

Kingborough



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

16 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
	3 Apologies 1
C38/3-2026	4 Confirmation of Minutes 2
	5 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting 2
C39/3-2026	6 Declarations of Interest 2
	7 Transfer of Agenda Items 2
C40/3-2026	8 Questions Without Notice from the Public 2
	8.1 Biodiversity Offsets 2
	8.2 Appointment of the AFL HPC Project Manager 3
	8.3 Definition of 'Staged Retreat' 3
	8.4 Bushfire Risk Mitigation 4
	8.5 Biodiversity Offset Policy 4
	8.6 Community Strategies 6
	8.7 Part 5 Agreements 7
C41/3-2026	9 Questions on Notice from the Public 7
	9.1 Biodiversity Offsets 7
	9.2 Section 35G Statement 8
	9.3 Tree By-law Consultation 8
C42/3-2026	10 Questions Without Notice from Councillors 9
	10.1 Design and Construction of Pathway to the Park and Ride in Huntingfield 9
	10.2 Bus Stops 9
	10.3 Dru Point Dog Obedience Park 10
	10.4 Waste Strategy 10
C43/3-2026	11 Questions on Notice from Councillors 11
	11.1 Sproules Road, Snug 11
	12 Officers Reports to Planning Authority 12
C44/3-2026	12.1 Development Application for Change of Use to Visitor Accommodation at Unit 9/9 Maranoa Road, Kingston 12
	13 Petitions still being Actioned 14
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period 14

Table of Contents

Item		Page No.
	15 Officers Reports to Council	14
C45/3-2026	15.1 Review of the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS)	14
C46/3-2026	15.2 AGM Notice of Motion - Development Application Requests for Information	15
C47/3-2026	15.3 AGM Notice of Motion: Trees on Private Property By-law	15
C48/3-2026	15.4 Reconsideration of AGM Motion 2023 - Environmental Reports	15
C49/3-2026	15.5 Land Lease - Kingborough Sports Precinct	15
C50/3-2026	15.6 Oval Lease - Kingborough Sports Precinct	16
C51/3-2026	15.7 Community Services Strategy	16
C52/3-2026	15.8 Policy Review 4.13 Establishment of Bushfire Hazard Management Areas on Council Land	16
C53/3-2026	15.9 Kingborough Waste Services - Director Remuneration	17
C54/3-2026	15.10 Financial Report - January 2026	17
C55/3-2026	15.11 Appendices	17
	16 Notices of Motion	17
C56/3-2026	16.1 Landscape Conservation Zone	17
C57/3-2026	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	18

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 16 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 A Midgley	✓
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
Manager Environmental Services	Ms Liz Quinn
Lead Strategic Planner	Mr Adriaan Stander
Team Leader – Statutory Planning	Ms Sarah Silva
Planner	Mr Benjamin Allen
Bushfire Planning Officer	Mr Christopher Salter
Communications Officer	Mr Stuart Heather
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton

3 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

C38/3-2026

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. 2 held on 2 February 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

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

Date	Topic	Detail
26 January	AFL High Performance Centre	Update on the progress of the AFL High Performance Training Centre at the Twin Ovals and associated infrastructure developments.
10 February	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Browns Road Upgrade 2. Community Resilience 3. LPS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update on upcoming works on Browns Road 2. Update on Community Resilience programming and future work 3. Update on progress of LCZ review for draft LPS

C39/3-2026

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Dave Stewart declared an interest in the item in closed session headed 'CEO's Performance Review'.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C40/3-2026

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 Peter Creef asked the following questions without notice:

8.1 Biodiversity Offsets

I found it interesting that planning had figures on how many properties have paid the biodiversity offset, and it was at the fingertips of Cr Cordover at the time when he asked the question, but we still haven't had any response as to how many properties have had a part 5 agreement and what was the value of the biodiversity of those properties prior to going into part 5 and there was no response to that in the Minutes. So just wondering if we get some sort of further information about that?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Apologies for that oversight. We can provide that information.

Mr Nick Booth asked the following questions without notice:

8.2 Appointment of the AFL HPC Project Manager

Can Council confirm whether the project manager or special projects manager who had oversight in the underpass and the Kingston interchange projects, has that program manager being promoted to the project director of the Sports Precinct project and whether this role was publicly advertised or only internally, and was it subject to competitive merit based recruitment process and compliant to the Council's Recruitment and Selection Policy 9.5?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

In terms of the specific roles within the organisation, I won't go into detail about staff members or who's done what in the past. In terms of the recruitment for the Project Manager for the Sports Precinct works related to the AFL High Performance Centre, that was an internal expression of interest process that we ran and there were multiple applicants for that and a competitive process was run to determine the successful applicant.

Mr Booth:

Can Council give their rationale behind this promotion, given that the report was critical of the oversight of the projects and the importance of the sports precinct of 100 million plus project?

Chief Executive Officer:

In terms of the scope of work, I think it's really important to understand the the bigger picture around the way we've structured our work up at the Sports Precinct. I'll note that the \$100 million figure relates to the training and administration facility itself, which isn't a Council oversight of that project. That's being delivered by the Tasmanian Football Club for their purpose. Our role in that is to provide the land and the enabling works around it. The overall program governance of that has been built internally with a lot of checks and balances around it and making sure that all the people working in that program are suitably supported and set up for success.

8.3 Definition of 'Staged Retreat'

The word 'staged retreat' has been bandied about a bit lately. Can you explain what that actually means in relation to STRLUS?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

That is in relation to potential natural hazards that we are going, as a community and a state and the country are going to be seeing greater impacts from, from climate change. Our commentary regarding that is that we already have many, many regional communities that are in these hazard zones as well as planned areas as well, even in metropolitan areas, there is going to be impacts and our commentary about that is around how that is actually going to translate in real life for our communities and if it comes to that, we have to look at potentially retreating our infrastructure, in particular, that's gonna be exposed to these hazards, what the guidance is from the State Government in relation to how that will happen and how our community and Council will be supported through that transition. We are seeking greater clarification on the practical translation of that.

Ms Alison Rogers asked the following questions without notice:

8.4 Bushfire Risk Mitigation

I do have a question that I brought up a couple of meetings ago about bushfire risk mitigation and the clearing of fuel loads on people's property. I did ask that whilst there is an information sheet available on the web site in relation to that. It all involves filling out a form or checking with other organisations, and my question was, given the nature of our risk in Tasmania and we're obviously concerned with Kingborough, that we believe that it's important that property owners are being active in the reduction of fuel loads on their properties. And so my question was, what can we actually do without having to fill in forms and apply for permits and run the risk of being penalised or fined in relation to that because there is some confusion. Some people think that they can pick up dead bark and sticks and things on their property and that that's perfectly okay, however, there is other information out there which may not be true and may be misleading, but some other people have said you can't do that because you're disturbing habitat for, for example.

Mayor responds:

My understanding was from the discussions that we had previously in the Chamber and also when we had the forum that some of us came to a couple of weeks ago that you were keen to see a resource developed that would be a quick checklist/reference that property owners could look at so that it was very clear to them that, yes, you can pick up sticks, you can pick up bark, you can do this, you can do that. My understanding was that we had given a commitment that we are working towards that.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

Yes, that's correct. We are working on more information and we also offer, and will have more information about how to do a free assessment for people, so it's not an application, it's a free assessment, and that is, I suppose, more tailored to your particular situation, noting that people's properties are in different areas, have different infrastructure on it etc. So yes, we are working on that and hopefully we'll have something out very soon.

Ms Rogers:

So just further on that then at this stage your advice would be even though I can identify, for example, at the front of my property that fronts Tinderbox Road that there is a very distinct fire hazard in terms of dead limbs, dead bark and some of that is created when your slashes go through on our road and they trim off all the trees and that all just falls to the ground. Can I pick all of that up or is your advice that you need to leave that alone until I've got further advice from Council?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

In terms of the stuff that has been cut and fallen to the ground, yes, you can pick that up.

Mr Charles Biggins asked the following questions without notice:

8.5 Biodiversity Offset Policy

As you are all aware Kingborough Council has had a formal offset policy for the last 10 years and has been collecting offsets since 2001. The current policy was amended by the previous Council in 2022 and the sitting councillors unanimously voted in favour of its incorporation into the Kingborough Interim Planning scheme in the beginning of 2024. As everyone in this room is very familiar with the offset policy and voted again two meetings ago that a review of the current could wait until after this year's Council election, there should be no problem with answering a few questions that rose today, after inspecting trees at a local school involved in a development application. We also heard from Miss Quinn at the Council meeting on January 2026 that Council applies a market based approach to offsetting, so please hold those market based principles front and center while considering the following questions. Could Council please explain when biodiversity first becomes materially present

on an otherwise vacant block of land and is a Council permit or part 5 agreement required for the cultivation of any high conservation values or priority vegetation?

Manager Environmental Services responds:

Do you mean in terms of cultivation growing native plants on a vacant lot of land?

Mr Biggins:

More importantly, the first part of the question – could Council please explain when biodiversity first becomes materially present on an otherwise vacant block?

Manager Environmental Services:

In relation to the triggers for the biodiversity offset policy to clarify that they are within that policy, there's a list of what those values are, the type of trees that they are or the type of vegetation communities or wildlife, and at least what size they need to be, so what diameter at 1.4 metres above the ground, that tree needs to be to qualify for acquiring an offset so people can check the biodiversity offset policy for those triggers.

Mr Biggins:

Low priority vegetation. All other vegetation communities doesn't specify a size.

Manager Environmental Services:

So if we're talking about, it's hard to know without knowing the specific site you're talking about, but I was assuming you were talking about trees that have grown ... *(Mr Biggins interjects)*.

Mr Biggins:

Within the policy there is Table 2 and Table 3. Yes, this specifies sizes for very high priority. But we're claiming a one to one ratio for low priority vegetation values, there's no size.

Manager Environmental Services:

Sorry, so the sizes in relation to trees in relation to biodiversity it's in relation to their conservation status. So whether they're listed as threatened, rare, vulnerable, endangered under the Nature Conservation Act and the EPBC Act.

Mr Biggins:

To go back to the question, could you please explain when biodiversity first becomes materially present on an otherwise vacant block?

Manager Environmental Services:

I think that's a really, really difficult question to answer without looking at a piece of vegetation. For individual native plants to become a vegetation community, they have to meet the requirements of that vegetation community classification, which the State Government set through the Tas Veg program. So it can't just be one plant or two plants, it needs to meet the classification of vegetation community. There are probably over 90 vegetation communities classified within Tasmania by the State Government, and they're all given a rating of whether they're common, or whether they're threatened or not, and the low, medium and high biodiversity value relates to how threatened they are. So something that's low is something that's much more common.

Mr Biggins:

Given that Council permission was not required for the planting of tree seedlings on private land 30 years ago, was the landowner entitled to any stewardship payments from Council's Environment Fund for the ongoing protection and cultivation of biodiversity's throughout the life of what is now

being assessed as high conservation or priority vegetation? The landholder has received no financial assistance directed towards the establishment and upkeep of what is now being classified as high conservation value trees. Why does the removal of the same vegetation 30 years later result in a material loss to the landowner as offsets when in fact the municipality has benefited from 30 years of high conservation assets within the landscape at zero cost to the Council or the municipality?

Manager Environmental Services:

Biodiversity values in Kingborough, as we know, are really high. They're high on a state level. They're considered high on a national level, and because of that, Kingborough Council has endorsed several policies, as does the State through the planning scheme, to protect those values. They are considered important and critical to the biodiversity of Australia. Land owners have native vegetation on their property, whether it's been there before they bought it, whether they plant it or not. It doesn't matter if they planted it or if it was there before them, or if it's always been there. It still has biodiversity value and offsetting as you know is one mechanism that we use at Kingborough Council to protect that biodiversity and where it can't be protected, it mitigates the loss by providing an offset.

Ms Tamika Adkins asked the following questions without notice:

8.6 Community Strategies

Tasmania is unique in requiring regional land use plans to reference community strategies. How are community strategies developed?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Can I have some more specification as to what community strategy you're referring to? Is it Council's strategic plan or a different one?

Ms Adkins:

Yes, any community strategy that needs to be built, as I said, Tasmania is unique in requiring regional land use plans, so they reference community strategy. I'm just wondering how our community strategy is developed?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I can talk about our most recent Council Strategic Plan, which is probably the most relevant community strategy. Essentially the way that that was developed is that there was consultation with our elected members, there was consultation conducted with the community, and there was also consultation with our staff as many of our staff have worked here in Kingborough and at Council for a number of years and have some really good insights into our community needs. Then those themes and suggestions and values were collated over a series of workshops and the draft reviewed at those workshops over multiple occasions until our final strategy was developed, which then came to the chambers and it was voted on and endorsed by Councillors.

Ms Adkins:

The Greater Hobart City plan references STRLUS. What local land use strategy did the nomination of 28% as LCZ and an equivalent area under the SAPS specifically reference?

Lead Strategic Planner:

I'll take a step back to answer that question. The way the planning system is set up in Tasmania is you've got your policies and recently the Tasmanian regional policies were introduced and they've got the regional plans. We are still operating under the current Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy and that work will flow into the planning schemes. It does not stipulate the percentage of properties that need to go to a specific zone. It provides more holistic and a broad scale approach to things that should be predicted or things that should be encouraged. It does not provide that level of

detail that you would expect. You will note this report on the agenda tonight, and I know we're not supposed to talk about those items, but I'm going to be cheeky by indicating that it's something that, in a way, we would like to see through the regional strategies and you'll see Council's submission and the recommendation is that we seek to see more articulation around that, the expectations, particularly for regional and rural areas. The strategy talks about that, but it's extremely high level, doesn't go down to percentages.

8.7 Part 5 Agreements

If a zone is changed and you have an overlay or overlays on your property, those overlays will generally carry over, with the information that I've researched, and the Part 5 Agreement will also carry over. My question is, the Part 5 Agreement is there for protection of a particular section of land, is that considered the same as an overlay on my property?

Lead Strategic Planner responds:

It's a very technical question and it's something that the Commission is exploring through the hearing process so they haven't provided opinion on that and I do realise there's a lot of different opinions about part 5 agreements and its interrelation with zoning, as well as overlays. Part 5 agreements have a specific purpose for specific land where overlays are more spatial. It's often an area covering multiple properties and it's got a different purpose, for instance, a flood overlay is essentially a mechanism that the planning authority can utilise to say we need to look at a property in more detail. It's more a trigger point than anything else where a covenant is actually quite explicit of what it is trying to protect or manage. They have two different mechanisms and they often work together but it is quite complex in terms of how people view that because sometimes the covenant can be utilised to address a broader issue and sometimes it simply doesn't go to the detail that it needs.

Ms Adkins:

If I only have a Part 5 Agreement and I don't have an overlay, does that mean that that's the only area on my portion of land that needs protecting?

Lead Strategic Planner:

I would say we don't know. Once you get down to the detail of the property overlay, like I said, it is so broad often you have to go and look at a site to actually determine whether it is appropriate to investigate further. The priority vegetation overlay is one of those overlays. It is a broad scale mapping, but often if you go on the site you'll find a different scenario. I don't think it's that simplistic, but I understand where you're coming from and it's something that the Commission is exploring as part of the LPS hearings.

C41/3-2026

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 Biodiversity Offsets

At the Council meeting on 2 February 2026, **Ms Natisha Knight** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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?

Officer's Response:

Council does not maintain data that specifically records whether development applications have remained undetermined or experienced delays due to an applicant not agreeing to a biodiversity offset or not entering into a Part 5 Agreement. Identifying this information would require a detailed review of individual applications over the past five years, which is not routinely undertaken.

For clarification, development applications involving offsetting requirements proceed to determination within the normal statutory process. Where biodiversity offsets are required, they are included as conditions of approval. These conditions must be met before works can commence, rather than affecting the determination of the application itself.

In practice, applicants are generally aware of the offsetting requirements contained within the performance criteria of the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme (and the incoming Tasmanian Planning Scheme). As a result, these conditions are typically satisfied and developments progress once requirements are met.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Acting Chief Executive Officer

9.2 Section 35G Statement

At the Council meeting on 2 February 2026, **Ms Karen Groves** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Were both the Section 35(G) and Section 35(F) report submitted on the same day for Councillors?

Officer's Response:

At its meeting on Monday, 21 July 2025, Council considered the Section 35F Report together with a separate Section 35G Statement. The Section 35G Statement is not part of the Local Provisions Schedule process and instead outlines recommended amendments to the State Planning Provisions. Any review of the State Planning Provisions would occur through a separate statewide process, which would provide opportunities for both Council and the community to make submissions once commenced. At this stage, no timeframe for the commencement of that process has been advised by the State Planning Office.

As part of its consideration of the Section 35F Report, Councillors were provided with copies of all representations. The report included detailed commentary on the key themes raised, including matters relating to the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ). A covering letter from Council accompanied the submission of both the Section 35F Report and the Section 35G Statement, highlighting and emphasising the community concerns identified in the representations regarding the LCZ.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Acting Chief Executive Officer

9.3 Tree By-law Consultation

At the Council meeting on 2 February 2026, **Mr Nick Booth** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

In August 2021, Kingborough Council ceased having a tree by-law provisions within their existing environmental by-laws. 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?

Officer's Response

The consultation process generated 79 written submissions. Of these, 62% expressed support for the proposed Tree By-law, while the remaining submissions indicated non-support, mixed views, unclear positions, or did not provide sufficient information to determine a position. More detailed information on the background and current status of the draft By-law is available in the report included in this agenda titled 'AGM Motion Response: Trees on Private Property By-law'

Deleeze Chetcuti, Acting Chief Executive Officer

C42/3-2026

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 Bain asked the following question without notice:

10.1 Design and Construction of Pathway to the Park and Ride in Huntingfield

I've had some Huntingfield residents contact me in relation to the possible pathway between Huntingfield and the park and ride. Within the current years budget we have a budget allocation to design a pathway between Siriu Drive in Huntingfield and the park and ride. My question is, can we just receive an update on how the design work is progressing and will the results of the design work form part of the upcoming 26/27 budget discussions?

Director Engineering Services responds:

I can confirm that the survey has been completed for the design work on that project. We are expecting the project design to be completed by about April and it will be considered as part of the 26/27 capital budget process.

Cr Midgley asked the following questions without notice:

10.2 Bus Stops

A couple of years ago, the State Government did a bus stop relocation and upgrade installation project and as part of that, they found a lot of bus stops that needed upgrading, and then they had to look at the DDA compliance around that. I know that then they chose a couple of bus stops to do across Kingborough. What I'm wanting to know is, have they all been completed, the ones that were in that budget? There was a long list of others, is there any plan for future upgrades?

Director Engineering Services responds:

I don't have more detail in terms of the numbers that predates me being here, but I do understand there is another tranche that are in the process of being designed, and will be, in terms of the shelters and the DDA compliance, I don't have the details on that, but I'll commit to getting the details back to you.

Mayor:

I think from memory that they identified the top ones to complete in the first lot of funding, I think it was around \$3,000,000 of funding from my collection, that we specifically got as part of maybe the City Deal, I can't quite recollect that, and that was far more than any other municipality received. As part of that, they did go through and prioritise them based on the usage of the the bus stops, the number of people that were actually using them every day and they started an assessment based on

the level of usage plus the accessibility of the bus stop, they were sort of the top 2 considerations and there were quite a lot completed from memory, there were at least 20 completed I believe. I know that it was certainly never going to do all of them, and there are still many more to do and they did come across some obstacles with some of them. There's one in Taroom on the Channel Highway, I think it's bus stop 36, and there was a power pole in the way and there was no way that we could make that bus stop totally accessible by a wheelchair or pram or anything like that. It's a very old location that it's been built on. It's built at the end of a road and it was a historic thing, but a lot of them they've done significant improvements to in terms of the accessibility, because the buses are now all fully wheelchair accessible as well.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

10.3 Dru Point Dog Obedience Park

I've heard a rumour this week that unfortunately the land for the dog obedience park at Dru Point has become unavailable due to TasWater opposing the development or the opportunity there. Could we get some clarity on that because it was news to my ears and what is the status and the rumor is that other land around Leslie Vale or other opportunities are being looked at with the dog obedience community feeling it's a disappointment, way too far.

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

It's not the case that TasWater have opposed, but it is the case that we have been unable to date to reach agreement in relation to the use of that land in terms of the Terms and Conditions. Given the time pressures associated with the AFL High Performance Centre project, we have looked at alternate options, one of which has been discussed with the obedience club, and I think it's fair to say they have a reasonably high level of interest in pursuing that option as an alternate, but those negotiations are still currently ongoing.

Cr Antolli:

Is it possible to come to an agreement with TasWater in the long term so that any interim step might be temporary or do the obedience park community or organisation feel that what you're looking at might be a better fit for them?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

We'll take feedback from the club in relation to whether it's an interim step or whether it's the longer term option. Councillors would be aware that as part of our support and rec strategy, we had an interest in the site at Dru Point for public recreation purposes and we will continue to pursue the use of that land irrespective of the decision of the obedience club. But, as I said, we will continue to liaise with them in relation to this as a short or long term option.

Cr Antolli:

And are you able to share what the sticking point is with TasWater?

Mayor:

It's the price that they're asking.

Cr Cordover asked the following questions without notice:

10.4 Waste Strategy

My question relates to the waste strategy and our waste wise events guide and Council's activities, specifically in relation to take away coffee cups. I realised that there's been community interest

around reducing the number of take away coffee cups that are in use and I realised that our waste wise events guidelines have some discussion around what we can do. There seems to be a disparity between how some café owners encourage people to use keep cups and whereas others don't so much. I was just interested to know how Council is leaning in and working with business owners to try and see what we can do to help get more keep cups and things like that?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Our guidelines relate to our events, however, I acknowledge that across the municipality and in all communities it's always better to be discouraging using single use packaging or food packaging. Right at this point in time we are not engaging in that space. We are working on developing a new waste strategy, which will have some broader community components in terms of education, advocacy, etc. That might be something that we consider in the development of that amongst all the other different actions that we could put in.

C43/3-2026

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

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

11.1 Sproules Road, Snug

At the Council meeting held on 2 February 2026, **Cr Richardson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

There's been 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?

Officer's Response:

Council does not normally impose specific requirements on construction traffic travelling on public roads unless works are proposed within the road reserve itself. Where a development requires construction of new or modified accesses, or service connections, those works are managed through a Road Works Permit, which includes conditions for traffic management and reinstatement of the road.

Planning permits cannot place conditions on how construction vehicles travel on an existing public road.

Sproules Road currently meets Council's standards for the level of traffic it carries. While the approved developments increase the number of properties from four to six, the resulting traffic volumes remain very low and consistent with a lightly trafficked local road.

Council has no plans to upgrade or widen Sproules Road at this time. Routine maintenance will continue to be undertaken as required to keep the road trafficable, in line with Council's service intervention levels.

Renai Clark, Senior Roads Engineer

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 6.13pm

12 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

C44/3-2026

12.1 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF USE TO VISITOR ACCOMMODATION AT UNIT 9/9 MARANOA ROAD, KINGSTON

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr David Bain

Cr Deane left the room at 6.28pm

Cr Deane returned at 6.30pm

Cr Glade-Wright left the room at 6.29pm

Cr Glade-Wright returned at 6.31pm

That the Planning Authority resolves that the development application for change of use to visitor accommodation at Unit 9/9 Maranoa Road, Kingston for Y Liu 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-2025-417 and Council Plan Reference No. P1 submitted on 25 November 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. The use and development must be managed so that the amenity of the area is not detrimentally impacted upon through any of the following:
 - (a) Transport of materials, goods or commodities to or from the land;
 - (b) Appearance of any building, works or materials;
 - (c) Emission of noise, artificial light, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, wastewater or waste products (rubbish).
3. The visitor accommodation is for short term stay only. Accommodated guests must not stay any longer than a total of three (3) months on any one occasion.
4. Guests must park within the designated car parking area for the strata lot.
5. Prior to the commencement of the approved use, a management plan for the operation of a visitor accommodation must be submitted and approved as a condition endorsement, to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services with such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. The management plan must include measures to limit, manage and mitigate unreasonable impacts upon the amenity of long term residents. These measures must include, but are not limited to the following requirements:
 - (a) To limit, manage and mitigate noise generated as a result of the visitor accommodation;
 - (b) To limit, manage and mitigate behaviour issues caused as a result of the visitor accommodation;

- (c) To maintain the security of the building where the visitor accommodation would be located, including managing and/or limiting access to shared areas and facilities;
- (d) To specify the maximum permitted occupancy of the visitor accommodation;
- (e) To specify that if guests utilise the site for the parking of vehicles the maximum number of vehicles to be parked on the sites is one (1) and detail where the designated parking space is located and how the space is to be accessed. Additionally, at the booking stage, guests should be discouraged from bringing more than one vehicle and be advised that the site is constrained and shared with a number of other users and to take care not to park in any other space or part of the site not allocated for the booking;
- (f) To provide a name and contact phone number of a person who will respond to any complaints regarding behaviour of guests. If the property is sold the Visitor Accommodation Management Plan (VAMP) must be updated with new contact details.

Once approved, the management plan must be implemented prior to the commencement of the approved use and must be maintained for as long as the visitor accommodation is in operation. The VAMP must be provided to adjacent property owners and occupiers within 14 days of being approved. If the property is sold, the updated VAMP (in accordance with (f) above) must be provided to adjacent property owners and occupiers within 10 business days of settlement.

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. This permit does not include approval for any signage to be erected on site. Further approval may be required for the erection of signage on the site.
- D. Food must not be sold or served to guests without prior consent from Council's Environmental Health Officer.

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

Against: Crs Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

CARRIED 7/3

PLANNING AUTHORITY SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed at 6.57pm

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

C45/3-2026

15.1 REVIEW OF THE SOUTHERN TASMANIAN REGIONAL LAND USE STRATEGY (STRLUS)

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

It is recommended that:

- (a) Council provide a submission on the draft Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy (STRLUS), noting that the Strategy's overall intent and strategic direction are supported in principle.
- (b) In that submission, express support for the Strategy while advocating for targeted refinements to strengthen clarity, implementation and place-based application, consistent with the themes, analysis and commentary set out in this report and in Attachment 1.
- (c) Council authorise the Chief Executive Officer to finalise and lodge Council's submission on the draft STRLUS.

Cr Richardson left the room at 7.16pm
Cr Richardson returned at 7.18pm

Cr Deane left the room at 7.17pm
Cr Deane returned at 7.19pm

CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7.40pm
Meeting resumed at 7.50pm

Cr Midgley left the room at 7.50pm
Cr Midgley returned at 7.51pm

Cr Antolli left the room at 7.50pm
Cr Antolli returned at 7.52pm

C46/3-2026**15.2 AGM NOTICE OF MOTION - DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That the response to the motion is noted and that Council continue progressing improvement initiatives relating to development assessment processes, including initiatives related to RFIs.

CARRIED

C47/3-2026**15.3 AGM NOTICE OF MOTION: TREES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY BY-LAW**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That:

- (a) Council defer any work on the proposed *Trees on Private Property By-law, By-law 1 of 2022* until the Tasmanian Planning Scheme is adopted; and
- (b) On adoption of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, a Council workshop be held to discuss the future of the *Trees on Private Property By-law, By-law 1 of 2022*.

CARRIED

C48/3-2026**15.4 RECONSIDERATION OF AGM MOTION 2023 - ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS**

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

It is recommended that:

- (a) Council determines that the change proposed in the motion is not required at this time and reaffirms its existing processes, noting that these already include internal expert review, requests for further information where clarification or additional detail is needed, seeking advice from external agencies and the option to commission an external review.
- (b) Council notes that the escalation process described in the report will be documented in an internal process and communicated to staff.

CARRIED

C49/3-2026**15.5 LAND LEASE - KINGBOROUGH SPORTS PRECINCT**

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Christian Street

That:

- (a) On completion of a subdivision and issue of title for ~3.298Ha of land within the Kingborough Sports Precinct, the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to negotiate a long-term lease agreement with the Tasmanian Devils Football Club with the following key terms and conditions to apply:
 - (i) Term – up to 99 years.
 - (ii) Rental – peppercorn with full rates and charges applicable to the property to apply.

- (iii) Use – AFL High Performance Training and Administration Centre and associated uses.
 - (iv) Termination – lease agreement to be reassigned to the State Government if terminated by the Tasmanian Devils Football Club.
 - (v) Asset ownership - lease applies to land only with the Tasmanian Devils Football Club to be the owner of all assets constructed thereon and responsible for full asset depreciation costs.
 - (vi) Insurance - \$25m subject to review every 10 years.
 - (vii) Assignment – subject to landlord consent.
 - (viii) Improvements – subject to statutory approvals with GM consent not to be unreasonably withheld.
- (b) Signing of the above lease agreement be subject to confirmation from the State Government that all elements of the project are fully funded.

CARRIED

C50/3-2026

15.6 OVAL LEASE - KINGBOROUGH SPORTS PRECINCT

Moved: Cr David Bain
Seconded: Cr Christian Street

That Council advertises its intent to dispose of the Twin Ovals AFL ground by means of a long-term lease to the Tasmanian Football Club.

CARRIED

C51/3-2026

15.7 COMMUNITY SERVICES STRATEGY

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

That Council note:

- a) The development of the Community Services 2027–2032 Strategy which will be presented to Council for endorsement prior to implementation.
- b) During its development, programming under existing strategies, including Youth, Art and Culture and Positive Ageing, will continue.

CARRIED

C52/3-2026

15.8 POLICY REVIEW 4.13 ESTABLISHMENT OF BUSHFIRE HAZARD MANAGEMENT AREAS ON COUNCIL LAND

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council

- (a) Endorse the attached Policy 4.13 on the Establishment of Bushfire Hazard Management Areas on Council Land.
- (b) Review the Policy in five years to ensure it remains relevant and consistent with statutory requirements for best practice building in bushfire prone areas.

CARRIED

C53/3-2026**15.9 KINGBOROUGH WASTE SERVICES - DIRECTOR REMUNERATION**

Moved: Cr Mark Richardson

Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That Council approves an increase to the remuneration for the Chairperson of the Board of Kingborough Waste Services Pty Ltd to \$12,500 and an increase for the other Independent Director to \$10,000.

CARRIED

C54/3-2026**15.10 FINANCIAL REPORT - JANUARY 2026**

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council endorses the attached Financial Report as at 31 January 2026.

CARRIED

C55/3-2026**15.11 APPENDICES**

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

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

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

C56/3-2026**16.1 Landscape Conservation Zone**

Moved: Cr Clare Glade-Wright

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

Cr Midgley left the room at 9.11pm

Cr Midgley returned at 9.12pm

That Council:

- (a) Acknowledges concerns raised by Kingborough residents that the use of the term “*discretionary*” is being interpreted by lenders and insurance providers in its ordinary English sense, resulting in:
 - (i) difficulty obtaining finance,
 - (ii) higher insurance premiums, or
 - (iii) refusal of insurance or lending for otherwise lawfully approved developments; and
- (b) Resolves to write to the Minister for Planning, the State Planning Office, and the Tasmanian Planning Commission:

- (i) outlining the adverse practical impacts this terminology is having on residents,
- (ii) requesting consideration of a clearer and more accurate term (such as “*performance-assessed development*”) to describe this assessment pathway within the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

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

Against: Crs Gideon Cordover and Flora Fox

CARRIED 8/2

C57/3-2026

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*

CEO's Performance Review

Regulation 17(2)(a) *personnel matters, including complaints against an employee of the council.*

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 9.29pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 10.30pm

C58/3-2026

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
CEO's Performance Review	Deferred

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 10.31pm

.....
 (Confirmed)

.....
 (Date)