



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

2 February 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

Item			Page No.
Open Session			
	1	Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians	1
	2	Attendees	1
C20/2-2026	3	Apologies	1
C21/2-2026	4	Confirmation of Minutes	2
	5	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
C22/2-2026	6	Declarations of Interest	2
	7	Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C23/2-2026	8	Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1	Biodiversity Offsets	2
	8.2	Part 5 Agreements	3
	8.3	Tree By-law Consultation	4
	8.4	Section 35G Statement	4
	8.5	STRLUS Review	5
C24/2-2026	9	Questions on Notice from the Public	6
	9.1	Algona Road Shared Path	6
	9.2	Street Lights and Power	6
	9.3	Outcome of 2023 AGM Motion by Georgina Kirkpatrick	7
	9.4	Motions Moved at Annual General Meetings	8
	9.5	Zoning	8
	9.6	Percentage of Community For and Against LCZ	9
	9.7	Silverwater Park	9
	9.8	Bushfire Mitigation	10
	9.9	Road Reserves	11
	9.10	Wildlife	11
C25/2-2026	10	Questions without Notice from Councillors	12
	10.1	Signage at Blackmans Bay Beach	12
	10.2	Illegal Vegetation Removal	13
	10.3	Dark Sky Reserve Status	13
	10.4	Sproules Road, Snug	13
	10.5	Cat Management	14
	10.6	Sherburd Park Car Park	14

Table of Contents

Item		Page No.
	11 Questions on Notice from Councillors	16
	12 Officers Reports to Planning Authority	17
C26/2-2026	12.1 PSA-2025-1 Proposed amendment to the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 - Site Specific Qualification (Additional Discretionary Uses) and DA-2025-164 Development Application for a medical centre at 124 Channel Highway, Taroon	17
C27/2-2026	12.2 Development Application for Eight (8) Multiple Dwellings (One Existing) at 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston	17
	13 Petitions still being Actioned	26
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period	26
	15 Officers Reports to Council	26
C28/2-2026	15.1 Amendment - Dog Management Policy (Proposed Areas)	26
C29/2-2026	15.2 CEO Performance Review Policy 1.28	26
C30/2-2026	15.3 Parks, Recreation & Natural Areas By-Law No. 3 of 2021 - Application for a Permit	27
C31/2-2026	15.4 Hall Fees	28
C32/2-2026	15.5 Appendices	28
	16 Notices of Motion	28
C33/2-2026	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	28

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 2 February 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 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
Lead Strategic Planner	Mr Adriaan Stander
Team Leader Statutory Planning	Ms Sarah Silva
Senior Statutory Planner	Mr Brian Huang
Communications Officer	Mr Stuart Heather
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton

C20/2-2026

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor A Midgley

C21/2-2026**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. 1 held on 19 January 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

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

Date	Topic	Detail
27 January	AFL High Performance Centre	Discussion on governance model and project update

C22/2-2026**6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Mr Dave Stewart declared an interest in the report headed 'CEO's Performance Review Policy'.

Cr Deane declared an interest in the report headed PSA-2025-1 Proposed amendment to the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 - Site Specific Qualification (Additional Discretionary Uses) and DA-2025-164 Development Application for a medical centre at 124 Channel Highway, Taroona.'

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C23/2-2026**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.

Ms Natisha Knight asked the following questions without notice:

8.1 Biodiversity Offsets

I think there are about 535 properties in total that have paid biodiversity offsets in the total of \$1 million which you've received, which equals \$2,000 on average per property and if that was the real case I don't think anyone would have much of a problem with that. We would like to get some clarification around those numbers if we can. Over the past five years, how many properties will the municipality have entered into a Part 5 Agreement in lieu of paying a biodiversity offset and can Council provide mapping with spatial data, identifying the location of those part 5 areas?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I'll have to take that on notice because I don't have that information readily at hand.

Ms Knight:

For those properties that have entered into a Part 5 Agreement over the past five years, what was the cumulative total value of the biodiversity offsets that were originally calculated or requested prior to the Part 5 Agreement being accepted?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I will take that on notice but I will add that generally paying and financial offset is the last tier of the hierarchy for offsetting, so it's not that an amount is calculated or a Part 5 Agreement, so it's unlikely that we will have that information, but I will take it on notice to clarify.

Ms Knight:

Over the past five years, how many development applications remained undetermined or significantly delayed where the applicant has not agreed to either pay a biodiversity offset, or voluntarily enter into a Part 5 Agreement?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I'll have to take that on notice.

Ms Tamika Adkins asked the following questions without notice:

8.2 Part 5 Agreements

Is the requirement to pay your biodiversity offset mandated by legislation or is it applied at the discretion of Council officers?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

The head of power for that is under the Land Use Planning Approvals Act and the planning scheme and there is also provision for offsetting to meet the new incoming scheme as well, and then Kingborough Council's offset policy is how we consider those offsets when triggered by the scheme.

Ms Adkins:

What guidelines or thresholds are used to ensure consistency between those applicants?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

That is outlined in our offset policy, which is available on our website. I can say that that policy has undergone technical review and aligns with, and I apologise, I can't remember the name of the guidelines, but it's a Tasmanian or regional guidelines for offsetting and it has also been reviewed by the State Government as well.

Ms Adkins:

Does that mean that Council set the figure, not necessarily the item, but the figure that an applicant would pay?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

It is determined in the policy. I believe that was set by Council, but in reference to standard or other values that other offset policies or guidelines within the State would set.

Ms Adkins:

How does Council ensure that two land owners clearing similar areas do not receive materially different offset requirements?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

By applying the guidelines in the policy. If they are paying a financial offset that is actually determined by the type of vegetation that they're clearing, so the type of tree and community and the area and then the ratios that are set out in the policy. For an area on one property, the payment might be different to the area on another property because it's dependent on what is actually being cleared and the area of what is being cleared.

Mr Nick Booth asked the following questions without notice:

8.3 Tree By-law Consultation

In August 2021, Kingborough Council ceased having a tree bylaw provisions within their existing environmental bylaws. In July 2022, Council passed a resolution by absolute majority of its intention to make trees on a private property a bylaw. In October 2023, a draft finally went out to public consultation. What was the response to the consultation and where is that information available?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I believe it was made available. I'd have to take that on notice. The response, again from my recollection, was that the majority, I can't remember the exact division, was for the bylaw. I do believe it has been circulated and I will have to find out where and how?

Mr Booth:

I believe that currently the bylaw is still in the process of meeting final approval. What is the Council's intentions with the bylaw and in relation to the proposed planning scheme?

Chief Executive Officer:

The bylaw was subject to a motion that was brought up through the AGM and Council staff are working on a response to come back to Council to formally address that motion, so it will be the subject of further conversation around this table in the coming weeks.

Mr Booth:

In 2022, Cr Gideon Cordover pushed the tree bylaw and used the response from a few hundred responses to get the unanimous vote from councillors as a sign of indication that a majority of ratepayers wanted the bylaw. Is it normal for Council to base the decision using the results from a small number of submissions, particularly from a targeted survey or audience, to justify decisions that may not represent the broader community views, such as the rural community and those who are directly affected by these laws application?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

My understanding of the engagement and consultation that was undertaken is that it was undertaken in a similar manner to how we undertake consultation for other policies and bylaws etc. So yes, it will form part of the decision making, but then it is for the councillors in the Chamber to make their decisions.

Ms Karen Groves asked the following questions without notice:

8.4 Section 35G Statement

As part of the draft LPS process, the Council Planning Authority completed a non-compulsory 40 page S35G statement. This was required to be based on feedback gained from community representations. Only four representations were cited, one of which was Council's own and none of which asked for the planners proposed extension of environmental controls. Not one recommendation to the TPC alluded to the wicked problem of applying the LCZ or RLZ to existing environmental or rural living zones,

creation of another zone maybe, or a bigger RLZ lot sizes, despite this being a consistent concern in representations. How did councillors pass this S35G statement, 40 pages of recommendations based on four representations and miss the chance to mention or suggest remedy for the zoning challenges mentioned in the remaining 616 representations?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

My understanding is that the section 35G report addressed specifically some recommendations for the SPP's. The remaining content was a replication of a submission to the SPO regarding the review of the SPP's made, I think about two or three years ago. In terms of endorsement that report was attached with the section 35F report when submitting the draft LPS after exhibition.

Mayor:

Can I just add to that answer because when we did consider as a Planning Authority those two documents jointly, we also did amend the motion that had been put forward to include a paragraph that would suggest that in providing all that information to the TPC, that a covering letter be prepared that outlined all of the concerns that members of the community and representors had put forward during the process. That was an amendment put on the floor of the Chamber to the recommendation, and we did do that subsequently to what was submitted.

Ms Groves:

So you're saying that the other 616 representations were acknowledged through one cover letter and not in the 40 page other document?

Mayor:

No, but they were all included in the section 35F as well. So what I'm saying is we also wanted to highlight the broad themes that we were receiving from the community as part of the process because we wanted to make sure it was front and centre as the first document that would be seen when that information went to the TPC.

Ms Groves:

Were they both submitted the same day for councillors, just to clarify? The 35F report and the 35G statement.

Mayor:

We considered them together.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I suggest we take this on notice to ensure that we get an accurate response to you so that we can review the timelines.

8.5 STRLUS Review

There are many benefits we're finding to supporting development in rural and regional areas and ways we could also limit that sustainably or keep it sustainable. For example, if we move to rural living zones, some home owners are going to still be limited by their lot size, their access, their services, their building requirements, overlays, cleared building envelopes. This would spread out new dwellings across regional areas of the municipality, and it provides individuals to care for a range then of environmental and natural features, while reducing pressure on existing infrastructure as opposed to developments in built up areas that provide, for example, large traffic volumes that would enter the Channel Highway at one place and these sorts of things are spread out. It's arguably a credible and sustainable way to provide low density dwellings. I'm interested in whether the Kingborough Council will be supporting this kind of development by recommending allowances for rural development and building be extended in the next STRLUS through feedback that is due this month?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

Council hasn't determined what a submission on the STRLUS will be yet, so that's still to be determined what Council's position is that we may put in a submission to the document under consideration at the moment.

Ms Groves:

Are there other ways that Council could propose to support rural and regional development through recommendation to the STRLUS, for example, not just housing supply but service delivery, infrastructure, transport, access to employment, aged care services and education and providing those in those places, for those that are outside satellite or major cities and towns in Kingborough?

Lead Strategic Planner:

I think there's different ways to approach planning and strategic planning. The Southern Tasmania Regional Strategy has got an approach to allow a lot of densification to happen around the major centres, but it also allows for rural development to occur and densification in those area. If you listen in on some of the LP's hearings, Council did actually propose densification in some of the rural living areas which the Commission is still considering. One of the things that was brought up in the discussions is that Council would need to undertake some strategic work to look at areas where we can promote some of that growth in some of those areas and some areas do have challenges and we recognise that. The simple answer is there is the ability to do that through regional planning, but also at local planning. The only challenge is our local planning can't go against the regional planning. When I speak to people on a daily basis, I advocate for people to make a submission on the review of the Southern Tasmania Regional Strategy that is out for exhibition at the moment because that is the ground and the underlying work that will inform everything else that we do. So it's extremely important for people to get their heads around that and to make a submission.

C24/2-2026**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 Algona Road Shared Path

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **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:

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?

Officer's Response:

In 2025 consultants developed an Algona Road shared path feasibility study and route options analysis, which identifies a preferred alignment for a future pathway. The remaining budget for the Algona Road shared path project will be spent preparing concept designs and undertaking further preliminary site investigations. The concept design phase of this project has been programmed for the second half of the 25-26 Financial Year.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.2 Street Lights and Power

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **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:

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?

Officer's Response:

The \$130,000 expended against the Street Light & Power budget item is expenditure year-to-date on powering streetlights and public lighting assets across the municipality. Council is responsible for paying for the electricity that powers Council owned streetlights and other Council owned public lighting.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.3 Outcome of 2023 AGM Motion by Georgina Kirkpatrick

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **Ms Tamieka Adkins** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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?

Officer's Response:

In accordance with the *Local Government Act 1993* (Tas), a report on the AGM motion was brought back to Council at the next meeting following its lodgement; at that meeting, Council resolved to defer the item to allow for further consideration through a councillor workshop. A Council Workshop was subsequently held in October 2024 to examine the matter in detail.

The following information was presented at the workshop:

- The current assessment process for technical reports required under the planning scheme (e.g., natural values, bushfire, landslide, inundation, contaminated land), including internal expert review to ensure reports address Scheme requirements and align with application material.
- The reasons reports may be found unsatisfactory and returned for revision (e.g., incorrect scope/site, inconsistencies with plans, omissions against Scheme criteria, methodology errors, or external referral advice requiring updates).
- Circumstances in which peer review may be commissioned by Council (at Council's cost) where there is limited internal expertise or a professional difference of opinion about recommendations or methodology.
- Whether any change to current practices is warranted, and if so, what scope such change should have across all technical report types, and how governance and budget implications would be managed.

The outcome of the workshop was as follows:

- In accordance with current practice, planning officers may request amendments to submitted reports where there are factual inaccuracies, inconsistencies with plans or other application material, incorrect methodology, failure to address relevant Scheme or policy criteria, and/or where another agency has requested amendments. The reasons for any requested revisions are to be clearly outlined in the Request for Further Information (RFI).
- If Council staff have concerns about the recommendations or methodology in a submitted report, the issue should be escalated to the appropriate Executive member. Where necessary, Council may arrange for an independent peer review.
- Planning assessment processes will continue to be reviewed as part of Council's continuous improvement program.

Council acknowledges the delay and that a further report should have been brought back to Council following the workshop. This was an inadvertent omission during 2024, noting competing priorities, particularly the significant work associated with the draft Kingborough Local Provisions Schedule. Council apologises for this oversight, and a subsequent report will be brought to Council for decision in March 2026.

Council will review its internal processes to ensure that all actions arising from Council meetings are captured and scheduled. It is also noted that four of the ten motions from the 2025 AGM have already been brought to Council, with the remaining motions scheduled for February and March, which provides assurance that this particular situation is an anomaly.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.4 Motions Moved at Annual General Meetings

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **Mr Charles Biggins** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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?

Officer's Response:

Council does not have the ability to amend a motion after it is passed; the wording of the motion remains as adopted.

From January 2024, Council had ongoing engagement with Mrs Kirkpatrick in relation to another matter.

It was not a deliberate omission that the Notice of Motion was not discussed directly with Mrs Kirkpatrick, as the earlier engagement had highlighted the concerns in relation to environmental reports. Council appreciates that this may have created some confusion and will continue review processes to ensure that concerns are appropriately acknowledged and responded to.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.5 Zoning

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **Mr Joel Hodson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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?

Officer's Response:

Council notes the question regarding the interpretation and application of the performance criteria within the Local Provisions Schedule relating to building access via Crown roads.

At this time, Council is not yet operating under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS), and therefore has not had to determine an application where this specific matter arises. This makes it difficult for Council to provide definitive advice on how the provisions will apply in practice once the TPS commences.

Council has a statutory obligation to assess all applications against the requirements of the relevant planning scheme, including any provisions relating to lawful and permanent access. Council is also actively discussing this issue with other Tasmanian councils, many of whom have raised similar concerns about the interpretation and workability of these requirements.

If, through further guidance or clarification, a compliant mechanism is or becomes available, including one that allows Council to determine that Crown roads provide permanent legal access for the purpose of assessment, then Council will utilise such a mechanism when assessing applications.

Given that the requirements in question are set by the State Planning Office (SPO), it is best placed to provide authoritative advice on the correct interpretation of these provisions. Council has formally raised this matter with the SPO and understands that a number of other councils have also done so. In addition, it is noted that Crown roads in Tasmania are managed by the Tasmanian Government through Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania (NRE Tas). Accordingly, the ultimate outcome in relation to access arrangements involving Crown roads will depend on how the relevant State authority determines those roads are to be managed and administered.

Council has sought advice from the Crown regarding its procedures and the potential implications for landowners, and future updates will be provided when received.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.6 Percentage of Community For and Against LCZ

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **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:

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?

Officer's Response:

Among representations that clearly stated a position on the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ), approximately 96.6% opposed the application of the LCZ and approximately 3.4% supported it. Representations that were neutral, unclear, or addressed the LCZ only indirectly have been excluded from this calculation.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.7 Silverwater Park

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **Mr Joel Hodson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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?

Officer's Response:

A wind wall was discussed during the design and consultation phase with community representatives. However, the benefits of a clear view and good passive surveillance through the site outweighed the benefits of wind protection. In addition, the gravel access pathway adjacent to the picnic shelter

prevents the installation of an effective wind wall structure. Council will be installing some additional seating in the park shortly.

Roy Langman, Urban Design Officer

9.8 Bushfire Mitigation

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **Ms Alison Rogers** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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 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?

Officer's Response:

Council acknowledges the community's ongoing concerns regarding bushfire risk and the need for clear guidance on what actions property owners may take to reduce fuel loads around their homes.

Council is currently preparing updated bushfire-related fact sheets, which will provide clear, practical information. These updated resources will be published on Council's website once finalised.

In the interim, if community members have any questions, they are encouraged to contact Council directly, and staff will provide advice tailored to their situation.

For immediate clarity, Council can confirm that no approval is required to collect and remove sticks, leaf litter or bark that have fallen on the ground on your property for the purpose of reducing bushfire risk. This type of routine property maintenance does not interfere with natural values in a way that requires a permit, and it is recognised as an appropriate and proactive bushfire risk-reduction activity. To achieve the most effective reduction in bushfire risk, these efforts should be focused around the home, other buildings and the property access.

Council appreciates the community's ongoing commitment to managing bushfire hazards and will continue to support residents with accessible information and guidance.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.9 Road Reserves

At the Council meeting on 19 January 2026, **Mr Joel Hodson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Since Crown Road reserves are not roads maintained by a road authority, and as the State Planning Office has confirmed, cannot give right of carriageway, regardless of whether a property owner has a current licence, a lease over that Crown Road Reserve, can Council give a total figure of properties that currently have the ability to build under the Interim Planning Scheme, but will lose that ability based on sections 20.4.3, 21.4.3 and 22.4.3 of the State Planning Provisions?

Officer's Response:

Council acknowledges the question regarding the number of properties that may currently have the ability to construct a dwelling under the Interim Planning Scheme through relying on a Crown licence over a reserved road, but which may lose that ability under sections 20.4.3, 21.4.3 and 22.4.3 of the State Planning Provisions (standard state wide access requirements of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme) due to reliance on the requirements for Crown Road reserved roads for access are different and a licence can no longer be relied upon.

Whether a right of way can or will be granted is a matter for the Crown, noting Council is aware of situations where a right of way has been given by the Crown over a reserved road for the purposes of access to a dwelling.

In reviewing both Council's available data and the publicly available information in LISTmap, it is not feasible for Council to provide a definitive total. Determining this figure would require a property-by-property assessment across all areas proposed to transition to the relevant zones. For each individual property, officers would need to examine:

- whether the land has potential for a new dwelling under the Interim Planning Scheme (i.e. is the land vacant),
- whether any associated access to a road maintained by a road authority reserve exists and, if so, whether it is a Council-maintained road, a Crown maintained Road reserve, or an asset of another authority,
- where there is no associated access to a road maintained by a road authority, the nature and legal attributes of existing or potential access arrangements, including existing rights of way and reliance on a Crown reserve road.

To Council's knowledge, this information is not presented as a consolidated dataset and cannot be extracted through spatial analysis or automated reporting. Each property would require manual investigation to verify tenure, status, and relevant approvals, which would involve a substantial use of officer time and is not considered an effective or reasonable use of Council's resources.

Council also understands that similar issues are arising in other municipalities, particularly those with a higher proportion of rural or regional areas where historical access arrangements frequently involve Crown reserved roads.

Council has sought advice from the Crown regarding its procedures and the potential implications for landowners, and future updates will be provided when received.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.10 Wildlife

Ms Jill Winter submitted the following question on notice:

Other than the 'Sharing our roads with Wildlife' section of the KC website, could Council please explain what steps are being taken or researched to mitigate the horrendous loss of native animal life on roads

that they manage eg are we investigating different lighting patterns or solar noise emitting fences or on larger roads, road bridges/underpasses for animals or even what can be purchased by drivers to help distract wildlife from "jumping out" in front of cars? Signage is helpful but probably needs to be of the "light up, in your face" variety to be noticed.

Officer's Response:

Council recognises that wildlife-vehicle collisions are a concern affecting both native animal populations and road safety. While our "Sharing our roads with Wildlife" messages provide general guidance, we acknowledge that more proactive mitigation strategies would be needed to reduce the impact on wildlife.

Reducing roadkill relies heavily on community driving behaviour. Both driver awareness and driving to conditions are known to affect the greatest reduction in roadkill numbers. Education and advocacy, such as the work undertaken by local groups and Council, plays a critical role in this space and is the most influential pathway to achieving meaningful reductions.

Council continues to use temporary signage on roadsides to identify roadkill hotspots for drivers and to remove dead wildlife from Council roads to minimise further wildlife loss.

Whilst a range of technical solutions have been researched and trialled nationally, Council is not aware of any results that have been effective at reducing vehicle-wildlife collisions. Council is not currently investing in any technical solutions. Regarding devices that drivers can purchase, ultrasonic animal deterrents (whistles) have been widely studied but generally show limited effectiveness for Australian wildlife.

Wildlife crossing structures, including underpasses and overpasses, have shown success in other jurisdictions. These structures, combined with exclusion fencing that guides animals toward safe crossing points, have demonstrated significant reductions in wildlife-vehicle collisions in some locations including at the Neck on Bruny Island. Incorporating these crossings into new road design or upgrades would need to be prioritised according to collision hotspots and budget constraints. Council is not currently investing in wildlife crossings.

Council's biodiversity program is focussed on reducing key threats to threatened species and maintaining and restoring wildlife habitat.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

C25/2-2026

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 Fox asked the following question without notice:

10.1 Signage at Blackmans Bay Beach

Could a report be prepared by Council staff for Council to consider placing signage at the northern end of Blackman's Bay Beach to alert the public of the presence of a dangerous rip in this area?

Mayor responds:

The Deputy Mayor and myself have really spoken to the CEO about this this afternoon following the events on the weekend where there were a number of young people that thankfully were rescued by some very heroic members of the community, all young people themselves. We are certainly going to look at that question of signage. The CEO and I some months ago met with Surf Life Saving Australia to discuss a proposal that they have to install their signs about what is safety, but they will also have a device attached to them which is a personal flotation device that can be used if a member of the community is undertaking a rescue. The discussion that we had was that they're proposing to roll those

out in a number of beaches around the State, but particularly to our non-patrolled beaches like Blackmans Bay. We're working through that process with them because obviously we want everybody to be safe but if you have too much signage, it can get very cluttered. The proposal is that potentially the information on the rip would be included with that information with the rescue devices. I've asked for that for that work to be speed up in light of what's occurred.

Cr Cordover asked the following questions without notice:

10.2 Illegal Vegetation Removal

I'm interested to get a bit of information around how many cases of illegal vegetation removal in Kingborough have been reported of late and how many of those cases have been resolved? More broadly, are there any discernible trends, for example, are reports of illegal vegetation removals increasing or decreasing overtime?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I don't have that information on hand. We certainly do have community members report potential unauthorised clearing and other ways that we may become aware is when it occurs on a property and then a new application comes in for that property and shows the clearing that we don't have the records for as well.

10.3 Dark Sky Reserve Status

On the 28th January in the Mercury, it was reported that the Southern Midlands Council might be seeking to obtain dark sky reserve status to encourage stargazing tourism and Australia has several officially designated sites for that. South Bruny Island has remote beaches with many secluded spots to enjoy the incredible night sky and also the Local Government Association of Tasmania recently endorsed a resolution to lobby the State Government to establish statewide dark sky planning guidelines and the tourism body destination in southern Tasmania is pursuing the highest level of dark sky certification for the Wilderness World Heritage Area. My question as it relates to Bruny Island, has the Kingborough Council looked into obtaining dark sky reserve status to encourage that kind of tourism to Bruny?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

My knowledge not recently. I believe it was looked at some time ago. It is not something we're actively reviewing or pursuing at the moment. If we were to, it would have to be in consideration with our other environmental management priorities we have.

Cr Cordover:

Is the Council engaged in promoting tourism? I remember that previously we used to actually fund tourism promotions, I think maybe \$20,000 or something like that. Is that budgeted for any more or is that on Kingborough Council's horizon to support tourism more directly?

Chief Executive Officer:

Council financially contributes to Destination Southern Tasmania. Beyond that I'm not aware of any separate line items that we have to fund the tourism ventures.

Cr Richardson asked the following question without notice:

10.4 Sproules Road, Snug

There's been a couple of development applications been approved up that road recently increasing the road traffic from four properties to 6. What requirements do we have for the construction phase on a narrow road and are there any plans in place to upgrade, widen and generally fix up Sproules Road?

Director Engineering Services responds:

I think given it's a minor rural road with only a small amount of dwellings, I think it's very unlikely that it would warrant any upgrade. But I will take it on notice and give a more fullsome response. In terms of controls, not to my knowledge is there any requirement for controls on the road during the construction phase.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

10.5 Cat Management

A resident has been contacting me on behalf of a range of residents who live around the Algona reserve, particularly properties that border the reserve in Sonnet Drive and it has to do with ongoing allegations of roaming domestic cats into the reserve and the neighboring yards. They are perceiving an impact on the bird life, they've talked about a noticable reduction in certain bird species over the past few months. They approached Council and allegedly received advice that the staff member who previously was responsible for setting cat traps has retired and no staff member has been identified to replace that person and they're concerned that the current resourcing limits Council's ability to respond through trapping or enforcement. The residents have suggested some potential responses, I'm not sure all of which are very manageable, letterbox drop, reminding owners of their responsibilities. They want to know whether trapping programs are active, paused or under review and what is our broad policy position on cats near reserves? I'm wondering if Council could address this general issue?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

At the moment we don't have a resource fulfilling that task of cat trapping. It will resume when we allocate a resource and that is in train at the moment. At times recruitment etc can take a little bit of time. We do undertake a lot of education activities and we have done some targeted education, particularly around Algona but in the broader area as well. We have authority to implement the Cat Management Act, so if we are aware of breaches, we will act on those. We work with the Department of Natural Resources when there is instances of cat hoarding and multiple cap permits, etc. In terms of policy position, Bruny Island is where cats are not permitted or have to be contained. Huntingfield is similar in terms of you can own a cat but it has to be suitably contained. Outside of those areas, we don't have a policy position. Of course we encourage responsible ownership though and are continuously active in educating and working with community members about that.

Cr Antolli:

This particular resident, who seems to be representing others has made mention that a lot of correspondence that he has sent to Council hasn't been answered, which conflicts with the fact that he's told me he's had some answers. Would it be possible for me to send the package of emails to a responsible officer for some sort of response to him and to them to make sure that they feel heard.

Mayor:

Absolutely.

10.6 Sherburd Park Car Park

There has been an ongoing issue where the people who live opposite the Sherburd Park car park are having ongoing issues with the unsealed car park fouling their front yards with dust, entering their roof guttering and their rain water collection systems, I had some meetings today with some people there. They've talked about hooning activity in the car park, people doing doughnuts, one individual with his two young sons who lives around the corner. They've identified anti-social behaviour, including suspicion of drug use and drug sales and the residents are afraid to report this to police with evidence because it requires them getting too close to the offenders because, you probably will know a bit of a mound there at the car park before it cascades down into Roslyn Avenue. So they want to know what our policy would be about possibly putting up some freestanding CCTV cameras attached to the building

nearby to provide evidence of the misdemeanors to police when they do happen and wondering what Council's position on that, noting that we have some substantial work there slated for the ongoing forward estimates?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

Sealing of the Sherburd Oval car park is a project that has been identified as being desirable, and indeed we had that project costed in 2021 and back then the cost was \$660,000 so it probably is more of an aspirational project given the other priorities for the oval. In recent years we've upgraded the lighting, the drainage, irrigation, the pitch is underway and as Councillors will be aware the change rooms is our latest project. The sealing of the car park is desirable, but in terms of the cost benefit, it's probably lower than some of the other projects we've had to address. CCTV, we would take advice from Tas Police in relation to whether that is something that would be of benefit in that area. We generally don't put up CCTV cameras without instruction from the police as to whether that is a location that (a) needs to be able to feed back to the police station so it's monitored and (b) whether they consider the level of anti-social behaviour to warrant it.

Cr Antolli:

So even with the recent vandalism of some young people setting fire to part of the frontage of the building some weeks back, something like that might not even trigger Council wanting to look after its assets with maybe some CCTV footage. Do we really need to rely on the police to tell us when we can put cameras up?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Given that the feed and monitoring goes to the police, it's not something we would do in isolation to them.

Cr Antolli:

Can you clarify what you mean by the feed and the monitoring? So cameras that record information and if there's an incident you can just go back to see it? Does that need to be as full blown a solution as to what you're mentioning, or do you have something else in mind?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

There are issues around the retrieval of the data that is stored by those cameras and the position of the police is that their very strong preference is to have a feed back to the police station rather than these individual data recorders that you then have to go and view the tape.

Cr Antolli:

So they are wanting access to a more centralized solution? That's their preferred method?

Mayor:

You might be aware that the majority of our cameras and I can't remember the figure, I think it's around 60 or 70 cameras that we have CCTV throughout the municipality at the moment and we've done significant work over the last two years of bringing a lot of those back onto line. They were outdated, they needed to be upgraded, they've been brought back onto line and all of those cameras now feed directly into the police station. In the event of an incident they can go and view it straight away or if somebody loses something or reports an incident at say, Kingston Park, the police can view that. Previously some of the devices that we had around the place, the information was just stored on a hard drive and in the event of something happening and then needing to access it, it was a bit more problematic, so a number of years ago now we went through a bit of an MOU with police about how the cameras would be maintained by us in a working order, but also making sure that they were letting us know if there were issues with them because we don't see if they're down because the feed is across the road at the police station.

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions on notice from Councillors.

Public Copy

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 6.13pm

12 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

C26/2-2026

12.1 PSA-2025-1 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE KINGBOROUGH INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2015 - SITE SPECIFIC QUALIFICATION (ADDITIONAL DISCRETIONARY USES) AND DA-2025-164 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR A MEDICAL CENTRE AT 124 CHANNEL HIGHWAY, TAROONA

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That Council resolves to:

- (a) Pursuant to s39(1) of the former provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, note the representations received in relation to Planning Scheme Amendment, PSA-2025-1 and DA-2025-164;
- (b) Pursuant to s39(2)(b)(i) of the former provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, indicate to the Tasmanian Planning Commission that the Planning Authority does not recommend any changes to the initiated and certified amendment as part of this report, but would like to reserve the opportunity to explore, at the hearing, potential modifications to permit conditions and other operational matters with the applicant and the representors, particularly in relation to addressing residential amenity impacts; and
- (c) Pursuant to s39(2)(a) of the former provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, forward a copy of this report, and representations received to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

CARRIED

C27/2-2026

12.2 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR EIGHT (8) MULTIPLE DWELLINGS (ONE EXISTING) AT 16 ADELONG DRIVE, KINGSTON

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That the Planning Authority resolves that the development application for eight (8) multiple dwellings (one existing) at 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston for Jodal Property Pty Ltd be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Except as otherwise required by this Permit, use and development of the land must be substantially in accordance with Development Application No. DA-2025-380 and Council Plan Reference No. P2 submitted on 1 December 2025.

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

2. Before the approved development commences, landscaping plans must be submitted for approval by Council's Manager Development Services.

The landscape plan must be prepared by a suitably qualified person and be at a suitable scale, and indicate the following:

- a) outline of the proposed buildings;
- b) proposed planting by quantity, genus, species, common name, expected mature height and plant size;
- c) existing trees to be retained and proposed measures to be carried out for their preparation and protection during construction;
- d) earth shaping proposals, including retaining wall(s);
- e) fencing, paths and paving (indicating materials and surface finish); and
- f) the proposed maintenance program.

It is recommended that the consideration be given to Council's Landscape Guidelines (Preparing a Landscape Plan), which is available on Council's website.

Once endorsed the Landscaping Plan will form part of the permit.

3. Prior to commencement of on-site works associated with the private infrastructure to service the approved dwellings, engineering design drawings must be submitted to Council for approval. The engineering plans and specifications must be prepared and certified by a professional Civil Engineer. Plans must be to satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services and comply with:

- Tasmanian Standard Drawings
- Austroads Standards and Australian Standards
- Australian Rainfall and Runoff Guidelines

The Plans must include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Detailed internal vehicular and pedestrian access, carparking and manoeuvring areas including:
 - (i) Longitudinal and cross sections of the driveway/access road.
 - (ii) Contours, finish levels and gradients of the driveway/access road.
 - (iii) Provision of vehicle access (crossovers) with notation to be constructed in standard grey concrete.
 - (iv) Pavement construction.
 - (v) Wheel stops for open parking bays (as appropriate) and
 - (vi) Marking of residential and visitor parking bays.
- (b) Design (including supporting documentation and hydraulic calculations) of the proposed stormwater infrastructure including:
 - (i) Stormwater layout details to service all dwellings.
 - (ii) A stormwater quality treatment system as required in Table E7.1 of the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015
 - (iii) A stormwater detention system as required in Table E7.1 of the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015.

- (iv) Overland flowpaths sized to accommodate the estimated 1% AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability) flow.
- (v) Soil and water management plan
- (c) A stormwater reticulation main upgrade and extension to service the proposed development connecting to the existing infrastructure in accordance with Council standards and as follows:
 - (i) Longitudinal section of the stormwater main extension.
 - (ii) Minimum 225mm class SN8 main from the existing stormwater roadside entry pit located at the front of 24 Adelong Drive, to the existing maintenance hole (18 Adelong Drive) and extension to the subject lot.
 - (iii) Provision of 'as-constructed' plans in Autocad format in accordance with Council Survey Requirements for Capital Works Projects Procedure 1.1.5.

Once endorsed the plans will form part of the permit.

- 4. A Council fee of 2% of the estimated value of the civil engineering construction works (future Council/public infrastructure only) including GST, provisional items and contingencies, for the development or the current minimum fee, whichever is the greater, must be paid at the time of submission of the engineering design plans for approval. The actual amounts payable shall be based on the rates adopted by Council and prevailing at the time of payment.
- 5. Prior to the commencement of on-site works, including vegetation removal or modification, demolition, construction, excavations, placement of fill, delivery of building/construction materials and/or temporary buildings, an 'Application for Approval of Planning Start of Works Notice' must be lodged with Council's Planning Department.

This application must be lodged a minimum of 14 days prior to commencement of on-site works and works must not commence until this notice has been approved by the Manager Development Services.

For Advice: This Planning Start of Works Notice is not the same as the Form 39 Building Start Works Notice. As such, lodgement of a Form 39 will not satisfy this condition, and a separate 'Application for Approval of Planning Start of Works Notice' must be lodged with Council's Planning Department. A copy of the application form is available on Council's website.

- 6. Construction works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings. Works must be to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services and include the following:
 - (a) the vehicular access/driveway, car parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring areas must be of a sealed construction (concrete) with associated drainage provision and comply with Australian Standard AS2890.1:2004 (Off-street car parking).
 - (b) 'No Parking'/'Keep Clear' signage must be installed for the passing and turning bays
 - (c) visitor carparking sign must be installed for three (3) on-site visitor carparking spaces
 - (d) signage noting residential carparking for each unit must be installed for their respective on-site carparking spaces
 - (e) wheel stops (as appropriate) and line markings for open carparking spaces must be provided and installed in accordance with Australian Standard AS2890.1:2004 (Off-street car parking)
 - (f) parking and vehicle circulation roadways and pedestrian paths must be provided with bollard lighting or similar

- (g) on-site stormwater detention and treatment systems must be installed
 - (h) Stormwater discharge from all new impervious surfaces must be disposed of by gravity to Council's stormwater infrastructure; and
 - (i) The stormwater main located on the Council road reserve must be upgraded and extended to service the development as per the engineering approved drawings. The Council road reserve including footpath and nature strip must be reinstated to Council satisfaction. A Permit to carry out works within a Council road reservation must be obtained prior to any works commencing within the Council road reservation.
7. All waste material generated by the development or from other sources must be contained in appropriate building waste containers for periodic removal to a licensed disposal site. The receptacle must be of a size to adequately contain the amount of waste generated and must be appropriately located on the subject site and must not impede residential traffic or parking at any time.
8. To reduce the spread of weeds or pathogens, all machinery must take appropriate hygiene measures prior to entering and leaving the site as per the Weed and Disease Planning and Hygiene Guidelines 2015 produced by the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment.

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

9. The construction works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings. All works relating to Council's assets must be to the Council's standards and to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services. These works must be inspected by Council prior to backfill. The supervising Engineer must request a joint onsite inspection with the Council's authorised representative.

On completion of works relating to Council's assets, a written certification from the developer's supervising professional engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Director Engineering Services that states:

- (a) works have been completed in accordance with the Council approved engineering design drawings, specifications and Council standards; and
- (b) the appropriate levels of quality and workmanship have been achieved

At the end of the project, acceptable "As Constructed" drawings certified as correct by a registered land surveyor in accordance with Council's Survey requirements for subdivisions and developments must be submitted to Council along with CCTV evidence of the Council's stormwater infrastructure to confirm any damage to the stormwater pipe. If damage has occurred, the applicant/developer will be responsible to carry out repair or replacement works as per Council's standards and requirements and bear its cost.

10. The applicant/developer must lodge a maintenance bond or bank guarantee of 10% of the total cost of the civil engineering construction works (future Council/public infrastructure only) including GST to cover the satisfactory rectification of all defects and defective works during the statutory 52 weeks maintenance period prior to the issue of Certificate of Practical Completion for the civil works (future Council/public infrastructure only).
11. The satisfactory completion of all public infrastructure works will be considered achieved when:
- (a) a Certificate of Practical Completion has been issued
 - (b) all defects and any defective works have been satisfactorily rectified at the completion of the 52 weeks maintenance period

- (c) Council will be entitled to call upon the bond and bank guarantee funds to complete or rectify any outstanding defective works after the expiry of the maintenance period
 - (d) at the end of the statutory 52 weeks maintenance period, the supervising Engineer must request a joint on-site inspection with the Council's authorised representative to confirm that all outstanding defects and defective works have been satisfactorily completed
 - (e) upon satisfactory completion of all outstanding defects and defective works Council will issue a notice of satisfactory 'Final Inspection' and the public assets will be taken over by Council; and
 - (f) after takeover of the works, it will be the responsibility of the supervising engineer or applicant/developer to request Council to release all Bond and Bank Guarantee monies.
12. At least three (3) visitor parking spaces must be provided for the proposed development. The visitor parking spaces must be appropriately signposted and kept available for visitor parking at all times. Any future application for strata title in respect of the property must ensure that the visitor parking space is included within the common property on the strata plan and be accessible through the common property from all units.
13. Landscaping must be provided prior to occupation of the new dwellings to the satisfaction of the Council's Manager Development Services.
- The landscaping areas shown on the endorsed plans must be used for landscaping and no other purpose.
14. Prior to the occupation of Units 1 through to 6, the permanently fixed screen fencing adjacent to any habitable windows / waste bin storage areas, as shown on the approved plans, must be installed to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services. The screens must be maintained for the life of the development.
15. The applicant must make provision for a private waste service agreement to enable the development to be serviced with waste and recycling collection. This agreement is to ensure these services are provided on site adjacent to the proposed garbage bay facility as indicated on the submitted plans. Council waste services will not be provided to service the development.
16. The conditions as determined by TasWater, and set out in the attached Appendix A, form part of this permit.

ADVICE

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

If your development involves demolition, new buildings or alterations to buildings (including plumbing works or onsite wastewater treatment) it is likely that you will be required to get approvals under the *Building Act 2016*. Change of use, including visitor accommodation, may also require approval under the *Building Act 2016*. Advice should be sought from Council's Building Department or an independent building surveyor to establish any requirements.

- C. An application for Notifiable Plumbing Work must be lodged with Council before commencing any work.

- D. A drainage design plan at a scale of 1:200, designed by a qualified Hydraulic Designer, showing the location of the proposed sewer and stormwater house connection drains; including the pipe sizes, pits and driveway drainage, must be submitted with the application for Plumbing Permit.
- E. The Developer should not allocate any property address numbers for the proposed units.

New property addresses have been allocated as follows:

Lot/Unit No.	Allocated Property Address
1	Unit 1 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston
2	Unit 2 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston
3	Unit 3 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston
4	Unit 4 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston
5	Unit 5 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston (existing dwelling)
6	Unit 8 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston
7	Unit 7 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston
8	Unit 8 / 16 Adelong Drive, Kingston

These numbers must then be referenced on design and As-Constructed drawings as well as any Strata Plans lodged for sealing.

CARRIED



Submission to Planning Authority Notice

Application details

Council Planning Permit No.	DA-2025-380
Council notice date	10/11/2025
TasWater Reference No.	TWDA 2025/01355-KIN
Date of response	14/11/2025
TasWater Contact	Timothy Carr
Phone No.	0419 306 130

Response issued to

Council name	KINGBOROUGH COUNCIL
Contact details	kc@kingborough.tas.gov.au
Development details	
Address	16 ADELONG DR, KINGSTON
Property ID (PID)	2112364
Description of development	Multiple Dwellings (7 new, 1 ex)

Schedule of drawings/documents

Prepared by	Drawing/document No.	Revision No.	Issue date
Skizze Building Design	Drawing set – Sheets 1 – 30	–	09 Oct25

Conditions

Pursuant to the *Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008* (TAS) Section 56P(1) TasWater imposes the following conditions on the permit for this application:

CONNECTIONS, METERING & BACKFLOW

1. A suitably sized water supply with metered connection(s) and sewerage system and connection(s) to the development must be designed and constructed to TasWater's satisfaction and be in accordance with any other conditions in this permit.
2. Any removal/supply and installation of water meters and/or the removal of redundant and/or installation of new and modified property service connections must be carried out by TasWater at the developer's cost.
3. Prior to commencing construction of the development, any water connection utilised for construction must have a backflow prevention device and water meter installed, to the satisfaction of TasWater.

ASSET CREATION & INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS

4. Prior to applying for a Certificate for Certifiable Works, the developer must physically locate all existing infrastructure to provide sufficient information for accurate design and physical works to be undertaken.

Tasmanian Water & Sewerage Corporation Pty Ltd
GPO Box 1393 Hobart, TAS 7001
development@taswater.com.au
ABN: 47 162 220 653

Page 1 of 3



5. Plans submitted with the application for Certificate(s) for Certifiable Work (Building and/or Plumbing) must, to the satisfaction of TasWater show, all existing, redundant and/or proposed property services and mains.
6. Prior to undertaking any works related to water and sewerage, physical markers must be in place that clearly identify where water and/or sewer connections are to be made in accordance with any approved plan to TasWater's satisfaction.

56W CONSENT

7. When applying for a Certificate for Certifiable Work (Building) and/or (Plumbing), the application documentation must include an application to TasWater, pursuant to section 56W of the Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008, for its consent in respect of that part of the development which is built within two metres of TasWater infrastructure.

Advice: No part of unit 6, including eaves and gutters, can be closer than 1.0m to TasWater's sewer property connection.

DEVELOPER CHARGES

8. Prior to TasWater issuing a Certificate(s) for Certifiable Work (Building) and/or (Plumbing), the applicant or landowner as the case may be, must pay a developer charge totalling \$8,433.60 to TasWater for water infrastructure for 4.80 additional Equivalent Tenements, indexed by the Consumer Price Index All groups (Hobart) from the date of this Submission to Planning Authority Notice until the date it is paid to TasWater.
9. Prior to TasWater issuing a Certificate(s) for Certifiable Work (Building) and/or (Plumbing), the applicant or landowner as the case may be, must pay a developer charge totalling \$10,981.25 to TasWater for sewerage infrastructure for 6.25 additional Equivalent Tenements, indexed by the Consumer Price Index All groups (Hobart) from the date of this Submission to Planning Authority Notice until the date it is paid to TasWater.

DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT FEES

10. The applicant or landowner as the case may be, must pay a development assessment fee of \$417.63 to TasWater, as approved by the Economic Regulator and the fee will be indexed, until the date paid to TasWater.

The payment is required within 30 days of the issue of an invoice by TasWater.

Advice

General

For information on TasWater development standards, please visit

<https://www.taswater.com.au/building-and-development/technical-standards>

For application forms please visit

<https://www.taswater.com.au/building-and-development/application-information/application-for-development-services-form>

Important Notice Regarding Plumbing Plans and Associated Costs

The SPAN includes references to documents submitted as part of the application. These plans are acceptable for planning purposes only and are subject to further detailed assessment and review during the next stage of the development proposal.

TasWater's assessment staff will ensure that the design contains sufficient detail to assess compliance with relevant codes and regulations. Additionally, the plans must be clear enough for a TasWater contractor to carry out any water or sewerage-related work.



Depending on the nature of the project, your application may require Building and/or Plumbing permits or could be exempt from these requirements. Regardless, TasWater's assessment process and associated time are recoverable through an assessment fee. Please be aware that your consultant may need to make revisions to their documentation to ensure the details are fit for construction. Any costs associated with updating these plans should be discussed directly with your consultant.

Developer Charges

For information on Developer Charges please visit the following webpage – <https://www.taswater.com.au/building-and-development/developer-charges>

Water Submetering

As of July 1 2022, TasWater's Sub-Metering Policy no longer permits TasWater sub-meters to be installed for new developments. Please ensure plans submitted with the application for Certificate(s) for Certifiable Work (Building and/or Plumbing) reflect this. For clarity, TasWater does not object to private sub-metering arrangements. Further information is available on our website (www.taswater.com.au) within our Sub-Metering Policy and Water Metering Guidelines.

Service Locations

Please note that the developer is responsible for arranging to locate the existing TasWater infrastructure and clearly showing it on the drawings. Existing TasWater infrastructure may be located by a surveyor and/or a private contractor engaged at the developers cost to locate the infrastructure.

- a. A permit is required to work within TasWater's easements or in the vicinity of its infrastructure. Further information can be obtained from TasWater.
- b. TasWater has listed a number of service providers who can provide asset detection and location services should you require it. Visit <https://www.taswater.com.au/building-and-development/service-locations> for a list of companies.
- c. Sewer drainage plans or Inspection Openings (IO) for residential properties are available from your local council.

56W Consent

The plans submitted with the application for the Certificate for Certifiable Work (Building) and/or (Plumbing) will need to show footings of proposed buildings located over or within 2.0m from TasWater pipes and will need to be designed by a suitably qualified person to adequately protect the integrity of TasWater's infrastructure, and to TasWater's satisfaction, be in accordance with AS3500 Part 2.2 Section 3.8 to ensure that no loads are transferred to TasWater's pipes. These plans will need to also include a cross sectional view through the footings which clearly shows;

- a. Existing pipe depth and proposed finished surface levels over the pipe;
- b. The line of influence from the base of the footing must pass below the invert of the pipe and be clear of the pipe trench and;
- c. A note on the plan indicating how the pipe location and depth were ascertained.
- d. The location of the property service connection and sewer inspection opening (IO).

Declaration

The drawings/documents and conditions stated above constitute TasWater's Submission to Planning Authority Notice.

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed 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

No Petitions had been received.

Cr Richardson left the room at 6.55pm

15 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C28/2-2026

15.1 AMENDMENT - DOG MANAGEMENT POLICY (PROPOSED AREAS)

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That:

- (a) On confirmation of land tenure, in accordance with s.25 of the *Dog Control Act 2000*, Council by public notice, notify the date on which the declarations of the dog exercise area at 34 Maddocks Road, Kingston, and the dog training area at Dru Point, Margate, take effect, and the period during which the declarations remain in force; and
- (b) The endorsed *Dog Management Policy* be amended as appropriate.

Cr Richardson returned at 6.57pm

CARRIED

Cr Antolli left the room at 7.07pm

C29/2-2026

15.2 CEO PERFORMANCE REVIEW POLICY 1.28

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That:

- (a) A new item 6.7.3 is added to the policy as follows:
"Responses to questionnaires gathered as part of this process are to be confidential."
- (b) Council endorse the CEO Performance Review Policy 1.28.

CARRIED

C30/2-2026**15.3 PARKS, RECREATION & NATURAL AREAS BY-LAW NO. 3 OF 2021 - APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT**

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane

Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That the Chief Executive Officer is authorised to grant an extension of the existing commercial By-Law permit to Elsewhere Sauna ABN 11 066 364 427 for use of the Tarooma Beach car park area for a further period of three (3) years with the following permit conditions.

- (a) The permit period is to commence on 28 March 2026 and will expire on 27 March 2029. ('permit period')
- (b) The applicant is to indemnify the Council in respect of any claim made against the Council, as a result of the use of the car park area by the applicant and the operation of the sauna business during the permit period.
- (c) The applicant releases and discharges the Council in respect of any future possible claim against the Council by the applicant as a result of use of the car park and the operation of the sauna business.
- (d) During the permit period, the applicant is required at all times to maintain suitable public liability coverage as well as comprehensive insurance for the sauna trailer from a reputable insurer, and if requested to do so, the applicant is required to provide evidence to Council of the insurance coverage.
- (e) During the permit period, registration of the sauna trailer is to be maintained and if requested to do so, the applicant will provide the Council with evidence of the current trailer registration.
- (f) The business will be allowed to operate for the whole year other than for the month of February during each year of the permit period.
- (g) The permit hours are no more than three (3) days per week with one of the days being Friday. It is up to the applicant as to whether the business operates up to three days per week.
- (h) The hours of operation during the permit period will be from 6.30 am to 4:00 pm during each day of operation with the first sauna session to commence not earlier than 8:00 am on each of the three days. The exception to this is that during the Dark Mofo Winter festival, the end of day sauna hours can be extended from 4:00 pm to 8:00 pm but only during the Winter festival and up to no more than two (2) weeks. The applicant is to promptly vacate and to remove the sauna trailer on or about 8:00 pm during this two week period.
- (i) At all times whilst operating in the car park, the sauna is to be staffed and the area around the sauna is to be kept clean and tidy by the applicant.
- (j) At the end of each day, the sauna is to be promptly removed from the car park area.
- (k) The sauna trailer is to be parked at the car park in the designated area as directed by Council.
- (l) In the event that during the permit period, an incident of any nature was to occur, the applicant is required to immediately report the incident to Council and to the Manager of Legal & Property.
- (m) The Council reserves the right to undertake any works during the permit period such as maintenance works and the Council does not guarantee that the car park will be available for use during the permit period.
- (n) The Chief Executive Office is to determine a user fee amount to be paid by the applicant to the Council prior to the commencement of the permit period as well as the conditions of such payment.

CARRIED

C31/2-2026**15.4 HALL FEES**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That Council notes the review of hall hire fees and advises Hall Management Committees that it considers the current structure to be fair and equitable.

CARRIED

C32/2-2026**15.5 APPENDICES**

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Cr Deane left the room at 7.38pm

Cr Deane returned at 7.40pm

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

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no Notices of Motion.

C33/2-2026**17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

That in accordance with the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 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 Kingborough Council *Meetings Audio Recording Guidelines Policy*, recording of the open session of the meeting will now cease.

Open Session of Council adjourned at 7.45pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 7.47pm

C34/2-2026

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr David Bain

The Closed Session of Council having met and dealt with its business resolves to report that it has determined the following:

Item	Decision
Confirmation of Minutes	Confirmed
Applications for Leave of Absence	Approved

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 7.48pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)