as well, but because it was not blue it wasn't so obvious but as Mr Mackey said, we're continuing to watch to ensure that it's in a fit state.

**Mr Jamie King** asked the following questions without notice:

**8.10 Fire Risk on Roads**

*In March 2023 I think the Melbourne University submitted a report to Council stating that there was 35 kilometres of extreme fire risk road in Kingborough. In Council's mind is that an acceptable risk?*

**Chief Executive Officer responds:**

We will need to go back and have a look at that report at exactly what it says and what risk mitigation that we may have done around those particular roads. As was alluded to in the answer to a previous question, some risk is always going to be inherent in the environment and so it's about managing that as practically as we can, but also working with our community to make sure that where it's no longer practical to bring that risk level down any further that we are communicating well about how people

should be prepared and as was said earlier, leave early, not wait for that risk to fully materialise, if the worst case scenario of a fire occurred. That's not directly answering your question, I acknowledge that, but we need to go back and have a look at that material.

**Mr King:**

So we should retreat well before the roads become inaccessible?

**Mayor:**

That is the advice that the TFS gives and asks all local governments to ensure that they continue to repeat that because there have been instances in fires around Australia where people unfortunately haven't done that and then they can't get out. That is very much a message that in terms of advising our communities, it is act faster rather than try and stay and protect your property so that you know that you can get out safely.

**Mr King:**

My last question would be, with a massive influx of tourists, especially places like Bruny Island, in the case of an emergency, what would those people do?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

They would follow the instructions and advice issued by SES and they could evacuate to either somewhere else where they're visiting, if there's high risk and or to an evacuation centre which would be established if Council were directed to do so in the event of a fire and it was deemed necessary.

**Mr King:**

Just to go a little bit further, if we had 5000 shack owners on Bruny Island and 5000 tourists and there's three ferries operating in the fires heading towards the ferry terminal, what will those people do?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

This is probably questions better directed to the TFS or the fire agencies who are responsible for fire risk management in Tasmania and would have, I assume or would expect, have thought through these different scenarios. The advice that I could give is that is what we're told is that, to repeat as the Mayor said, evacuate early, there are evacuation centres, I imagine the TFS and SES would be liaising with your example with the ferry operators etc in the event of emergency, so we're not in a position where we can comment in detail on what would happen in that event.

**Mayor:**

If I can just add to that, just to be clear what our role is during such an event such as a fire on Burny Island, we are not the first responding agency, we are a partner in those events and we take our direction from the incident control team that would be set up, which would be a multi-jurisdictional one across the various agencies. I do know that following the Dunnally bushfires many years ago that there were a lot of learnings from that as to how to evacuate people, where the roads are cut off, and they had some rather unusual circumstances during that event where a well meaning local boat operator took some residents to rescue them and took them to his home and fed them and did all what he thought was the right things, but for a while they were all regarded as missing. There are a range of protocols in place now to try and deal with things in a way that the safety of everybody is directed by a central agency, and so all those people who want to help in a situation like that should take their direction from there as we do when we're directed by the state wide command, when to offer our evacuation centres for local residents and we're very much a partner in those sort of emergency situations, but it needs a central control.

**Mr Harry Hale** asked the following question without notice:

#### 8.11      **Bruny Ferry**

*Prior to Christmas and after Christmas, there's noticeably a big line of cars waiting to get on the ferry and they come all the way back onto the highway and they come right up past where the church and the cemetery are. When you're coming down to Kettering there are some cars obviously in the queue that are wanting to get on the ferry, but there are also quite a few that want to continue on to Woodbridge or whatever. Is Council aware of this situation and I would also say that the local policeman down there was trying to help out by having his lights flashing and coming along in an northerly direction, stopping at each car and suggesting to them that if they were going on the ferry, would they please move over as far as they could to the left allowing other cars to get past and carry on. I'm not sure if this is a Council problem to solve or whether it's State Government?*

**Mayor responds:**

We're very well aware of that issue and I think probably all of us around this table have been caught in that, either in the queue ourselves on the way to Bruny or trying to get through to other parts of the channel, and it is very, very difficult around the peak holidays, particularly around Easter and Australia Day are two particular points that cause concern. It is the responsibility of the Department of State Growth to manage that and we have raised this issue with them numerous times because of the safety concerns about people overtaking in an unsafe way in order to get past the queue and I've had discussions in the past with our local police inspector and I know he's well aware of it. I know that when the new ferries were put on a few years ago that as part of the discussions around that, we did plead with the Department of State Growth to try and come up with an alternative to that because it is a traffic hazard. We can raise this issue again through our Director of Engineering Services because I know that it does frustrate many people in the community who perhaps aren't using the ferry but need to get home.

**Mr Marcus Redeker** asked the following question without notice:

#### 8.12      **Percentage of Community For and Against LCZ**

*It's been mentioned previously at meetings here and most recently on the no compulsory landscape conservation zoning Facebook page that some suggestion of a percentage either for or against the LCZ zoning. I was hoping that Council would be able to advise formally of the correct percentages to clarify these comments, preferably without taking into account that people did not make representations due to more than likely not knowing about the problem?*

**Mayor responds:**

I just want to clarify what you're asking, are you saying based on the submissions that we received that then went to the TPC, what percentage were in favour and what percentage were against a certain element of it?

**Mr Redeker:**

Yes, that would do.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

We would have to take that on notice. Our Section 35F report does detail the different representations received and what the varying views are of those so you could glean from that an overall or indicative percentage, but I don't have those numbers in front of me. The other point is that if community members didn't make a representation, then we don't have that data to be able to inform a percentage.

**Mr Redeker:**

I was hoping not to have to read 700 pages.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

Then we will have to take it on notice.

**Mayor:**

There is a summary contained in that document from memory that is available in the Council agenda, but we'll confirm that in the answer to the question.

**Mr Marcus Redeker** asked the following question without notice:

#### **8.13 Independent Consultants**

*I'm interested in any feedback on the progression of our newly appointed independent advisors, if there is any?*

**Chief Executive Officer responds:**

There are two different consultants that we appointed. One who's reviewing the allocation of landscape conservation zone across the municipal area, and the other one who's looking into the specific area plans for Burny Island and the Bonnet Hill and Blackmans Bay Bluff area. We brought on the LCZ consultant more rapidly because we were able to move more rapidly through the contracting process with them. So they are underway and have been reviewing all the materials; the submissions that we've received through the exhibition process, the materials relating to any hearings that have happened so far, and they are coming up with the road map for how we will look at the allocation of zoning to the properties that have previously been indicated that may be landscape conservation. Ms Chetcuti might pick up with more detail about exactly where they're at. In regard to both consultants, the original indicative timeline that we provided to the Tasmanian Planning Commission of the 30<sup>th</sup> January is rapidly approaching, and we have undertaken to make sure that we go through a thorough process with Council as well as make sure our Councillors receive that material and can approve it before it goes back to the TPC. We've spoken to both our consultants as well as the Planning Commission to indicate that we would quite like a little bit of extra time to be able to fully make sure that we do a thorough job in both of those reports. They have indicated a willingness to work with us on that. So we are just working through the time frame so that we can be really clear about what a good process looks like from here, how it can get back past our elected members as the planning authority and then be returned to the Planning Commission. We don't want to take too long and that, no one wants to string this out any longer than it needs to be, but at the same time, we want to make sure it's a thorough and robust process. We intend to write to the Commission this week, providing an indication of that timeline, and then we'll be able to publicly communicate and post their acceptance of that.

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

What I can add is we don't believe that it will be a significant extension or delay. As the CEO said, we want this to continue to progress and we're working very hard for that to happen. In terms of the LCZ review, significant progress has been made, including the review of the methodology used by Council in drafting the draft LPS and as well as formulating recommendations about how each property or area of land within the municipality should be considered in terms of landscape conservation zone, potentially rural living or other applicable zones, and we're planning a workshop with councillors to present that before proceeding further, so that when that exercise is done in terms of re-evaluating the properties, Councillors clearly understand how that will be done and we will have feedback to refine that model as well.

**Mr Joel Hodson** asked the following questions without notice:

#### **8.14 Silverwater Park**

*The Silverwater Park redevelopment at Woodbridge has been really, really well received by the public and it's great. Part of the old structure there, the old picnic structure, had a windbreak I guess and the new structure doesn't and it gets super windy there. Is there any possibility Council can potentially install either a vegetation screen or something to assist with stopping the wind, along with a couple of bench seats up in the playground?*

**Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:**

I will take that on notice and refer that to our urban design officer for comment.

**Mr Richard Woolley** asked the following questions without notice:

#### **8.15 Decision Making**

*Do you Councillors, as representatives of the people, prioritise your decision making in view of the people or are you there to support and defend some of the advice that you get from the staff?*

**Mayor responds:**

That's a very broad question and I can only answer generally how I believe that as elected representatives that we go about our decision making and I guess it's not dissimilar to the way we would make decisions whether that be the CEO of an organisation who's answerable to a board or as a board member or any range of scenarios you can think of, and that is with the facts presented and all the information that's available. I guess the difference for Council is that we can't make decisions around this table that are in complete opposition to the roles that we need to fulfill as an organisation under the statutory requirements that we have, which are a lot, such as the meeting procedures regulations, that dictate how it is that we are to make decisions and the Local Government Act, where it talks about things like having an open mind when it comes to decisions, not having a predetermined outcome when we sit as a planning authority, for example. That's a broad response and I'm aware that that KLUB have invited Councillors along to a meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January and it's my understanding that that's one of the questions that will be put to - what do we consider when making decisions. As I said, I can't speak on behalf of everyone who sits around this table and there are different ways of answering that question and we look forward to those who can attend to be able to do that.

**Mr Woolley:**

As Mayor you do represent everyone around this and the answer that you've just given me is very similar to the answer I got and the last question I asked at the previous meeting, which was basically that the legislation says you have to do with this, that and the other and I've also heard you state that you've done everything to the minimum legislation requirements and I'd like to think that, as Mayor and Councillors, you might be able to do a little bit more than the minimum.

**Mayor:**

No, I do recall that conversation and I didn't say we did the minimum. I said we met the minimum and in many occasions we exceeded it. So for example, with all the consultation that we went through the end of the year before last, we did a whole range of public drop in sessions that were not mandatory, they were outside of the legislated process, we ran those in various locations around Kingborough including over on Bruny Island to ensure that the community had additional say. You are slightly misunderstanding my role as Mayor. I am one vote around the table of 10 Councillors. I don't get any more votes on any issue other than the same equal one as everybody else here. My role as Mayor is to be the spokesperson for Council, to chair Council meetings and to be the leader in the community, but it doesn't mean that I have any more persuasive powers over my colleagues, or any greater ability to influence the way that they vote, because I'm taking that inference from your question that you're suggesting that I should be able to change the course of something based on my position. I apologise if that's not what you're intending, but that's how I took that question.

**Mr Woolley:**

Well, my third question then would be along the lines of the hierarchy and how the system works, because my understanding is that as elected representatives, the people elect you to, through you Councillors, to oversee the CEO and the staff and the vibe that I'm picking up and I think as a community, we are all picking up is that the view of the people takes second standard to what the staff are advising you. The community would like to see a little bit more defence and representation to the people, if you understand what I'm trying to say?

**Mayor:**

I understand what you're saying, but can I just clarify that the Local Government Act says that the CEO is the only staff member that the Councillors have anything to do with overseeing. All of the other 200 or so staff are the responsibility of the CEO. Councillors under the Local Government Act cannot direct staff, that is specifically within the Act. But the staff are there to give Councillors the professional and technical advice that we don't have. There is nobody around this table who, for example, if you want to take the planning issue because that's what the majority of you are interested in, there are none of us as Councillors who have qualifications in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme or are qualified planners. We are reliant on being provided with that advice and in fact the TPC through the whole process that is legislated, demand that when documents go before them that any recommendations are backed up by technical advice. So we are reliant on being able to receive advice from our staff and passing that on because everything that goes before the TPC has to be justified across a whole range of policies and provisions under the Act. And yes, we are answerable to the community, absolutely, and we are all very aware of that. But one thing that you need to know is it's really hard sometimes within the legislative framework that we operate within to do things in a particular way, when you know the community don't want it. Planning applications are a very good example where we've had occasions where individual development applications come before the Chamber and we might have had 40 or 50 representations where people in the community say we don't want this, we don't like this because of X, Y, or Z and unless we can demonstrate that those things that the community doesn't like about it are things that are contained in the planning scheme, then we are compelled to vote for that application that might be coming before the Chamber, because otherwise it will be appealed by the applicant because we wouldn't be arguing on a point of law, if you like, it will be appealed by the applicant and then we would lose the appeal and have to pay the costs. There have been a couple of occasions over the last 10 or 12 years that I can think of where perhaps that has happened and it's a very costly exercise. We are constrained in many ways in the way that we operate and we strive at all times, I can say that for everyone around this table, we strive at all times to do the best for our community. Sometimes the system in which we operate can let us down and it's a frustration for us and it is also a frustration for our staff because there are things in the planning scheme that they don't agree with either, but they're there and we can't change that and I know that there are people within the State Government at the moment, members of State Government are starting to think that maybe the way that the Tasmanian Planning Scheme has been written is not helpful in situations like the one that we're facing here at the moment with the LCZ.

C4/1-2026

**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      Publication of Consultants Reports**

At the Council meeting on 15 December 2025, **Ms Catherine Anderson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

*Will the consultant's draft findings be made available for public comment before finalisation?*

**Officer's Response:**

The consultant's draft findings will not be released for public comment prior to finalisation. This approach aligns with the scope set out in the Notice of Motion and reflects the tight timeframes for this review. Importantly, one of the key objectives of the review is to consider the representations already received and the evidence presented at hearings to date, ensuring that community input is fully integrated into the process.

The draft report will be presented to Council for consideration before being finalised. Following this, it will be submitted to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC), who will use it to inform their decision-making. Hearings are continuing, providing representors with further opportunities to present their views.

*Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services*

## 9.2 Consultants

At the Council meeting on 15 December 2025, **Mr Vince Taskunas** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

*Could you please tell us how many firms were considered in terms of the process for the selection of the consultant and can the list of those be tabled?*

**Officer's Response:**

Council undertook a two-phase process in the identification of external expert consultant. Phase one was a market sounding exercise where council asked for expressions of interest. Six consultants were contacted in this process, with the list compiled through a review of Tasmanian Planning Institute of Australia members, internal knowledge of qualified consultants, assessment of available consultancy services (excluding those without a strategic planning focus), and consideration of potential conflicts of interest, such as consultants representing multiple submitters. Of the consultants contacted only one expressed interest (IrenelInc). Due to the limited initial interest, the consultancy list was broadened for the formal request for tender, which was issued to IrenelInc and five other planning consultants, including a firm based in Victoria. In total, thirteen (13) consultants were approached by Council through the process.

*An objective included within the deliverables of the scope of works was to; 'evaluate the suitability of alternative zoning options currently proposed under the Kingborough Bushland and Coastal Living Zone and other LCZ areas, with particular consideration of a broader application of the Rural Living Zone where appropriate'.*

Three proposals were received from the formal tender process - Pitt & Sherry, Damien Mackey, and IrenelInc. The proposals were assessed in accordance with Council's procurement assessment processes by a panel comprising of the CEO, Director – Environment, Development and Community and the Director – Governance, Recreation and Property Services. Assessment of the proposals considered price, experience and qualifications, clarity and feasibility of the submitted project plan and timelines and any potential conflicts. A copy of the proposals and scope of works and a detailed memo containing the selection recommendation (IrenelInc to undertake the LCZ review and Pitt & Sherry undertake the SAP review) was circulated to Councillors for review and approval, which was subsequently received.

*Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services*

### 9.3 Lost Property

At the Council meeting on 15 December 2025, **Mr Mark Donnellon** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

*When Council staff find lost property like a jacket, phone, watch or a pram at Kingston Park and the Kingborough Community Hub, what happens to it and is there a policy that defines what should be done?*

**Officer's Response:**

High value items (phones, wallets etc) are handed in to the Kingston Police Station. Lower value items (principally clothing) are kept at the Community Hub and if not collected after a period of time, are donated to St Vincents De Paul.

*Daniel Smee, Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services*

### 9.4 Property Values

**Professor Michael Rowan** submitted the following question on notice:

*With reference to media reports that properties zoned Landscape Conservation will be reduced in value, has Council either established that this is not correct, or alternatively modelled the reduction in revenue from rates according to the proportion of Kingborough's ratable properties are expected to be confirmed as correctly zoned Landscape Conservation?*

**Officer's Response:**

Council has not undertaken an analysis of the potential impact of zoning changes on property values, as this is a complex matter influenced by multiple market factors. Council is also not aware of any available dataset that has assessed this issue.

The zones and requirements for their application under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme are determined at a state level. Any comprehensive analysis of potential zoning impacts on property values would need to be undertaken on a statewide basis. Without this analysis, modelling of any potential rate revenue impact cannot be undertaken.

*Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services*

**C5/1-2026**

## 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 Digitising Annual Reports

*Do we submit our annual reports to libraries and are we digitising older annual reports, those pre-2020 to put on the Kingborough Council website?*

**Chief Executive Officer responds:**

Yes, we do provide our annual reports through to State Archives. It is my understanding that there are some annual reports back in time that haven't been digitised yet, that's a piece of work that we

would need to undertake. It's one of these that's probably not the highest priority in the day-to-day operations of the organisation, but it's one that sits in the backlog.

## 10.2 Rural Roads

*Has Council applied for the Natural Disaster Risk Reduction grants program for upgrades to Van Morey Road, Margate to ensure that emergency service vehicles and machinery can get to the top of Van Morey Road and have the space to turn around there?*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

No, I don't believe that is the case and in terms of whether we would apply for specific roads, would be determined by an assessment of which roads potentially need that more than others and also potentially in consultation with the TFS as well. It's not something the Council would independently just pursue for a specific road without robust consideration of whether it's required.

## 10.3 Ownership of Sandfly Road and Old Huon Highway

*Is this road a Kingborough road or is it State Growth and when roads like that are transferred from State Government to Kingborough Council, is that done from a decision made by Councillors, or is that a determination made by management? The underlying question here is about cost shifting, it obviously matters a lot to Council whether we have to take on State Growth responsibilities for roads, because then we have to maintain them.*

**Director Engineering Services responds:**

I did a little bit of research on that this afternoon. To the best of our understanding, both those roads were transferred to Council in the around the 1980's. We don't have any records confirming the exact dates and without that documentation, we can't determine whether or not it was accepted by a Council resolution or not. In terms of the process, I'd have to take that on further notice as to understand what that process looks like around taking on State owned roads or conversely actually transferring roads to State owned.

## 10.4 Bushfire Risk Mitigation

*The Climate Council recently released a report 'When Cities Burn' and one of the highlights there was that in Australia up to 90% of the homes in high risk zones were built before modern bushfire resilient building standards, BAL ratings and the like, which increases ember ignition and house to house fire, spread risk. Is the Council aware of how many buildings on Kingborough's urban fringe are built before bushfire resilient building standards were introduced and how might this impact emergency services response in the event of bushfire? Is older building stock a factor that emergency services are going to take into account when they're working on bushfire planning preparedness and emergency access and water supply considerations?*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

No, we don't know the proportion of houses prior to and after that being a requirement for building standards. Also, we'd have to define what urban fringe was to be able to do that. In terms of fire planning, that's a matter that the TFS would need to answer. We can't answer that on their behalf, so I would suggest contacting them directly. Also in relation to the age of a house, in terms of its risk, really what is probably more important is the materials that it's built out of, if the property has been prepared and the building itself for fire preparedness as well as its location in the landscape, surrounding land uses etc. It's really probably not a very good indicator of risk, but I couldn't tell you whether it's considered in fire response planning or not.

*Cr Deane left the room at 6.46pm*

**Cr Midgley** asked the following question without notice:

**10.5 Cat Management, Huntingfield Development**

*Regarding the Huntingfield housing development, I'm wondering if there are any updates in regards to the cat management as part of the subdivision? Have there been any changes or updates?*

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:**

Yes, there has been. It's quite a complicated background and Ms Quinn might correct me if I'm wrong here with part of my response. There were conditions both in the DA and also the EPBC approval contained approval conditions for the development, then one of those controls was that the restriction was to be placed on the titles. Now that has evolved because of the new legislation or updates to the Residential Tenancy Act regarding pet ownership and we've had advice that those conditions on the title needed to be adjusted to ensure alignment with that Act. There are still restrictions on cat ownership in Huntingfield and it's being aligned directly with the approval condition in the EPBC in that cats must be contained in line with satisfactory standards of what is contemporary containment measures that at a dwelling.

**Cr Midgley:**

Do we still have a cat management officer being able to oversee the future subdivision and the cat containment in that area?

**Director Environment, Development & Community Services:**

That is still an accountability within our natural areas and biodiversity team and we're looking at what that resourcing looks like and it will likely be part of a position alongside some other natural area responsibilities as well.

*Cr Antolli left the room at 6.47pm*

*Cr Deane returned at 6.49pm*

*Cr Antolli returned at 6.49pm*

---

**11      QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS**

There were no questions on notice from Councillors.

**OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS**

## PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 6.50pm

### 12 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

**C6/1-2026**

**12.1 REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO BUILD OUTSIDE THE BUILDING ENVELOPE ON CT 179428/5 AT 14E BONNIE VALE DRIVE, HOWDEN**

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

That Council:

- (a) determine to grant consent under the covenant on Sealed Plan No. 179428 to allow a development application, under the provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and the *Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015*, to be considered for the construction of an outbuilding and associated water tank outside the building area on Lot 5, generally in accordance with the plans submitted under DA-2025-46 and as shown in Attachment 2; and
- (b) advise the applicant that this consent does not imply approval for the development which will be subject to an assessment of the application under the above Act and Scheme.

**CARRIED**

## PLANNING AUTHORITY SESSION ADJOURNS

## OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed at 6.55pm

*Cr Bain left the room at 6.55pm*

### 13 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

A report on the petition 'Kerbside Collection, Leslie Vale' will be provided to a future Council meeting.

### 14 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

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

### 15 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

**C7/1-2026**

#### 15.1 AGM MOTION RESPONSE: REVIEW AND WITHDRAWAL OF COUNCIL'S BIODIVERSITY OFFSET POLICY

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That the response to the proposal to withdraw and review the Biodiversity Offset Policy following a 6 week public consultation period conducted by Council is noted and that:

- (a) The Biodiversity Offset Policy is reviewed in accordance with the current review schedule in November 2027.
- (b) The next review of the Biodiversity Offset Policy in 2027 includes community consultation in accordance with Council's Communication and Engagement Framework.

*Cr Bain returned at 6.57pm*

#### **Amendment:**

Moved Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded Cr Christian Street

That the Biodiversity Offset Policy be reviewed within 6 months of the commencement of the Statewide Planning Scheme in Kingborough, including community consultation and an assessment of the financial impacts of the policy on applicants and Council.

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

Against: Crs Gideon Cordover and Flora Fox

**CARRIED 7/2**

Moved Cr Christian Street  
Seconded Cr Kaspar Deane

That the motion be put.

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

Against: Crs Gideon Cordover and Flora Fox

**CARRIED 7/2**

That the Biodiversity Offset Policy be reviewed within 6 months of the commencement of the Statewide Planning Scheme in Kingborough, including community consultation and an assessment of the financial impacts of the policy on applicants and Council.

**CARRIED**

*Meeting adjourned at 7.52pm*

*Meeting resumed at 8pm*

**C8/1-2026**

## **15.2 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING NOTICE OF MOTIONS - CHANGE OF ZONING FOR DRAFT LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover  
Seconded: Cr David Bain

*Cr Midgley left the room at 8pm*

*Cr Midgley returned at 8.04pm*

Moved Cr Clare Glade-Wright  
Seconded Cr Amanda Midgley

That Cr Cordover be allowed one minute to complete his contribution.

**CARRIED**

That Council:

- a) Note the motions carried at the Annual General Meeting held on 6 December 2025 and the community concerns they represent.
- b) Endorse the continuation and completion of the current review of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) and related areas, as resolved by Council on 20 October 2025, to provide a robust and lawful response to Direction 69.
- c) Continue the hearing process and provide responses to questions and directions from the TPC that consider evidence presented, statutory requirements and the local context.

**CARRIED**

**Amendment:**

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

That Council:

- a) Note the motions carried at the Annual General Meeting held on 6 December 2025 and the community concerns they represent.

- b) Endorse the continuation and completion of the current review of the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ) and related areas, as resolved by Council on 20 October 2025, to provide a robust and lawful response to Direction 69.
- c) Continue the hearing process and provide responses to questions and directions from the TPC that consider evidence presented, statutory requirements and the local context.
- d) a separate communication be provided to the Tasmanian Planning Commission outlining that elected councillors note the community position expressed at the Annual General Meeting regarding zoning outcomes, while acknowledging that final recommendations must be informed by qualified planning advice and statutory criteria.

**CARRIED**

The substantive motion was then put.

**CARRIED**

*Cr Street left the meeting at 8.42pm*

**C9/1-2026**

**15.3 AUDIT OF DELEGATIONS**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover  
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That the proposal for a review of delegated powers be referred to Council's Audit Panel for consideration.

**CARRIED**

**C10/1-2026**

**15.4 DRAFT ELECTORAL REFORMS BILL**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover  
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council provide a submission to the Department of Premier and Cabinet in relation to the draft Electoral Reform Bill 2025 that expresses the following:

- a) Opposition to the proposal to move away from the popular election of the position of Deputy Mayor.
- b) Support for the retention of the term of Deputy Mayor in alignment with that of the Mayor and councillors.

**CARRIED**

**C11/1-2026**

**15.5 DISABILITY INCLUSION & ACCESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMUNITY NOMINATIONS**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox  
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

*Cr Deane left the room at 8.49pm*

*Cr Deane returned at 8.50pm*

That:

(a) The DIAAC Terms of Reference be amended to permit up to ten (10) individual community representatives and up to four (4) organisation representatives and set a quorum for Committee meetings to a minimum of five (5) members.

(b) 1. Don Hempton

2. Fran Thompson

3. Kevin Clayton

4. Heather Anderson

5. Di Carter

6. Tamara Manning

7. Taraidh Colquhuon

8. Zola Lawry

9. Paula Heald

10. Michelle Warr

be appointed as individual community members of the Kingborough Disability Inclusion & Access Advisory Committee.

(c) 1. Angelica Thaddeus (Disability Voices Tasmania)

2. Samara Jenkins (Kingston Neighbourhood House)

3. Sarah Young (ParaQuad Tasmania)

4. Tracie Schollum (Calvary)

be appointed as organisation representatives on the Kingborough Disability Inclusion & Access Advisory Committee.

**CARRIED**

**C12/1-2026**

## **15.6 FINANCIAL REPORT - DECEMBER 2025**

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

*Cr Antolli left the room at 8.53pm*

*Cr Antolli returned at 8.54pm*

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

**CARRIED**

**C13/1-2026****15.7 APPENDICES**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover  
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

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

**CARRIED**

**16 NOTICES OF MOTION**

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

**C14/1-2026****17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION**

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley  
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

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*

**Lease of Facilities - Kingborough Sports Centre**

Regulation 17(2)(c), and (2)(g) *information that, if disclosed, is likely to confer a commercial advantage or impose a commercial disadvantage on a person with whom the council is conducting, or proposes to conduct, business, and proposals for the council to acquire land or an interest in land or for the disposal of land.*

**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 9pm

**OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS**

## OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 9.06pm

### C15/1-2026

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley  
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
Lease of Facilities - Kingborough Sports Centre	Confirmed

**CARRIED**

### CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 9.07pm

.....  
(Confirmed)

.....  
(Date)