MINUTES – ORDINARY MEETING
21 SEPTEMBER 2015

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NORTHERN MIDLANDS COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, LONGFORD AT 5.05PM ON MONDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 2015

243/15 ATTENDANCE

1 PRESENT

Mayor Downie, Deputy Mayor Goss, Cr Adams, Cr Calvert, Cr Goninon, Cr Gordon, Cr Knowles, Cr Lambert, Cr Polley AM, Mr Jennings – General Manager, Mr Chellis – Works & Infrastructure Manager (to 8.26pm), Miss Bricknell – Corporate Services Manager (to 9.29pm), Mr Payton – Planning & Development Manager (to 9.29pm), Ms Green – Economic & Community Development Manager (to 8.22pm), Mr Godier – Senior Planner (to 8.09pm), Miss Mason (to 6.00pm), Mrs Eacher – Executive Assistant

2 APOLOGIES

Nil
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245/15 DECLARATIONS OF ANY PECUNIARY INTEREST OF A COUNCILLOR OR CLOSE ASSOCIATE

Section 8 sub clause (7) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) 2005 require that the Chairperson is to request Councillors to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have a pecuniary interest in any item on the Agenda.

No declarations of pecuniary interest were received.

246/15 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING – 17 AUGUST 2015

DECISION

Cr Goss/Cr Gordon

The Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Northern Midlands Council held at the Council Chambers, Longford on Monday, 17 August 2015, be confirmed as a true record of proceedings.

Carried unanimously

2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

Minutes of meetings of the following Committees were circulated in the Attachments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) 16/06/2015</td>
<td>Avoca Museum and Information Centre</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) 30/06/2015</td>
<td>Avoca Museum and Information Centre</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) 30/06/2015</td>
<td>Avoca Museum and Information Centre</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) 12/08/2015</td>
<td>Morven Park Management &amp; Development Association Inc</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) 01/09/2015</td>
<td>Campbell Town District Forum</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) 01/09/2015</td>
<td>Evandale Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) 02/09/2015</td>
<td>Ross Local District Committee</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) 09/09/2015</td>
<td>Longford Local District Committee</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DECISION

Cr Adams/Cr Lambert

That the Minutes of the Meetings of the above Council Committees be received.

Carried unanimously

3 RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUB COMMITTEES

In the attached minutes of sub committees, no new recommendations have been noted as being for Council’s consideration.

NOTE: Matters already considered by Council at previous meetings have been incorporated into INFO 15: Officer’s Action Items.
Mayor Downie advised that the next Ordinary Council Meeting would be held on Monday, 19 October 2015, at the Northern Midlands Council Chambers at Longford to commence at 5.00pm.

### INFORMATION ITEMS

#### 1 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS/MEETINGS HELD SINCE THE LAST ORDINARY MEETING

**Responsible Officer:** Des Jennings, General Manager

The General Manager advised that the following workshops/meetings had been held since the last Council meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Held</th>
<th>Purpose of Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/08/2015</td>
<td><strong>Special Council Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2015</td>
<td><strong>Council Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NBN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Targa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• West Perth Drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stokes Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chamber of Commerce membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local District Committee Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• By-Law: Keeping of Pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Closure of Burghley Street/Lewis Streets, Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heritage Highway Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/09/2015</td>
<td><strong>Council Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• prior to Council meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2 MAYOR’S COMMUNICATIONS

Mayor Downie’s communications to 21 September are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 August 2015</td>
<td>Attended Hydro Tasmania Cocktail Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2015</td>
<td>Attended NTD Executive Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2015</td>
<td>Attended EMIT meeting, Campbell Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2015</td>
<td>Attended meeting with Katrena Stephenson, CEO - LGAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August 2015</td>
<td>Attended Beacon Foundation Group Establishment Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 2015</td>
<td>Unveiled the History Board at Cressy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 2015</td>
<td>Attended special Council workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended Bendigo Bank information lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended the Campbell Town Football Club Grand Final at Oatlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended the Australian Motorcycle Championships, Symmons Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September 2015</td>
<td>Conducted Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended Council workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended meeting with TNT, Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended Longford Velodrome Turbomeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 September 2015</td>
<td>Attended Meals on Wheels AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 September 2015</td>
<td>Met with individuals re education in Tasmania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>Meeting with Deputy Secretary re Launceston Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 September 2015</td>
<td>Opened the Norfolk Plains Jazz Festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3  PETITION

1  PURPOSE OF REPORT

In accordance with the Vision, Mission and Values of Council as identified in the Council’s Strategic Plan 2007-2017 and the Local Government Act 1993, S57 – S60, provision is made for Council to receive petitions tabled at the Council Meeting.

2  OFFICER’S COMMENT

In relation to the receipt of petitions, the following provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, Part 6 - Petitions, polls and public meetings, S57 and S58, should be noted:

Section 57. Petitions

(1) A person may lodge a petition with a council by presenting it to a councillor or the general manager.
(2) A person lodging a petition is to ensure that the petition contains –
   (a) a clear and concise statement identifying the subject matter; and
   (b) a heading on each page indicating the subject matter; and
   (c) a brief statement on each page of the subject matter and the action requested; and
   (d) a statement specifying the number of signatories; and
   (e) the full printed name, address and signature of the person lodging the petition at the end of the petition.

58. Tabling petition

(1) A councillor who has been presented with a petition is to –
   (a) table the petition at the next ordinary meeting of the council; or
   (b) forward it to the general manager within 7 days after receiving it.
(2) A general manager who has been presented with a petition or receives a petition under subsection (1)(b) is to table the petition at the next ordinary meeting of the council.
(3) A petition is not to be tabled if –
   (a) it does not comply with section 57; or
   (b) it is defamatory; or
   (c) any action it proposes is unlawful.
(4) The general manager is to advise the lodger of a petition that is not tabled the reason for not tabling it within 21 days after lodgement.

3  PETITIONS RECEIVED

Nil.

4  CONFERENCES & SEMINARS:

REPORT ON ATTENDANCE BY COUNCIL DELEGATES

1  PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide an opportunity for Councillors and the General Manager to report on their attendance at recent conferences/seminars.

In accordance with Council’s Strategic Plan 2007-2017 (2012/13 Revision), Part 1 – Governance, the core functions are:

- Support Council with governance advice and effective leadership, review and implement organisational values through day to day operations, effective communication, community consultation and advocacy, issues identification, strategic and corporate planning, annual reports, public and private resource sharing, induction of elected members, provision of legal advice, human resources management and liaise with representative bodies.
- Support Council with sound financial advice and management, and generate funds without burdening the community. Rates administration, budgeting and reporting, debt collection, taxation, asset registers and depreciation, receipts and payments, wages and salaries, loans and investments, records management,
2 CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS

Nil

5 WORKS & INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT

The Works & Infrastructure Report for the period to 8 September 2015 was circulated in the Attachments.

6 BUILDING APPROVALS

The following table provides a comparison of the number and total value of building works for 2014 and 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Total Value ($)</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Total Value ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwellings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>763,820</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10,195,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Additions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>571,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage/Sheds &amp; Additions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>137,509</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,111,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7,573,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Signs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Certificates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended Permits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,153,329</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>19,524,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures do not include Building Approvals processed under the Resource Sharing Agreements.

7 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Planning decisions in August 2015:
Total Approved: 13
Total Refused: 1
Total Permitted: 2
Total Discretionary: 8
Average Days for Permitted: 6
Average Days for Discretionary: 41
Days allowed for approval by LUPAA: 28
Days allowed for approval under LUPAA: 42
Total Exempt under IPS: 4
Total Strata Plans Approved: 4
Total Withdrawn: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>No of LUPAA days</th>
<th>Perm / Disc / Exempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P15-028</td>
<td>2-lot subdivision</td>
<td>42 Main Street, CRESSY</td>
<td>Cohen &amp; Associates Pty Ltd (obo Kelder)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-153</td>
<td>Subdivision &amp; boundary adjustment (add lot 3 to CT44886;1; subdivide CT44510/2 into lots 2 &amp; 4; create rights of ways and easements to maintain access &amp; water rights)</td>
<td>1308 P owranna Road &amp; Lot 1 Burlington Road, CRESSY</td>
<td>Rogerson &amp; Birch Surveyors (obo Lowe &amp; Tooma)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-187</td>
<td>Lunchroom (ancillary to level 2 activity under EMPCA)</td>
<td>2080 Bishopsbourne Road (accessed via 556/15D), LONGFORD</td>
<td>Wilkin Design (obo TasWater)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-194</td>
<td>Dwelling (vary front &amp; side [N &amp; S] setbacks) &amp; garage (vary setback to dwelling, opening widths facing frontage &amp; floor area) in the Low Density Residential zone</td>
<td>24 Minerva Drive (lot 33), PERTH</td>
<td>G &amp; T Development</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DELEGATED DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>No of LUPAA days</th>
<th>Perm / Disc / Exempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P15-197</td>
<td>2-lot subdivision &amp; boundary adjustment - heritage precinct</td>
<td>24 Macquarie Street &amp; 23 Murray Street, EVANDALE</td>
<td>Michell Hodgetts &amp; Assoc Pty Ltd (obo Wallis &amp; Castrechini)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-199</td>
<td>Demolition of fire-damaged dwelling (heritage precinct)</td>
<td>18 Badajos Street, ROSS</td>
<td>A C Double</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-200</td>
<td>2-lot subdivision (heritage precinct)</td>
<td>11A Frederick Street, PERTH</td>
<td>Sty Degrees (obo Wrigley)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-207</td>
<td>Shed (7m x 7m) - vary N side setback to 0.97m</td>
<td>1 Gatenby Street, CRESSY</td>
<td>Prime Design (obo J Farrow)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-222</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>17c Cracroft Street, LONGFORD</td>
<td>GJ Gardner Homes Launceston</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-224</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>256 Norwich Drive, LONGFORD</td>
<td>I A Ferrier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-228</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>6 Country Field Court, LONGFORD</td>
<td>D J Stewart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-231</td>
<td>Garage &amp; demolition of existing garden shed</td>
<td>166 Fairtlough Street, PERTH</td>
<td>MHL &amp; RL Pedder</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15-240</td>
<td>Dwelling addition (exempt in flood-prone area)</td>
<td>1 George Street, PERTH</td>
<td>Loop Architecture Pty Ltd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COUNCIL DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>No of LUPAA days</th>
<th>Perm / Disc / Exempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P15-165</td>
<td>Multiple dwellings x 4 at the rear of existing dwelling (vary rear setback &amp; visitor parking), tree removal &amp; shed demolition</td>
<td>27 Lewis Street, LONGFORD</td>
<td>Porky &amp; Co</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REFUSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>No of LUPAA days</th>
<th>Perm / Disc / Exempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P15-165</td>
<td>Multiple dwellings x 4 at the rear of existing dwelling (vary rear setback &amp; visitor parking), tree removal &amp; shed demolition</td>
<td>27 Lewis Street, LONGFORD</td>
<td>Porky &amp; Co</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 8 MATTERS AWAITING DECISION BY TPC & RMPAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPC</th>
<th>Tasmanian Planning Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>Northern Midlands Interim Planning Scheme 2013 – effective date 1.6.13. Report on representations sent to TPC. TPC held a meeting on 21 May 2015 with Council staff and representors to discuss representations to the Interim Scheme. Results of the meeting yet to be received. Planning Reform Taskforce established by State – the declared schemes will be used as a consistent platform for the transition to a single planning scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gap Analysis

01/2015 Rural Living zone subdivision provisions – public exhibition completed 27.5.15, report to June meeting, sent to TPC. Clarification of Draft Amendment to be provided to TPC.

05/2015 Rezone from Community Purposes to Village – TPC to convene a public meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RMPAT</th>
<th>Resource Management &amp; Planning Appeals Tribunal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P11-122</td>
<td>Section 64 order – earthworks at 18 Logan Road, Evandale adjourned pending outcome of planning application – amendment 04/2015 regarding zoning of access is in process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Decisions received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/2015</td>
<td>Amend General Residential zone re access to 18 Logan Road, Evandale –approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RMPAT
75/15P  P15-165 – Refusal of Multiple dwellings x 4, 27 Lewis St, Longford – teleconference held 7.9.15.
Revised grounds of refusal to be provided by 14.9.15. Mediation listed for 15.9.15. Hearing listed for 19.11.15.

9  USE OF COUNCIL SEAL: AUGUST 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2015/2016</th>
<th>2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Final plans of subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part 5 Agreements under Land Use Planning &amp; Approvals Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Instruments of Approval for Planning Scheme Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Draft Amendments to Northern Midlands Planning Scheme 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Management Agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Agreements/Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10  132 & 337 CERTIFICATES ISSUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Certificates Issued 2015/2016 year</th>
<th>Total 2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul  Aug  Sept  Oct  Nov  Dec  Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr  May  June</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 37</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11  ANIMAL CONTROL: AUGUST 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Registered</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>88,126</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Impounded</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-claimed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-homed/To RSPCA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kennel Licences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed Kennel Licences</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infringement Notices (paid in full)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5,307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Impounded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>102,091</td>
<td>36,565</td>
<td>58,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12  HEALTH ISSUES

Immunisations

The Public Health Act 1997 requires that Councils offer immunisations against a number of diseases. The following table will provide Council with details of the rate of immunisations provided through Schools. Monthly clinics are not offered by Council; however, parents are directed to their local General Practitioner who provides the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July-September</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-December</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-March</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-June</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Environmental Health Services

Determine acceptable and achievable levels of environmental and public health by ongoing monitoring, inspection, education and, where necessary, by applying corrective measures by mutual consent or application of legislation.
Ensure safe standards of food offered for sale are maintained.

### Investigations/Inspections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>2014/2015</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notifiable Diseases</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of Food Premises</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notifiable Disease investigations have been carried out by the Department of Health and Human Services from Hobart, with only significant outbreaks directed to Council to assist with investigations. However, due to the prompt and thorough investigating by Council Environmental Health Officers, the Department now directs more cases for Council to investigate.

Food premises are due for inspection from 1 July each year.

### 13 CUSTOMER REQUEST RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Area</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works (North)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works (South)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14 GIFTS & DONATIONS (UNDER SECTION 77 OF THE LGA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
<td>Campbell Town District High School</td>
<td>Chaplaincy</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
<td>Campbell Town District High School</td>
<td>Inspiring Positive Futures Program</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Aug-15</td>
<td>Rural Alive &amp; Well</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-14</td>
<td>Helping Hand Associated</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-14</td>
<td>Longford Care-a-car</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
<td>Mr Bailey Groves</td>
<td>28th Summer Universiade South Korea</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
<td>Ms Teressa Morris</td>
<td>Aust Darts Championships WA</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Aug-15</td>
<td>Miss Ktaitlyn Cawthen</td>
<td>Indoor Bias Bowls Championships 2015</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Aug-15</td>
<td>Mrs Helen Farrow</td>
<td>Indoor Bias Bowls Championships 2015</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Aug-15</td>
<td>Miss Georgia Brown</td>
<td>2016 Aust Jamboree in Sydney - Cressy Scouts</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Mr Chayce Jones</td>
<td>All Australian U15 Football Team</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DONATIONS** $17,220
## 15 ACTION ITEMS: COUNCIL MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Min. Ref.</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Expected Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>220/15</td>
<td>Code Of Conduct Amendment Bill</td>
<td>That Council recommend to the Local Government Association of Tasmania to recommend Option 4) To only allow for complaints regarding incidents/matters that have happened in the preceding 90 days, but clearly provide the ability for the Code of Conduct Panel to consider related matters that precede the 90 days but are within the current term to the Legislative Council regarding code of conduct complaints.</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>LGAT notified</td>
<td>19/8/2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>222/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Cressy Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Cressy Local District Committee: That Council consider Cressy as a priority for town entrance statements.</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>223/15</td>
<td>Councillors Allowances, Travelling &amp; Other Expenses Policy</td>
<td>That Council adopt the amendments to the Councillors Allowances, Travelling &amp; Other Expenses Policy.</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>225/15</td>
<td>Policy Manual Amendment</td>
<td>That Council adopt the amendments to the Volunteer Recognition Program Policy.</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>226/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Longford Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Longford Local District Committee: That the LLDC seek the Council’s support to appoint an appropriately qualified person to develop a concept plan improving the streetscape of Longford from the Illawarra Road roundabout to the southern end of the heritage precinct.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Report to September Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>227/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Longford Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Longford Local District Committee: That Council officers establish with State Growth permissible signage for the eastern and western approaches to Longford from Illawarra Road.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Discussions underway with Department of State Growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>228/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Perth Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Perth Local District Committee: That Council undertake a full review of the facilities at the Perth Community Centre.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Report to September Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/2014</td>
<td>329/14</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>That Council facilitate meetings with the local businesses in each of the towns to explore business opportunities and other matters of interest.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>To be progressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/2015</td>
<td>148/15</td>
<td>Information Items</td>
<td>That TasWater be requested to provide a water tank to the Conara community.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Contact made with TasWater. TasWater to follow up the matter with Cr Gordon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02/2015</td>
<td>42/15</td>
<td>Launceston Airport And TRANSlink Precinct Master Plan Proposal</td>
<td>That: i) management continue to seek stakeholder support for the Launceston Gateway Precinct Master Plan. ii) Council support the recommendation to the Northern Tasmania Development (NTD), Local Government Committee to identify the project as being of regional and state significance, having links to the Regional Futures Plan. iii) an estimate of costs be identified for Council’s consideration.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Fee offer sought for preparation of a Freight Demand Analysis. Funding support to date - RDA Tasmania $10,000; NTD $10,000; Launceston Airport $5,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Min. Ref.</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Expected Date of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>218/15</td>
<td>Local Government Reform</td>
<td>That the Council i) endorse engagement in a benchmarking project involving councils in northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing comparative data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and identifies areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between councils; ii) support the tender process for the feasibility study being open to consultants that are not included on the list of four consultants identified on the Tender Panel; iii) the General Manager be authorised to appoint a consultant with suitable local government experience; and iv) authorise the General Manager to report back to the September council meeting on a way forward, if no progress has been made on the benchmarking project involving other councils.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Report to September Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2015</td>
<td>94/15</td>
<td>Perth Town Structure Plan</td>
<td>That: i) Council supports the preparation of the Perth Town Structure Plan; ii) Council’s Management seek external financial support for the preparation of the Plan; iii) Council’s Management engage with the local businesses and the Perth Local District Committee to seek support for the process; and iv) a funding allocation is incorporated in the 2015/2016 Budget to progress the project.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Discussion with State Growth continues, seeking funding support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/2015</td>
<td>186/15</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Assets - Macquarie Road, Campbell Town</td>
<td>That pursuant to section 39(7) of the Local Government (Highways) Act 1982; Council resolves to require the occupier of the land situate and known as ‘Rosedale’ owned by Rosedale Rural Pty Ltd on which trees are growing on land adjoining Macquarie Road at Campbell Town, to remove each of the trees as identified in this report together with the plan attached to this resolution and described as follows: Situate adjacent to Road Asset number 774: i) The first section of trees commences 235 metres from Ashby Road (on the Campbell Town side) to 663 metres from Ashby Road, number of trees in this section is 101. ii) The second section of trees commences 798 metres from Ashby Road (on the Campbell Town side) to 877 metres from Ashby Road, number of trees in this section is 19. Council is of the opinion that it is desirable to remove the said trees to address the associated danger, obstruction and inconvenience to the users of Macquarie Road, Campbell Town. That the General Manager have discussions with land owners to determine whether an adequate resolution can be reached and if agreement cannot be reached Council revert back to 1) and 2) above.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager to arrange meeting with property owner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/2015</td>
<td>192/15</td>
<td>Tasmania Trade Mission to China</td>
<td>That Council approach Northern Tasmania Development seeking consideration by the regional group to establish formal relationships with the cities in China to develop and maintain cultural and economic networks.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Letter sent to NTD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/2015</td>
<td>190/15</td>
<td>Tyre Recycling Facility Tour</td>
<td>1) That Council officers continue to assist to facilitate a sustainable waste tyre recycling option. 2) That Council officers investigate funding options that may be available through Tyre Stewardship and other funding sources.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Council officers continue to assist proponents and raise the matter with State Growth officers and requested the matter be considered by the Premier's local government committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/09/2013</td>
<td>226/13 (3)</td>
<td>Recommendations of Sub Committees - Natural Resource Management Committee</td>
<td>That Council investigate the feasibility of a trial of cat management activities in a local community in the Municipality with a view to test the effectiveness of cat control in reducing populations of feral and unrestrained cats. It is suggested that the investigation consider approaches used in the Bellingham area as a model for use in NMC.</td>
<td>NRM Officer / Planning &amp; Development Manager</td>
<td>Awaiting outcome of State Government Cat Management Plan, due end 2015.</td>
<td>30-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MINUTES – ORDINARY MEETING

**21 SEPTEMBER 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Min. Ref.</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Expected Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>234/15</td>
<td>NRM North – Association Representation</td>
<td>That Council nominate Cr Knowles as its representative and Cr Adams as its NRM Committee representative to the Association.</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Manager</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/2014</td>
<td>267/14</td>
<td>Policy Review: Policy 30 – Dog Management Policy</td>
<td>That Council endorse the proposed changes to Policy 30, as highlighted in the attached document, for public exhibition in accordance with s.7 of the Dog Control Act 2000.</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Manager</td>
<td>To be advertised and letters to be sent to local kennel owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>212/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Longford Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Longford Local District Committee: That the LLDC supports the general thrust of the Fox Report and urges Council to develop a challenging but realistic tourism plan for Longford, including in particular: 1. Improvements to the streetscape, such as banners, to add vibrancy (key Fox observation); 2. Council provide support to maximise benefits stemming from a collaborative information/promotion link between the Longford Business &amp; Tourism Association, Woolmers and Brickendon (Fox recommendation 15); 3. Adoption of a Longford Visitors Centre based on the Evandale model, subject to the 20 July 2015 decision of Council; 4. Development of a calendar of museum/exhibition events showcasing items unique to Longford; 5. Uniform local street and attractions signage throughout Longford and surrounds (Fox recommendation 6).</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Report to September Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>232/15</td>
<td>Heart FM Community Radio Station</td>
<td>That Council approve the allocation of $11,000 to fund the conversion of the room in the Memorial Hall into HeartFM’s studio and office, and in return Council will receive at no charge a Gold Level Sponsorship package with HeartFM across 2015–2018.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Work to commence late September.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2015</td>
<td>90/15</td>
<td>Honeysuckle Banks Masterplan proposal</td>
<td>That Council approve the development of a masterplan for Honeysuckle Banks, Evandale, at a maximum cost of $2,000.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Consultant contracted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>216/15</td>
<td>Longford Visitor Appeal Study Report; Implementation Update</td>
<td>That Council endorse the implementation plan for the Longford Visitor Appeal Study.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/2015</td>
<td>150/15</td>
<td>Northern Midlands Community Sports Centre Master Plan</td>
<td>That Council: i) Accept the Northern Midlands Community Sports Centre Master Plan in principle; and ii) Request Council Officers, in collaboration with Health Revival Longford, to review the recommended implementation stages in the Master Plan and develop a revised prioritised list of implementation stages; with the exclusion of the therapy pool.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Revised priority staging developed. Plans being prepared for the new gym and storage area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>217/15</td>
<td>Northern Midlands Further Education Bursary Program 2015</td>
<td>That Council appoint Cr Knowles, Cr Lambert and Cr Calvert to the 2015 Further Education Bursary Committee.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Committee to meet mid-October to select bursary recipients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/2015</td>
<td>160/15</td>
<td>Proposed Contemporary Destination Play Space At Longford</td>
<td>That Council: a) Council authorises management to progress the preparation of a concept plan for the play space in consultation with stakeholders. b) Council authorises Council officers to arrange a public forum to collate the ideas of the community for the project, prepare a brief and submit to play space developers.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Report to September Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2015</td>
<td>118/15</td>
<td>Recommendations Of Sub Committees - Northern Midlands Economic Development Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and endorse the following recommendation of the Northern Midlands Economic Development Committee: That Council write to the Minister for Primary Industries and Water to outline Council’s vision for the development of a Rural Processing Centre at the western end of Burlington Road, and request the Minister give consideration to approving the inclusion of Cressy Research Farm land in this Centre.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Letter sent to Minister 25/6/2015, response awaited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Min. Ref.</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Expected Date of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2015</td>
<td>118/15</td>
<td>Recommendations Of Sub Committees - Northern Midlands Economic Development Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and endorse the following recommendation of the Northern Midlands Economic Development Committee: That Council write to landowners adjoining the western end of Burlington Road to outline Council’s vision for the development of a Rural Processing Centre at the western end of Burlington Road and request the landowners give consideration to making land available for inclusion in the Centre.</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Dev. Manager</td>
<td>Letters sent to landowners 25/6/2015, responses awaited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2015</td>
<td>118/15</td>
<td>Recommendations Of Sub Committees - Ross Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Ross Local District Committee: That Council investigate the possibility of offering a subsidy for returning bottles/ cans/ drink bottles.</td>
<td>Engineering Officer</td>
<td>To be included in discussions at next Northern Regional Waste Management Group meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/08/2015</td>
<td>212/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Ross Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Ross Local District Committee: That Council investigate the installation of a bus stop and shelter on Church Street, Ross on the land next to the Town Hall and in front of the Public Toilet for all school buses.</td>
<td>Works &amp; Infrastructure Manager</td>
<td>To be investigated further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2015</td>
<td>91/15</td>
<td>Frequency of Kerbside Refuse Collection</td>
<td>That Council continues to provide a fortnightly collection service and encourages residents to request additional bins if they have insufficient capacity, and investigate if the Regional Waste Management Group could undertake a Green Waste Collection trial within the Northern Midlands.</td>
<td>Works &amp; Infrastructure Manager</td>
<td>To be negotiated with Regional Waste Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2015</td>
<td>102/15</td>
<td>Priority Project: Sealing of Nile Road</td>
<td>That Council authorises the preparation of an economic appraisal of road infrastructure investment for the sealing of the Nile Road, up to a maximum of $10,000.</td>
<td>Works &amp; Infrastructure Manager</td>
<td>Consultants being assessed for feasibility study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2015</td>
<td>118/15</td>
<td>Recommendations Of Sub Committees - Ross Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Ross Local District Committee: That the new picnic table on the northern end of Church Street be moved to the southern end of Church Street, and be replaced with the existing sandstone style.</td>
<td>Works &amp; Infrastructure Manager</td>
<td>To be investigated further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LONG TERM ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Min. Ref.</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Expected Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2015</td>
<td>105/15</td>
<td>Northern Midlands Towns Entrance Statements</td>
<td>That Council authorises officers to investigate the cost to design and implement entrance statements for: a) Avoca; b) Campbell Town; c) Cressy; d) Evandale; e) Longford; f) Perth; g) Ross; and list within the draft 2015/2016 budget for consideration</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2015</td>
<td>118/15</td>
<td>Recommendations Of Sub Committees - Longford Local District Committee</td>
<td>That Council note and investigate the following recommendation of the Longford Local District Committee: The Longford Local District Committee recommends Council establish a bi-lateral agreement with State Growth for the maintenance of the appearance and condition of the roundabout and its surrounds.</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>To be considered as part of entrance statement review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2015</td>
<td>125/15</td>
<td>Glenorchy City Council Re: Council Reform</td>
<td>That Council defer any action on this request from Glenorchy City Council awaiting the outcome of current benchmarking project with neighbouring councils.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/2012</td>
<td>262/12</td>
<td>Sub Committee Recommendations - Cressy Local District Committee</td>
<td>That funding be sought for the establishment of a cycle way between Cressy and Longford or other areas that may be appropriate</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Awaiting suitable grant funding program.</td>
<td>Review 6 Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/2015</td>
<td>60/15</td>
<td>Confirmation Of Minutes - Recommendations Of Sub Committees - Ross Local District Committee</td>
<td>Note and investigate the following recommendations of the Ross Local District Committee: The Ross Local District Committee request the Northern Midlands Council to have all cats registered.</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Manager</td>
<td>Awaiting outcome of State Government Cat Management Plan, due end 2015.</td>
<td>31-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16 KEY ISSUES BEING CONSIDERED: MANAGERS’ REPORTS

Activities from the 1 to 31 August 2015

1. GOVERNANCE UNIT – GENERAL MANAGER

a. Governance – Meetings/Conferences

- Council meetings:
  - Ordinary meeting 17 August
- Council Workshops:
  - Ordinary workshop 17 August
  - Special workshop 31 August
- Community meetings:

- Executive Management Team:
  - 5 August
  - 19 August

- Staff Meeting
  - 11 August
  - 25 August

- Other Meetings:
  - Met with Greg House and Lara Hendriks Department of State Growth
  - Attended Meeting at UTAS
  - Attended second advisory group meeting – Continuous Improvement Framework
  - Met with David Denman re the sports centre and main street projects
  - Attended Local Government Committee Meeting
  - Attended MAX Employment Work for the Dole launch
  - Met with Eric Abetz re Launceston Airport rates
  - Industrial land prospectus – Northern Tasmania – RDA
  - Met with Kim Clifford and Penny Spoelder, TRC Tourism consultants re Ben Lomond Study
  - Attended northern update – Planning Reform Taskforce
  - Met with Deputy Secretary re Launceston and Hobart Airports.
  - Attended Perth Road Reference Group Meeting
  - Attended meeting with Shane Gregory – Department of State Growth
  - Attended GM’s Meeting re Benchmarking Project
  - Met with Lynda McKay - Beacon Business Engagement Manager
• Met re Longford Equestrian Association proposal
• Met with Page Seager
• Met with Kristy Scott, HR Consultant
• Undertook tour of Qantas freight facility at Melbourne airport
• Met with Max Employment re Work for the Dole
• Attended Perth Primary School - Major Works Committee meeting
• Met with David Denham
• Attended unveiling of Cressy History Board

b. General Business:
• Health & Safety and Risk Management Review
• NBN Rollout
• Sub Regional Alliance
• Legal issues, leases and agreement reviews
• Interim Planning Scheme issues
• Road Construction
• Engineering Services
• Drainage issues & TRANSlink stormwater
• Road and Traffic issues
• Resource Sharing
• Animal Control
• Buildings
• Tourism
• NRM North
• Staff issues/Employment
• Childcare issues
• Management Agreements and Committee Administration
• Office improvements
• Media releases and news items
• Grant application administration and support letters
• Local District Committee project support
• Event management
• Governance Audit
• General correspondence.

c. Other Activities:
• Citizenships
• Agenda
• Councillor requests, meetings, speeches, emails & phone enquiries
• Project support
• Newsletters
• Staff

2. CORPORATE SERVICES BUSINESS UNIT

a. Customer Service
• Member of the National Local Government Customer Service Network.
• Service Tasmania contract for services in Campbell Town.
• Policy reviews.

b. Finance
• Rates and dog licence issue & collection, valuation maintenance and adjustments, supplementary valuations, street numbering, electronic receipting & direct debit systems, interest and penalty.
• Pension rebates claims and maintenance, classification for two rebate maximums, verification of data.
• Sundry Debtors, and account review.
• Creditor payments and enquiries.
• Payroll, ETP calculations, payroll tax, child support, maternity leave, PAYG & annual summaries,
superannuation, salary sacrifice, Workplace Legislation changes, EB provisions, salary reviews, staff training, leave accrual adjustments, leave loading calculations, Councillor allowances and expenses, Workers Compensation claims and payments, Award adjustments, sundry HR and policy issues, and childcare support issues.

- Property sales for unpaid rates, Debt Collection services, Debt summons/warrants.
- Grants Commission information, sundry grant reporting and auditing. Committee financial management support and auditing.
- Property ownership, licences and leases, property committee, aged care unit tenancy, unclaimed monies register, Public Land Register, and sports centre management support.
- Records Management, archives, website and facebook, town and local committee web pages, new residents information, council information policies and procedures.
- Banking & Investments, Direct Debit, Ezidebit, BPay Billing etc and setup alterations.
- Rate System issues, 2015/16 Rating and Budget issues, General Finance, ABS Data Collection, and Grant Funding issues, Tax issues including GST PAYG FBT Fuel & Land Tax, and Northern Finance committee.
- Cemetery management, onsite map display and website databases.
- Roads to Recovery work schedules, mapping, Annual Report and quarterly reports.
- Childcare financial reporting, audit, budgets & fee schedule reconciliations. Service support and account issues.
- General accounting, customer service, correspondence and reports.
- Audit & Audit committee procedures, processes and support.
- Emergency Management meetings, EM Plan reviews, Emergency Risk Register, Strategic Fire Plan meetings, and general administration issues.
- Waste Transfer Station Management issues, Kerbside waste collection contract issues and special clean-up service.
- General Office support and attendance of meetings, reports, emails & phone enquiries.
- Works & Infrastructure support.
- Tooms Lake & Lake Leake ownership transfers, caretaker support, licence fee review issues, and contract issues.
- Street lighting contract & aurora pole reporting and maintenance.
- Community events and Special Projects support.
- Risk Management, safety management and reporting, drug & alcohol policy implementation, and contractor and volunteer management.
- Light Fleet Management.

c. Insurance
- Insurance renewals and policy maintenance.
- Risk Register review and audits.
- 2 ISR claims and 1 Motor Vehicle claim

d. Information Technology
- Server and desktop maintenance.
- Minor upgrades of other IT equipment.
- Open Office Software upgrade and enhancement requests.
- GIS maintenance and training.
- Information Management System maintenance and upgrade interim planning.
- IT Independent Audit, Disaster Recovery & IT backup upgrade and maintenance.
- Council Web Site, Town and Local District Committee site maintenance, NMBA website and HH App maintenance.
- Infonet system maintenance.
- ApproveTas maintenance.
- Office phone system upgrade & Mobile phone plan review.
- Sundry database creation and maintenance.
- Mobile device applications implementation, and remote access logins.
- Building security systems maintenance.
• Microsoft software maintenance.
• Maintain photocopiers and printers.
• Advanced security implementation.
• WiFi network and hotspots
• Fleet tracking

3. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT UNIT

a. Tourism/Economic Development focus
• Developed comprehensive database for the TNT Tourism Infrastructure Audit.
• Assisting TNT to plan the Tourism Infrastructure Audit Northern Midlands community forum on September 24th.
• Assisting TNT to plan the Northern Midlands Tourism Skills Training Workshop October 24th.
• Preparing a funding application Expression of Interest to the Stronger Communities Funding Program for the purchase of four marquees for hire to Northern Midlands events organisers. Have been advised the EOI was successful and a formal funding application is being prepared.
• In negotiations for Longford to host a folk festival event in January 2016.
• Council’s application to the National Stronger Regions Fund Round Two are submitted on July 31st. Coordinated the preparation of the application, and developed the business case, procurement management plan, asset management plan, quality management plan, project management plan, risk management plan and TRANSlink business database; undertook the online entry of the application data.
• Investigating with State Growth whether Council should consider supporting a public walk from Launceston to Hobart along the Midland Highway planned for Easter 2016.
• Unit input to Council’s 2015/2016 Annual Plan.
• Longford Equestrian Association: registered the business name on behalf of NMBA; assisted with planning and resourcing the 29/7/15 stakeholder forum.
• Preparing a Tasmanian Community Fund application for funding for the proposed Longford Destination Play Space.
• Longford Visitor Appeal Study: managing implementation of the report implementations.
• Liaising with Opcon Pty Ltd re the community consultation for the 2016 Longford Revival Festival.
• Member of the Northern Region Futures Plan working group.
• Commenced review of Council’s online business directory.
• Participated in an information session on the Asian Business Engagement Plan funding program and on a working group progressing this project.
• Proposed nomination of the Ross Bridge for National Heritage Listing: await nomination form template from Australian Government.
• Coordinated Council’s funding application for Bridges Renewal Programmes Round One Funding for Westmoor Bridge, Powranna Road Cressy. Funding secured. Prepared and submitted application for funding in Round Two for Lake River Bridge on Macquarie Road.
• Financial and economic analysis of the Campbell Town War Memorial Oval Precinct Development Plan. Report due within next four weeks.
• Participating in the review of the Economic and Community Development Unit.
• Assisting the Heritage Highway Tourism Region Association Board with the implementation of the Association’s 2015/16 Business Plan.
• Representing NMBA at the quarterly TCCI Chambers Alliance Forums.
• Collaborating with NMBA to plan the 2015 Northern Midlands ‘Think Big: Shop Small’ Campaign.
• Assisting with driving the ‘Tourism Potential of Ben Lomond National Park: Feasibility Study’. Contracted TRC Tourism to undertake the study. Supplying supporting materials and reports. Consultants onsite August 10th-12th. Report due within four weeks.
• Supported a film company to develop a feasibility study towards the making of a Norfolk Island – Norfolk Plains documentary: company currently applying for funding.
• Facilitating the progressing of the agenda of the Northern Midlands Economic Development Committee.
• Serving on a working group aiming to secure a sustainable future for Heart FM Radio Station. Prepared a business case for Northern Midlands Community Broadcasters, assisted with the securing of a General Manager (voluntary position) for the radio station and progressing the development of the studio in the Memorial Hall.
• Assisted with securing funds from Your Community Heritage Grants program to interpret convict stories...
At Woolmers and Brickendon Estates. Assisting with the introduction of the convict-themed tours.

- Representing the Heritage Highway Region at quarterly Tourism Northern Tasmania Local Tourism Association forums.

b. Community development focus

- Assisting to promote the 26TEN Adult Literacy Program to Longford residents.
- Prepared and submitted an application to the Heart Foundation Local Government Awards 2015. Award secured: announcement/cheque presentation event (Turbomeet at the Velodrome) held September 12th.
- Assisted Child Care Director resolve Community Centre access issues with the Perth Tennis Club.
- Managing project briefs for the Perth and Longford Recreation Grounds Master Plans.
- Working to secure the future of the Country Courier,
- Represented Council at the Sport and Recreation Disability and Sport Providers Inclusion Forum on September 1st.
- Collaborating with Beacon Foundation and local district high schools to establish a Northern Midlands Business Partnership Group: assisted with organising the stakeholder held August 27th 2015. Managing the planning of the first Group Meeting in October 2015.
- Managing contracts with PCYCs and Northern Job Links for the third term youth programs.
- Participating on the Christ Church tree restoration/management working group and assisted the Parish to secure a Tasmanian Community Fund Grant for the project.
- Participating in the implementation of the Master Plan for the Northern Midlands Health, Fitness and Sports Centre.
- Coordinating Council’s Further Education Bursary Program 2015.
- Assisting Health Revival with efforts to secure grant funding to expand the range of programs and equipment at the Northern Midlands Sports Centre. To date, a grant has been secured from the Longford Rotary Club.
- Assisting Campbell Town resident Mr Bill Chugg to obtain flags and banners from Federal and State Parliament members for the Campbell Town Town Hall War Memorabilia Display.
- Participating in the quarterly Northern Midlands Health Service Providers Forums.
- Participating on a state Equine Emergency Management working group.
- Managing the risk register for the Economic and Community Development Unit.
- Member of the Northern Region Sport and Recreation Committee
- Member of Council’s Health and Safety Committee

4. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT UNIT

a. Policy

- Continuing participation in NTD regional planning committee.
- Ongoing review of current policies.
- Ongoing review of work programs and standard operating procedures.
- Regular planning and building assessment unit meetings.
- Participation in the Economic Development Committee.
- Pursue development of tyre recycling facility.
- Participation in Launceston Gateway Project - brief and presentations.
- Preparation of Land Use and Development Strategy proposal.
- Perth Strategy Plan

b. Health

- Ongoing issues requiring water samples etc.
- Liaise with Department of Health re. Royal George water quality issues.
- Liaise with Department of Health re. Avoca water quality issues.
- Ongoing testing of recreational water quality.
- Continue to support and administer the Immunisations programme.
- Licensing and inspection of food premises.
- Place of Assembly licence inspections and renewals is ongoing.
- Review of procedures for continuous improvement is ongoing.
School Immunisation Programme.
EPA - Smoke Awareness campaign.
Ongoing review of potential asbestos issues at Avoca.

c. Building
- Follow up of illegal works continuing.
- Assistant Building Surveyors attending ongoing professional development training seminars.
- Plumbing inspections and assessment are ongoing.
- Review of procedures for continuous improvement is ongoing.
- Amended Plumbing and Building regulations to be assimilated into ongoing practices.
- Comment on building regulatory framework reform.

d. NRM
- Participation with the Mill Dam Committee.
- Operation of NRM Committee of Council.
- National rainwater and grey water initiative of the Australian Government – opportunities to be investigated.
- Environmental Management Plan – review of implementation programme.
- Review of relevant development proposals is ongoing.
- Weed management and action plan implementation.
- Follow up and monitoring of reported weed infestations
- Regular articles in local news papers.
- Coordination of Mill Dam bank stabilisation project.
- Maintenance of Mill Dam plantings.

e. Compliance
- Permit conditions – Structured review of compliance with planning permit conditions – ongoing.
- Building audit - ongoing.
- Service of Building and Planning Notices.
- Prosecution for illegal buildings and works ongoing as required.
- Signage.
- Follow up dog registrations and compliance with kennel and dangerous dog restrictions.
- Regular inspection visits to Mill Dam.
- Campaign re picking up after dogs.
- Active review of dogs not previously registered.
- Promote consistent processes across region.
- Fire Abatement inspections and notices.
- Overhanging tree inspections - Implementation of Policy.

f. Planning
- Participation in the TRANSlink working group.
- Consideration of TRANSlink rail hub development concept.
- Participation in Regional Planning Scheme issues.
- Consideration of Planning Directives.
- Consideration of proposed planning legislative amendments.
- Ongoing review of procedures and physical office environment.
- Brief for Heritage Streetscape project.
- Resource Sharing - BODC.
- Amendments to interim scheme.
- Assessment of development proposals.

g. Animal Control
- Continued follow up of dog registrations.
- Follow up of kennel licences
- After hours call outs for dog at large etc.
- Review of procedures.
- Dog attacks.
5. WORKS & INFRASTRUCTURE UNIT

In conjunction with INFO 5 – Works & Infrastructure Report.

a. Asset Management
   • New asset information collection and verifications – ongoing.
   • Programmed inspections of flood levee and associated infrastructure – ongoing.

b. Traffic Management
   • Liaising with Department of State Growth to resolve traffic issues within municipality.
   • Traffic counts on roads throughout the municipality – ongoing.

c. Development Work
   • McShane subdivision, stage 2, (Seccombe Street, Perth) has reached practical completion.
   • 4 Lot Pegasus subdivision Ross at practical completion.
   • 3 lot Coenen subdivision, White Hills Road has reached practical completion.
   • Stage 2 of Hollijeett subdivision (3 lots) in Edward Street, Perth has reached practical completion.
   • 3 lot Gadsby subdivision in Cromwell Street, Perth has reached practical completion.
   • 5 lot Chugg subdivision in Malcombe Street, Longford has reached practical completion.
   • 13 lot Shervan subdivision between Norfolk Street and Drummond Crescent, Perth has reached practical completion.
   • Stage 2 of the Kerr/Bean/Shervan subdivision, Mulgrave and Seccombe Street, Perth has reached practical completion.
   • 9 Lot Shervan Subdivision in Fairtlough Street, Perth has reached practical completion

d. Waste Management
   • Input into regional waste management discussions – ongoing.

e. Tenders and Contracts
   • Tender for the Westmoor Bridge on Powranna Road has been awarded to Bridgepro and detailed design work is currently being finalised and works are due to commence on site in late September.

f. Flood levee
   • Programmed monthly/bi-monthly inspections of flood levee carried out by Works and Infrastructure staff.

g. Engineering
   • Input into Northern Regional Infrastructure group – ongoing.
   • Hydraulic modelling of stormwater system in Western Junction Industrial Area – ongoing.

h. Capital works
   • Road reconstruction works in Cromwell Street, Perth – in progress.

17 RESOURCE SHARING SUMMARY FROM 01 JULY 2015

Prepared by: Martin Maddox, Accountant/Executive Officer

Resource sharing summary for the period 1 July to 30 June 2016 was circulated in the Attachments.

18 VANDALISM: AUGUST 2015

Prepared by: Jonathan Galbraith; Engineering Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost of Damages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and smashed windows at Evandale Doctors Surgery</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti in toilet on a number of occasions</td>
<td>Perth Train Park</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST VANDALISM</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500 $9,800 $1,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 YOUTH PROGRAMME UPDATE: AUGUST 2015

Prepared by: Lorraine Green, Economic and Community Development Manager

Youth Activity Programs

Council has contracted the Longford and Launceston PCYC’s to provide youth programs weekly across the third school year term.

Evandale and Perth

- Evandale Primary School - 7th = 5, 14th = 14, 21st = 1, 28th = 12 - TOTAL = 32
- Perth Community Hall - 6th = 10, 13th = 7, 20th = 5, 27th = 6 - TOTAL = 28

Summary (Evandale) – The numbers fluctuated quite dramatically during the month, and where the numbers were down, the weather and families being away on the mainland appeared to contribute significantly to the downturn. The school staff have regularly advertised the sessions and the figures already for September indicate that numbers are more consistent again.

Summary (Perth) – The numbers here have remained small but steady during the month, but significantly, the elimination of the ‘ringleaders’ has given us the opportunity to make steady in-roads into the elimination of the poor behaviour, and there have been some excellent personal, group and solid activity participation in recent weeks. The onus has been placed on those currently there to display leadership and bring other young people into the fold who can demonstrate similar behaviour.

The Longford Friday evening Youth Program at the Sports Centre had 44 participants across the August sessions; averaging 11 participants each session.

20 NRM ACTIVITIES

Responsible Officer: Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager

Prepared by: Monique Case, NRM Facilitator

Scotch Oakburn – St Johnstone Excursion:

On Thursday 27th and 28th of August Scotch Oakburn’s Year 9 participated in their 4th year of “out door” class room activities at Gilbert and Kate Taylor’s property St Johnstone at Campbell Town.

Student’s participated in a suite of activities which included: Flora and Fauna transect surveys with Mark Wapstra of Ecotas, monitoring of previous years revegetation works, recording mortality, species and writing up reflections on other factors influencing revegetation establishment success, Macro invertebrate and water testing with John Gooderham of The Waterbug Company, revegetation installation along the next section of creek and soils with Agronomist Iain Bruce of TP Jones.

Rosemary Grant of ABC radio visited the excursion this year and talked with Staff, Students and Gilbert Taylor. We are looking forward hearing the story on air soon (TBA)

Review of 2015 event and 2016 planning has commenced at a meeting with Scotch Oakburn staff and Gilbert Taylor on 10th of September with the next meeting tentatively scheduled for 15th October.

On Ground Works Applications:

On ground works funding application support to NRM Nth remains in high demand with the next assessment meeting scheduled for 23rd of September.

Green Army Round 4:

Green Army Round 4 application has proven quite an onerous and time consuming task that has required a team effort from Landcare Australia, Manpower Australia and Council to develop. The application covers 2 projects – Brickendon and Woolmers – Heritage project and Rossarden / Storys Creek – other environmental matters. Application deadline 16th September 2pm.

Green Army Round 1 & 2 teams have, over the last few weeks, worked at numerous sites across the municipality to support landholders with on-ground works. Works include, but are not limited to, a week assisting with revegetation works with a Campbell Town land-holder, 2 weeks at Woolmers assisting with weed control and revegetation and
time at the Mill Dam assisting with existing revegetation maintenance and WoNS weed control in association with the 
oxbow lake on Swift land.

21 TELSTRA TOWER - 8A LYTTLETON STREET LONGFORD

Responsible Officer: Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager
Prepared by: Paul Godier, Senior Planner

1 PURPOSE OF ITEM

The purpose of this report is to provide advice regarding a proposed upgrade to the mobile base station at 8A 
Lyttleton Street, Longford.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Council has received notification of a proposal to upgrade the existing mobile phone base station at 8A Lyttleton 
Street, Longford.

The proposal is for:

- Two panel antennas each 2.53m long;
- Eight Remote Radio Units each measuring a maximum of 518mm x 470mm x 190mm to be installed on the 
extisting pole at a height of 25m, but below the top of the existing antenna;
- The installation of ancillary equipment such as feeders; and
- Works within the existing equipment shelter.

These facilities are defined as low impact facilities in accordance with Part 3 of the Telecommunications (Low-impact 

A facility cannot be a low impact facility if it is in an area of environmental significance as defined by the 
Determination, which includes a place on the Register of the National Estate.

Council’s legal advice is that:

The Register of the National Estate was established pursuant to the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975. 
The Act was amended with effect from 19 February 2012 in a way which deleted all references to the Register 
and any obligation to maintain it. Therefore, with effect from 19 February 2012, the Register ceased to operate 
as a statutory instrument. It follows that any reference to the Register, as if it operates as a current document, 
in any other legislative instrument, is ineffective because there is no Register of the National Estate which 
attracts the operation of clause 2.5 (6) of the Determination.

Consequently the facility is not in an area of environmental significance as defined by the Determination.

The proposed upgrade is therefore a low impact facility and is exempt from requiring a planning permit under clause 
5.3.1(a) of the Northern Midlands Interim Planning Scheme 2013.

22 COMPLIANCE - PERMIT REVIEW AND OVERHANGING VEGETATION

Prepared by: Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager

Following the February 2015 adoption of the Overhanging Trees Policy and the more recently expressed concern from 
councillors regarding follow up of planning permit conditions, arrangements were made for Mrs Tammi Axton to 
commence employment on a part time basis to address these.

However, with the recent resignation of Council’s Animal Control Officer, Ms Stojkoski, Mrs Axton has commenced a 
fixed term full time position undertaking the animal control function pending a review of Council’s options for a long 
term solution.

Having regard to the concerns expressed by councillors, Mrs Axton is devoting as much time as practicable to a review 
of permits and of overhanging vegetation concerns raised by Works and Infrastructure.

Taking a systematic approach, Mrs Axton is reviewing planning permits issued in six monthly blocks, starting from the 
present and working backwards.

Of the fifty-six properties inspected, following desk top review, thirty three have not or have only just started work 
and will be reinspected at a later date, twenty fully comply with their permit conditions and three breached their
permit in some way:

1) Sign Illuminated with Solar lights, the permit does not allow this. Property owner will be notified to remove the lights.

2) House is 55 metres from the back boundary line; whereas, on the plans, the house is to be 35 metres from the back Boundary line. Property owners will be notified to have this amended on the plans and apply for permit to be amended. It is noted that this development was privately certified and inspected.

3) Sign height on the approved plans is 2700m but the sign is only 1790m, the applicant will be notified to apply for the permit to be amended or to raise the height of the sign.

As the review moves further back there will be significantly less projects that have not substantially commenced.

**DECISION**

Cr Goss/Cr Lambert

That the Information items be received.

Carried unanimously

---

**249/15 TOM ROBERTS: PROPOSED INTERPRETATION AND GRAVE UPKEEP**

Responsible Officer: Manager Economic and Community Development, Lorraine Green

Report prepared by: Manager Economic and Community Development, Lorraine Green

1 **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

Councillor Polley requested this item be included on the Council Meeting Agenda, to:

i) provide Council with background on artist Tom Roberts and his connection to Longford;

ii) seek Council’s position on the interpretation of his life at a location in Longford;

iii) seek Council’s position on entering into negotiations with Christ Church regarding the upkeep of his grave in the Christ Church Illawarra Cemetery and possible onsite interpretation.

2 **INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND**

Born in England in 1856, Tom Roberts migrated to Australia with his widowed mother and family in 1869. He was interested in art from an early age and studied in Australia and overseas.

Visiting Tasmania in 1877 he met his first wife Elizabeth (Lillie) Williamson. They married in East Kew Victoria in 1896. They honeymooned in Tasmania and their son Caleb was born in 1898. In the years that followed, they visited Tasmania several times and moved mainly between Melbourne, Sydney and England before finally settling in Kallista Victoria in 1923. Lillie died in Victoria in 1928. Later that year Tom once again travelled to Tasmania and married Lillie’s childhood friend, Miss Jean Boyes at Christ Church, Illawarra. Tom and Jean settled at Kallista Victoria and visited Tasmania each year.

To many Tom Roberts is considered ‘the father of Australian landscape painting’: as he was the first artist to capture Australia’s natural light with startling realism. He was the founder of the Heidelberg School in Victoria; Australia’s first significant art movement.

His extensive array of paintings tell the story of the development of Australia as a society and as an idea. Tom’s *Shearing of the Rams* is arguably our single most widely recognised and best loved painting. When Roberts first exhibited the painting in 1890, the artwork was initially generally...
well received: with Melbourne newspaper The Age reporting that the painting was a "most important work of a distinctly Australian character". However more conservative elements were critical; with The Argus critic James Smith commenting that the picture was too naturalistic: "art should be of all times, not of one time, of all places, not of one place", adding "we do not go to an art gallery to see how sheep are shorn". Roberts defended his choice of subject responding that "by making art the perfect expression of one time and one place, it becomes for all time and of all places".

Roberts wished to sell Shearing of the Rams to the National Gallery of Victoria, however this was opposed by key people at the gallery, including the director and one of the trustees. Eventually he sold the painting to a local stock and station agent for 350 guineas. The agent displayed it in his office in Melbourne. The National Gallery of Victoria finally acquired the painting in 1932—one year after Roberts' death—using funds from the Felton Bequest.

The most important commission of Tom’s career was the Opening of the First Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia by H.R.H. The Duke of Cornwall and York (Later H.M. King George V) May 9 1901. Two years in the making, the painting is 15sq metres of pomp and portraiture, featuring over 250 likenesses of Colonial and British dignitaries. At the time the painting only received condescending notice from the critics.

Tom Roberts was not recognised as an accomplished painter in his lifetime, with his work not becoming fashionable until the mid twentieth Century.

Tom died at Kallista Victoria in 1931 and his ashes were returned to Tasmania and buried in the Boyes’ family plot at Christ Church Illawarra in a grave with a simple headstone and no embellishment.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:
2.2. Tourism Industry Support: “To increase tourist visits, tourist spend and length of stay, and enhance the visitor experience.”

4  FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost of the interpretation and grave upkeep has yet to be determined. The interpretation project is likely to secure an external funding grant.

5  CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

Tourism Northern Tasmania, the regional tourism organisation, ‘Northern Tasmania’s Destination Management Plan 2015-2017’ ‘....is designed to identify the key things we need to do to grow sustainable returns from Northern Tasmania’s tourism industry.’ The plan emphasises the need to offer an eclectic collection of quality boutique experiences that exceed visitors’ expectations. The Tom Roberts Interpretation Project strategically aligns with this plan.

‘Tourism 21: The Tasmanian Government and Tasmanian Tourism Industry Joint Strategic Business Plan (August 2013)’ identifies ambitious shared long term goals to grow the value of tourism in the state. There is a strong focus on product development; with the plan identifying the need ‘to support improvements in the number and type of tourism experiences, infrastructure and events at key tourism destinations and centres within Tasmania, including the harnessing of federal and state funding programs for tourism.’ The Tom Roberts Interpretation Project strategically aligns with this plan.

As part of the development and implementation of the Heritage Highway Touring Route Interpretation Strategy undertaken across 2005-2008, part-funded by the Australian Tourism Development Program, two new tourism experiences/products relating to Tom Robert’s were developed: the Tom Robert’s Interpretive Display Board in the Information Booth on the Village Green, and ‘Land and Landscape: Artists of the Heritage Highway Region’ postcard series. Tourism Tasmania and the University of Tasmania’s Community, Place and Heritage Research Unit played pivotal roles in the development and implementation of the strategy.

6  COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The volunteers who man the Northern Midlands Business Promotion and Visitor Information Centre at JJs Bakery report receiving frequent enquiries about the location of Tom Robert’s grave. Council’s Tourism Officer, Ms Fiona Dewar, designed a flier that provides information on Tom Robert’s life and connection with Longford, and holds a map showing how to get to the grave in the Christ Church Illawarra Cemetery.

Community consultation regarding the design and extent of the Tom Robert’s interpretation will be vital to the success of the project.

7  OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council can either support or not support the proposal for Tom Robert’s interpretation at Longford and/or Christ Church Illawarra, and to entering into negotiations with Christ Church with regard to the upkeep of Tom Robert’s grave.
8 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

To many Tom Roberts is considered ‘the father of Australian landscape painting’ as he was the first artist to capture the amazing light and colour of the Australian bush, the Australian way of life and its people. Tom Robert’s life and paintings are widely interpreted in Victoria, including via the Heidelberg School Artists Trail and the City of Whitehorse Artists’ Trail.

Tom Robert’s interpretation at Longford will be a significant tourist drawcard and has the potential to develop further into a Northern Midlands’ Artist Trail by expanding on the Land and Landscape: Artists of the Heritage Highway Region’ postcard series.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council:

i) endorse the proposal for Tom Robert’s interpretation at Longford and/or Christ Church Illawarra, and

ii) enter into negotiations with Christ Church with regard to the upkeep of Tom Robert’s grave.

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Knowles
That the matter be discussed. Carried unanimously

Cr Polley/Cr Knowles
That Council:

i) endorse the proposal for Tom Robert’s interpretation at Longford and/or Christ Church Illawarra, and

ii) enter into negotiations with Christ Church with regard to the upkeep of Tom Robert’s grave. Carried unanimously
provision of goods, services or facilities, against people on the basis that they have, or may have, a disability.

The Act states that an organisation may develop an Action Plan to eliminate discriminatory practices and the Australian Local Government Association recommends Councils develop an Action Plan as the best way to manage the range of issues involved.


This included endorsing the terms of reference for the committee, being:

i) To review the current Access Policy and provide advice to Council on any changes recommended to the Policy

ii) To assist Council with the development and implementation of a DDA Access Action Plan for 2015-2020 by overseeing the six key steps of an Action Plan as outlined under the Disability Discrimination Act (1992): being:

1. The review of current Council practices and facilities with a view to identify any discriminatory practices
2. The development of strategies to eliminate discriminatory practices
3. The setting of goals and targets and associated time frames
4. The allocation of responsibility for implementation
5. The promotion of the Plan to current and potential customers, Councillors and staff
6. The establishment of evaluation mechanisms

Council endorsed the composition of the committee, being:

- Two Northern Midlands residents with disabilities
- Two representatives of Disability Specialists Organisations
- A Councillor
- Manager Economic and Community Development
- Manager Corporate Services or Unit delegate
- Manager Planning and Development or Unit delegate.

Mr Dale Luttrell, CEO Eskleigh Foundation Inc. and Ms Jan Harvey, Manager Community Services at the Campbell Town Health and Community Service have nominated for the two Disability Specialists Organisations positions.

Mrs Karen Bell, parent and carer of children with disabilities has nominated for one of the residents with disabilities’ positions. Ms Jan Harvey is seeking a Campbell Town district resident with a disability to nominate for the second resident with a disability position: name to be advised.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Directions” goals have relevance to this issue:

3.2. Health “To develop the health and well-being of Northern Midlands communities.”
4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It is proposed that Council’s Access Policy be reviewed and updated as required.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act (1992) makes it unlawful to discriminate, in the provision of goods, services or facilities, against people on the basis that they have, or may have, a disability.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS


7 RISK ISSUES

Developing and implementing a DDA Action Plan is a proactive way for Council to address disability discrimination issues in the Northern Midlands. There are two key benefits in taking this positive approach:

i) Eliminate discrimination which will:
   • Minimise Council’s liability under the Disability Discrimination Act (1992);
   • Provide people with a disability with the opportunity to make an economic and social contribution to the local community;
   • Improve the quality of our customer service through focussed, action orientated customer consultation

ii) Avoid complaints being lodged with the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. These may develop into expensive and time-consuming matters.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

Tasmanian Health Organisation North within the Department of Health and Human Services will be consulted during the review of the Access Policy and development of the Access Action Plan.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION


10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council can either endorse or not endorse the proposed membership of the Northern Midlands Disability Discrimination Action Committee.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Developing and implementing a DDA Action Plan is a proactive way for Council to address disability discrimination issues in the Northern Midlands.
12 ATTACHMENTS

N/A

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council appoint Councillor _________________ to the Northern Midlands Disability Discrimination Action Committee and endorse the membership, comprising Mr Dale Luttrell, Ms Jan Harvey, Mrs Karen Bell, _________________ (name of Campbell Town resident with a disability to be advised) and Council’s Manager Economic and Community Development, Manager Corporate Services or Unit delegate, and Manager Planning and Development or Unit delegate.

DECISION

Cr Goss/Cr Lambert

That Council appoint Councillor Cr Adams to the Northern Midlands Disability Discrimination Action Committee and endorse the membership, comprising Mr Dale Luttrell, Ms Jan Harvey, Mrs Karen Bell, name of Campbell Town resident with a disability to be advised) and Council’s Manager Economic and Community Development, Manager Corporate Services or Unit delegate, and Manager Planning and Development or Unit delegate.

Carried unanimously

251/15 PROPOSAL FOR A STAND ALONE VISITOR INFORMATION AND TOURIST CENTRE AT LONGFORD

File: 41/007/001
Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Lorraine Green, Manager Economic and Community Development

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide Council with a report on the actions taken in response to Council’s decision at the August 17th 2015 Council Meeting that Council note and investigate the recommendations from the August 2015 meeting of the Longford Local District Committee, which incorporated a recommendation that Council adopt a Longford Visitors Centre

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Council at the August 17th 2015 Council Meeting resolved to note and investigate the following recommendations from the August 2015 Longford Local District Committee:

i) The committee urges Council to develop a challenging but realistic tourism plan for Longford including in particular, improvements to the streetscape, such as banners, to add vibrancy

ii) Council provide support to maximise benefits stemming from a collaborative information/promotion link between the Longford Business and Tourism Association, Woolmers and
iii) Adoption of a Longford Visitors Centre (in the Memorial Hall) based on the Evandale model, subject to seeking the input of the existing and potential users of the Memorial Hall, and to the assessment of the cost to establish a trial visitor centre.

iv) Council develop a calendar of museum/exhibition events showcasing items unique to Longford.

v) Uniform local street and attractions signage throughout Longford and surrounds.

Please find following the response to each of the committee’s recommendations.

1) The committee urges Council to develop a challenging but realistic tourism plan for Longford including in particular, improvements to the streetscape, such as banners, to add vibrancy.

   Council has committed to developing a Strategic Plan in 2015/2016 that will include Economic Development and Tourism.

   Council has on the agenda for this Council Meeting an item seeking Council’s endorsement for the engagement of Village Well to develop a Placemaking Strategy for Longford.

2) Council provide support to maximise benefits stemming from a collaborative information/promotion link between the Longford Business and Tourism Association, Woolmers and Brickendon.

   The Fox Report included the recommendation:

   “That business, community and the Estates work collaboratively to explore their shared narrative and how it can be connected in an engaging and innovative way”

   This recommendation would be addressed during the development of the Longford Placemaking Strategy.

3) Adoption of a Longford Visitors Centre (in the Memorial Hall) based on the Evandale model, subject to seeking the input of the existing and potential users of the Memorial Hall, and assessment of the cost to establish a trial visitor centre.

   It is noted that discussions and investigations in respect to a Visitor Information Centre have been ongoing for some time. The proposal was initially raised by the Longford Local District Committee in February 2014 when a motion was moved that Council investigate the installation of a Visitor Information Centre in the Longford Memorial Hall.

   A further motion by the Longford Local District Committee was moved in June 2014 which requested that Council identify funding, location and implementation of a standalone Visitor Information Centre as a matter of priority.

   In January 2015 Ms Dee Alty, in conjunction with former committee members submitted a Business Plan to the Council for a standalone visitor information centre in Longford.

   Council sought the advice of Sarah Lebski & Associates to comment on the Business Plan for a Standalone Visitor Information & Tourist Centre in Longford.

   Both Ms Alty and Mrs Lebski’s reports were formally accepted by Council at its meeting of July 2015.

   It is noted that the advice of Ms Lebski was, in determining the case for a Visitor Information Centre in Longford, Council should consider:

   • Is the Centre justified in terms of a visitor/market demand?

   • Is there a more cost effective and appropriate way to provide visitor information in the Northern Midlands – i.e. could the same funding be allocated to a more contemporary services model?
• Is the Council prepared to provide long-term, and potentially extensive funding for the future operation of the Centre?
• Does the Council view the Visitor Information Centre more as a community asset, or a business?

At the Council meeting of July 2015 Council made the following decision regarding the investigation of a standalone Visitor Information Centre in Longford:

Cr Knowles/Cr Goninon
That Council:
  i) Seek the comments of the current volunteers that support the Visitor Information shop front at JJ’s Bakery.
  ii) If the Memorial Hall is a consideration for the location of the Visitor Information Centre, seek the input of existing and potential users of the Memorial Hall.
  iii) Assess the cost to establish a trial Visitor Information Centre at the Memorial Hall.
  iv) Review appropriateness of Council staff managing the centre volunteers, and the staffing capacity to undertake this role.
  v) Seek comments from the Ross Wool Centre in respect to downgrading from the yellow “i” to the white “i”.

Carried unanimously

This request was actioned and the following responses received:

i) Seek the comments of the current volunteers that support the Visitor Information shop front at JJ’s Bakery.
   Comments of current volunteers do not support a proposed stand alone visitor centre at Longford;
   It is noted further that the JJs information centre was established by the Northern Midlands Business Association, originally in a shop front on the corner of Wellington & Marlborough Streets as a standalone centre. Given the lack of visitors to the centre in that location, in about 2006 the centre moved to JJs Bakery.

ii) If the Memorial Hall is a consideration for the location of the Visitor Information Centre, seek the input of existing and potential users of the Memorial Hall.
   The existing and potential users of the Memorial Hall have not yet been consulted regarding this proposal.

iii) Assess the cost to establish a trial Visitor Information Centre at the Memorial Hall.
   Council staff have costed the items required to establish a visitor centre in the Longford Memorial Hall based on the Evandale model. The costings are held as an attachment and total approximately $14,000.

iv) Review appropriateness of Council staff managing the centre volunteers, and the staffing capacity to undertake this role.
   The Visitor Information Centres at Ross, Campbell Town and Avoca are managed by entities independent of Council. The Evandale Visitor Centre is managed by the Evandale Community Centre and Evandale War Memorial Hall Committee of Management: a Special Committee of Council. The management model for the proposed Longford Visitor Centre will need to be determined and operate aligned to the other visitor centres in the Northern Midlands i.e. no direct involvement of Council staff.

v) Seek comments from the Ross Wool Centre in respect to downgrading from the yellow “i” to the white “i”.
   Visitor Centres operating as part of the Tasmanian Visitor Information Network (yellow ‘i’ centres) are required to hold tourism accreditation administered by the Tourism Industry Council of Tasmania and operate under the guidelines of a Code of Practice.
which provides national benchmarks for service delivery, presentation and management standards. By adopting the Code, Visitor Centres demonstrate their ability to deliver high quality customer services and maintain relevant management processes and documentation to support that delivery.

The Ross Wool Centre opted to downgrade to white ‘I’ status due to the excessive accreditation requirements.

A possible alternative option for the proposed visitor centre has been identified. At the University of Tasmania Open Day on August 30th 2015, the School of Architecture had on display at the Newnham campus a pod designed and built by students. The pod design can be tailored made for clients. Photos of the first pod designed are held as an attachment.

One option would be to locate the pod at the front of the Village Green. The pod could be opened up when manned (with verandahs/side walls to provide protection from the weather) and closed up when unmanned. When unmanned, visitors then access information 24 hours a day via the touch screen on the side of the pod. The pod can easily be relocated as required.

Photos are also included of a visitor information centre utilizing a converted shipping container that was viewed at Salamanca Place recently.

4) Council develop a calendar of museum/ exhibition events showcasing items unique to Longford
   This recommendation could be raised during the development of the Longford Placemaking Strategy and tourism operators, community members and community organisations will have the opportunity to identify the priority events they will collaborate to bring to fruition.
   It is noted that presently Council has an events calendar on its website which any person is able to access and request their event be uploaded.

5) Uniform local street and attractions signage throughout Longford and surrounds.
   The General Manager is considering if Council can resource share this expertise from another Council.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1: Mapping Our Direction” goal is relevant to this issue” 2.2. Tourism Industry Support: “To increase tourist visits, spend and length of stay, and enhance the visitor experience.”

4 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council can either accept or not accept this report and the recommendations therein.

5 ATTACHMENTS

5.1 Costings for the establishment of a visitor centre in the Longford Memorial Hall based on the Evandale Centre model
5.2 Photos of a pod designed and built by students at the University of Tasmania’s School of Architecture
5.3 Photos of converted shipping container visitor information centre.
RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council

1. accept the report on the actions taken in response to Council’s decision at the August 17th 2015 Council Meeting that Council note and investigate the recommendations from the August 2015 meeting of the Longford Local District Committee.

2. support the trial of a Visitor Information Centre in the Memorial Hall, Longford, contributing up to $15,000 toward the cost of equipment and furniture, subject to the following:
   a) Consultation with existing users is undertaken and an agreement reached in respect to shared use of the Hall; and
   b) The establishment of a group (independent of Council) to manage and man the Visitor Information Centre.

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Goninon
That the matter be discussed. Carried unanimously

Cr Polley/Cr Knowles
That Council

1. accept the report on the actions taken in response to Council’s decision at the August 17th 2015 Council Meeting that Council note and investigate the recommendations from the August 2015 meeting of the Longford Local District Committee.

2. support a 3 year trial of a Visitor Information Centre in the Memorial Hall, Longford, contributing up to $15,000 toward the cost of equipment and furniture, subject to the following:
   a) Consultation with existing users is undertaken and an agreement reached in respect to shared use of the Hall; and
   b) The establishment of a group (independent of Council) to manage and man the Visitor Information Centre.

3. liaise with the Heart FM, Longford Tourism Group, Longford Local District Committee and Northern Midlands Business Association. Carried unanimously

252/14 LONGFORD DESTINATION PLAY SPACE: PROPOSED STAGE TWO DEVELOPMENT

File: 16/052
Responsible Officer: Lorraine Green, Manager Economic and Community Development
Report prepared by: Lorraine Green, Manager Economic and Community Development

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek Council’s response to the request by Longford resident Mr Karen Bell for Council to consider the inclusion of a Liberty Swing in the planned Longford Destination Play Space.
2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

At Council’s August 17th Meeting, in Closed Council, Council considered the proposal to develop a state-of-the-art, electronic, destination play space and a contemporary playground for toddlers and young children on Longford Village Green.

Council made the following decision available to the public:

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Knowles
That the matter be discussed.
Carried unanimously

Cr Knowles/Cr Polley
That Council endorse the playgrounds proposal prepared by Ultimate Play and commit to funding at least $116,579 of the cost of the playgrounds.
Carried

Voting for the motion:
Acting Mayor Goss, Cr Polley, Cr Calvert, Cr Gordon, Cr Lambert, Cr Knowles, Cr Goninon

Voting against the motion:
Cr Adams

Council has subsequently received a letter from Ms Karen Bell requesting consideration of the inclusion of a Liberty Swing in the play space design. Ms Bell is confident she can secure the funding required to purchase and install the swing and the required surround fencing.

A Liberty Swing enables a person who uses a wheelchair to truly swing. The wheelchair is wheeled up on a platform, secured, and then the platform is released and it swings. The Liberty Swing weighs close to 360kgs and has many moving pieces and therefore must be fenced to ensure its security and that no-one is able to collide with the operating swing. All Liberty Swings in Australia operate with the same key and many people reliant on a wheelchair for mobility purchase the key and attach it permanently to their wheelchair.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- Part 1B: Finance:
  - 1.13 Asset Management
- Part 2: The Local Economy
  - 2.1 Long Term Economic Development
- Part 3: The Local Community
  - 3.2 Health
- Part 5: Focus on Playground Assets
  - 5.3 Community Facilities
    Provide reserves, public open spaces, recreational facilities, cemeteries, public buildings and other council amenities which are designed, developed and maintained to meet the needs of the Northern Midlands community
4 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The purchase and installation of the Liberty Swing is estimated to cost $40,000-$50,000. Additional rubber softfall base would also be required. Ms Bell is confident she can secure the funding required to cover these costs.

5 RISK ISSUES

A review of the literature on Liberty Swings, reveals that some oppose their use as they promote segregation instead of inclusion; as whilst the swing is completely accessible, it is separated from the rest of the play equipment and a person using it is not playing with friends and peers. The counter-argument from parents of children and young adults who use the swings is that the experience of swinging far outweighs the need to engage with friends and peers for that one aspect of play.

6 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A

7 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Ms Bell advises she has developed a short survey regarding the Liberty Swing that is being distributed to the broader community.

8 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council can either support or not support the inclusion of a Liberty Swing in the planned Longford Play Space.

9 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

The Longford Play Space is inclusive and can support play by people of all ages and abilities. The swings in the current design suitable for use by people reliant on wheelchairs for mobility, require them to be lifted from their wheelchairs and seated on the swings.

The Liberty Swing enables a person to experience swinging whilst seated in their wheelchair. The inclusion of a Liberty Swing in the play space has the potential to attract to Longford many families with members reliant on a wheelchair for mobility, and also organisations supporting people with disabilities seeking new experiences for their clients.

10 ATTACHMENTS

10.1 Letter from Ms Karen Bell
10.2 Liberty Swing information and specification
10.3 Concept plan of the Longford Play Space including the Liberty Swing – to be circulated separately.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed.
MINUTES – ORDINARY MEETING

21 SEPTEMBER 2015

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council support the inclusion of a Liberty Swing in the planned Longford Play Space on the proviso that the funding for the purchase and installation of the Liberty Swing and fencing, and the associated additional rubber softfall is secured by Mrs Karen Bell.

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Lambert

i) That Council support the inclusion of a Liberty Swing and Carousel in the planned Longford Play Space on the proviso that the funding for the purchase and installation of the Liberty Swing and fencing, and the associated additional rubber softfall is secured by Mrs Karen Bell; and

ii) That Council contribute $5,000 toward the purchase and installation of the Liberty Swing and Carousel; and

iii) Should the funding application for the playspace not be successful, that Council continue to progress the installation of the liberty swing and carousel.

Carried unanimously

253/14 POLICY REVIEW
NORTHERN MIDLANDS COUNCIL MEETING PROCEDURES AND RECORDING OF MEETINGS POLICY

File: 44/001/001
Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Amanda Mason, Executive Officer

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is for Council to review and approve amendments to the Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures Policy, which, as amended incorporates the existing Recording of Meetings Policy.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Council has had in place a Meeting Procedures Policy and Recording of Meetings Policy since 2010 and 2006 respectively. Recent changes to the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 has prompted a review of the policies and it was considered appropriate to consolidate the two policies.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

• 1.1 Governance

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It is important to conduct policy reviews on a regular basis, in particular when legislative changes have come into force.
5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

5.1 Local Government Act 1993
Sections 23, 24 and 57-60A

5.2 Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015
Regulations 31 and 33

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
N/A

7 RISK ISSUES
Whilst legislation provides for high level process, there is a need for low level procedures and processes to be identified by Council. Without a policy identifying low level procedures it may be unclear for Councillors, staff and ratepayers alike as to what process is to be followed during meetings.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT
N/A

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
N/A

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER
There are two options for Council to consider:

a) Accept the proposed amendments and endorse the Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures Policy; or

b) Reject the proposed amendments.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION
Attached to this report is a marked up copy of the amended Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures Policy.

New wording to the policy is identified by being underlined. Wording that is to be deleted is marked with a strikethrough. There are also some notes in the margins of the policy identifying why it is the wording is recommended to be removed.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures Policy (marked up version)
RECOMMENDATION 1

That Council adopt the changes to the Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures Policy, incorporating the previous Recording of Meetings Policy.

DECISION

Cr Adams/Cr Goss

That Council adopt the changes to the Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures Policy, incorporating the previous Recording of Meetings Policy.

Carried unanimously

Policy Name: Northern Midlands Council Meeting Procedures

Originated Date: Adopted 23 September 2002 – Min. No: 379/02 (as Policy 32)

Amended Date/s: Revisited 25 January 2010 – Min. No: 15/10 (388/06)

Amended 22 March 2010 – Min. No. 69/10

Amended 21 September 2015 and incorporating Recording of Meeting Policy (formerly Policy 51) – Min. No.

Applicable Legislation: Local Government Act 1993

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015

Dataworks Reference: 44/001/001

Objective

The objective of this policy is to set Council meeting procedures for the following:

1. Public Question Time during Council meetings;
2. Public representations on planning items during Council meetings;
3. Petition procedures during Council meetings;
4. Recording of Council meetings; and
5. Appointment of Council Representatives to Committees of Council, or a committee external to Council.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Local Government Act 1993 and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 allow for Public Question Time, Public Representations on planning items, Petitions, Recording of Council meetings and the establishment of committees of Council. Whilst the legislation identifies how these processes can occur, there are some lower level procedures required to be set out by Council. This policy stipulates those guidelines.

2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Regulation 31 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 relates to the provison of Public Question Time during a Council meeting. Regulation 31(7) of the Regulations stipulate that “a Council is to determine any other procedures to be followed in respect of public question time at an ordinary council meeting.”

Public question time is to commence immediately after the meal break at approximately 6:45pm and is to be conducted in accordance with the following guidelines:
At each Council Meeting up to 20 minutes, or such longer period as Council may determine by resolution at that meeting, is to be provided for persons at the meeting to ask questions.

A person seeking to ask a question must firstly identify himself or herself by stating their name and the town they reside in.

If more than one person wishes to ask a question, the Mayor is to determine the order in which those questions are asked.

Questions must be directed to the Mayor who shall answer or direct the question to the appropriate Councillor or Council Officer. A question will be answered if the information is known otherwise taken on notice and responded to in writing within 10 working days. Questions should preferably be in writing and provided to the General Manager 7 days prior to the Council Meeting.

A person is entitled to ask no more than 2 questions on any specific subject. If a person has up to two questions on several subjects, the Mayor may defer those questions until other questions have been asked and refer back to that person only if time permits.

Each speaker is limited to a maximum of 3 minutes.

3 REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING ITEMS

A maximum of 4 persons per item (2 for and 2 against) will be permitted to address Council on a planning item. After the representation has been made, Councillors are permitted to ask questions of the party who made the representation.

Each speaker is limited to a maximum of 3 minutes.

4 PETITIONS

Part 6, Division 1 of the Local Government Act 1993 refers to the presentation of a petition to Council. Council is to treat any petition received in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993.

5 RECORDING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS

Regulation 33 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 provides for the audio recording of Council meetings.

Regulation 33(4) provides that "a Council may determine any other procedures relating to the audio recording of meetings it considers appropriate."

The purpose of recording meetings of Council is to assist Council officers in the preparation of minutes of proceedings.

The provision of recording of Council meetings in this policy:
- only applies to formal Council meetings (ordinary meetings, special meetings and Annual General meetings);
- does not apply to closed sessions of Council;
- does not apply to Committees of Council;
- The recording will not replace written minutes and a transcript of the recording will not be prepared;
- The recording may be used by Council staff to assist with the preparation of the minutes and by Council during a subsequent meeting within the period that the recording is retained;
- The official copy of the recording of a Council meeting is to be retained by Council for at least a period of 6 months from the date of a meeting and deleted after that period has expired.
- If requested, a recording of a Council meeting to be available to Councillors at no cost within 24
hours of the meeting.

- Notices advising that
  - the proceedings of the meeting are to be audio recorded; and
  - the detail relating to the recording of meetings by members of the public are to be on display at each meeting.

A member of the public may only use an audio recorder, or any other recording and/or transmitting device, to record the proceedings of a meeting of Council with the written permission of the General Manager for the express purpose proposed. The Northern Midlands Council reserves the right to revoke such permission at any time.

Unless expressly stated otherwise, Northern Midlands Council claims copyright ownership of the content of recordings of Council meetings ("the Recordings").

The Recordings may not upload, display, print and/or reproduced without the written permission of the General Manager for the express purpose proposed.

The Northern Midlands Council reserves the right to revoke such permission at any time. Apart from uses permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, all other rights are reserved.

Requests for authorisations, including authorisations for the use of recordings, should be directed to the General Manager, 13 Smith Street, Longford TAS 7301.

6 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES TO COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL AND OUTSIDE BODIES

Sections 23 and 24 of the Local Government Act 1993 permit Council to establish council committees or special committees of Council. From time to time Councillors may be invited to represent Council on committees external to Council.

With the exception of appointments made by the Council under any enactment, all representative appointments of the Council to community committees and outside bodies expire at the first Council meeting following every ordinary Council election.

At the first ordinary meeting following a Council election Council is to appoint a Councillor representative to all Council Committees and Special Committees of Council in accordance with the following procedure:

- A list of all Council committees and special committees of Council is to be produced at the ordinary Council meeting;
- Councillors are to nominate which committee/s they wish to be a representative on;
- In the event two or more Councillors nominate for the same committee, all of those Councillors can be appointed as a representative to that committee, except where that committee specifies that there is to be only one Councillor representative, in which case the Councillors are to vote on which Councillor is to be appointed, with the nominee having the least number of votes to be eliminated and this process followed until there is one nominee remaining. In the event there is a tie, the Mayor is to have the casting vote.
- If there is a casual vacancy for a representative appointment made by Council, then the Council is to elect a replacement appointee to fill the vacancy at the earliest available meeting of the Council in accordance with the above procedure.

7 REVIEW

The policy will be reviewed every 2 years or more frequently, if dictated by operational demands or legislative changes.
1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek a decision of Council regarding requested changes to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Northern Midlands Council at the Campbell Town District Forum.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The Northern Midlands Council has 7 local district committees, one for each major township in the municipality. They are:

- Avoca, Royal George & Rossarden Local District Committee (meeting bi-monthly);
- Campbell Town District Forum (meeting monthly);
- Cressy Local District Committee (meeting bi-monthly);
- Evandale Advisory Committee (meeting monthly);
- Longford Local District Committee (meeting monthly);
- Perth Local District Committee (meeting monthly); and
- Ross Local District Committee (meeting monthly).

Each committee is a special committee of Council created pursuant to section 24 of the Local Government Act 1993.

The purpose of the committees is to act as a focal point between Council and the Community, identifying local needs and providing feedback to Council on decisions.

The Committees are all of varying ages. Some have been in place since 1994, others have been formed in more recent years.

The relationship between the Northern Midlands Council and each committee is governed pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The purpose of the MOU is to:

- set the purpose, roles and responsibilities of the committee; and
- provide guidelines in respect to membership and meeting procedures.

In May 2015 Council considered a uniform Memorandum of Understanding for all 7 local district committees and made the following decision:

Cr Calvert/Cr Polley

That

i) Council endorse the draft Memorandum of Understanding to apply to all 7 local district committees and the Memorandum of Understanding be circulated to all 7 committees for their approval; and

ii) Council officers enter into discussion with the Committees and recommend that they consider holding the minimum of 6 meetings per year at which council resources/secretarial assistance is to be provided.
The Campbell Town District Forum do not agree with the Memorandum of Understanding in the terms drafted and have requested the amendments as shown in the attachment to this report.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- Part 1 – Governance
  1.1 - Governance
  1.3 - Community Dialogue
  1.4 – Community Agendas

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

N/A

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Each committee is formed as a special committee of Council pursuant to section 24 of the Local Government Act 1993. There is no statutory requirement for there to be a Memorandum of Understanding between Council and a local district committee.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

7 RISK ISSUES

The members of the local district committees do not receive any formal training, in particular in respect to the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005. It has been identified that binding the committees to legislation, without providing formal training places an unrealistic expectation on the committee. On this basis, the revised MOU outlines the specific requirements for the meetings, to avoid confusion.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Six of the seven local district committees have signed the uniform Memorandum of Understanding. The Campbell Town District Forum have not signed the Memorandum of Understanding as they consider the following changes necessary.
Clause 6:
“Meeting length is not to exceed 1.5 hours” to “meeting length should not normally exceed 1.5 hours”.

Clause 9:
“Secretarial assistance is to be provided by the Northern Midlands Council to the Campbell Town District Forum on at least 6 instances annually” to “Secretarial assistance is to be provided by the Northern Midlands Council to the Campbell Town District Forum on a minimum of 6 instances annually.”

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

To review the proposed changes and decide whether or not to implement the same.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

There are two changes proposed by the Campbell Town District Forum to the Memorandum of Understanding.

The first change is:
“Meeting length is not to exceed 1.5 hours” to “meeting length should not normally exceed 1.5 hours”.

It has been explained to all the local district committees that they are entitled to meet for as long as they wish. The intention of this clause is to ensure the Council officer time in attending the meetings is capped. In the instances where there is a guest at a meeting it is accepted that the meeting may run over the 1.5 hours.

The second proposed change is:
“Secretarial assistance is to be provided by the Northern Midlands Council to the Campbell Town District Forum on at least 6 instances annually” to “Secretarial assistance is to be provided by the Northern Midlands Council to the Campbell Town District Forum on a minimum of 6 instances annually.”

In the view of the writer, the above two sentences both mean the same thing, therefore there is no necessity to amend the wording of the agreement to a phrase with exactly the same meaning.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Memorandum of Understanding – Campbell Town District Forum, marked up changes.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed by Council.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council reject the proposed amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding made by the Campbell Town District Forum and Council officers reconfirm the commitment to provide support that may exceed 1.5 hours in instances such as where a guest is present at the meeting.

DECISION

Cr Adams/Cr Goss

That the matter be discussed by Council.

Carried unanimously
**Cr Adams/Cr Calvert**

That Council reject the proposed amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding made by the Campbell Town District Forum and Council officers reconfirm the commitment to provide support that may exceed 1.5 hours in instances such as where a guest is present at the meeting.

Carried

**Voting for the motion:**

Deputy Mayor Goss, Cr Adams, Cr Calvert, Cr Goninon, Cr Gordon, Cr Knowles, Cr Lambert, Cr Polley AM

**Voting against the motion:**

Mayor Downie

---

**255/15 MEMBERSHIP LOCAL DISTRICT COMMITTEES**

File: 07/024  
Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager  
Report prepared by: Amanda Mason, Executive Officer

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek ratification from Council of a new member of the Longford Local District Committee and a new member of the Ross Local District Committee.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The Northern Midlands Council has 7 local district committees throughout the municipality. The purpose of the committees is to:

- Provide a focal point for information to and from Council;
- Identify and prioritise local needs; and
- Provide advice and feedback on Council wide and local decisions.

The membership of the Committees is limited to 10 members. Each Committee is appointed one Councillor as the Council representative. The term of membership is 2 years.

The Committees are governed by a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- 1.3 – Community Dialogue

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

N/A
5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
N/A

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
N/A

7 RISK ISSUES
N/A

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT
N/A

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
i) Positions on the Longford Local District Committee were advertised in January 2015. Currently there are 8 members of the Longford Local District Committee. Due to the vacancies on the committee, notice has been advertised in Your Region in the Examiner for the vacant positions.

On 25 August 2015 a further nomination was received from Mr Anthony Morehouse.

ii) Membership of the Ross Local District Committee has been at 9 for the majority of the current term (commencing in November 2014). When the revised Memorandum of Understanding was signed earlier this year, the membership capacity for the Ross Local District Committee increased from 9 to 10 people. Further to that a resignation was received in August. As such, there are presently 8 current members of the committee.

The following nominations have been received for the Ross Local District Committee:
  • Ms Noelene Carroll on 8 September 2015; and
  • Ms Helen McQuade 15 September 2015.

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER
i) Accept Mr Anthony Morehouse as a member of the Longford Local District Committee for the balance of the term to June 2016; or

ii) Not accept Mr Anthony Morehouse as a member of the Longford Local District Committee for the balance of the term to June 2016; and

iii) Accept Ms Noelene Carroll and Ms Helen McQuade as members of the Ross Local District Committee for the balance of the term to June 2016; or

iv) Not accept Ms Noelene Carroll and Ms Helen McQuade as members of the Ross Local District Committee for the balance of the term to June 2016.
11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Mr Morehouse is a long term resident of the region and has expressed interest in assisting in the wellbeing of the area.

Ms Carroll was born in Ross and has recently returned to Ross to live permanently and has expressed enthusiasm to become an active, contributing member of the local community. Ms McQuade is the current lessee of the Ross Caravan Park and owner of the Ross Motel.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council accept:

i) Mr Anthony Morehouse as a member of the Longford Local District Committee for the balance of the current term, expiring on 30 June 2016.

ii) Ms Noelene Carroll and Ms Helen McQuade as members of the Ross Local District Committee for the balance of the current term, expiring on 30 June 2016.

DECISION

Cr Knowles/Cr Adams

That Council accept:

i) Mr Anthony Morehouse as a member of the Longford Local District Committee for the balance of the current term, expiring on 30 June 2016.

ii) Ms Noelene Carroll and Ms Helen McQuade as members of the Ross Local District Committee for the balance of the current term, expiring on 30 June 2016.

Carried unanimously

256/15 FUNDING REQUEST FROM TARGA AUSTRALIA

File: 44/001/001
Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Amanda Mason, Executive Officer

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s position regarding contributing financially to the 2016 Targa Tasmania’s Longford Street Stage.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Targa Australia is a national body which runs three events:

- Targa High Country;
- Targa Hellyer Gorge; and
- Targa Tasmania.

Next year, Targa Tasmania will be celebrating its 25th Anniversary.

The George Town and Longford stages are the two major street stages in Targa Tasmania. Historically the George Town stage has been sponsored by a local business in George Town. Due
to a recent restructure of that business sponsorship of the event is no longer available. On this basis, the George Town Council has agreed to sponsor the 2016 25th Anniversary Targa Tasmania George Town Street Stage.

With increasing obligations regarding safety, and the fact that the street stage has no bearing on the overall Targa competition, the running of street stages is becoming increasingly expensive. Targa Australia have estimated that the total cost of a street stage is $50,000.

Targa Australia considers it inequitable for George Town Council to be sponsoring the George Town Street Stage, whilst the Northern Midlands Council does not currently sponsor the Longford Street Stage, notwithstanding the in kind support that has been received by the Northern Midlands Council toward the event in previous years.

Targa Australia is seeking to enter into a commercial arrangement with the Northern Midlands Council to sponsor the 2016 Targa Tasmania Longford Street Stage.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- Part 2 – Economic Development

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It is noted that at its meeting of 22 June 2015 Council rejected a request from the Longford Revival Festival to invest funding into the 2016 Longford Revival Festival.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

N/A

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The funding amount that Targa Australia is seeking from Council to retain the Longford Street stage is $15,000, plus GST.

As this request has been submitted following 30 June 2015 the Northern Midlands Council 2015/16 budget has been set without making an allowance for a contribution to the Targa event.

Council contributed up to approximately $3,000 per annum towards the running of the event until 2010, after this time Targa took control of all traffic management and organisation of the event through the town.

Should Council wish to contribute to the event again it would need to extend its Round 2 Event Funding budget allocation.

7 RISK ISSUES

The indication received from Targa Australia is that it cannot justify retaining the Longford Street Stage event without a financial contribution to the event by Council. As such, failure to make the
financial contribution is likely to see the street stage removed from the 2016 25th Anniversary Targa Tasmania event.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Community consultation has not occurred in respect to this proposal, given the timeframe in which it has been raised. However, it is generally considered that the Targa Tasmania, Longford Street Stage is a positive event for Longford. It is noted further that in recent years, visitor numbers to the Targa Longford Street Stage have decreased. This could be due to a number of factors, one of which is the time of the day the event is held not being convenient for those working full time.

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council has three options to consider:

- Contribute $15,000 to the 2016 Targa Tasmania, Longford Street Stage;
- Contribute no money to the 2016 Targa Tasmania, Longford Street Stage; or
- Contribute an alternative amount of money to the 2016 Targa Tasmania, Longford Street Stage.

It is noted there has been a suggestion from Targa Australia that Council consider on-selling components of any agreed sponsorship to local businesses within Longford.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

The Longford Street Stage has been part of the Targa Tasmania event since its inception in 1991.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Presentation by Targa Tasmania

RECOMMENDATION 1

That Council discuss the matter.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council contribute the amount of $............. to the 2016 Targa Tasmania, Longford Street Stage.

DECISION

Cr Calvert/Cr Goninon
That the matter be discussed. Carried unanimously

Cr Polley/Cr Goninon
That Council do not contribute to the 2016 Targa Tasmania, Longford Street Stage. Carried unanimously
1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

Council at its meeting on the 17th August 2015 sought a report on the progress to date to initiate the benchmarking project and, in particular, advice on the agreement of the northern councils to participate in the project.

The General Manager was also to report on the estimate of the cost to carry out benchmarking for the Northern Midlands Council.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Council at its meetings in April, July and August have formally resolved the following:

Council, at its meetings in April and July have formally resolved the following:

20 April 2015: Minute Reference 101/15:
Cr Polley/Cr Goss
That
i) Council agrees to collaborate with the councils of Meander Valley and West Tamar in a benchmarking exercise of financial and service delivery measures utilising the services of an independent consultant.
ii) the General Manager be authorised to engage a project consultant with local government experience.
Carried unanimously

20 July 2015: Minute Reference 191/15:
Cr Adams/Cr Knowles
That Council authorise the Mayor to enter into discussions with all Tasmanian Councils that express an interest in respect to potential benchmarking and resource sharing initiatives.
Carried unanimously

17 August 2015: Minute Reference 218/15
Cr Polley/Cr Goninon
That the Council
i) endorse engagement in a benchmarking project involving councils in northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing comparative data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and identifies areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between councils;
ii) support the tender process for the feasibility study being open to consultants that are not included on the list of four consultants identified on the Tender Panel;
iii) the General Manager be authorised to appoint a consultant with suitable local government experience; and
iv) authorise the General Manager to report back to the September council meeting on a way forward, if no progress has been made on the benchmarking project involving other councils.
3 STRATEGIC PLAN

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following, “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals identified have relevance to this issue:

- **Part 1A: Governance**
  - 1.1 Governance
  - 1.3 Community Dialogue
  - 1.4 Community Agendas
  - 1.8 Regional/ State/ Federal/ International Relations

- **Part 1B: Governance**
  - 1.9 Financial Management
  - 1.10 Customer Service
  - 1.12 Information Management
  - 1.13 Asset Management

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There are no policy implications.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

*Local Government Act 1993.*

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

At the time of writing this report, costs for the eight Council project had not been finalised.

The estimate of cost for a Financial Sustainability Assessment for the Northern Midlands Council had been received and provided in closed council.

7 RISK ISSUES

It is critical that the eight councils engage an independent consultant to carry out the benchmarking project to ensure openness and transparency. With projects of this nature it is important to analyse the positives and negatives arising from the investigations.

Each Council must be open to the provision of data to allow its analysis in a consistent fashion that will support meaningful performance measures and benchmarks. Without a consistent approach and process mapping, data collection and input costings the benchmarking project will fail.

The acceptance of Council to proceed with a singular benchmarking project will only allow for comparison with State average and may not provide a clear comparison for judging like services and data (comparing apples with apples).

8 CONSULTATION WITH THE STATE GOVERNMENT

As the Minister for Local Government initiated the discussion on local government reform, it is important that the councils keep the Minister for Planning and Local Government, the Hon. Peter Gutwein MP, informed on the progress of the enterprise wide service review and benchmarking
9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Community consultation would be integral in determining an outcome from the service review and benchmarking project. Outcomes from this project will be utilised to inform future strategic discussion with the community.

Local government faces increasingly demanding and complex community expectations with limited resources and competing demands, it is critical that councils find new ways to plan and deliver services so that local government is sustainable and able to flourish. Strategic collaboration and partnerships are ways that councils can respond to these challenges.

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

The options for Council to consider, include:

i) not to accept the recommendation;

ii) to proceed with the project; or

iii) accept the proposal with modifications.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

The following were the decisions of other member councils in relation to the Benchmarking/Shared Services Project:

11.1 Break O’Day Council

17 August 2015 meeting:

Moved: Clr G McGuinness / Seconded: Clr J Tucker
1. That Council participate in the benchmarking process and investigation of a shared service model with Councils in the northern region.

2. That Council liaise with Councils from the south-east including Glamorgan-Spring Bay with a view to undertaking modelling regarding merger options and/or boundary adjustment of these Councils as it might affect the Break O’Day Council.

3. That the Mayor and General Manager be authorised to enter into arrangements necessary for this to occur.

4. That at the first 2015-2016 Budget review an allocation of $50,000 be provided to assist in meeting consultant costs for the modelling exercises.

Carried unanimously

11.2 Dorset Council

Not yet considered by Council.

11.3 Flinders Council

At the July meeting

203.07.2015 Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr D Williams
That the Mayor write to the Minister for Local Government expressing that:

1) Flinders Council has for many years been at the forefront of utilising resource sharing.

2) Flinders Council will continue to explore how these can deliver improved services and cost efficiencies for our community.

3) With funding support provided by the State Government, Flinders Council confirms a willingness to explore other models of sharing resources either within our existing agreements or at a regional level.
Carried unanimously

It is understood that there will be an agenda item relating to Resource Sharing on the 24th September’s meeting agenda.

11.4 George Town Council

19 August 2015 meeting:

Moved: Cr Burt Seconded: Cr Harris

That Council:
1) Receive and note the information presented in this report; and
2) Agree to collaborate with participating Northern Councils to undertake a benchmarking process involving Councils in northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and which additionally identifies from the data areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between the Councils; and
3) Authorise the Mayor and General Manager to participate in these investigations and projects as outlined and in accordance with Council’s resolutions; and
4) That George Town Council will continue to participate in the benchmarking/shared services investigation project with the four panel members as outlined or an expanded panel as agreed with the State Government and participating Councils.

Carried (8/1)

11.5 Launceston City Council

Not yet considered by Council.

11.6 Meander Valley Council

8 September 2015 meeting:

Cr Synfield moved and Cr Connor seconded “that Council -

1. Endorse engagement in a benchmarking project in the manner conveyed in the attached project brief dated July 2015, or as amended from time to time, involving Councils in Northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing comparative data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and identifies areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between Council; and
2. The General Manager be authorised to engage a project consultant in consultation (consensus) with the other General Managers involved.
3. Support the tender process for the feasibility study being open to additional consultants that are not included on the list of four consultants identified on the Tender Panel put forward by the State Government.

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

11.7 West Tamar Council

18 August 2015 meeting:

Moved Cr Kearney seconded Cr Woinarski that council:

1. endorse engagement in a benchmarking project involving Councils in Northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing comparative data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and identifies areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between Councils; and
2. the General Manager be authorised to engage a project consultant.
3. support the tender process for the feasibility study being open to additional consultants that are not included on the list of four consultants identified on the Tender Panel put forward by
As would be appreciated, a number of councils are yet to determine their positions with regard to participating in the benchmarking project.

It would be hoped that advice on the willingness to participate is known prior to the end of October 2015.

Matters that still need clarification relating to conditional funding from the State Government include:

- The ability to seek fee offers for the project outside the State Government confirmed panel of consultants (see email advice from Local Government Division).
- The Expressions of Interest to no longer be received by a Council’s General Manager but be directed to the Local Government Division.

Further, clarification will be provided at the Council meeting, post a meeting of General Managers on the 16th September 2015 at which time the Shared Service Brief will be discussed.

**12 ATTACHMENTS**

i) Copy of Draft Brief: Investigation of Shared Service Model
ii) Email from the Director of Local Government dated 18 August 2015

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

That the matter be discussed.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

That

i) the General Manager continue to participate in discussions with the councils to achieve a collaborative approach to the regional benchmarking project.

ii) the fee offer from CT Managerial Group be noted and a decision on the matter be held in abeyance.

**DECISION**

Cr Knowles/Cr Goss

That

i) the General Manager continue to participate in discussions with the councils to achieve a collaborative approach to the regional benchmarking project.

ii) the fee offer from CT Managerial Group be noted and a decision on the matter be held in abeyance.

Carried unanimously
258/15 ALGA NATIONAL LOCAL ROADS AND TRANSPORT CONGRESS ATTENDANCE

Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Gail Eacher, Executive Assistant

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to consider the attendance of Councillors at the ALGA National Local Roads and Transport Congress 2015 to be held at the Ballarat Lodge and Convention Centre in Ballarat, Victoria from 17-19 November.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The 2014 ALGA National Local Roads and Transport Congress was held in Tamworth, Council authorised Cr Brooks and Cr Goss to attend the conference with Council meeting the normal cost of attendance.

ALGA President, Mayor Troy Pickard, has provided the following overview in relation to this year’s event:

The Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) National Local Roads and Transport Congress (the Roads Congress) have historically built a reputation for influencing significant change. This year’s Congress is likely be the last before the expected 2016 Federal Election.

It will be your opportunity to ensure both the Government and Opposition understand the key concerns that Local Government share in this vital area. The 2015 Roads Congress will take place in historic Ballarat, Victoria from 17-19 November.

For many councils, local roads and bridges are their single largest area of expenditure and present the greatest challenge in terms of asset management and financial sustainability.

ALGA’s advocacy has contributed to some significant outcomes at the Federal level in recent years including new funding for bridges, a longer term commitment to the Roads to Recovery program and a massive injection of extra funding for Roads to Recovery. However none of that would have been possible without a strong and united Local Government voice.

A key aim of this year’s Roads Congress is to highlight the importance of Federal funding to local government in overcoming road and infrastructure challenges. Together, ALGA, state and territory local government associations and delegates of the National Roads and Transport Congress have been very successful in advocating for additional Roads to Recovery funding.

The R2R program was doubled in 2015-16 and as a result of our continued work on R2R and Financial Assistance Grants, the first two years of the indexation of fuel excise has been allocated to additional R2R funding. These are fantastic outcomes for the R2R program, but we need to continue to make our case, especially in the lead up to the next Federal election, to ensure this funding finds support across the political spectrum. That is why this Congress is so important.

Your council’s attendance at this year’s Congress shows your support for the work that ALGA and your state and territory association is doing to secure better funding for local government roads and infrastructure. Not only does it demonstrate the need for the continued program but the Congress can also assist us to showcase how effectively Commonwealth funds are being utilised.

The 2015 Congress program has a strong focus on collaboration – between towns, cities, regions and jurisdictions. The theme ‘Connecting Communities: Building the Nation’ highlights the reality that our
national prosperity relies on building networks between communities and linking local roads with regional and national routes.

The Congress will feature national and international speakers and I have invited the Deputy Prime Minister, the Hon Warren Truss MP and the Shadow Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, the Hon Anthony Albanese MP. We will also hear directly from councils about transport challenges they have faced and overcome.

Your council’s experience and knowledge will help to make the 2015 Congress a success and provide the ALGA Board with important input as we develop our election position for 2016.

I look forward to seeing you in Ballarat in November.

3 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

The 2014/15 budget allocation for Training, Conferences and Seminars for Councillors is $11,930. An amount of $2,514 had been expended to August 2015, with $9,415 of the allocation still being available.

Cost of full registration before 7 October is $890.

Virgin, Jetstar and Qantas fly to and from Melbourne with prices ranging from approximately $200 to $600 return.

Coaches from all the congress hotels will collect delegates from Melbourne Airport hourly between 1pm and 3pm on 17 November and leave again at 3.45pm and 4.30pm on 19 November; however, delegates may wish to hire a car or travel by coach / train to and from Ballarat.

Prices for accommodation at the conference venue are between $139 and $159 per night, other accommodation options are available ranging in price from $120 to $379 per night.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Provisions is made in Council’s adopted Policy No. 4 “Councillors Allowances, Travelling and Other Expenses” for attendance at conferences and seminars. The policy provisions are as follows:

6. CONFERENCES & SEMINARS

Council will make a budget allocation each year to reimburse delegates registration, travel costs and accommodation expenses (excluding ‘mini-bar’ expenses). Partners will be reimbursed for meals at state conferences and the ‘major dinner’ at Federal conferences.

The budget will be allocated to the following conferences:
- LGAT & LGMA conference to be attended by up to 6 councillors
- ALGA conference attended by Mayor & Deputy Mayor
- Australian Roads conference attended by 1 councillor
- ‘Other’ conferences and seminar sessions as approved.

Attendance to all conferences, seminars and training sessions with a cost in excess of $100 are to be in compliance with a resolution of the Council, except on emergency situations, where approval must be given by a unanimous approval from Council Executive.

Following attendance of a conference by any councillor, a report must be submitted to Council setting out the relevance to local government, and the benefits that can be further investigated by Council. Where two or more councillors attend a conference, a joint report may be submitted.
5 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Councillor Michael Polley has indicated a preparedness to attend the congress.

6 ATTACHMENTS

Correspondence dated 14 August 2015.
Conference Programme.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Cr ......................... be authorised to attend the 2015 ALGA National Local Roads and Transport Congress with Council meeting the normal cost of attendance.

DECISION

Cr Goss/Cr Lambert

It is recommended that Cr Polley be authorised to attend the 2015 ALGA National Local Roads and Transport Congress with Council meeting the normal cost of attendance.

Carried unanimously

259/15 AUSTRALIAN BAUXITE: REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Des Jennings, General Manager & Wayne Chellis, Works & Infrastructure Manager

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present to Council a request for financial support from Australian Bauxite towards the upgrade of West Street, Campbell Town and seek direction from Council.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Australia Bauxite wishes to apply for funding of $200,000 under the “Roads to Recovery Programme” for the upgrading of West Street Campbell Town.

2.1 Australian Bauxite

Australian Bauxite have provided the following information in support of their request:

Australian Bauxite is developing a Bauxite mine at Campbell Town (Bald Hill) and as part of our commitments we are responsible for the repair to damage done through transport to Macquarie Road and West Street. We understand that the Council can assist with our application to seek assistance for upgrading West Street, rather than just repairing it.

Bald Hill Mine 5km WNW of Campbell Town

We are mining Bauxite, the ore of Aluminium, at Bald Hill. TasRail trucks the bauxite to Conara siding and rails it to Bell Bay for export. Bald Hill is the first mine to be developed and we will be eventually be operating 3 mines simultaneously and producing in excess of 1 million tonnes per year. Based on our current knowledge, only Bald Hill will use West Street.
Bald Hill got away to a later than expected start resulting in a slow ramp-up because of damp ore, winter weather and short days. This has resulted in significant rework to dry out the bauxite causing the project to run 3 to 4 months behind schedule in making our maiden shipment of bauxite. We are working very hard to ensure this seasonal setback does not impact on the longer term business growth. The product is good quality and demand for Tasmanian type of bauxite (clean, highly compatible blending bauxite) has stayed firm, even in the current market volatility.

We therefore are making this request for financial assistance regarding the West Street upgrade.

**West Street**

West Street is the connector road needed from the Midlands Hwy to Macquarie Rd. and presented the shortest road transit and, more importantly, the least disruption to the community. The residents have been supportive of our activities and are aware that the road will be maintained.

**Road Design & Cost**

Pitt & Sherry’s recommendation was to upgrade all of the West Street connector length to ensure the road would be fit for purpose and would leave a substantially improved community asset going forward. The road will be widened to council specification (6 Mtrs seal with .5 Mtrs shoulders). We paid Pitt & Sherry to design and manage the whole process, to ensure a professional job and they have forecast a total project cost of $350,000. The plan is to start the process in October, as the weather improves and this plan was presented to your Works Manager, Wayne Chellis and he endorsed the plan and design.

**Employment**

The project currently has 29 direct full time employees and will grow to 45 employees plus considerably more indirect employees in the community to service industries etc. All these employees live and work in the district, we do not have fly in/fly out operators. ABx has specifically chosen Tasmanian based contractors to ensure this project is solely Tasmanian and is contributing to the Tasmanian economy.

### 2.2 Details of Road Condition

Following the permit application the Works & Infrastructure Manager provided Council, Australian Bauxite and Pitt & Sherry engineers with the following information in regards to the condition of the section of road proposed to be extensively used with heavy vehicles for the purpose of carting bauxite:

- that the section of Macquarie Road that was proposed to be used had been upgraded during the last 20 years and it was his opinion that if any damage occurred it should only be minor;
- that West Street was in a satisfactory condition to cater for the general vehicles; however, the poor sub grade materials under the road surface would not cater for the number of heavy vehicles proposed to be used by Australian Bauxite; and that it was expected that the road would deteriorate to an unusable state in a short period of time.

**Action Taken By Australian Bauxite**

Pitt & Sherry engineers were engaged to inspect and report on the condition of the road and the potential deterioration of the section of road following usage by a number of heavy vehicles.

As part of their survey Pitt & Sherry carried out a beam test on the road and electronically measured the road deflection with a specially designed weighted vehicle.
The results confirmed the Works & Infrastructure Manager’s view and Pitt & Sherry agreed that the West Street pavement would not be able to withstand the volume of heavy vehicle traffic and that Macquarie Road may have some minor failures.

2.3 Past Usage of West Street

To provide direct access onto High Street (Midlands Highway), Pedder Street was upgraded during the Macquarie Road upgrade. This was considered to be a satisfactory route in the residential area due to the low number of heavy vehicles.

West Street was only subject to minor heavy vehicle usage as the junction onto Macquarie Road did not cater for a satisfactory access turn.

Australian Bauxite propose to widen this access, to provide a shorter cartage route along West Street.

In addition to that, it may not be considered acceptable for a large number of heavy vehicles to travel along the residential section of Pedder Street.

2.4 Heavy Vehicle Permit

In the first instance the Works & Infrastructure Manager rejected the heavy vehicle permit to use Macquarie Road and West Street until such time as Australian Bauxite signed the agreement which required their company to undertake repairs or upgrade the road to cater for the proposed heavy vehicles.

2.5 Proposed Road Reconstruction by Council

On 13 February 2015, at the request of Australian Bauxite, the Works & Infrastructure Manager provided a cost estimate to fully reconstruct West Street. The cost estimate of $340,000 did not include any profit or contingency.

At that time, it was the view of the Works & Infrastructure Manager that if a minor overrun in cost occurred Council was receiving good value for money as Australian Bauxite were committed to pay for the works to be carried out if the estimate was accepted.

It should be noted that Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department is now not in a position to undertake these works, given other commitments for this financial year.

The estimate of cost provided for the following work to be carried out.

- Excavation and removal of existing materials to a depth of 400mm and width of 10 metres to provide for a 6.2 metre wide road, 1 metre shoulders and roadside drainage. Excavated materials to be disposed of on Tom Clarke’s property in close proximity of West Street.
- Supply and delivery of 6,000 tonne of quality assured gravel from Boral Quarries in Launceston.
- Grading and compaction of 450mm in depth of gravel.
- Two Coat Sealing of street.
- Minor Culvert Upgrading.

2.6 Response by Pitt & Sherry Engineers & Australian Bauxite

Further to that Pitt & Sherry Engineers met with Council officers and provided the following design which was accepted. It was the view of the Works & Infrastructure Manager that
there would be a substantial saving by using local bauxite material to mix with lime to stabilise the existing road material and that the engineers had significant experience in stabilisation of materials.

At the same time it is believed that there may be some risk with the process; however, if failures occurred Australian Bauxite would be responsible to undertake further repairs.

2.7 Proposal by Pitt & Sherry to Upgrade West Street

Peter Douglas, Principle Engineer at Pitt & Sherry provided the following proposal:

The pavement of West St will be widened from 5.8m to 7.2m which will include 2 x 3.1m wide lanes and 0.5m wide unsealed shoulders. The pavement of Macquarie Rd, in the vicinity of the junction with West St, will be widened, as necessary and in accordance with the plan provided by NMC, to accommodate the turning paths of the proposed truck fleet.

The pavement formation of West St will be widened using local lateritic gravel from the mine site or a suitable substitute. This material, together with the existing pavement of West St, will be chemically stabilised, in-situ, with 2% quicklime, compacted and trimmed to level. The stabilised pavement layer will be overlaid by 150mm of good quality fine crushed rock and the sealed with a 10mm primer seal. This strengthened pavement would (theoretically) withstand up to 5 times the calculated traffic loading generated by the development.

New table drains will be excavated and trimmed whilst existing surface drainage will be cleaned and graded. Existing culverts will be extended where necessary and headwalls provided where they are currently not installed.

A plan of the proposed works is attached.

The construction technique for West St should enable the works to be completed expeditiously, under traffic, and over the forthcoming late autumn/early winter period. There should be minimal disturbance to local amenity and very little disruption to local traffic.

The works will be performed under a construction Contract let and managed by ABx’s consultants, Pitt & Sherry.

It is expected the work will take approx. 6-8 weeks.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following, “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals identified have relevance to this issue:

- **Part 1B: Finance**
  1.9 Financial Management

- **Part 2: The Local Economy**
  2.1 Long Term Economic Development
  2.3 Business Support

- **Part 5: Focus On Physical Assets**
  5.1 Transport Infrastructure Operations

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

N/A
5  STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

N/A

6  FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Australian Bauxite has sought funding of $200,000.

The actual additional Roads to Recovery funding amounts to $1,245,133 in 2015/16 and $1,542,247 in 2016/17 or average of an additional $696,845 over the next 4 year period.

If Council was to upgrade the road to meet its standards for the use of the road, the estimated cost would be $340,000.

7  RISK ISSUES

Risks identified may include:

- That the project costs are underestimated and the proponents and Council contributions fall short of the actual cost.
- Council agrees to fund an unreasonable portion of the works, above which would normally be the communities cost if the development had not occurred.
- The risk and uncertainty that the project will be completed/built when or as anticipated.
- The risk that Council does not support a significant investment in the municipality and the State.

8  CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A

9  COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

N/A

10 OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Council agrees to:

i) refuse the request for funding support;
ii) provide a portion of the funding request; or
iii) provide the full amount of the requested funds.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Australian Bauxite is seeking a contribution of $200,000 from Council towards the cost of the works which is estimated at $350,000.

In making a decision regarding this request Council should consider the following:

- The estimated cost of the project proposed by Pitt & Sherry using local material is similar to that provided by Council using imported quality assured gravel supplied and delivered from
Launceston at a cost of $200,000.

- Existing material is not proposed to be removed from the site which is an additional saving in cost.
- It is the view of the Works & Infrastructure Manager that the road upgrade proposed by Pitt & Sherry may present more risk of failure in the future than the proposal by Council; however, having said that the Works & Infrastructure Manager iacknowledges the process presented by the Pitt & Sherry engineers who are more experienced in lime stabilisation.
- Council should also consider that Australian Bauxite have signed an agreement to undertake road repairs and upgrading at their cost.
- West Street was considered suitable to cater for the normal traffic and reconstruction was not listed in the ten year works program.
- It should be noted that Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department is now not in a position to undertake these works, given other commitments for this financial year.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That Council discuss the matter.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council agree to contribute $100,000 to the West Street upgrade on the basis that employment opportunities are created for Northern Tasmanians by Australian Bauxite.

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Goninon

That Council not contribute to the West Street upgrade and that Australian Bauxite honour their agreement with Council.

Carried unanimously

Mayor Downie adjourned the meeting for the mealbreak at 6pm, at which time he vacated the Chair and left the meeting. Miss Mason and Ms Green left the meeting at this time.

Cr Goss assumed the Chair and reconvened the meeting after the mealbreak at 6.45pm

260/15 PUBLIC QUESTIONS & STATEMENTS

In accordance with a decision made by Council at the meeting held on 16 October 2006, “The existing policy for public questions/ representations was examined and it was agreed that this part of the meeting should become the only opportunity for members of the public to make a representation on a matter in which they have an interest on an item which is before the Council for decision e.g. development applications. Other than with approval of the Mayor, individuals will not be allowed to address Council on agenda related matters at any other time during the meeting.”
Public Question and Statements Time will commence at 6.45pm.

1 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

P&D 1 WEST PERTH STORMWATER ASSESSMENT

Mr Colin Smith, Woolcott Surveys obo Holliejet Investments Pty Ltd

Mr Smith tabled the following statement to which he spoke:

We have reviewed the Agenda Report on this matter and we would like to reiterate a few points on behalf of our clients.

The first point in recommendation #2 is very similar to the previous actions taken by Council as a result of the 2011 Stormwater report. Terry Eaton, Council’s Contract Engineer has advised over the last few years that he has spoken to TAS Rail and DIER on numerous occasions and at those times neither were interested in contributing to the stormwater upgrade works. We are now four years on from the original stormwater report and our clients are now in a position where they need to proceed with the balance of their subdivision.

Our clients do support the idea of a Stormwater Headwork’s levy in principle but they would want to see how this is structured before commenting further. We had asked for Council’s Engineers to look into whether an onsite detention basin would be acceptable for our site to allow the 16 Lot subdivision to proceed in the interim and we were under the impression from various discussions with Council staff that this was being considered along with some other interim measures in Cameron Oakley’s Report. This was a possible alternative solution until the complete stormwater works could be completed. If this scenario was proven acceptable then our clients would still be willing to contribute to the overall works in the form of a Headworks Levy if this levy was fair and equitable.

Significant changes have occurred to the Sheepwash Creek Catchment and Drainage System since the initial 2011 Stormwater Report. A major Dam has been constructed upstream of our clients property on the MacKinnon’s and DPIPWE land which has significantly decreased the amount of Stormwater runoff which makes its way into the drainage channel from the catchment. This is anecdotal evidence from the Land Owner. The drainage report prepared by Cameron Oakley is not available to the Public as yet but having seen the Plans for the Perth Bypass there may be an opportunity for further upstream Flood/Dam mitigation which could be more cost effective than the proposed upgrades costed and mentioned in the Agenda Report. Upstream Dam Flood Mitigation is a common practice utilised successfully in other areas and Municipalities.

We attach a copy of the original 2009 decision from the Tasmanian Planning Commission which rezoned our clients land from Rural General to Residential Serviced under the 1995 Northern Midlands Planning Scheme. It states on page 12 that, “Council submitted that the land can be serviced through water and sewage connections and matters relating to drainage across the land can be addressed as the land is developed”. Our clients also had further correspondence from Council in 2009 relating to the matter which confirms that the land could be developed to the full potential but that the land would need to be filled to above the 1 in 100 year flood level. Our clients proceeded with the purchase of this land upon that Council advice and Councils rezoning of the land to Residential Serviced.

At the same Council meeting that reviewed and accepted the previous stormwater report of April 2011 a 12 Lot Subdivision was approved directly north of our client’s property on the other side of Edward Street. Significant filling of the land was done as part of that subdivision right up to the drainage channel reserve.

Shortly thereafter our clients were then told no further subdivision would be allowed where filling of the land was proposed. Our clients were able to complete a further three Lot subdivision after this...
time after a Hydrology Report was completed that supported the filling of the land for a further three Lots only.

This matter has now dragged on for four years since the last Stormwater Report was completed in 2011 and previous discussions with TAS Rail and DIER did not resolve or progress the issue of funding for the stormwater upgrades. We are deeply concerned that a similar plan of action will yield the same results.

We hope that the Council will understand the history with this matter and that our clients are now at a point where a resolution is urgently required or they will have to look at what other avenues are available to them. We hope that Council will consider interim engineering measures in relation to stormwater so that our clients can proceed with their development.

We have made our best efforts to work with Council on this matter over the last four years and we will continue to be open to discussion.

I am willing to take any questions on the matter.

### 261/15 COUNCIL ACTING AS A PLANNING AUTHORITY

Section 25 (1) of the Local Government (meeting procedures) Regulations require that if a Council intends to act at a meeting as a Planning Authority under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, the Chairperson is to advise the meeting accordingly.

**DECISION**

**Cr Goninon/Cr Lambert**

That the Council intends to act as a Planning Authority under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* for Agenda items PLAN 1 – PLAN 3.

Carried unanimously

### 2 STATEMENTS

No representations or statements were forthcoming from the gallery.

### 262/15 PLANNING APPLICATION P15-230

**MIDLAND HIGHWAY, BREADALBANE**

**Responsible Officer:** Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager

**Report prepared by:** Paul Godier, Senior Planner

**File Number:** P15-230

#### 1 INTRODUCTION

This report assesses an application for the Midland Highway duplication between Perth and Breadalbane.

#### 2 BACKGROUND

**Applicant:** Department of State Growth

**Owner:** Department of State Growth; H MacKinnon; M Peart; J & K Pirlot; L Toy; L Nettlefold; Jorjs Pty Ltd; Island Block & Paving Pty Ltd; B & L Ayres; T Hardman; C & M Hughes.
Zone: Utilities & Rural Resource  
Codes: Road and Railway Assets Code; Car Parking and Sustainable Transport Code; Scenic Management Code; Biodiversity Code; Water Quality Code; Local Historic Heritage Code

Classification under the Scheme: Utilities  
Existing Use: Road; farmland; Digga Excavations; Island Block and Paving

Deemed Approval Date: 27 September 2015  
Recommendation: Approve

Discretionary Aspects of the Application
- Rural Resource zone - development and use of Utilities;
- Road and Railway Assets Code - development and use involving works within 50m of a Category 1 road subject to a speed limit of more than 60 km/h;
- Scenic Management Code – development and use of land within the scenic management – tourist road corridor and local scenic management area;
- Biodiversity Code – removal of native vegetation;
- Water Quality code – development and use of land within 50m of a watercourse;
- Local Historic Heritage Code – development and use of a local heritage place (Haggerston House).

Planning Instrument: Northern Midlands Interim Planning Scheme 2013

3 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The proposal is an application pursuant to section 57 of the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993 (i.e. a discretionary application).

Section 48 of the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993 requires the Planning Authority to observe and enforce the observance of the Planning Scheme.

Section 51 of the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993 states that a person must not commence any use or development where a permit is required without such permit.

4 ASSESSMENT

4.1 Proposal

It is proposed to:
- Construct a new four lane carriageway to the west of the existing two lane carriageway, between Perth and Breadalbane.
- Construct grade-separated interchanges with Evandale Road and Devon Hills Road (via a service road).
- Reconfigure existing highway accesses to adjacent private properties along the existing Midland Highway to either service roads or via the new interchanges.
- Convert the existing highway to a new service road to facilitate local traffic movements from Devon Hills Road and Gibbet Hill, (including Gibbet Hill Rise) back to Perth, property access, and pedestrian and cyclist movements.
• Undertake earthworks to provide for future extension of the highway to join with the future Perth Western Link.
• Undertake associated earthworks with the proposed alignment requiring moderate to significant cutting or embankments in some sections due to the nature of terrain and road gradient.
• Acquire private properties (or part thereof) adjacent to the highway to facilitate the proposed construction works.
• Transfer all service roads associated with the new highway to Council following completion of the project.
• Demolish a house and two sheds.

Figure 1 – Extent of proposed roadworks (Source: Department of State Growth, Midland Highway Perth to Breadalbane Duplication, Development Application Supporting Report, August 2015)

Figure 2 – Proposed Devon Hills Road junction looking north (Source: Department of State Growth, August 2015)
Figure 3 – Proposed service road intersection looking towards Youl Road and Perth (Source: Department of State Growth, August 2015)

Figure 4 – Looking south towards proposed underpass (Source: Department of State Growth, August 2015)
Figure 5 – Proposed Breadalbane interchange looking south (Source: Department of State Growth, August 2015)

Figure 6 – Looking west from existing roundabout to proposed Breadalbane interchange (Source: Department of State Growth, August 2015)
4.2 Zone and land use

*Figure 7 - Zone Map – Utilities and Rural Resource (Source: Department of State Growth, August 2015)*
The land is zoned Utilities (Midland Highway) and Rural Resource (adjoining land).

The Planning Scheme defines Utilities as:

| Utilities | use of land for utilities and infrastructure including:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) telecommunications;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) electricity generation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) transmitting or distributing gas, oil, or power;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) transport networks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) collecting, treating, transmitting, storing or distributing water; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) collecting, treating, or disposing of storm or floodwater, sewage, or sullage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples include an electrical sub-station or powerline, gas, water or sewerage main, optic fibre main or distribution hub, pumping station, railway line, retarding basin, road, sewage treatment plant, storm or flood water drain, water storage dam and weir.

Utilities is Permitted (with permit) in the Utilities zone and Discretionary in the Rural Resource zone.

### 26.2 Rural Resource zone Use Table (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Class</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 28.2 Utilities zone Use Table (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Class</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Subject site and locality

The author of this report undertook a site inspection on 11 September 2015. The site is located on and adjacent to the Midland Highway from north of Youl Road to north-west of the Breadalbane roundabout. See Figure 1 for an aerial photograph of the area.

*Figure 8 – looking towards subject site from Seccombe Street (unmade) intersection with Midland Highway*
4.4 Permit/site history

None relevant to this application.

4.5 Representations

Notice of the application was given in accordance with Section 57 of the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993. A review of Council’s Dataworks system after completion of the public exhibition period revealed that representations (Attachment B) were received from:

- A Stuart, 38 Summit Drive, Devon Hills
- Woolcott Surveys (obo Jorjs Pty Ltd, owner of 16523 Midland Highway)
- P Thurlow, Managing Director, Island Block & Paving Pty Ltd, 16525 Midland Highway.

The applicant’s response is included at Attachment B.
The matters raised in the representations are outlined below followed by the planner’s comments.

- A Stuart, 38 Summit Drive, Devon Hills

  *Highway elevations submitted to the Stuarts by State Growth on 26 August 2015 were inaccurate.*

  **Planner’s comment:** State Growth advises that highway elevations provided to the Stuarts were based on a plan prepared for another stakeholder and showed a cross-section at another location that does not represent the true height of the new highway at the Stuart’s property. A drawing has now been provided to the Stuarts that demonstrates the true height of the highway embankment adjacent to their property which is lower than the typical cross section. Photographs at 50m intervals along the new highway alignment, corrected to driver eye height, show the Stuart’s residence would remain concealed by trees (see Attachment B).

  *Noise level modeling, taking into consideration engine braking and acceleration at the proposed underpass has been promised but not done.*

  **Planner’s comment:** State Growth advises that the noise assessment provided (with the application) demonstrates that the Stuart’s property does not trigger considerations for mitigation in accordance with State Growth’s State Road Traffic Noise Guidelines. Extension of the noise model currently being undertaken will inform any requirements to revise the number of properties eligible for consideration of noise mitigation under the Guidelines. It is not envisaged that this will show any change to noise levels on the Stuart property.

  *Effects on the Stuart’s boundary are unclear at this stage. Fencing requirements/obligations have not been discussed or agreed.*

  **Planner’s comment:** State Growth advises that there is no intention of State Growth to acquire any of the Stuart’s property, however due to the inclusion of the cycleway it is necessary to relocate the current boundary fence to the true title boundary location. This fence is also to be constructed to be cycle and pedestrian friendly while still providing for suitability to contain livestock. Fencing agreements are currently being obtained by
Noise during construction and hours of operation.

Planner’s comment: State Growth advises that the contractor will be required to comply with normal operating hours as determined by Council and EPA requirements. The Contractor may request permission from time to time to operate outside these hours. There should be no reason for the contractor to undertake night works unless requested to do so and this would require prior notification to adjacent residents. In terms of dust, it is intended to keep the traffic on sealed pavements for virtually the whole project and water carts will be required to suppress dust as part of standard environmental conditions.

Power supply to the Stuart’s property – currently overhead from the opposite side of the highway. At this stage no plan submitted to them.

Planner’s comment: State Growth advises that the current highway power supply will be relocated to the western side of the new highway and a new underground connection will link the western side to the existing overhead supply at the Stuart’s boundary. This is intended to be suitable for 3 phase supply, at the Stuart’s request.

Existing large trees on the Stuart’s boundary – whose responsibility is it to remove, if required.

Planner’s comment: State Growth advises that trees located between the true boundary and the road are the responsibility of State Growth to manage. Considerable effort is being made in the design to maintain as many trees as possible through this section as well as providing for the cycleway. If the tree is on the actual title boundary, State Growth in consultation with the landowner will determine whether the tree is to be removed, or, if possible, the tree will be retained and the fence located to miss the trees.

Options to mitigate any of the above concerns have not been committed to, including but not limited to sound barriers, road surface selection, double glazing, fence design/type.

Planner’s comment: State Growth advises that they do not intend to install attenuation fencing or earth mounds in this location as they will have limited effect due to topography, be cost prohibitive, create an ongoing maintenance issue including anti-social behavior, disrupt drainage and require acquisition of a wide expanse of land (a 3m high mound would be up to 20m wide) and thereby compromise the environmental preservation constraints that exist on this project. Glazing and other building treatments are considered the only option if noise mitigation is deemed required. There is no requirement for noise mitigation adjacent to the Stuarts.

- Woolcott Surveys (obo Jorjs Pty Ltd, owner of 16523 Midland Highway)

Notes that extensive consultation has been carried out between GHD, State Growth and Jorjs Pty Ltd in regard to the highway duplication and in particular the design and its impacts on 16523 Midland Highway, Perth. Whilst not objecting to the idea of road improvements to the Midland Highway, the layout advertised by Council with the Development Application is substantially different to the one discussed and agreed between the parties. The displayed layout takes much more land from the industrial site than expected. Attaches a plan from GHD as agreed by the parties which shows the difference between this and the advertised plan. The taking of excessive land from adjoining landowners is a waste of resources, when this land can be used for other, more strategic, purposes. Advises that if the design were to revert to the SK077 dated
26 August 2015 layout as discussed and agreed with Jorjs Pty Ltd, it is more than likely this representation would be withdrawn.

Planner’s comment: State Growth advises that they have undertaken active engagement with affected landowners during development of the project, and has continued to have ongoing discussions during assessment of the Development Application. Impacts on the property at 16523 Midland Highway were carefully considered during the comprehensive planning and design phases for the project. The design lodged as part of the Development Application was determined to achieve optimal outcomes for both operational efficiency of the Highway and safety of access for local properties.

Any further discussions undertaken with individual landowners are being considered by State Growth separately to the current Development Application process. If any suggested alterations to the design emerge as part of this ongoing process, they will be carefully considered in terms of project cost and constructability, safety standards, access arrangements and impacts for other properties, and environmental and heritage constraints. Any significant proposed changes will be communicated to the Northern Midlands Council and confirmed to be substantially in accordance with any approval before they are implemented. On this basis it is most appropriate that Council consider the design plans lodged with the Development Application that have been publicly exhibited as part of the statutory planning process.

- P Thurlow, Managing Director, Island Block & Paving Pty Ltd, 16525 Midland Highway.

The present proposal incorporates alterations to the access to Island Block and Paving, and the removal of signage and fencing. It will directly affect the business including security of products and present advertising arrangements. Asks that consideration is given to the impact that this will have on current operations, in so far as is reasonably practical under the terms of the current planning scheme. This includes, the ability for signage to be replaced in alternative locations and installation of new fencing and security gates.

Planner’s comment: State Growth advises that they have undertaken active engagement with affected landowners during development of the project, and has continued to have ongoing discussions during assessment of the Development Application. Impacts on the property at 16525 Midland Highway were carefully considered during the comprehensive planning and design phases for the project. The design lodged as part of the Development Application was determined to achieve optimal outcomes for both operational efficiency of the Highway and safety of access for local properties.

Alterations to access to the property will be a significant improvement to current arrangements that present potential conflict points between vehicles entering or exiting these accesses and the main traffic on the existing highway. Direct connection with the duplicated high-speed highway will not be provided. The proposal provides access to this property via a new service road to ensure safe and convenient access. Extensive consultation with this representor culminated in their acceptance of the submitted proposal. The business will be compensated under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act 1993. Any accommodation works for the properties will not detrimentally impact on any existing security or advertising arrangements, a separate application for relocation of approved signage will be submitted in due course.
4.6 Referrals

**Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department**

**Precis:** Council’s consultant engineer, Terry Eaton, advised that it is impossible to provide a technical audit of this proposal without the attendant traffic and cost benefit analysis reports. Perusal indicates issues likely due to:

Lack of continuity of Hobart Road;

The need for traffic to exit Hobart Rd to the highway from Devon Hills and exit the Highway to return to the local road network a short distance later i.e. likely insufficient length between the merge / diverge;

The deficiency for speed control and capacity variance at the entry to Perth, upgrading by say a roundabout and separate exit to Youl Road may be worthy of consideration;

The lack of consideration of ODP planning for a road link to East Perth at Gibbet Hill i.e. Seccombe Street junction.

My suggestion is to “stop clock” until the traffic analysis and supporting benefit / cost analysis is provided.

**Planner’s comment:** Clause 8.1.3 of the planning scheme allows council to stop the clock by requesting additional information as considered necessary or desirable to satisfy itself that the proposal will comply with any relevant standards and purpose statements in the zone or codes applicable to the proposal.

Additional information was requested and received by way of a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) to satisfy compliance with the Road and Railway Assets code which states that a TIA is required to demonstrate compliance with performance criteria.

As the planning scheme does not require a traffic analysis and benefit / cost analysis, it was not required of the applicant.

**TasWater**

**Precis:** The application was referred to TasWater on 24 August 2015. As of writing a response had not been received. In accordance with S. 56P (3) of the Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008, the planning authority may assume that TasWater has no submissions to make in relation to an application of which notice has been given if no such submissions are received by the planning authority within 14 days after the notice was given.

**Heritage Adviser**

Council’s heritage adviser, David Denman, advised that he has no objection to the proposal, noting that it is not visible from Haggerston House.

**Tasmanian Heritage Council**

**Precis:** The Heritage Council provided a Notice of No Interest in the application, advising that the works are within a part of the place (Haggerston) that is not entered on the Tasmanian Heritage Register.

**Department of State Growth**

The Department of State Growth is the applicant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launceston Airport</td>
<td>Not applicable to this application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasrail (adjoining landowner)</td>
<td>Not applicable to this application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Officer</td>
<td>Not applicable to this application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Protection Agency (level 2 under EMPCA)</td>
<td>Not applicable to this application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local District Committee</td>
<td>Not applicable to this application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td><strong>Precis:</strong> Application signed by the General Manager with regard to those parts that affect Council roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister administering Crown Lands</td>
<td><strong>Precis:</strong> Application signed by the Minister’s delegate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultant Hydraulic Engineer                       | **Precis:** The plans were sent to Mr Cameron Oakley, Consultant Engineer, Hyrodynamica, with a request to review the applicant’s statement that “the new carriageway will increase the impervious area in the overall catchment by less than 1% and the catchment generally drains to the existing storage dam on MacKinnon’s property at 390 Illawara Road. Accordingly, the risk of exacerbating local drainage or flooding issues is considered low”. Mr Oakley advises:  

_I have conducted a high level assessment of the sensitivity of the West Perth catchment (to Drummond Street) of the highway duplication._  

DSGs comment is reasonable:  

_The new carriageway will increase the impervious area in the overall catchment by less than 1% and the catchment generally drains to the existing storage dam on MacKinnon’s property at 390 Illawara Road. Accordingly, the risk of exacerbating local drainage or flooding issues is considered low._  

Assuming a total width of 25m by 2.1km length (from southern most chainage 5600 to the top of the catchment chainage 8700 next to Island Block & Paver) gives a total area of about 7.75 ha which is being converted from pervious to impervious. This compares to an overall catchment size of some 865 ha, so it is less than 1%.  

Modelling from Bullocks 2011 report calculates the 100 year peak flow to Drummond Street of 15.3 m3/s. Assuming an additional 1% impervious fraction would only very slightly increase this prediction. Please note that since the modelling was carried out, MacKinnon’s dam has been installed which has the potential to reduce flows to West Perth considerably from this predicted rate. The exact behaviour and storage capacity of the dam is currently unknown. More work would need to be done to fully assess it.  

Most of the new carriageway length is above the dam, so DSGs claims regarding draining to the dam are true. There may be minor localised issues created by additional stormwater between the road and the dam, however I note in places that have included several small vegetated wetlands adjacent the road, which will serve to mitigate stormwater flows and provide some stormwater quality benefits.

As such as long as the discharge points/culverts are constructed appropriately I wouldn’t anticipate any issues.

NRM Facilitator

Precis: Council’s NRM Facilitator, Monique Case, raised the following concerns:

The only Code mentioned in the documents that might fit is Natural Hazards i.e. salinity is a natural hazard. Salinity Hazard Report for NMC, could be used to guide conditions?

**Planner’s comment:** The application has a section on Natural Hazards, but the planning scheme does not contain a Natural Hazards Code, and the proposed salinity management code was not included in the regional planning scheme.

Water Code – in terms of the water management plan – can we ask for consideration of downstream impacts of their proposed design? As in, are we sure that it will not have adverse impacts on downstream neighbours, such as flooding and storm water management concerns in Perth?

**Planner’s comment:** Refer to comments above from Cameron Oakley, Hydrodynamica, which advises that as long as the discharge points/culverts are constructed appropriately, issues are not anticipated.

Under the planning framework / scheme are we allowed to consider post development / construction impacts of infrastructure on landscape processes such as the identified sodicity sites and salinity hazards – issues identified in the provided soils report do not discuss issues aside from construction considerations rather than landscape (i.e. longer term impacts on neighbours) overland flow/drainage adverse impact avoidance.

**Planner’s comment:** As above, the planning scheme does not contain codes addressing natural hazards or salinity hazard.

4.7 Planning Scheme Assessment

See Attachment D for an assessment against the planning scheme provisions.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS TO COUNCIL

Not applicable to this application.

6 OPTIONS

Approve subject to conditions, or refuse and state reasons for refusal.

7 DISCUSSION

Discretion to refuse the application is limited to:
- Development and use of Utilities in the Rural Resource zone;
• Development and use involving works within 50m of a Category 1 road subject to a speed limit of more than 60 km/h under the Road and Railway Assets Code;
• Development and use of land within the scenic management – tourist road corridor and local scenic management area under the Scenic Management Code;
• Removal of native vegetation under the Biodiversity Code;
• Development and use of land within 50m of a watercourse under the Water Quality Code;
• Development and use of a local heritage place (Haggerston House) under the Local Historic Heritage Code.

Conditions that relate to any aspect of the application can be placed on a permit.

Three representations to the application were received, raising concerns over issues such as views into adjacent properties, noise, effects on boundaries, noise during construction, sound mitigation, impact on future use of 16523 Midland Highway and impact on access and signage for 16525 Midland Highway. These concerns are addressed in part 4.5 of this report.

The application has addressed the discretionary elements of the proposal through a Traffic Impact Assessment, Flora and Fauna report and addressing the requirements of the Water Quality Code. The highway will be sufficiently distant from Haggerston House as to not impact on its heritage values. The highway will be adjacent to the existing highway and as such is not introducing a new element into the local landscape and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the scenic management code.

It is recommended that the application be approved.

8 ATTACHMENTS

A Application & plans
B Responses from referral agencies
C Representations & applicant’s response
D Planning scheme assessment

RECOMMENDATION

That land at Midland Highway, Breadalbane be approved to be developed and used for Utilities (Midland Highway, Perth to Breadalbane duplication) in accordance with application P15-230, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Layout not altered

The use and development must be substantially in accordance with the endorsed plans numbered P1 (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0000, 0001, 0002, 0010, 0011 & 0012 Rev B, Dated 07.08.2015); (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0040 – 0057 Rev C, Dated 07.08.2015), (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0060 – 0067 Rev B, Dated 07.08.2015); (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0071 – 0083 Rev B, Dated 07.08.2015) & (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0300 & 0320 Rev C, Dated 07.08.2015) and must not be altered without the written consent of the planning authority.
DECISION

Cr Calvert/Cr Goninon
That the matter be discussed.
Carried unanimously

Cr Knowles/Cr Polley
That land at Midland Highway, Breadalbane be approved to be developed and used for Utilities (Midland Highway, Perth to Breadalbane duplication) in accordance with application P15-230, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Layout not altered
The use and development must be substantially in accordance with the endorsed plans numbered P1 (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0000, 0001, 0002, 0010, 0011 & 0012 Rev B, Dated 07.08.2015); (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0040 – 0057 Rev C, Dated 07.08.2015), (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0060 – 0067 Rev B, Dated 07.08.2015); (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0071 – 0083 Rev B, Dated 07.08.2015) & (Registration No: A0087.026, Sheet Nos. 0300 & 0320 Rev C, Dated 07.08.2015) and must not be altered without the written consent of the planning authority.

2. Stormwater infrastructure
That the Department of State Growth further investigate the impact of the increased water run-off on the West Perth stormwater infrastructure and mitigation measures required, prior to the commencement of construction.
Carried unanimously

263/15 DRAFT AMENDMENT 01/2015 - RURAL LIVING ZONE – SUBDIVISION PROVISIONS

File: P14-326
Responsible Officer: Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager
Report prepared by: Paul Godier, Senior Planner

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report advises Council of a hearing held by the Tasmanian Planning Commission into the Rural Living amendment, and recommends advice to be provided to the Commission.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

On 20 April 2015, Council initiated an amendment to the Rural Living zone subdivision provisions to increase the minimum lot size for Caledonia Drive and Kalangadoo to 2ha, and for Blackwood Creek, Deddington, Norwich Drive and Pateena Road to 5ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10ha over the area being subdivided.

The draft amendment was placed on public notification from 29 April to 27 May 2015. Two representations to the draft amendment were received and considered by council at its meeting of 22 June.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission held a public hearing on 26 August 2015 in relation to the draft amendment.
The Commission has requested a submission from the Council to assist in understanding Council’s plans in relation to the matters below.

**TPC request:** Maximising the utilisation of land zoned Rural Living through subdivision lot sizes to accommodate demand for this form of residential settlement and to limit demand for additional areas to be rezoned to Rural Living.

**Comment:** Consistent with the initial statement in the Settlement Strategy at clause 3.6 of the Interim Scheme, Council’s view is that the utilisation of Rural Living zoned land should be maximised by allowing subdivision of such land providing it is consistent with the settlement pattern of the existing areas within that zone, thereby limiting the demand for additional areas to be rezoned to Rural Living.

**TPC request:** The permissible lot size and density of land at each locality or settlement zoned Rural Living in the municipality, and any recommendations to revise those parameters.

**Comment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Currently permitted</th>
<th>Currently discretionary</th>
<th>Proposed permitted</th>
<th>Proposed discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateena Road</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TPC request:** Possible areas of rural land that may be earmarked for future rezoning to Rural Living over the next 20 to 30 years, including areas that might enable improved access in the event of bushfires (such as in the Norwich Drive area which is serviced by a single road providing one way in and one way out).

**Comment:** If Council seeks to rezone land to Rural Living, this would be on the basis that such rezoning would improve access to existing Rural Living areas in the event of bushfire. In keeping with the settlement strategy at clause 3.6.3, this is expected to be principally in the Pateena Road/Norwich Drive area. However, in the absence of a detailed analysis of the land and consultation with the landowners, Council is unable to say whether it would seek to expand the Rural Living zone towards Meander Valley Road or towards the Midland Highway-Devon Hills Road intersection.

**TPC request:** The type and availability of infrastructure services and the accessibility of supporting facilities (such as public transport, shops, schools, medical or other community services) for each settlement with Rural Living zoning.

**Comment:** See tables below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Reticulated Sewer</th>
<th>Reticulated Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Shops/Medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cressy District High School bus</td>
<td>Cressy/Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cressy District High School bus</td>
<td>Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fire Stations** – using Tasmania Fire Service for location of fire stations and Google Maps for estimated driving times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Driving Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>14km</td>
<td>17 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17km</td>
<td>19 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17km</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19km</td>
<td>25 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>26km</td>
<td>32 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>15km</td>
<td>18 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>33km</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>1.5km</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TPC request:** Specifically, and in light of clause 3.6.2 of the interim scheme, a clarification of Council’s strategies for Blackwood Creek, Deddington and Kalangadoo in terms of further subdivision, appropriate use and development and supporting infrastructure and facilities in these areas.

**Comment:** Clause 3.6.2 of the Interim Scheme states:

Un-serviced Settlements
The following settlements lack some essential services, and any growth prospects are constrained by the practicality of improving their delivery, quality and reliability.

- Breadalbane
- Bishopspurbe
- Nile
- Deddington
- Blackwood Creek
- Conara
- Rosssarden
- Lake Leake/Kalangadoo
- Royal George

Consequently, it is not the policy of NMC to promote the growth of these settlements or augment the capacity of services beyond meeting their existing needs. Zoning is intended to reflect these principles.
It is not immediately clear whether the growth referred to in this clause means growth in number of lots by subdivision within the existing zoned land, or outward growth by rezoning adjacent land.

Based on the following clauses, the growth of the un-serviced settlements strategy is taken to mean that development is encouraged in the existing zoned land, but the zone is not to be expanded beyond existing boundaries:

- 3.6.3 - Any additional future supply of rural living is expected to be by the incremental expansion of established areas.
- 3.7.3 - Urban growth boundaries are shown for a number of towns and its purpose is to define the areas within which development is to be encouraged.

The strategy is therefore that these settlements will be developed by way of subdivision consistent with the settlement pattern of the existing areas, and that such subdivision and subsequent residential development will help to support local services such as fire brigades, district schools and school bus services by allowing for additional population in these areas.

**TPC request:** The allocation of land for Rural Living (and particularly Norwich Drive and Pateena Road) and its alignment (or fit) with land use plans and zoning in the adjoining areas under the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme.

**Comment:** The Meander Valley provisions for the adjoining area of Traveller’s Rest are included below.

**Subdivision - Performance Criteria**

**P1** Each new lot on a plan must be suitable for use and development in an arrangement that is consistent with the Zone Purpose, having regard to the combination of:

- a) slope, shape, orientation and topography of land;
- b) any established pattern of use and development;
- c) connection to the road network;
- d) availability of or likely requirements for utilities;
- e) any requirement to protect ecological, scientific, historic, cultural or aesthetic values; and
- f) potential exposure to natural hazards.

While the Meander Valley Interim Scheme does not specify lot sizes, the performance criteria are consistent with the draft amendment to the Northern Midlands Interim Scheme which proposes that each lot must:

Provide sufficient useable area and dimensions to allow for:

- i) a dwelling to be erected in a convenient, appropriate and hazard free location; and
- ii) appropriate disposal of wastewater and stormwater; and
- iii) on-site parking and manoeuvrability; and
- iv) adequate private open space; and
- v) vehicular access from the carriageway of the road to a building area on the lot, if any; and

Be consistent with the local area having regard to:

- i) the topographical or natural features of the site; and
- ii) the ability of vegetation to provide buffering; and
- iii) any features of natural or cultural significance; and
- iv) the presence of any natural hazards; and
- v) local area objectives, if any.
TPC request: The merit of developing a Specific Area Plan as an alternative means to incorporate the draft amendment into the interim scheme.

Comment: It is understood that a specific area plan for the Rural Living areas would likely be carried over into the Statewide scheme. Whereas, the proposed amended provisions would likely be replaced with the Statewide provisions for Rural Living zones, which are currently unknown.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- 4.6 Strategic Planning
- 4.7 Land Use Planning

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

None applicable.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

5.1 S. 40. of the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993 - consideration by Commission of draft amendment and relevant representations

The Commission must consider the draft amendment and the representations, statements and recommendations contained in Council’s report.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None.

7 RISK ISSUES

No risk issues identified.
8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

The Tasmanian Planning Commission has requested the information following a public hearing into the draft amendment.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The draft amendment has been placed on public notification and the two representations received brought before council previously.

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Move the recommendation or move an alternative recommendation.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

The recommendation is considered to address the matters raised by the Tasmanian Planning Commission in regard to the draft amendment to the Rural Living zone subdivision provisions and it is recommended it be endorsed.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Correspondence from the Tasmanian Planning Commission

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council advise the Tasmanian Planning Commission that its views in relation to the matters raised by the Commission are:

TPC request: Maximising the utilisation of land zoned Rural Living through subdivision lot sizes to accommodate demand for this form of residential settlement and to limit demand for additional areas to be rezoned to Rural Living.

Comment: Consistent with the initial statement in the Settlement Strategy at clause 3.6 of the Interim Scheme, Council’s view is that the utilisation of Rural Living zoned land should be maximised by allowing subdivision of such land providing it is consistent with the settlement pattern of the existing areas within that zone, thereby limiting the demand for additional areas to be rezoned to Rural Living.

TPC request: The permissible lot size and density of land at each locality or settlement zoned Rural Living in the municipality, and any recommendations to revise those parameters.

Comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Currently permitted</th>
<th>Currently discretionary</th>
<th>Proposed permitted</th>
<th>Proposed discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TPC request: Possible areas of rural land that may be earmarked for future rezoning to Rural Living over the next 20 to 30 years, including areas that might enable improved access in the event of bushfires (such as in the Norwich Drive area which is serviced by a single road providing one way in and one way out).

Comment: If Council seeks to rezone land to Rural Living, this would be on the basis that such rezoning would improve access to existing Rural Living areas in the event of bushfire. In keeping with the settlement strategy at clause 3.6.3, this is expected to be principally in the Pateena Road/Norwich Drive area. However, in the absence of a detailed analysis of the land and consultation with the landowners, Council is unable to say whether it would seek to expand the Rural Living zone towards Meander Valley Road or towards the Midland Highway-Devon Hills Road intersection.

TPC request: The type and availability of infrastructure services and the accessibility of supporting facilities (such as public transport, shops, schools, medical or other community services) for each settlement with Rural Living zoning.

Comment: See tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Reticulated Sewer</th>
<th>Reticulated Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Shops/Medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cressy District High School bus</td>
<td>Cressy/Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cressy District High School bus</td>
<td>Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire Stations – using Tasmania Fire Service for location of fire stations and Google Maps for estimated driving times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Driving Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>14km / 17 min from Bracknell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17km / 19 min from Poatina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17km / 20 min from Bishopshourbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19km / 25min from Cressy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>26km / 32 min from Blessington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>15km / 18 min from Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>33km / 30 min from Cranbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>1.5km / 3 min Relbia Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TPC request: Specifically, and in light of clause 3.6.2 of the interim scheme, a clarification of Council’s strategies for Blackwood Creek, Deddington and Kalangadoo in terms of further subdivision, appropriate use and development and supporting infrastructure and facilities in these areas.

Comment: Clause 3.6.2 of the Interim Scheme states:

Un-serviced Settlements

The following settlements lack some essential services, and any growth prospects are constrained by the practicality of improving their delivery, quality and reliability.

- Breadalbane
- Bishopsbourne
- Nile
- Deddington
- Blackwood Creek
- Conara
- Rossarden
- Lake Leake/Kalangadoo
- Royal George

Consequently, it is not the policy of NMC to promote the growth of these settlements or augment the capacity of services beyond meeting their existing needs. Zoning is intended to reflect these principles.

It is not immediately clear whether the growth referred to in this clause means growth in number of lots by subdivision within the existing zoned land, or outward growth by rezoning adjacent land.

Based on the following clauses, the growth of the un-serviced settlements strategy is taken to mean that development is encouraged in the existing zoned land, but the zone is not to be expanded beyond existing boundaries:

- 3.6.3 - Any additional future supply of rural living is expected to be by the incremental expansion of established areas.
- 3.7.3 - Urban growth boundaries are shown for a number of towns and its purpose is to define the areas within which development is to be encouraged.

The strategy is therefore that these settlements will be developed by way of subdivision consistent with the settlement pattern of the existing areas, and that such subdivision and subsequent residential development will help to support local services such as fire brigades, district schools and school bus services by allowing for additional population in these areas.

TPC request: The allocation of land for Rural Living (and particularly Norwich Drive and Pateena Road) and its alignment (or fit) with land use plans and zoning in the adjoining areas under the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme.

Comment: The Meander Valley provisions for the adjoining area of Traveller’s Rest are included below.

Subdivision - Performance Criteria

P1 Each new lot on a plan must be suitable for use and development in an arrangement that is consistent with the Zone Purpose, having regard to the combination of:

a) slope, shape, orientation and topography of land;
b) any established pattern of use and development;
c) connection to the road network;
d) availability of or likely requirements for utilities;
e) any requirement to protect ecological, scientific, historic, cultural or aesthetic values; and
f) potential exposure to natural hazards.

While the Meander Valley Interim Scheme does not specify lot sizes, the performance criteria are consistent with the draft amendment to the Northern Midlands Interim Scheme which proposes that each lot must:

Provide sufficient useable area and dimensions to allow for:

i) a dwelling to be erected in a convenient, appropriate and hazard free location; and

ii) appropriate disposal of wastewater and stormwater; and

iii) on-site parking and manoeuvrability; and

iv) adequate private open space; and

v) vehicular access from the carriageway of the road to a building area on the lot, if any; and

Be consistent with the local area having regard to:

i) the topographical or natural features of the site; and

ii) the ability of vegetation to provide buffering; and

iii) any features of natural or cultural significance; and

iv) the presence of any natural hazards; and

v) local area objectives, if any.

Rural Living Zones – Norwich Drive, Pateena Road, Traveller’s Rest.

**TPC request:** The merit of developing a Specific Area Plan as an alternative means to incorporate the draft amendment into the interim scheme.

**Comment:** It is understood that a specific area plan for the Rural Living areas would likely be carried over into the Statewide scheme. Whereas, the proposed amended provisions would likely be replaced with the Statewide provisions for Rural Living zones, which are currently unknown.

**DECISION**

**Cr Adams/Cr Goninon**

That the matter be discussed.

Carried unanimously

**Cr Adams/Cr Knowles**

That Council advise the Tasmanian Planning Commission that its views in relation to the matters raised by the Commission are:
TPC request: Maximising the utilisation of land zoned Rural Living through subdivision lot sizes to accommodate demand for this form of residential settlement and to limit demand for additional areas to be rezoned to Rural Living.

Comment: Consistent with the initial statement in the Settlement Strategy at clause 3.6 of the Interim Scheme, Council’s view is that the utilisation of Rural Living zoned land should be maximised by allowing subdivision of such land providing it is consistent with the settlement pattern of the existing areas within that zone, thereby limiting the demand for additional areas to be rezoned to Rural Living.

TPC request: The permissible lot size and density of land at each locality or settlement zoned Rural Living in the municipality, and any recommendations to revise those parameters.

Comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Currently permitted</th>
<th>Currently discretionary</th>
<th>Proposed permitted</th>
<th>Proposed discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateena Road</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>10 ha</td>
<td>5 ha with an overall density of 1 lot per 10 ha over the lot(s) being subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TPC request: Possible areas of rural land that may be earmarked for future rezoning to Rural Living over the next 20 to 30 years, including areas that might enable improved access in the event of bushfires (such as in the Norwich Drive area which is serviced by a single road providing one way in and one way out).

Comment: If Council seeks to rezone land to Rural Living, this would be on the basis that such rezoning would improve access to existing Rural Living areas in the event of bushfire. In keeping with the settlement strategy at clause 3.6.3, this is expected to be principally in the Pateena Road/Norwich Drive area. However, in the absence of a detailed analysis of the land and consultation with the landowners, Council is unable to say whether it would seek to expand the Rural Living zone towards Meander Valley Road or towards the Midland Highway-Devon Hills Road intersection.

TPC request: The type and availability of infrastructure services and the accessibility of supporting facilities (such as public transport, shops, schools, medical or other community services) for each settlement with Rural Living zoning.

Comment: See tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Reticulated Sewer</th>
<th>Reticulated Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Shops/Medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cressy District High School bus</td>
<td>Cressy/Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
<td>Evandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cressy District High School bus</td>
<td>Longford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fire Stations – using Tasmania Fire Service for location of fire stations and Google Maps for estimated driving times (noting that these can be different on the ground, depending on driving conditions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Driving Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Creek</td>
<td>14km</td>
<td>17 min from Bracknell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17km from Poatina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17km from Bishopsbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19km from Cressy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deddington</td>
<td>10.2km</td>
<td>10 min from Nile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Drive/Pateena Road</td>
<td>15km</td>
<td>18 min from Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalangadoo</td>
<td>33km</td>
<td>30 min from Cranbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Drive</td>
<td>1.5km</td>
<td>3 min from Relbia Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TPC request:** Specifically, and in light of clause 3.6.2 of the interim scheme, a clarification of Council’s strategies for Blackwood Creek, Deddington and Kalangadoo in terms of further subdivision, appropriate use and development and supporting infrastructure and facilities in these areas.

**Comment:** Clause 3.6.2 of the Interim Scheme states:

**Un-serviced Settlements**

The following settlements lack some essential services, and any growth prospects are constrained by the practicality of improving their delivery, quality and reliability.

- Breadalbane
- Bishopsbourne
- Nile
- Deddington
- Blackwood Creek
- Conara
- Rossarden
- Lake Leake/Kalangadoo
- Royal George

Consequently, it is not the policy of NMC to promote the growth of these settlements or augment the capacity of services beyond meeting their existing needs. Zoning is intended to reflect these principles.

It is not immediately clear whether the growth referred to in this clause means growth in number of lots by subdivision within the existing zoned land, or outward growth by rezoning adjacent land.

Based on the following clauses, the growth of the un-serviced settlements strategy is taken to mean that development is encouraged in the existing zoned land, but the zone is not to be expanded beyond existing boundaries:

- **3.6.3** - Any additional future supply of rural living is expected to be by the incremental expansion of established areas.
- **3.7.3** - Urban growth boundaries are shown for a number of towns and its purpose is to define the areas within which development is to be encouraged.

The strategy is therefore that these settlements will be developed by way of subdivision consistent with the settlement pattern of the existing areas, and that such subdivision and subsequent residential development will help to support local services such as fire brigades, district schools and school bus services by allowing for additional population in these areas.

**TPC request:** The allocation of land for Rural Living (and particularly Norwich Drive and Pateena Road) and its alignment (or fit) with land use plans and zoning in the adjoining areas under the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme.

**Comment:** The Meander Valley provisions for the adjoining area of Traveller’s Rest are included below.
**Subdivision - Performance Criteria**

P1 Each new lot on a plan must be suitable for use and development in an arrangement that is consistent with the Zone Purpose, having regard to the combination of:

a) slope, shape, orientation and topography of land;
b) any established pattern of use and development;
c) connection to the road network;
d) availability of or likely requirements for utilities;
e) any requirement to protect ecological, scientific, historic, cultural or aesthetic values; and
f) potential exposure to natural hazards.

While the Meander Valley Interim Scheme does not specify lot sizes, the performance criteria are consistent with the draft amendment to the Northern Midlands Interim Scheme which proposes that each lot must:

- Provide sufficient useable area and dimensions to allow for:
  - i) a dwelling to be erected in a convenient, appropriate and hazard free location; and
  - ii) appropriate disposal of wastewater and stormwater; and
  - iii) on-site parking and manoeuvrability; and
  - iv) adequate private open space; and
  - v) vehicular access from the carriageway of the road to a building area on the lot, if any; and

- Be consistent with the local area having regard to:
  - i) the topographical or natural features of the site; and
  - ii) the ability of vegetation to provide buffering; and
  - iii) any features of natural or cultural significance; and
  - iv) the presence of any natural hazards; and
  - v) local area objectives, if any.

**Rural Living Zones – Norwich Drive, Pateena Road, Traveller’s Rest.**

**TPC request:** The merit of developing a Specific Area Plan as an alternative means to incorporate the draft amendment into the interim scheme.

**Comment:** It is understood that a specific area plan for the Rural Living areas would likely be carried over into the Statewide scheme. Whereas, the proposed amended provisions would likely be replaced with the Statewide provisions for Rural Living zones, which are currently unknown.

Carried unanimously
264/15 APPEAL - P15-165 - 27 LEWIS STREET, LONGFORD: (CT 218150/1) - MULTIPLE DWELLINGS X 4 AT THE REAR OF EXISTING DWELLING, TREE REMOVAL & SHED DEMOLITION

File: P15-165
Responsible Officer: Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager
Report prepared by: Paul Godier, Senior Planner

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report advises Council that an appeal has been lodged against the refusal of the development application, that mediation has been held, and that revisions to the plans have resulted in a consent agreement being proposed.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Council refused the development application for four dwellings at the rear of an existing dwelling at its August meeting on the following grounds:
1) The proposal does not provide adequate visitor parking contrary to clause E6.6.1 P1.
2) The proposal does not provide convenient or adequate car parking and manoeuvring space contrary to clause E6.7.2 P2.

The applicant lodged an appeal against this refusal (see attached). A directions hearing was held on 7 September as a result of which the grounds of refusal were revised as follows:
1) The proposal does not provide adequate visitor parking, contrary to clause E6.6.1 P1, in that it does not provide the 1 visitor car parking space required.
2) The proposal does not provide convenient or adequate car parking and manoeuvring space, contrary to clause E6.7.2 P2, in that the proposal seeks to vary the width of manoeuvring spaces adjacent to the second car parking space for units 1-4 to less than the required 4.8m.

Figure 1 – original proposal refused by Council
The width of manoeuvring space needs to be at least 4.8m. The revised plan provides for manoeuvring widths of Unit 1 (4.81m); Unit 2 (5.39m); Unit 3 (4.88m); Unit 4 (5.24m); Unit 5 (6.19m).

The revised plan adds a parking space adjacent to Unit 5, thereby creating a visitor parking space. The added parking space allows Unit 5 to retain its required amount of private open space.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

• 4.3 Development Control
4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS
None.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
5.1 S. 61 Land Use Planning & Approvals Act – Appeals against planning decisions

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
Appeals are provided for within the existing budget allocation.

7 RISK ISSUES
None identified.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT
None required.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The original application was placed on public notification. A representation was received from an adjoining owner, A Wilkins, 37 Anstey Street, Longford which raised concerns regarding the development including lack of visitor parking and lack of turning space within the site.

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER
Council can form the view that the proposed changes to the layout:
1) address its concerns regarding visitor parking and vehicle manoeuvring space and resolve the appeal by a consent agreement; or
2) do not address its concerns regarding visitor parking and vehicle manoeuvring space and allow the matter to be determined by a hearing of the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION
The proposed changes to the layout add the required visitor car parking space to the site, and increase the manoeuvring widths to greater than the 4.8m required by the planning scheme.

It is considered that the amended layout addresses the concerns with regard to lack of visitor parking and vehicle manoeuvring.

12 ATTACHMENTS
12.1 Notice of Appeal
12.2 Amended plans

RECOMMENDATION 1
That the matter be discussed.
RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council grant the Planning & Development Manager the authority to sign a consent agreement approving application P15-165 subject to the following conditions:

1 Layout not altered
The use and development shall be in accordance with the endorsed plans numbered P1 – P18 (Drawings by Pinnacle Homes Project No: 1415.004 Sheet No’s: Cover Page, Ad01-Ad15 Dated: 17-06-2015 (sheets Ad02, 03 & 04 dated 09.09.15), (sheets Ad06, 08 & 10 dated 28.05.2015) & (Drainage Plan by AJL Consulting Engineers Project No:15.145 Sheet No’s: C01 & C02 Dated: 02-07-2015) & D1 Proposal Design Response/Planning submission & D2 Stormwater Design Calculations (email dated 15-07-2015 from A.J. Leake to T. Keegan).

2 Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department conditions

2.1 Municipal standards & approvals
Unless otherwise specified within a condition, all works shall comply with the Municipal Standards including specifications and standard drawings. All works shall be constructed to the satisfaction of Council. Where works are required to be designed prior to construction, such designs and specifications must be approved by Council prior to commencement of any in situ works.

2.2 Works in road reserve
No works shall be undertaken within the public road reserve, including crossovers, driveways or kerb and guttering, without prior approval for the works by the Works & Infrastructure Manager. Twenty-four hours (24) notice shall to be given to the Works & Infrastructure Manager for works within the public road reserve before placement of concrete to enable formwork to be inspected. Failure to do so may result in rejection of the vehicular access or other works and its reconstruction.

2.3 Access
a) A double width concrete driveway crossover and apron shall be constructed from the edge of the street to the property boundary in accordance with Council standards.

b) Prior to the application for a building permit or commencement of any access works, a vehicular crossing application form shall be completed and approved by Council.

c) All works must be done in accordance with Council Standard Drawing TSD-R09 and to the satisfaction of the Works and Infrastructure Manager.

2.4 Stormwater
a) Each dwelling shall be provided with a connection to the Council’s stormwater system, constructed in accordance with Council standards and to the satisfaction of Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department.

b) The developer shall be responsible upgrading the existing stormwater system in Lewis St to drain the development and shall provide confirmation to Council that they will be responsible for these works. Design plans, and calculations shall be provide to Council for approval prior to the commencement of any works.

c) Concentrated stormwater must not be discharged into neighbouring properties

d) Landscaping and hardstand areas must not interfere with natural stormwater run-off from neighbouring properties.

e) All driveways and hardstand areas must be designed to allow stormwater run-off to be adequately drained to the Council stormwater system.

f) Prior to the application for a building permit for any units, the applicant shall design and
provide plans for underground stormwater drainage to collect stormwater from the driveways and roofed area of buildings. The system shall connect through properly-jointed pipes to the stormwater main, inter-allotment drainage or other lawful point of discharge to the satisfaction of the Plumbing Inspector.

2.5 Silt
a) The developer/property owner shall be responsible for ensuring pollutants such as mud, silt or chemicals are not released from the site.

b) Prior to the commencement of the development works the developer/property owner must install all necessary silt fences and cut-off drains to prevent soil, gravel and other debris from escaping the site. No material or debris is to be transported onto the road reserve (including the naturestrip footpath and road pavement). Any material that is deposited on the road reserve shall be removed by the applicant. Should Council be required to clean or carry out works on any of their infrastructure as a result of pollutants being released from the site the cost of these works may be charged to the developer/property owner.

2.6 Works & Infrastructure damage bond
Prior to the application for a building permit, a $1000 bond shall be provided to Council, which shall be refunded if Council’s infrastructure is not damaged.

a) This bond is not taken in place of the Building Department’s construction compliance bond.

b) The nature strip, crossover, apron and kerb and gutter and stormwater infrastructure shall be reinstated to Council’s standards if damaged.

c) The bond shall be returned after building completion if no damage has been done to Council’s infrastructure and all engineering works are done to the satisfaction of the Works & Infrastructure Department.

2.7 Naturestrips
Any new naturestrips, or areas of naturestrip that are disturbed during construction, shall be topped with 100mm of good quality topsoil and sown with grass. Grass must be established and free of weeds prior to Council accepting the development.

3 TasWater conditions
Sewer and water services shall be provided in accordance with Submission to Planning Authority Notice (dated: 16-June-2015; reference No. TWDA 2015/00912-NMC).

4 Landscape Plan
Prior to the application for a building permit, the applicant shall provide a landscape plan to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Manager. The landscaping plan shall address:

a) Fencing to a minimum height of 1.8m.
   Where not already provided, fencing shall be replaced with a solid (no gaps) fence to a minimum height of 1.8m. The southern and rear half of the eastern boundary fences shall be replaced in their entirety. The rear half of the western boundary fence shall be either replaced with a 1.8m high solid fence or upgraded with a solid ‘topper’ to a minimum height of 1.8m.

b) Ground coverings
   All ground coverings (impervious and pervious) shall be clearly stipulated on the plan. The area of private open space to the east of unit one shall be suitably covered to provide for a safe, attractive and functional area for the recreational needs of future residents of unit one.

c) Planting Schedule
   A planting schedule, nominating the location and size at maturity of all trees and shrubs to
be planted, and the common (and botanical) names of such plants, shall be included with the Landscape Plan.

d) Privacy Screen
Further details regarding the height (minimum 1.7m) and construction materials of the privacy screen adjacent to unit one shall also be shown on the plan.

e) Ancillary works
Ancillary works as shown on the site plan, including 6m³ storage sheds, waste storage, mail and newspaper receptacles and clothes-drying facilities shall be included on the landscape plan.

Once approved, the Landscape plan shall be endorsed and will then form part of the permit.

5 Landscaping
i) Landscaping works shall be in accordance with the endorsed plans, and landscaping works for each unit shall be completed prior to the commencement of use of that unit and then maintained for the duration of the use.

ii) A bond of $1000 shall be provided prior to the application for a building permit for the development – the bond will be refunded if the landscape works are completed within the timeframe mentioned in this permit.

6 Sealing of driveways
The applicant shall seal the driveways and parking areas around each unit with an impervious asphalt or concrete pavement prior to the commencement of use of the unit.

7 Required prior to the application for a building permit
Prior to the applicant of a building permit for any unit, the applicant shall:

- Pay a $1000 works bond (as per condition 2.6).
- Pay a $1000 landscape bond (as per condition 5);

Prior to the application for a building permit or commencement of any access works, a vehicular crossing application form shall be completed and approved by Council (as per condition 2.3).

8 Prior to commencement of use
Prior to the commencement of the use of each unit, the following must be completed:

- landscaping works for each unit, including plantings, 6m³ storage sheds, waste storage areas, mail and newspaper receptacles, clothes-drying facilities, and fence screening (as per condition 4 and 5);

- driveways and parking areas around each unit sealed (as per condition 6).

Ms Green returned to the meeting at 7.10pm.

DETECTION
Cr Goninon/Cr Adams
That the matter be discussed. Carried unanimously

Cr Goninon/Cr Polley
That Council grant the Planning & Development Manager the authority to sign a consent agreement approving application P15-165 subject to the following conditions:

1 Layout not altered
The use and development shall be in accordance with the endorsed plans numbered P1 – P18 (Drawings by Pinnacle Homes Project No: 1415.004 Sheet No’s: Cover Page, Ad01-Ad15 Dated: 17-06-2015 (sheets Ad02, 03 & 04 dated 09.09.15), (sheets Ad06, 08

2 Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department conditions

2.1 Municipal standards & approvals

Unless otherwise specified within a condition, all works shall comply with the Municipal Standards including specifications and standard drawings. All works shall be constructed to the satisfaction of Council. Where works are required to be designed prior to construction, such designs and specifications must be approved by Council prior to commencement of any in situ works.

2.2 Works in road reserve

No works shall be undertaken within the public road reserve, including crossovers, driveways or kerb and guttering, without prior approval for the works by the Works & Infrastructure Manager. Twenty-four hours (24) notice shall to be given to the Works & Infrastructure Manager for works within the public road reserve before placement of concrete to enable formwork to be inspected. Failure to do so may result in rejection of the vehicular access or other works and its reconstruction.

2.3 Access

a) A double width concrete driveway crossover and apron shall be constructed from the edge of the street to the property boundary in accordance with Council standards.

b) Prior to the application for a building permit or commencement of any access works, a vehicular crossing application form shall be completed and approved by Council.

c) All works must be done in accordance with Council Standard Drawing TSD-R09 and to the satisfaction of the Works and Infrastructure Manager.

2.4 Stormwater

a) Each dwelling shall be provided with a connection to the Council’s stormwater system, constructed in accordance with Council standards and to the satisfaction of Council’s Works & Infrastructure Department.

b) The developer shall be responsible upgrading the existing stormwater system in Lewis St to drain the development and shall provide confirmation to Council that they will be responsible for these works. Design plans, and calculations shall be provided to Council for approval prior to the commencement of any works.

c) Concentrated stormwater must not be discharged into neighbouring properties

d) Landscaping and hardstand areas must not interfere with natural stormwater run-off from neighbouring properties.

e) All driveways and hardstand areas must be designed to allow stormwater run-off to be adequately drained to the Council stormwater system.

f) Prior to the application for a building permit for any units, the applicant shall design and provide plans for underground stormwater drainage to collect stormwater from the driveways and roofed area of buildings. The system shall connect through properly-jointed pipes to the stormwater main, inter-allotment drainage or other lawful point of discharge to the satisfaction of the Plumbing Inspector.
2.5 Silt
   a) The developer/property owner shall be responsible for ensuring pollutants such as mud, silt or chemicals are not released from the site.
   b) Prior to the commencement of the development works the developer/property owner must install all necessary silt fences and cut-off drains to prevent soil, gravel and other debris from escaping the site. No material or debris is to be transported onto the road reserve (including the naturestrip footpath and road pavement). Any material that is deposited on the road reserve shall be removed by the applicant. Should Council be required to clean or carry out works on any of their infrastructure as a result of pollutants being released from the site the cost of these works may be charged to the developer/property owner.

2.6 Works & Infrastructure damage bond
   Prior to the application for a building permit, a $1000 bond shall be provided to Council, which shall be refunded if Council’s infrastructure is not damaged.
   a) This bond is not taken in place of the Building Department’s construction compliance bond.
   b) The nature strip, crossover, apron and kerb and gutter and stormwater infrastructure shall be reinstated to Council’s standards if damaged.
   c) The bond shall be returned after building completion if no damage has been done to Council’s infrastructure and all engineering works are done to the satisfaction of the Works & Infrastructure Department.

2.7 Naturestrips
   Any new naturestrips, or areas of naturestrip that are disturbed during construction, shall be topped with 100mm of good quality topsoil and sown with grass. Grass must be established and free of weeds prior to Council accepting the development.

3 TasWater conditions
   Sewer and water services shall be provided in accordance with Submission to Planning Authority Notice (dated: 16-June-2015; reference No. TWDA 2015/00912-NMC).

4 Landscape Plan
   Prior to the application for a building permit, the applicant shall provide a landscape plan to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Manager. The landscaping plan shall address:
   a) Fencing to a minimum height of 1.8m.
      Where not already provided, fencing shall be replaced with a solid (no gaps) fence to a minimum height of 1.8m. The southern and rear half of the eastern boundary fences shall be replaced in their entirety. The rear half of the western boundary fence shall be either replaced with a 1.8m high solid fence or upgraded with a solid ‘topper’ to a minimum height of 1.8m.
   b) Ground coverings
      All ground coverings (impervious and pervious) shall be clearly stipulated on the plan. The area of private open space to the east of unit one shall be suitably covered to provide for a safe, attractive and functional area for the recreational needs of future residents of unit one.
   c) Planting Schedule
      A planting schedule, nominating the location and size at maturity of all trees and shrubs to be planted, and the common (and botanical) names of such plants, shall be included with the Landscape Plan.
d) Privacy Screen
Further details regarding the height (minimum 1.7m) and construction materials of the privacy screen adjacent to unit one shall also be shown on the plan.

e) Ancillary works
Ancillary works as shown on the site plan, including 6m3 storage sheds, waste storage, mail and newspaper receptacles and clothes-drying facilities shall be included on the landscape plan.

Once approved, the Landscape plan shall be endorsed and will then form part of the permit.

5 Landscaping
i) Landscaping works shall be in accordance with the endorsed plans, and landscaping works for each unit shall be completed prior to the commencement of use of that unit and then maintained for the duration of the use.

ii) A bond of $1000 shall be provided prior to the application for a building permit for the development – the bond will be refunded if the landscape works are completed within the timeframe mentioned in this permit.

6 Sealing of driveways
The applicant shall seal the driveways and parking areas around each unit with an impervious asphalt or concrete pavement prior to the commencement of use of the unit.

7 Required prior to the application for a building permit
Prior to the applicant of a building permit for any unit, the applicant shall:

• Pay a $1000 works bond (as per condition 2.6).
• Pay a $1000 landscape bond (as per condition 5);

Prior to the application for a building permit or commencement of any access works, a vehicular crossing application form shall be completed and approved by Council (as per condition 2.3).

8 Prior to commencement of use
Prior to the commencement of the use of each unit, the following must be completed:

• landscaping works for each unit, including plantings, 6m3 storage sheds, waste storage areas, mail and newspaper receptacles, clothes-drying facilities, and fence screening (as per condition 4 and 5);
• driveways and parking areas around each unit sealed (as per condition 6).

Carried unanimously

261/15 COUNCIL ACTING AS A PLANNING AUTHORITY – CESSATION

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council cease to act as a Planning Authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, for the remainder of the meeting.

DECISION

Cr Knowles/Cr Lambert

That the Council cease to act as a Planning Authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, for the remainder of the meeting.

Carried unanimously
265/15 PROPOSED BY–LAW: ANIMAL MANAGEMENT

Responsible Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Des Jennings, General Manager

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide Council with a report and seek direction on a proposal to establish an Animal Management By-Law.

Council has available, a legal framework called the Local Government Act 1993. In addition to this legislation Council may also create by-laws to manage, regulate or control various activities within the municipality.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Goss, has received complaints regarding the lack of control over animals within close proximity to neighbouring properties, with particular regard to the keeping of pigs.

Northern Midlands Council currently has no powers to manage the keeping of animals, other than dogs which are regulated by the Dog Control Act 2000.

There is some scope to address issues through Part 12 of the Local Government Act in dealing with nuisance, which is defined to include anything that:

(a) causes, or is likely to cause, danger or harm to the health, safety or welfare of the public; or
(b) causes, or is likely to cause, a risk to public health; or
(c) gives rise to unreasonable or excessive levels of noise or pollution; or
(d) is, or is likely to be, a fire risk; or
(e) constitutes an unsightly outside or rubbish.

Whilst Council can issue an infringement notice for failure to comply with an abstract notice, there is an expectation that Council will undertake any required works not done and seek to recoup costs after the fact. The notice of the alleged nuisance and the level of any action taken by Council are all subject to challenge through the courts.

The difficulty with reliance upon this legislation is the inherent subjectivity of concepts such as ‘unreasonable’. A suitably drafted by-law may be able to address this.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following, “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals identified have relevance to this issue:

- Part 1: Governance
  1.1 Governance
  1.3 Community Dialogue
Part 3: Community Development
3.2 Health

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Once adopted, Council will be required to implement/enforce the by-law.

This will raise resource implications as responding to complaints, follow-up investigation and enforcement action are all time consuming and expensive.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

- Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994
- Local Government Act 1993
- Acts Interpretation Act 1931
- Subordinate Legislation Committee Act 1969
- Monetary Penalties Enforcement Act 2005
- Dog Control Act 2000

Part 11 of the Local Government Act 1993 sets out the process of making, adoption and implementation of by-laws.

Both EMPCA and the LGA provide specific means to deal with nuisance, environmental nuisance and or environmental harm.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial implications identified at this time, will include:
- Administration time progressing the preparation and drafting of a by-law;
- Legal costs associated with settling and approving a by-law – approximately $1,000 (excl. GST);
- Implementation cost and actual compliance/enforcement implementation;
- Actions taken under existing measures, and any in a proposed by-law, will require a significant investment in time to gather evidence and take action. All actions will be subject to challenge through the courts.

7 RISK ISSUES

A risk assessment should address issues such as whether:
- a problem does exist;
- the problem is a Council problem, does it impact on the achievement of Council’s objectives;
- a response is required to the problem by Council;
- a by-law is the best way of dealing with the problem;
- are existing measures available;
- economic cost, which includes the cost of imposition on the community and the cost of enforcement;
- social cost, for example the restrictions of freedom versus the community benefit.

It is important to consider the objective should not be to reduce the risk to zero. The objective is
8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

Under the Local Government Act 1993, the primary role of the Director of Local Government is to certify that the Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) meets the requirements of the Act and advise the Council that its public consultation process for the by-law may commence. The Local Government Division will provide assistance in explaining the process of developing a by-law and preparing the RIS although it cannot provide legal advice.

A RIS must include:
- the by-law’s objectives and the means by which they are to be achieved;
- the nature of any restriction on competition and impact on business;
- assessment of the direct and indirect economic, social and environmental impacts of the by-law;
- assessment of the benefits or costs to the community;
- any alternative options;
- details of the proposed consultative process.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Once the Director of Local Government has certified that the Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) meets the requirements of the Act, advice will be given, Council will initiate the public consultation process for the by-law.

10 OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

The options for Council to consider, include:
- not to accept the recommendation and take no further action;
- to proceed and accept the recommendation.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Council must not make a by-law that:
- applies retrospectively;
- shift the burden of proof unless specifically provided for in an Act;
- are contrary to law, or conflict with a planning scheme in the municipal area;
- restrict competition or have a significant impact on business, unless the outcome is justified in the public interest;
- exempt a person from prosecution for nuisance under common law;
- exempt a Council from any liability;
- permit rates, charge, fees or fines to be set, altered or substituted other than by amending the by-law.

Where any by-law is made in contravention of these restrictions, it is invalid.

Council intending to make a by-law must first pass a resolution of intent to that effect by an absolute majority of Councillors.
A by-law is invalid if such a resolution is not passed.

The resolution of intent may be passed at various stages in development of the by-law. However, Council would normally make its resolution based on a draft by-law or explanatory materials setting out what the by-law will cover and the impact it will have.

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

That the matter be discussed.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

That management prepare, for Council’s consideration, a draft Animal Management By-Law, inclusive of explanatory materials setting out what the by-law will cover and the impact it will have.

**DECISION**

Cr Polley/Cr Calvert

That the matter be discussed.  
Carried unanimously

Cr Polley/Cr Goninon

That management prepare, for Council’s consideration, a draft Animal Management By-Law, inclusive of explanatory materials setting out what the by-law will cover and the impact it will have.  
Carried unanimously

---

**266/15  STOKES PARK: CONCEPT PLAN**

Responsible Officer:  Des Jennings, General Manager  
Report prepared by:  Des Jennings, General Manager & Lorraine Green, Economic & Community Development Manager

1  PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to seek approval to seek community comment on the draft concept plans prepared for Stokes Park a number of years ago.

The plans would be used for discussion purposes, with a draft concept plan to be prepared post the receipt of community comment.

2  INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

A large area of land between St Georges Square and Union Street, reaching from the old flood levee to Abel Tasman Avenue was given to Council by the Stokes family in 2003. The Stokes family asked that the area between the old levee and the new levee (i.e. the area protected by the new flood levee) be filled in to the level of the old levee and established as parkland. The family agreed Council operations could do this ‘at their leisure’ and asked that the area be known as ‘the Stokes Family Levee’ or similar.
At the same time Mr Peter Stokes ‘also had no problem with the area of the property on the riverside of the new flood levee to be used as a borrow pit and filled by Council operations/reclaimed/rehabilitated over a period of time (approximately two years)’. At the time Council’s General Manager advised the Stokes family that there were plans to extend the caravan park into this area in the future.

Over time the borrow pit has mistakenly become known as Stokes Park and the area the Stokes family requested be known by this or a similar name, has been undeveloped.

For ease of reference in this report, the area the Stokes family wanted developed and named in their memory will be referred to as the “Stokes Family Area” and the other area as the “Borrow Pit”.

Two concept plans have been found on Council files relating to this parcel of land.

David Denman’s plan shows the Stokes Family Area being developed as a parkland with a walking track, two pavilions along the track and a possible pet cemetery. The Borrow Pit is shown as a parkland with walking tracks, a pond, barbecue and pavilion, and a tarsealed area for a motor home park or caravan park extension.

The other concept plan, prepared by Kirby Brown Landscape Architects in 2009 shows the Stokes Family Area as a parkland with a pet cemetery, hedge lined to provide a quiet contemplative space. The Borrow Pit is shown as a parkland with walking tracks, community orchard, picnic areas, community shelter/shed, grass bowl for water retention during flooding, and native planting areas.

Mr Michael Salhani, Smart Communities, made a presentation at Council’s August 17th 2015 Workshop on a proposed horse trail in three stages:

- Stage One: Mill Dam to Borrow Pit
- Stage Two: Racecourse Road to Brumby, Hazelwood, Marlborough, Western Street
- Stage Three: Borrow Pit to Brickendon/Woolmers.

Mr Salhani is advocating for a multi-use trail that can accommodate horses and their riders, pedestrians and cyclists, and dog walkers. He is also advocating for the Borrow Pit to be developed
for use as a community pony jumping area with portable cross country jumps.

Council approached Sport and Recreation Tasmania for their advice with regard to the pros and cons of multi-use trails. The Sport and Recreation consultant sought the advice of Mr Ken Marriott, HM Leisure Planning Pty Ltd, one of Australian’s leading recreation planning and research practices.

Mr Marriott informally advised:

“I’ve done some trails stuff but don’t know of standards but there is a fair bit of info around about shared use. The issue seems to be that if, as a horse rider, you have never shared trails with others you hate the idea vs if you have shared trails you think it’s ok. It also depends on the degree of familiarity with sharing ...so rural horses are more impacted than city horses... and on trail designs than engender familiarity. For instance, at Red Hill (Mornington Peninsula), we proposed parallel but separate horse riding and walking/cycling trails for say 200 m. from the trail beginning so (a) familiarisation was possible and (b) groups starting off together had a chance to spread out. My feeling is that as horses can be frightened so easily, wherever it is possible to separate them, do it!”

Mr Marriott also provided the Kingston City Council, Victoria, document “Physical Requirements of Multi-Use Trails for Pedestrians, Bicycles and Horses” (held as an Attachment).

Mr Gary Baker, Junior Vice President of the recently formed Longford-Esk Cycling Club, has proposed that a criterion, or ‘crit’ track be constructed around the Borrow Pit to complement the adjacent velodrome – possibly in the shape of the Longford Grand Prix track. The track would be booked by cycling clubs for criterion meetings and at other times be available as a public walking track. He also proposed that the skate park be relocated to the Borrow Pit (Pfeiffer Cranes has advised Mr Baker they would be able to manage this relocation).

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following, “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals identified have relevance to this issue:

• **Part 1A: Governance**
  1.1 Governance
  1.3 Community Dialogue
  1.4 Community Agendas
  1.8 Regional/ State/ Federal/ International Relations

• **Part 2: Economic Development**
  2.1 Long Term Economic Development
  2.2 Tourism Industry Support

• **Part 3: Community Development**
  3.2 Health
  3.3 Youth
  3.5 Older Persons

• **Part 5: Physical Assets**
  5.3 Community Facilities
4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

N/A

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

N/A

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The only identified cost at this stage would relate to the community advertising and focus/community group meeting on site.

Costs to be determined for preparation and an amended draft concept plan following community consultation.

7 RISK ISSUES

Risks identified include:
- Council fails to develop a community approved concept plan for Stokes Park.
- Council accepts/approves a concept design for Stokes Park and fails to adequately source or fund an implementation strategy.
- Community expectation for the site is not affordable.
- Council fails to explore and pursue all external funding sources available.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Community consultation would include:
- Advertising locally and by way of Council’s website.
- Letter drop to immediate properties that surround the site.
- Community session on site.
- Feedback sought from Longford Local District Committee.

10 OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Council may either approve or not approve the request to review the concept plans for Stokes Park.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

The plans that have been created are dated and require review.

The site in question is a valuable community asset and would be ideal as a developed passive recreation area.

An agreed concept plan, with implementation strategy and estimate of costs would place Council in a good position for sourcing external funding opportunity, allowing Council to implement the
works as funds become available.

12 ATTACHMENTS

Physical Requirements of Multi-Use Trails for Pedestrians, Bicycles and Horses

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the matter be discussed by Council.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That

i) management meet with Mr Stokes to discuss the concept plan.

ii) management be authorised to seek community comment on the previously prepared concept plans for Stokes Park.

iii) the comments received be used as a basis for amending the concept plans and then presented to Council at a Workshop.

DECISION

Cr Adams/Cr Knowles

That the matter be discussed.

Carried unanimously

Cr Knowles/Cr Gordon

That

i) management meet with Mr Stokes to discuss the concept plan.

ii) management be authorised to seek community comment on the previously prepared concept plans for Stokes Park.

iii) the comments received be used as a basis for amending the concept plans and then presented to Council at a Workshop.

iv) the horse trail be considered as part of the concept plans.

Carried unanimously

267/15 PERTH COMMUNITY CENTRE AND PRIMARY SCHOOL MASTER PLAN

Responsibility Officer: Des Jennings, General Manager
Report prepared by: Des Jennings, General Manager

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s approval to collaborate with the Perth Primary School to develop an integrated Master Plan to guide the future development of the facilities and service provided by the Perth Community Centre and Primary School.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Council at its meeting on the 17th August agreed to note and investigate the following recommendation of the Perth Local District Committee:

“That Council undertake a full review of the facilities at the Perth Community Centre.”
The General Manager recently met with representatives of the Perth Primary School at their invitation to discuss their need to prepare a master plan for the Perth Primary School.

The school has currently reached its capacity in relation to the facilities available, including classrooms and kindergarten facilities.

There are currently 270 students enrolled at the school with numbers increasing, on average, by 10 students per annum.

Council’s Community Centre provides for facilities and services to the community, inclusive of child care (long day, before and after school and vacation care), which are operating to capacity and in constrained facilities.

It should be noted that
- the Child Care Service is already at full capacity every day,
- the current area used for After School Care, Before School Care and Vacation Care is only limited to 20 children, due to licensing and regulation requirements; to increase numbers the Service would either have to find a bigger space to use or find another room to use in conjunction with the program and group children according to ages e.g. Kinder to grade 2 and grade 3 to 6.
- currently the 4/5 year old children attend After School Care in the Long Day Care Service due to limited numbers in the After School Care program.

Both the school and the community centre facilities are adjacent to the Perth Sports Ground, which is currently having a master plan prepared which will identify opportunities for the future.

Council is also responsible for the roadways, with traffic and pedestrian movements around all facilities.

It is the opportune time to develop an overall master plan for the community centre and school, particularly as Council will soon engage in discussions with regard to the development of the Perth Structure Plan and the outcome of the Perth Link Road around Perth.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following, “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals identified have relevance to this issue:

- **Part 1A: Governance**
  1.1 Governance
  1.3 Community Dialogue
  1.4 Community Agendas
  1.8 Regional/State/Federal/International Relations
  1.9 Financial Management

- **Part 2: The Local Economy**
  2.1 Long Term Economic Development

- **Part 3: The Local Community**
3.2 Health  
3.3 Youth  
3.4 Children’s services  
3.5 Older Persons  

- Part 4: Structure Planning & Sustainability  
  4.10 Sub-regional Centre  
  4.14 Regional Planning  

- Part 5: Focus On Physical Assets  
  5.1 Transport Infrastructure Operations  
  5.3 Community Facilities  

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS  

N/A  

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS  

N/A  

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS  

A brief is currently being prepared and a cost estimate for that is being sought.  

7 RISK ISSUES  

The risk issues may include:  

- Council does not recognise the opportunity to participate/collaborate to prepare a master plan that would guide the development of the Community Centre and Primary School, possibly reducing duplication.  

- Council is not part of the development of an integrated facility/facilities that meet the growing needs of the community and acts as an attraction to new residents as Perth expands within its current constraints and those identified through the Perth Town Structure Plan and the expanding employment opportunities particularly at TRANSlink.  

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT  

Consultation will be necessary with the State Government as the Perth Primary School is a government facility and service.  

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION  

It will be important to consult with the Community Centre Committee, Local District Committee and the Perth Community.  

10 OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION  

10.1 Council accept the proposal to collaborate with the Perth Primary School and develop an integrated master plan for the area.
10.2 Council take no action on the proposal.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

As General Manager I would recommend that Council take up this opportunity to collaborate with the Perth Primary School to investigate/determine the facilities required in the short and long term for Perth and the surrounding district.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That Council discuss the matter.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council agrees to collaborate with the Perth Primary School to prepare an integrated master plan that would guide the future development of the Primary School, Community Centre, Sports Ground, Council’s Perth Child Care Services, the adjacent tennis courts, and the surrounding road infrastructure.

DECISION

Cr Adams/Cr Lambert
That Council discuss the matter.

Carried unanimously

Cr Lambert/Cr Knowles
That Council agrees to collaborate with the Perth Primary School to prepare an integrated master plan that would guide the future development of the Primary School, Community Centre, Sports Ground, Council’s Perth Child Care Services and the surrounding road infrastructure, in consultation with all other relevant user groups;.

Carried unanimously

268/15 NORTHERN MIDLANDS COUNCIL DELEGATIONS

HEAVY VEHICLE NATIONAL LAW (TASMANIA) ACT 2013

File: 12/035
Responsible Officer: Wayne Chellis, Works & Infrastructure Manager
Report prepared by: Jonathan Galbraith, Engineering Officer

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek Council permission to delegate powers pursuant to the Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania) Act 2013.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

As a Road Manager, pursuant to the Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania) Act 2013, Local Government is recognised in legislation as being responsible for consenting to access for 'restricted access' vehicles on their roads, and the conditions under which they will operate. The Heavy Vehicle National Law requires local government to formally consent to operation on their roads before a permit can be issued. The national law sets out the role of the Local Government road manager and indicates responsibilities on a range of matters including the capacity to provide
consent to industry applicants seeking to travel on the relevant road manager's roads.

Advice has been received by LGAT advising that Council should issue a delegation to perform the duties of road manager under the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania) Act 2013*.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “*Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction*” goals have relevance to this issue: Part 1: Governance.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There are no policy implications associated with this delegation.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

5.1 *Local Government Act 1993*

Section 22 of the *Local Government Act 1993* provides for delegation of powers by the Council. Section 64 of the Local Government Act provides for the General Manager to delegate powers to Managers and other relevant staff members. In some circumstances specific Acts stipulate where Council can delegate powers to the General Manager or other Council staff directly.

5.2 *Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania) Act 2013*

5.3 *Heavy Vehicle National Law (Queensland) Act 2012*


Section 4 of the *Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania) Act 2013* relates to the adoption and application of the Heavy Vehicle National Law (i.e. the Queensland Act), and indicates that:

- The Heavy Vehicle National Law –
  - (a) applies as a law of this (Tas) jurisdiction; and
  - (b) as so applying may be referred to as the Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania); and
  - (c) as so applying is part of this Act.

These two sections working together essentially mean therefore that when the delegation refers for example to s156 of ‘the Act’, it is in fact referring to all that is included within the Tasmanian legislation, which because of section 4 includes the Queensland legislation too.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications.

7 RISK ISSUES

It is important for a Council to appropriately delegate its role as a Road Manager. Failure to give the correct delegation may result in individuals authorising actions they do not have the delegated power to do.
8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT
Consultation with State Government is not required.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
Community consultation is not required.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION
A suggested instrument of delegation is attached.

12 ATTACHMENTS
12.1 Recommended Road Manager Delegation.

RECOMMENDATION 1
That the matter be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2
That Council adopt the attached Road Manager Delegation and add it to their delegations register.

DECISION
Cr Adams/Cr Goninon
That the matter be discussed.  
Carried unanimously

Cr Adams/Cr Calvert
That Council adopt the attached Road Manager Delegation and add it to their delegations register.  
Carried unanimously

269/15 MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENT

File: Subject 24/023
Prepared by: Maree Bricknell, Corporate Services Manager

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT
The purpose of this report is to present the monthly financial reports as at 31st August 2015.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND
The Corporate Services Manager circulated a copy of the Monthly Financial Summary for the period ended 31st August 2015.

SUMMARY FINANCIAL REPORT
For Month Ending: 31-Aug-15

A. Operating Income and Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Revenue</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>($,000)</th>
<th>Target 100%</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-$9,446,051</td>
<td>-$9,446,051</td>
<td>-$9,255,034</td>
<td>-$191</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recurrent Grant Revenue - $4,369,402
Fees and Charges Revenue - $1,706,334
Interest Revenue - $272,000
Reimbursements Revenue - $88,898
Other Revenue - $1,163,322

Employee costs - $4,923,111
Material & Services Expenditure - $4,635,663
Depreciation Expenditure - $4,693,630
Government Levies & Charges - $662,620
Councillors Expenditure - $187,332
Other Expenditure - $813,525

SG Perth Bypass planning fees in advance $186K
State Govt Fire Levy instalment not yet paid
Most Alliances Paid quarterly

Pension rate rebates not yet received

Interest Revenue - $272,000
Gain on sale of Fixed Assets - $0
Loss on Sale of Fixed Assets - $450,000

Capital Grant Revenue - $2,352,000
Subdivider Contributions - $350,000
Capital Revenue - $2,702,000

SG Perth Bypass planning fees in advance $186K
Accrued revenue adjustment
Capital Revenue

Pension rate rebates not yet received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Breakdown</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Monthly Change</th>
<th>Same time last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opening Cash balance</td>
<td>$11,389,501</td>
<td>$9,922,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cash Inflow</td>
<td>$5,910,576</td>
<td>$4,506,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cash Payments</td>
<td>-$4,055,997</td>
<td>-$1,184,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Closing Cash balance</td>
<td>$13,244,080</td>
<td>$13,244,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Breakdown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trading Accounts</td>
<td>$3,267,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Investments</td>
<td>$9,976,262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmanian Public Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>1/08/2015</td>
<td>31/08/2015</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Bank</td>
<td>17/07/2015</td>
<td>31/08/2015</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>12/03/2015</td>
<td>12/09/2015</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpac Banking Corporation</td>
<td>12/03/2015</td>
<td>14/09/2015</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Bank</td>
<td>17/07/2015</td>
<td>16/10/2015</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass &amp; Equitable</td>
<td>25/05/2015</td>
<td>23/11/2015</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Bank</td>
<td>25/05/2015</td>
<td>25/11/2015</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My State Financial</td>
<td>25/12/2014</td>
<td>25/12/2015</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Investments by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>14/05/2015</th>
<th>14/05/2016</th>
<th>% to Raised</th>
<th>Total Investments</th>
<th>Total Investment Earnings YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANZ</td>
<td>$1,277,499</td>
<td>$1,313,367</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>$9,981,288</td>
<td>$10,138,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rate Debtors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>% to Raised</th>
<th>Same Time</th>
<th>% to Raised</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>% to Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance b/fwd Rates</td>
<td>$1,017,753</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>$772,705</td>
<td></td>
<td>$772,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates Raised</td>
<td>$9,263,958</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,148,068</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,920,774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates collected</td>
<td>$5,151,072</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>$4,522,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Rebates</td>
<td>$398,455</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount &amp; Remissions</td>
<td>$47,149</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>$442,564</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates Outstanding</td>
<td>$4,749,444</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>$4,955,393</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Payments received</td>
<td>-$64,408</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-$64,408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outstanding Rates

![Graph showing outstanding rates from July to June]

### Trade Debtors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current balance</td>
<td>$198,565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 30 Days</td>
<td>$169,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 60 Days</td>
<td>$6,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 90 Days</td>
<td>$4,031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More than 90 days</td>
<td>$18,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Accounts more than 90 days:
- Norfolk Plains Book sales     | 3,176   |
- Hire of meeting rooms         | 93      |
- Removal of fire hazards       | 2,880   |
- Damage to bridge              | 3,076   |
- Dog Registrations & Fines     | 6,127   |
- Ben Lomond Study              | 2,750   |
- Building Plumbing Fees        | 410     |
- Damage to tree guard          | 50      |
C. Capital Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Program</th>
<th>Budget ($,000)</th>
<th>Actual ($,000)</th>
<th>Target 100%</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>$3,163,000.00</td>
<td>$403,454.16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New assets</td>
<td>$7,828,900.00</td>
<td>$419,369.57</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,991,900.00</td>
<td>$822,823.73</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major projects:
- Powranna Bridge    | $1,922,000     | $127,133       | 7%          | Concrete work commenced outside |
- Lake River Bridge  | $1,250,000     | $0             | 0%          | Waiting outcome of grant application |
- Ross Toilet Block Replacement | $150,000 | $4,317 | 3% | Planning & Building Permit stage |
- Glenelg Street K&G and Reconstruction | $350,000 | $3,808 | 1% | Scheduled Dec/Jan |
- Wilmores Lane reconstruction | $642,000 | $0 | 0% | Scheduled Jan/Feb |
- Delmont Road reconstruction | $390,000 | $0 | 0% | Scheduled Nov/Dec |

* Full year to date capital expenditure for 2015/16 provided as an attachment.

D. Financial Health Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Health Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Revenue / Total Revenue</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Source Revenue / Total Revenue</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>-24.9%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Surplus / Operating Revenue</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>-72.0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt / Own Source Revenue</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency Ratios
- Receivables / Own Source Revenue | 39.0%  | 50.5%  | -11.4%   | ↓     |
- Employee costs / Revenue | 28.9%  | 6.6%   | 22.3%    | ↑     |
- Renewal / Depreciation | 67.4%  | 51.6%  | 15.8%    | ↑     |

Unit Costs
- Waste Collection per bin | $9.80  | $10.03 | ↔        |
- Employee costs per hour | $41.03 | $34.36 | ↑        |
- Rate Revenue per property | $1,378.99 | $1,352.40 | ↔    |
- IT per employee hour | $3.17  | $5.55  | ↓        |

E. Employee & WHS Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee &amp; WHS Scorecard</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>This Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours worked</td>
<td>18882</td>
<td>9476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Injuries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Days</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Incidents Reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards Reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Incidents Reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance claims - Public Liability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance claims - Industrial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance claims - Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 ALTERATIONS TO 2015-16 BUDGET

The following alteration to the 2015-16 Budget is provided for Council consideration and approval (by absolute majority).

- No items identified for month of August 2015.

The following alteration has been approved by the General Manager under delegation:

- No items identified for month of August 2015.
4 OFFICERS COMMENTS

Copies of the financial reports are also made available at the Council office.

5 ATTACHMENTS

5.1 Income & Expenditure Summary for period ending 31st August 2015.
5.2 Account Management Report to end August 2015.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive and note the Monthly Financial Report for the period ending 31st August 2015.

DECISION

Cr Goninon/Cr Adams
That Council receive and note the Monthly Financial Report for the period ending 31st August 2015.

Carried unanimously

270/15 POLICY REVIEW

File: 44/001/001
Responsible Officer: Maree Bricknell, Corporate Services Manager
Report prepared by: Maree Bricknell, Corporate Services Manager

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to amend the following policies:

• Contractual insurance Policy
• Investment of Council Funds Policy
• Rural Refuse Collection Service Policy
• Management of Donated Goods after a Disaster Policy
• Fencing Reserves – Contribution Policy
• Access to Residential Units Policy
• Rates & Charges Policy
• Audit Committee

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

A recent review of the above policies has resulted in some slight amendments.

The Rate Incentive for new Development Policy, Rate Remission Policy and Rating for ‘Granny Flats Policy have been deleted as they have been superseded by the Rates and Charges Policy introduced in 2012.
3  STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- Part 1 – Governance
- Part 1B – Financial Management

4  POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Regular review of Policies is important to ensure they remain current and correspond with any legislative changes.

5  STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

N/A

6  FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

7  RISK ISSUES

N/A

8  CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A

9  COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

A letter has been received from two developers requesting Council consider a rate remission incentive for subdivision of residential land. They request that Council provide a remission for newly subdivided allotments for a 2 year period commencing when titles are issued (or until sold).

10  OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council can accept the amended policies as circulated.

Council can amend the Rates & Charges Policy to include a remission for subdivided allotments.

11  OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

There have only been small amendments to the policies except for the Audit Committee Policy which has been re-written in accordance with the Local Government Audit Panels practice guide.

The Rates & Charges Policy has not been amended for a rate remission for newly subdivided land. A rate remission for newly subdivided allotments has been considered previously, it was decided then to remit the service charges including water, sewer and waste management charges but not the General rate. Subdividers normally stage developments to release only a certain amount of allotments into the market at any one time. Given the valuation process very few vacant allotments are separately assessed prior to sale. For example, the Minerva Court subdivision at Perth has 3 allotments paying minimum rates of $249 each from the 33 total subdivided allotments over 4 stages. Similarly, the Mulgrave Street subdivision has 2 allotments assessed for
rates prior to sale from several subdivision stages. It is noted that TasWater provides a remission of water and sewer charges for a maximum period of 2 years from date of issue of titles or when sold by the developer.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Contractual insurance Policy
12.2 Investment of Council Funds Policy
12.3 Rural Refuse Collection Service Policy
12.4 Management of Donated Goods after a Disaster Policy
12.5 Fencing Reserves – Contribution Policy
12.6 Access to Residential Units Policy
12.7 Rates & Charges Policy
12.8 Audit Committee Policy
12.9 Superseded policies

RECOMMENDATION 1

That Council discuss the matter.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council adopt the amendments to the following policies:
  - Contractual insurance Policy
  - Investment of Council Funds Policy
  - Rural Refuse Collection Service Policy
  - Management of Donated Goods after a Disaster Policy
  - Fencing Reserves – Contribution Policy
  - Access to Residential Units Policy
  - Rates & Charges Policy
  - Audit Committee Policy.

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Knowles
  That the matter be discussed.  
  Carried unanimously

Cr Polley/Cr Adams
  That Council adopt the amendments to the following policies:
  - Contractual insurance Policy
  - Investment of Council Funds Policy
  - Rural Refuse Collection Service Policy
  - Management of Donated Goods after a Disaster Policy
  - Fencing Reserves – Contribution Policy
  - Access to Residential Units Policy
  - Rates & Charges Policy
  - Audit Committee Policy.  
  Carried unanimously
1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of a policy to provide guidance and direction on the creation and management of information and records.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The proposed policy ensures that Council is committed to establishing and maintaining information and records management practices that meet its business needs, accountability requirements and stakeholder expectations.

The benefits of compliance with this policy will be trusted information and records that are well described, stored in known locations and accessible to staff and clients when needed.

This policy is written within the context of model policy adopted by the State Archives office and supported by the Council's records management framework which is attached. This policy is also supported by complementary policies and additional guidelines and procedures including the ECM software developed by Technology One.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

- Part 1 – Governance

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The State Archives Office is encouraging all government agencies and local government councils to develop an Information Management Policy. Regular review of this policy is important to ensure it remains current and corresponds with any legislative changes.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

N/A

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The adoption of this policy will not directly have any additional immediate financial burden on Council resources.

7 RISK ISSUES

The risk of not having a clear policy for Information Management may result in less than
acceptable use of corporate information systems and procedures.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

The State Archives Office has communicated that it intends to audit the information management practices of all government agencies and local government councils.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Not applicable.

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Council can accept, amend or reject the policy circulated.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Regardless of format, records must be created, captured, maintained, secured and disposed of in accordance with policy and procedures to ensure storage and retrieval. Council is endeavouring to digitise as many current and historical records as possible to free office space and allow easy future access to all.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Information Management Policy
12.2 Information Management Framework.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That Council discuss the matter.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council adopt the Information Management Policy.

DECISION

Cr Adams/Cr Calvert
That the matter be discussed. Carried unanimously

Cr Adams/Cr Calvert
That Council adopt the Information Management Policy. Carried unanimously
1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report follows and confirms the report delivered by Mr Cameron Oakley of Hydrodynamica to the Council workshop of 07 September 2015, dealing with options to resolve stormwater drainage issues at west Perth.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The issue of stormwater drainage through west Perth has been in existence for many years and is exacerbated by increased development pressures in the immediate area.

Essentially a catchment of some 865 hectares flows through Sheepwash Creek and the existing floodway through west Perth, with significant restriction at the culverts under Youl Main Road and the railway line and again at culverts under Drummond Street.

Figure 1. Sheepwash Creek Catchment to Edward Street (Hyrodynamica report p.6)

Over the years, some works have been undertaken to attempt to improve the water flow and ease the flooding pressure on Youl Main Road and adjoining land (e.g. realignment works directing flow through a new channel across the corner of land at Edward Street and Youl Main Road).
Other residential subdivision and development has gone ahead on the basis of engineering solutions raising the ground level through the introduction of fill and demonstrating that the cumulative effect of this displacement of flood plain will not adversely affect surrounding homes.

This is not a perfect solution and ultimately the point has been reached where the introduction of further fill into the flood plain is not considered acceptable.

Consequently, it has become increasingly important to identify the means to remove the constrictions to the current flow and enable its escape without backing up and flooding adjoining land.

Specifically, concerns have been raised with regard to the desired further residential subdivision and development of the land bordered by Edward Street, Youl Main Road and the unmade Frederick Street, where there is potential for an additional sixteen residential lots.

*Figure 2. Proposed subdivision - Woolcott Surveys, 2015 - (Hydrodynamica report, p.10)*

Whilst these potential sixteen lots are directly within the path of floodwater, in a flood event, there is also considerable potential for further residential subdivision and development west of the northern end of Cromwell Street, west of Napoleon Street and north of Phillip Street. Cumulatively this offers potential in excess of one hundred lots - many of which might contain multiple dwellings - and all of which would increase stormwater drainage (i.e. impervious surfaces leading to increased runoff coefficients) in this catchment.

In his report and workshop presentation, Mr Oakley advocated improved infrastructure under Youl Main Road, the railway and Drummond Street to substantially resolve the current drainage issues and open development opportunities in west Perth.
With regard to Youl Main Road and the railway culvert, Mr Oakley proposes cost estimates for two options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Supply Cost</th>
<th>Installation Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.4, addition culvert alongside existing road and rail crossings</td>
<td>2 no. 3600x900 culverts (total area 6.5 m²). Total length 50m</td>
<td>$182,277</td>
<td>$150,328</td>
<td>$332,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.5, new culvert crossing on original creek alignment (some floodwater would bypass this arrangement in the 100 year event)</td>
<td>2 no. 4200x900 culverts (total area 7.6 m²). Total length 50m</td>
<td>$234,883</td>
<td>$172,877 (assumed 15% loading on above install)</td>
<td>$407,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hydrodynamica report p.22*

With regard to Drummond Street, Mr Oakley proposes cost estimates for three options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Supply Cost</th>
<th>Installation Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 no. DN1200 culverts (flush joint for open trenching)</td>
<td>$24,186</td>
<td>$64,679</td>
<td>$88,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no. DN1200 culverts (butt joint for jacking pipe)</td>
<td>$39,459</td>
<td>$64,679 (assumed the same as trenching)</td>
<td>$104,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no. 3600 x 900 box culverts</td>
<td>$131,056</td>
<td>$117,248</td>
<td>$248,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hydrodynamica report p.27*

Consequently, to take a significant step towards resolving the ongoing flooding issues through west Perth, it will be necessary to expend at least $421,470 and up to at least $656,064.

3 **STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017**

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” policies have relevance to this issue:

- 1.13 Asset Management
- 4.6 Strategic Planning
- 5.2 Hydraulic Infrastructure (Stormwater)

4 **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

None applicable.

5 **STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS**

This proposal will be affected by the *Local Government Act 1993*, the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and the *Urban Drainage Act 2013*.

6 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

These proposed works carry a substantial financial implication, ranging from approximately $420,000 to over $650,000.

Weighed against this is the potential increased financial return through increased rate income following further residential development in the area (i.e each new residence generates perhaps $1,000 additional rate revenue per year.)

7 **RISK ISSUES**

Taking no action will potentially prevent development of adjoining land subject to inundation.
Premature action may result in Council funding works that may have been funded (at least partly) by the State before handing the roads over to Council.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

It is recommended that Council initiate ongoing discussion with the State Government and Tas Rail as soon as possible to fully investigate opportunities to fund the required upgrade of Youl Main Road and Drummond Street and their associated drainage culverts, including culverts under the railway line.

9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Not undertaken at this time

10 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

1. Do nothing. This will leave the status quo and likely restrict further development in west Perth.

2. Adopt and fund the recommendations contained in Mr Oakley's report. Whilst this would provide immediate relief to the existing drainage issues, the expense to Council is potentially prohibitive, particularly in terms of likely financial return on investment.

3. Initiate ongoing discussion with the State Government and Tas Rail as soon as possible to fully investigate opportunities to fund the required upgrade of Youl Main Road and Drummond Street and their associated drainage culverts, including culverts under the railway line. This is considered an appropriate early step in formalising a final solution.

4. Advise that the application for subdivision of the adjoining land may be considered further if the developer meets the costs for the stormwater improvements or we await the negotiation of the transfer of Youl Road to Council when we would be seeking costs for improvements.

5. Consideration be given to the introduction of a stormwater head-works charge to contribute towards the future costs of the required works.

11 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Of the above options, the last three are seen as working together to provide a positive outcome.

Clearly, if a potential developer wants to fund infrastructure works to facilitate their development, Council will be receptive. However, it is likely that the cost of the required works in this instance may outweigh the potential benefits.

The cost of the required works leads to a reasonable expectation that some, most of all of these should be met by the State and or potential developers rather than by all ratepayers.

Therefore, it is considered prudent to pursue discussions with the State and Tas Rail now, whilst concurrently investigating options to introduce stormwater head-works as a developer levy to further contribute to the cost.
12 ATTACHMENTS

Nil.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the report be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council
1) initiate ongoing discussion with the State Government and TasRail to fully investigate opportunities to fund the required upgrade of Youl Main Road and Drummond Street and their associated drainage culverts, including culverts under the railway line; and
2) concurrently investigate the introduction of a stormwater head-works levy.

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Knowles

That the matter be discussed.

Carried unanimously

Cr Goninon/Cr Knowles

That Council
1) initiate ongoing discussion with the State Government and TasRail to fully investigate opportunities to fund the required upgrade of Youl Main Road and Drummond Street and their associated drainage culverts, including culverts under the railway line; and
2) concurrently investigate the introduction of a stormwater head-works levy.

Carried unanimously

273/15 LONGFORD LED/NEON SIGNAGE

File: 17/007/010
Responsible Officer: Duncan Payton, Planning & Development Manager Report
Prepared by: Melissa Cunningham, Planning & Compliance Officer

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information regarding the existing use and approval status of flashing signs within Longford. This matter was raised by councillors at the July council meeting.

2 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Over the past number of years there has been the introduction of flashing signage within Longford by business owners. Not all of the signs have planning permission or comply fully with their planning permit conditions.

There are two distinct types of flashing signs; the larger custom designed fixed signs and the
smaller portable ‘OPEN’ signs. The smaller portable signs have come into favour within the last three years as they are readily available, affordable and only require a power point to operate.

3 STRATEGIC PLAN 2007/2017

The Strategic Plan 2007/2017 (2012/2013 Revision) provides the guidelines within which Council operates. The following “Volume 1 – Mapping Our Direction” goals have relevance to this issue:

4.3 Development control
Reinforce community confidence in the planning process and the integrity of Council.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Policy 11: Non-Conforming signs
Statutory requirement to bring non-conforming signs into conformity with the Planning Scheme.

5 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

5.1 Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993

The planning process is regulated by the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993.

- Section 48 of which requires Council to observe and enforce the observance of its planning scheme.
- Section 48A gives Council the power to require persons to remove signs that would have required a planning permit, which no planning permit has been granted.
- Section 51 states that a person must not commence any use or development where a permit is required without such permit.
- Section 63A allows Council to enforce compliance with planning schemes.
- Section 65A allows Council to issue infringement fines for non-compliance with the Planning Scheme.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Whilst not a direct planning consideration, the cost of enforcement proceedings can cost Council large sums of money in following up non-conforming or non-compliant uses. Traditionally Council has had very minimal powers to recover costs of enforcement proceedings. Under the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993, Section 48 gives Council the opportunity to recover the cost if a sign is removed. Recent, amendment of the Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993, has enabled infringement notices to be issued for infringement offence against the Act to help Council recover costs of enforcement actions.

7 RISK ISSUES

Council must ensure that the signs are in accordance with the planning scheme and do not pose a hazard to pedestrians or distraction for road users.

8 CONSULTATION WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

N/A
9 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

This matter has not been specifically raised for community consultation. Community consultation will occur if the planning applications require advertising.

10 OFFICER’S COMMENTS/CONCLUSION

Four neon signs have been identified as being installed without Council approval; these signs are the smaller OPEN signs that are displayed in windows. These signs can be easily removed by the business operators, letters will be sent to the business owners about the breach of the planning scheme, as in accordance with Policy 11. A discretionary planning permit is required for these signs, as they are classed as an animated building fascia sign and cost of a planning application is $692.

Jo’s #1 Takeaway – 18A Marlborough Street. Small static OPEN/Cafe sign in front window.

Longford pharmacy – 19 Marlborough Street. Small static OPEN sign in front window.

Longford Pizza House and Takeaways – 34 Marlborough Street. Small static OPEN sign in front window. (not on when photo taken in morning).
Three larger permanent fixed signs have been identified:

- Browns IGA
- Rural Supplies
- Jo’s #1 Takeaway

Brown’s IGA, Planning Permit P10-271

Planning permit issued under the Northern Midlands Planning Scheme 1995. The sign was assessed as a Pole Sign. The sign contains LED writing and the writing changes daily; often reflecting opening times, products on special, current time and current temperature. Currently the sign is turned off at night and on the day inspected the sign was changing approximately every four seconds. The sign is in breach of planning condition two, which required it not to contain any flashing light.

**Signage details**

The signs shall:

- not contain any flashing light.
- be located wholly within the boundary of the land.
- be constructed and maintained to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Manager.
not be illuminated by external lights except with the written consent of the Planning & Development Manager. External sign lighting shall be designed, baffled and located to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Manager to prevent any adverse effect on adjoining land.

Rural Supplies, Planning Permit P11-049

Planning permit issued under the *Northern Midlands Planning Scheme* 1995. The sign was assessed as an Animated Sign. The sign is in breach of condition one the planning permit as it chases (wording is pulled through sign in a variety of ways).

**Signs not altered**

The location and details of signs and signwriting shall be in accordance with the endorsed documents numbered P1 – P2. The sign shall:

- not contain any flashing light.
- not flash, chase or continually change (other than daily).
- be located wholly within the boundary of the land.
- be constructed and maintained to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Manager.
- The sign is not to face Wellington Street.

Jo’s #1 Takeaway, Planning Permit P15-108

Planning permit issued under the *Northern Midlands Interim Planning Scheme* 2013. The sign was assessed as a Horizontal Projecting Wall Sign. The sign is in breach of the planning permit as it is not in accordance with the approved planning permit and it chases and flashes. Currently the setting of the sign is for each letter of OPEN chases through, then the red line lights up and then the sign flashes for a number of times. The neon OPEN and red line were never approved under Planning Permit P15-108.
Approved plan for P15-108

Double sided Illuminated sign

11 OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Option 1  
Note the report and do nothing further. This is not recommended as the breaches of the planning scheme have been brought to Council’s attention and Section 48 of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act* 1993 requires permit authorities to enforce planning schemes. It also is in breach of the strategic plan to ‘reinforce community confidence in the planning process and the integrity of Council’.

Option 2  
Follow Policy 11 for four smaller signs erected without a planning permit. Letters to be sent to the business owners to notify them of the breach of the planning scheme. The business owners will either need to apply for a planning permit ($692) or remove the signs.

Write to the business owners of the three larger signs, which have planning approval. Inform them that they are not complying with conditions of their planning permit and that if the issues are not rectified, Council will start legal proceedings under Division 4A - Enforcement by Planning Authorities of *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act* 1993.

Option 3  
Follow Policy 11 for four smaller signs erected without a planning permit. Letters will be sent to the business owners to notify them of the breach of the planning scheme.

Write to the business owners of Brown’s Store and Rural Supplies to inform them that they are not complying with conditions of their planning permit and that if the issues are not rectified, Council will start legal proceedings under Division 4A - Enforcement by Planning Authorities of *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act* 1993.

Jo’s #1 Takeaway has blatantly constructed a sign different from the approved plans; therefore, Council can issue a *Notice of intention to issue an enforcement notice* and serious consideration should be given to issuing an enforcement fine. The enforcement notice will require the owner within 14 business days to either make the sign conform to the approved planning permit or seek a new planning permit for the erected sign (cost $1174). NOTE: The proprietor can submit a planning application for both the smaller OPEN/Café sign and the animated sign on the same application (cost $1174).
Option 4 Is to issue all non compliant signs a *Notice of intention to issue an enforcement notice* and an infringement notice.

12 ATTACHMENTS

12.1 Policy 11: Non-conforming signs
12.2 Planning permit P10-271 – 7a Wellington Street, Longford
12.3 Planning permit P11-049 – 13 Marlborough Street, Longford
12.4 Planning permit P15-108 – 18A Marlborough Street, Longford

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the report be discussed.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That Council supports Option 2 or 3.

DECISION

**Cr Adams/Cr Knowles**

That the matter be discussed.  

Carried unanimously

**Cr Goninon/Cr Polley**

That the issue of large non-compliant signs be addressed and that a policy be developed in relation to the small compact signs.  

Carried unanimously
## CON – ITEMS FOR THE CLOSED MEETING

### DECISION

**Cr Gordon/Cr Knowles**

That Council move into the “Closed Meeting” with the General Manager, Corporate Services Manager, Planning and Development Manager, Works & Infrastructure Manager, Economic & Community Development Manager and Executive Assistant.

Carried unanimously

*Mr Godier left the meeting at 8.09pm.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>274/15</td>
<td>APPLICATIONS BY COUNCILLORS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per provisions of Section 15(2)(h) of the <em>Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275/15 (1)</td>
<td>PERSONNEL MATTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per provisions of Section 15(2)(a) of the <em>Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275/15 (2)</td>
<td>INFORMATION OF A PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OR INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE COUNCIL ON THE CONDITION IT IS KEPT CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per provisions of Section 15(2)(g) of the <em>Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275/15 (3)</td>
<td>MATTERS RELATING TO ACTUAL OR POSSIBLE LITIGATION TAKEN, OR TO BE TAKEN, BY OR INVOLVING THE COUNCIL OR AN EMPLOYEE OF THE COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per provisions of Section 15(2)(i) of the <em>Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275/15 (4)</td>
<td>INFORMATION OF A PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OR INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE COUNCIL ON THE CONDITION IT IS KEPT CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per provisions of Section 15(2)(g) of the <em>Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275/15 (5)</td>
<td>PROPOSALS FOR THE COUNCIL TO ACQUIRE LAND OR AN INTEREST IN THE LAND OR FOR THE DISPOSAL OF LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per provisions of Section 15(2)(f) of the <em>Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**276/15  PLACEMAKING STRATEGY FOR LONGFORD**

**DECISION**

**Cr Goninon/Cr Calvert**

That the matter be discussed.  

Carried unanimously

**Cr Polley/Cr Knowles**

That Council endorse the engaging of Village Well to manage the development of a placemaking strategy for Longford in accordance with the recommendation made in the Longford Visitor Appeal Study Report implementation plan for the Longford Visitor Appeal Study.

Carried

**Voting for the motion:**

Deputy Mayor Goss, Cr Goninon, Cr Gordon, Cr Knowles, Cr Lambert, Cr Polley

**Voting against the motion:**

Cr Adams, Cr Calvert

**277/15  BIENNIAL TENDERS 2015/2016 – 2016/2017**

**DECISION**

**Cr Knowles/Cr Goninon**

That Council, for the 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 financial years:

1. accept the tender received from Mulch Management for the Reach Arm Slashing of Roadsides (Contract No. 15/14)

2. accept the tender price received from Spider Pest and Weed Control (Mr Robert Wadley) for Spraying of Roadsides and Parks and Reserves (Contract No. 15/15), however advise Mr Robert Wadley that council reserves the right to engage All Weeds Solution in the event that the works are not carried out in a timely manner and or on a trial basis.

3. in regard to Contract No. 15/16,
   3.1 accept the tender price received from Stornoway Quarrying and BIS Industrial Logistics for Road Maintenance Gravel and advise both parties that council reserves the right to purchase resheeting gravel from both contractors, subject to the quality of gravel supplied and delivered.
   3.2 accept Walters Constructions tender price for Supply and Delivery of Road Construction gravel and advise Walters Construction that council reserves the right to trial and purchase gravel from Gradco and other tenderers

4. in regard to Contract No. 15/17,
   4.1 accept the tender received from Venarchie Contracting for Bituminous Resealing of Roads for a one year period only. The quality of work to be reviewed in July 2016 prior to engaging Venarchie to undertake the second year of the sealing contract.

4.2 Crossroads Civil Contracting for the Asphalt Sealing of town streets only.

5. in regard to Contract No. 15/18,
   5.1 accept the tender prices received from Crossroads Civil Contracting Pty Ltd and
PJ Contracting for the Construction of Concrete Kerb and Gutter and Crossovers; and

5.2 further advise that council will engage whichever contractor is available to undertake the work in a timely manner.

6. in regard to Contract No. 15/19, accept the tender received from North Seal Pty Ltd for the Dig outs and Repairs to sealed roads.

7. in regard to Contract No. 15/20,

7.1 accept the tender prices received from Elite Concrete for the construction of Concrete Footpaths; and

7.2 further advise that council reserves the right to engage Cross Roads Civil Construction at any time to ensure the footpath program is completed. Carried unanimously

278/15 TELEPHONE SYSTEM REPLACEMENT PROJECT

DECISION

Cr Polley/Cr Goninon
That the matter be discussed. Carried unanimously

Cr Calvert/Cr Polley
That Council replace its current telephone system with Shortel/MyNetPhone option, with full replacement of 5 switches across the organisation. Carried unanimously

279/15 INFORMATION OF A PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OR INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE COUNCIL ON THE CONDITION IT IS KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

As per provisions of Section 15(2)(g) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015. Rates Matter

280/15 CONTRACTS, AND TENDERS, FOR THE SUPPLY OF GOODS AND SERVICES AND THEIR TERMS, CONDITIONS, APPROVAL AND RENEWAL;

As per provisions of Section 15(2)(d) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015. Launceston Gateway Precinct – Master Plan Project: Stage 1 – Demand Analysis

281/15 INFORMATION OF A PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OR INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE COUNCIL ON THE CONDITION IT IS KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

As per provisions of Section 15(2)(g) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015. Tyre Storage
282/15  MATTERS RELATING TO ACTUAL OR POSSIBLE LITIGATION TAKEN, OR TO BE TAKEN, BY OR INVOLVING THE COUNCIL OR AN EMPLOYEE OF THE COUNCIL

As per provisions of Section 15(2)(i) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

Review: Refusal to initiate Draft Amendment

283/15  PERSONNEL MATTERS

As per provisions of Section 15(2)(a) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

DEcision

Cr Knowles/Cr Lambert

That Council move out of the closed meeting and make the following decision(s) available to the public:

• CON 3 (Min. Ref. 276/15): Placemaking Strategy for Longford
• CON 5 (Min. Ref. 278/15): Telephone System Replacement Project

Carried unanimously

Mayor Downie closed the meeting at 9.44pm.