

# COUNCIL AGENDA

## MONDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER 2010



### GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL

\* *The General Manager certifies that the reports contained in this Agenda have been written by qualified persons under Section 65 of the Local Government Act 1993.*

**Hour:** 6.00 p.m.

**Present:**

**In attendance:**

**Leave of Absence:**

**Workshops held since last Council Meeting**

**Date:** Monday, 25th October 2010

**Purpose:** To discuss:

- Bridgewater Bridge Replacement Planning Study
- Draft Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2015
- Review of Waste Management Practices of Local Government in Southern Tasmania
- General Business
- Mayor Activities Report

### TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.	APOLOGIES.....	4
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	4
3.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR.....	4
4.	PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION.....	4

5.	<b>RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....</b>	<b>4</b>
6.	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES) .....</b>	<b>4</b>
7.	<b>PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>COMMUNITY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
8.	<b>MAIN ROAD, GRANTON - SPEED LIMIT.....</b>	<b>6</b>
9.	<b>DRAFT SOUTHERN TASMANIA REGIONAL LAND USE STRATEGY 2010-2035 .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENT.....</b>	<b>22</b>
10.	<b>COMMERCIAL PRECINCT CAR PARKING PLAN.....</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>GOVERNANCE.....</b>	<b>26</b>
11.	<b>MONTHLY FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE STATISTICS.....</b>	<b>27</b>
12.	<b>GLENORCHY EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN.....</b>	<b>29</b>
13.	<b>POLICY 28-1 MEETING PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>31</b>
14.	<b>SELECTION PROCESS FOR CHAIRPERSON OF WATER AND SEWERAGE CORPORATIONS .....</b>	<b>33</b>
15.	<b>NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE.....</b>	<b>35</b>
15.1	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMEN MATT STEVENSON AND JENNY BRANCH .....</b>	<b>35</b>
15.2	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION 1 - ALDERMAN MATT STEVENSON .....</b>	<b>37</b>
15.3	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION 2 - ALDERMAN MATT STEVENSON .....</b>	<b>39</b>
15.4	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION 3 - ALDERMAN MATT STEVENSON .....</b>	<b>42</b>
15.5	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN PETER RIDLER .....</b>	<b>44</b>
	<b>CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC .....</b>	<b>46</b>
16.	<b>APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....</b>	<b>47</b>

**COMMUNITY .....48**

**17. CIVIC CENTRE .....49**

**18. GLENORCHY ART AND SCULPTURE PARK (GASP!)  
BOARDWALK .....49**

**19. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE /  
WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED).....49**

---

**1. APOLOGIES**

---

---

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 11th October 2010 be confirmed.

---

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

---

---

**4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION**

---

---

**5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS  
TAKEN ON NOTICE**

---

---

**6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)**

---

Mr. Bob Holderness-Roddam has given notice of a question to be asked at the meeting.

---

**7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS**

---

# COMMUNITY

---

## 8. MAIN ROAD, GRANTON - SPEED LIMIT

---

Author: Traffic Engineer (Russell Grierson)  
Qualified Person: Manager - City Assets (Andrew Lawrence)  
File Reference: Main Road, Granton

### Community Plan Reference:

2.2.14 Develop strategies that support the provision of integrated and sustainable transport services in Glenorchy including private and public transport, bicycles and pedestrian.

### Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

3.5.1 Manage the City's transport network to promote sustainability, accessibility, choice, safety and amenity.

### Reporting Brief:

The purpose of this report is to seek support for a change to the existing 70km/h speed limit on a 1.5km section of Main Road, Granton, to a lower speed limit of 60km/h.

### Proposal in Detail:

Council received a request from a resident of Main Road, Granton, to review the speed limit on Main Road between Hestercombe Rd / Whitestone Drive and the area near the York Hotel (refer Attachment 1 for the extent of the existing 70km/h zone). The resident pointed out that while this section of Main Road has a 70km/h speed limit, the sections to the north and south are signed at 60km/h. It was noted that residential development on the 70km/h section is increasing and the time saving for drivers in travelling at a faster speed over such a short section of the road is minimal (approximately 13 seconds).

Given that the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) sets and controls speed limits on all public roads in the State, rather than individual Councils, the request was forwarded to DIER for their comments. At this stage DIER's traffic engineers have commented that, while there are fewer intersections and property accesses on the 70 km/h section compared with the 60 km/h sections either side, the overall nature of the road is similar. The road mainly carries local traffic, with the parallel section of the Brooker Highway available for longer distance traffic. DIER have further advised that if Council were to formally request the speed limit change they would arrange for the change to be made under the Traffic Act.

The benefits of lowering the speed limit are as follows:

- A 60km/h limit would be consistent with the other sections of Main Road to the north and south, this is becoming more relevant with increasing residential development in the 70km/h area.

- Slower speeds would result through Goulds Lagoon area, where bird kills on the road have been an ongoing concern. There is also the hazard of a vehicle losing control and running off the road and into the lagoon. The risk of this occurring would be reduced at lower speeds.
- Improved road safety generally through reduced speeds. Both international and Australian road research has examined the influence of speed on crash rates and crash severity. This research has provided evidence that even small changes in travel speeds result in significant changes in risk (refer to Attachment 2 taken from Austroads 2008 – Guide to Road Safety Part 3: Speed Limits and Speed Management).
- Improved safety and amenity for cyclists and pedestrians. It is noted that this section of Main Road is popular with road cyclists as a training run. This section of Main Road does not have formed footpaths.

The disadvantage is essentially in the additional time taken to travel through the area at a lower speed. As stated previously, over such a short length of road, the time ‘saving’ between travelling 1.5km at 70km/h against 60km/h is 13 seconds.

The proposal was put before the Austins Ferry / Granton Precinct Committee August 2010 meeting. The Precinct Committee were generally supportive of the proposed speed limit reduction but expressed a desire to see Council consult more widely on the change. Following the Precinct Meeting, a Community Engagement Strategy was developed and a letter was circulated to community members on the Special Interest Register who have an interest in traffic management issues (refer Attachment 3). Only one response was received from a community member who had some concerns with “repeated changes” to speed limits but was in support of consistency in the setting of limits.

**Consultations:**

ELT

DIER

Austins Ferry / Granton Precinct Committee

Access Committee

Cultural Diversity Committee

Safer Communities Committee

Glenorchy Youth Task Force

Glenorchy Bike Committee

Sport and Recreation Advisory Committee

Special Interest Register

(refer Community Engagement Strategy – Attachment 3)

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Nil

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Past experience has shown that speed limits can divide public opinion, particularly when followed up with subsequent enforcement. Nonetheless, public road safety campaigns have raised awareness of the need for lower speeds and the link between speed and safety. It is noted that “Changed Speed Limit Ahead” signs would accompany the change in speed limit and would remain in place for 3 months.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that:

- (a) Council supports the proposed change in speed limit at Main Road Granton from 70km to 60km.
- (b) The General Manager be authorised to write to DIER requesting the change.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Map Showing Extent of Existing 70km/h Zone
- 2 Extract from Austroads 2008, Guide to Road Safety: Speed Limits and Speed Management
- 3 Community Engagement Strategy for Speed Limit Change Proposal



---

## **9. DRAFT SOUTHERN TASMANIA REGIONAL LAND USE STRATEGY 2010-2035**

---

Author: Project Manager Planning Scheme Review (Tony McMullen)  
Qualified Person: Project Manager Planning Scheme Review (Tony McMullen)  
File Reference: Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project

### **Community Plan Reference:**

4.2.5 Advocate for a regional and State strategic planning and policy framework within which economic growth in Glenorchy can develop.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

#### *Strategic Plan*

- 2.1.4 Partner with others to promote economic development in the City and the region.
- 3.4 Promote high quality sustainable development of Glenorchy.
- 4.4.2 Partner and, where feasible, share resources with other stakeholders to improve local and regional outcomes.

#### *Annual Plan*

- 2.1.4.2 - Participate in the Southern Tasmania regional planning project to co-ordinate regional strategy and increase standard provisions.

### **Reporting Brief:**

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of a Submission on the draft *Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2035*. (Attachment 1)

### **Proposal in Detail:**

#### **Background**

##### ***Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project***

Council is a participant in the Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project.

The project outputs are:

- A regional land use strategy
- An infrastructure investment plan.
- A model planning scheme.
- Individual Council draft planning schemes aligned to the model scheme and the regional strategy.

At its meeting on 11th October 2010, Council endorsed the draft *Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2035* as suitable for public exhibition.

The public exhibition period is running for six weeks from late October. It is proposed that Council make a submission on the draft Strategy. To achieve this within the required time period, it is necessary for the draft submission to be considered by Council at its meeting on 8th November 2010.

***Council Workshop***

A Council workshop was held on 25th October 2010 to brief aldermen on the draft Strategy and to seek their guidance on the drafting of a Council submission.

Aldermen were provided with a printed copy of the draft Strategy at that workshop. Those aldermen unable to attend the workshop were separately provided with a copy.

***Comments on (previous) Preliminary Draft version***

The Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) project team has conducted workshops with this Council on two occasions. Most recently, there was a briefing on 5th July 2010 on the preliminary draft Regional Land Use Framework - which was a preliminary version of the draft Strategy currently being considered here. At that workshop, aldermen sought clarification of two key concerns:

1. That the activity centre hierarchy (or network) not be so rigid as to preclude the potential for some decentralization of some functions e.g. government offices to Glenorchy; and
2. While acknowledging the shortage of industrial land in the region, that the regional strategy not be so rigid in relation to industrial land supply that it preclude merits-based consideration of land use change for redundant industrial sites.

Council staff provided detailed officer-level comments on a preliminary working draft of the Framework on 23rd July 2010. These comments are summarized below. The STCA has provided a summary of its responses to major comments from councils and government agencies. The STCA response is also set out below in relation to each of Glenorchy City Council's major comments (in italics):

1. The project team was congratulated because of the effective way in which they had approached the huge task of preparing a regional plan – the first in Southern Tasmania since the 1970s - and because of the project team's consultative approach.
2. Some concern that the Framework might overestimate the demand and underestimate the supply of residential land in the region, potentially resulting in ineffectual policy settings for land supply.

*The need for a monitoring mechanism has been clearly articulated as is the need to improve the dwelling capacity and yield data for the next iteration. While it can be argued that demand has been overestimated and supply underestimated, the only logical response to changing this would be to tighten even more the urban growth boundary which would be of significant concern to other councils as well as affect the affordability of the housing market (until such time as pricing signals for water and sewerage have changed).*

3. Questions over the rigidity of the activity centre hierarchy and its potential impact on the decentralization of some land uses to the Glenorchy centre (as discussed at the Council workshop).

*The Activity Centre Network has been revised.*

4. Question over whether there was sufficient flexibility in the industrial aspects of the strategy to allow merits-based consideration of rezoning from industrial to be considered (as discussed at the Council workshop).

*There is no prohibition for councils on rezoning industrial land to other purposes.*

5. Clarification as to how the regional strategy was to be put into effect through planning schemes and some of the implications of the strategy at the local level, including that the regional strategies sometimes stray into local controls.

*See the completed implementation section (Part D).*

*Consistent outcomes at the local level often deliver regional outcomes (for example, consistent management of vegetation clearance across the region will ensure that the values which are identified on a bioregional or regional basis are protected).*

6. The absence of any real discussion of regional skyline values and their protection.

*This is clearly acknowledged as an area that has not been adequately addressed (due to time and budget issues).*

7. The need for a risk management approach to land hazards.

*The policies and actions have been revised.*

8. Metropolitan councils need to acknowledge the likelihood of a minimum requirement to achieve 15 plus dwellings per Ha density within the Greater Hobart Urban Area, as this would be a key outcome of the Framework.

*Noted.*

9. Some suggested changes to document layout and expression, so as to improve readability and enforceability. E.g. Part C Regional Policies should be ordered to be consistent with the 5 key directions.

*The Strategic Framework section has been revised.*

It is assessed that the STCA project team has responded to the comments of this Council as well as of other councils and State agencies in relation to the preliminary draft Regional Land Use Framework.

## **The Draft Strategy**

### ***The Structure of the Draft Strategy***

The draft Strategy is in 4 parts:

Part A: Introduction and Context

This part sets out the purpose of the Strategy, the planning context and gives a quick snapshot of the region.

Part B: The Vision and Strategic Directions.

This part sets out the vision for the region and the key strategic directions. See “The Key Directions of the Draft Regional Strategy” below.

Part C: The Regional Policies

For each topic in a series of topic areas, this part sets out the desired regional outcome, gives a brief overview, considers relevant strategies, policies and reports before stating the regional policies and actions for that topic.

The nineteen topic areas are: biodiversity and native vegetation, water resources, the coast, managing risks & hazards, cultural values, recreation and open space, social infrastructure, physical infrastructure, land use and transport integration, tourism, strategic economic opportunities, productive resources, industrial activity, activity centres; and providing for housing needs

Part D: Implementation, Monitoring and Review

This Part sets out the process forward, the action plan, the infrastructure investment plan and the proposed zoning framework.

***The Key Directions of the draft Regional Strategy***

The draft Regional Strategy proposes the following vision for Southern Tasmania:

*A vibrant, growing, liveable and attractive region, providing a sustainable lifestyle and development opportunities that build upon our unique natural and heritage assets and our advantages as Australia’s southernmost region.*

The draft Regional Strategy contains a series of “strategic directions” which are the broad policy framework to guide planning and execution of the Strategy. These are set out below with a summary explanation:

- SD1 Adopting a more integrated approach to planning and infrastructure  
(Locate development to make the most efficient use of infrastructure capacity.)
- SD2 Holistically managing residential growth  
(Plan for settlement growth on a whole of settlement and whole of region basis to maximize use of infrastructure and transportation systems, improve access to services, provide housing affordability and look after the environment. The aim is a less dispersed settlement with greater diversity of housing types and densities.)
- SD3 Using the settlement strategy as the key planning driver  
(The settlement strategy is to be the key determinant of residential land release in rural areas, not simply a narrow focus on agricultural capability.)
- SD4 Creating a network of vibrant and attractive activity centres  
(Recognise and protect a network of interconnected activity centres across the region to promote clustering of activities for social, environmental and economic benefits to the community and business through easier access to services and commercial synergies.)

- SD5 Improving our economic infrastructure  
(Make the most effective use of economic infrastructure such as key transport corridors and assets, the rollout of broadband and a strong strategic approach to protect the industrial land resource.)
- SD6 Supporting our productive resources  
(Support primary production uses such as aquaculture, forestry and agriculture because of their economic and social role in the health of regional communities.)
- SD7 Increasing responsiveness to our natural environment  
(Make sure that our settlement planning takes account of the protection of natural environmental values and the management of risk with respect to land hazards.)
- SD8 Improving management of our water resources  
(Water resources are vital to community health and well-being and to underpin the region's productive resources and industry. While the region as a whole does not suffer from an intrinsic lack of water, the efficient management of those resources remains a challenge, particularly in light of changing climatic conditions.)
- SD9 Supporting strong and healthy communities  
(Build more inclusive communities through affordable housing in locations closer to services, creating a less car dependent environment, integrating land use and social infrastructure planning, improved urban design and access to open space and recreational opportunities.)
- SD10 Making the region nationally and internationally competitive  
(Ensure the national and inter-national competitiveness of the region is maintained to strengthen investment, long term economic health and increasing gross regional product. This can be achieved by identifying opportunities that build on the region's clear comparative and competitive advantages.)

The key strategic directions are assessed to be sound.

### ***The Action Plan***

The ultimate test of the acceptability of the draft Strategy rests upon those matters upon which councils are required to act. The draft Strategy contains an Action Plan at Part D.

The Action Plan in the draft Strategy contains some 158 actions – to be undertaken by a variety of parties including councils, State government departments, infrastructure providers, the Tasmanian Planning Commission and the (undefined) future body responsible for maintaining the regional strategy. An analysis of the draft Strategy was undertaken to identify how many actions involved councils - whether acting alone or with others. Of the 158 proposed actions, 93 (59%) require council involvement.

In the Action Plan, the actions requiring planning scheme implementation are identified. Of the 158 actions, there are 81 to be implemented through new interim planning schemes, of which 62 are required to be carried out by councils – either alone or in collaboration with others. The remaining 77 actions are required to be implemented outside of planning schemes. Councils are required to undertake 31 of those actions – again either alone or in collaboration with others.

The Actions relevant to Glenorchy have been summarised and re-categorised by the author. The full Summary of Actions is available at Table 6 on pages 110-124 of the draft Strategy.

**Settlement Strategy**

SD2	Holistically managing residential growth
-----	--

- Regional growth boundary created
- Bring more people closer to public transport corridors and activity centres
- “Inner Residential Zone” – gross density 25dph
- “General Residential Zone” – most of municipality – gross density 15 dph
- No extensions of Rural Residential areas.
- Stop ad hoc growth pattern.

**Infrastructure**

SD1	Adopting a more integrated approach to planning and infrastructure
SD8	Improving management of our water resources

- Co-ordinate infrastructure planning, augmentation and new works with the regional strategy.
- Infrastructure investment plan for regional scale works.
- Develop a regionally consistent framework of developer charges.
- Protect significant infrastructure.
- Improve planning for infrastructure.

**Integrated Land Use and Transport**

SD9	Supporting strong and healthy communities
-----	---

- Protect major freight & public transport corridors.
- Locate high intensity uses in walking distance of public transport stops.
- Higher density and mixed use zoning near public transport corridors.
- Undertake a car parking strategy across the higher order activity centres.
- Encourage use of alternative transport modes.
- Investigate light rail on the rail corridor.

**Activity Centres**

**SD4 Creating a network of vibrant and attractive activity centres**

- Adopt a network of activity centres – primary, principal, major, minor, specialist etc.
- Promote in-centre development & minimise out of centre development.
- Centralise State government administration and governance functions in Hobart CBD and other government administration in Primary Activity Centres.
- Consistent planning controls, activity and improved urban design.
- Further research on commercial land supply and demand.

**Industry**

**SD5 Improving our economic infrastructure**

- Protect industrial land from land use conflict.
- Maintain a 10-15 year supply of development- ready industrial land.
- Prior to rezoning from industrial, planning authorities to take into account impact on regional industrial land supply.
- Investigate potential future industrial areas.

**Tourism**

**SD10 Making the region nationally and internationally competitive**

- Ensure tourism related uses can be considered across a range of zones.
- Recognise subservient tourism activity in rural zones.
- Provide consistent terminology in planning schemes for tourism-related uses.
- Prepare guidelines for assessment of tourist developments involving amendments.

**Coastal Values**

**SD7 Increasing responsiveness to our natural environment**

- Zone undeveloped land in the coastal area Environmental Management, Recreation or Open Space unless used for agriculture or strategically identified for urban/residential use.
- Identify and protect areas for habitat retreat.
- Prohibit canal estates.
- Incorporate coastal provisions in planning schemes.

**Environment**

**SD7 Increasing responsiveness to our natural environment**

- Consistent planning scheme provisions to protect biodiversity, habitat, native vegetation & water quality including setbacks in riparian areas.
- Minimise new zoning for development in natural areas.

- Identify and protect regionally-significant landscapes.
- Improve environmental information.
- Review treatment of natural values under RMPS.

**Land Hazards**

**SD7 Increasing responsiveness to our natural environment**

- Avoid zoning new areas for development in risk areas.
- Incorporate standard provisions in planning schemes.
- Use overlays where spatial data is available.
- Prepare a Climate Change Mitigation & Adaptation Policy (State govt).
- Part 5 Agreements for bushfire hazard management.
- Compliance checks on bushfire management plans (State govt).

**Open Space**

**SD9 Supporting strong and healthy communities**

- Regionally-consistent open space policy & planning framework in line with State Open Space Policy & Planning Framework 2010.
- Consistent approach to open space and recreation zoning
- Regional audit of open space supply.
- Improve open space planning and review contributions legislation

**Heritage and Character**

**SD9 Supporting strong and healthy communities**

- Protect heritage places through standard planning scheme provisions and local lists.
- Allow for local area plans to protect character.
- Consult with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community to ensure protection of cultural heritage values.
- Complete legislative reviews.

**Agriculture**

**SD3 Using the settlement strategy as the key planning driver**

**SD6 Supporting our productive resources**

- Categorise agricultural land – as either intensive (Significant Agriculture) or extensive (Rural Resource).
- Joint development of planning scheme provisions for the 5 agricultural sub-regions.
- Key subdivision standard such as minimum lot size are to relate to optimum size for viable enterprise.



- Protect agricultural land and land use by minimising conflict with sensitive uses.

### ***Infrastructure Investment Plan***

The draft Strategy contains an infrastructure investment plan which sets out investments of State and regional significance. The following infrastructure investments of possible relevance to Glenorchy are featured in the Infrastructure Investment Plan:

- Brighton hub (under construction)
- Brooker Highway Transport Plan. (A no. of projects ranging from short to long term)
- Bridgewater Bridge replacement. (medium term 5-15 years)
- High intensity public transport corridors with park and ride facilities (includes proposal for park and ride at Claremont). (Immediate to medium term 0 - 15 years (staged)).
- Western shore light rail (medium term 5-15 years)
- Cycle path network (includes a Lutana connector). (Medium term 5-15 years)
- Northern Hobart Substation Development Program (includes a new 33/11kV substation in Austins Ferry. (Medium term - 2017).
- Gas pipeline rollout from existing areas to main urban area of Greater Hobart. (Short term 1- 5 years)
- National Broadband Network rollout. (under construction)
- Hopkins Street social housing project (Immediate term)

### ***Zoning Framework***

The draft Strategy sets out a zoning framework which guides the application of the standard template zones within the Region. The guidelines also recommend some additional zone intent statements and suggest development control outcomes.

*While there will be flexibility for individual planning authorities to tailor specific zone provisions to their local circumstances, the intent and application of a zone in one planning area will be generally the same as in another. (Draft Strategy, p. 145)*

### ***Implications for Glenorchy***

Section 30E(6) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* provides that a draft interim planning scheme and an interim planning scheme must be consistent with, and likely to further the objectives and outcomes of, the regional land use strategy. That is, once the regional strategy is adopted, Council's planning scheme will be required to be consistent with it. It is therefore important for Council to thoroughly vet the draft Strategy to avoid future difficulties in planning scheme implementation.

### **Summary of Grounds of Submission**

The grounds of submission as set out in Attachment 2 – Submission are summarised below. Where possible, the submission has recommended positive measures which can be taken to address areas for improvement.

#### ***Congratulations to the Project Team***

Congratulations are due to the STCA Project Team for the enormous amount of work which they have carried out to develop the draft Strategy. The participative way in which the Project has been undertaken has also been greatly appreciated.

#### ***A Spatial Vision for the Region***

After decades of ad hoc growth, the draft Strategy articulates a clear spatial vision for future management of growth in the Greater Hobart Metropolitan area.

If it achieves nothing else, the draft Strategy provides a benchmark to steer debate about the future management of growth in the region.

#### ***Consistency with Council's Interim Land Use Planning Strategy***

The draft Strategy is, in large part, consistent with the Interim Land Use Planning Strategy adopted by Council on 13th September 2010 as part of its planning scheme review.

#### ***An Opportunity to Co-ordinate and Focus Service Provision***

The draft Strategy also provides a focus for the integration and co-ordination of infrastructure and services – in particular to use infrastructure planning and delivery and developer charges in tandem with land use planning to reinforce the management of growth within the region.

#### ***Challenges to Implementation of the Strategy***

The development of the draft Strategy has involved a collective “leap of faith” by local and State government participants. There are a number of challenges to implementation – which need to be satisfactorily addressed before a Strategy can reasonably be adopted:

Without a body or structure to oversee its implementation, there is a danger that there will not be ongoing implementation, monitoring and review of the Strategy.

There is a risk that the non-statutory actions will simply not be carried out – resulting in uneven implementation of the Strategy.

Apart from their obligations to give effect to the Strategy in planning schemes, councils will be signing up to a range of other obligations to undertake further works. The scope, necessity and timing of these tasks needs to be clarified so that councils can clearly assess the resource implications before deciding whether or not to ratify the Strategy.

#### ***The Settlement Strategy***

The Project Team has had a difficult balancing act in balancing the policy requirements necessary to achieve a sustainable and affordable settlement pattern – particularly for Greater Hobart, with the political realities of achieving “buy-in” from local and State governments.

The draft Strategy provides a clear vision for better future management of urban growth through more infill development and less fringe development – to bring more people closer to services. However, there is a concern that the policy settings may not “bite” sufficiently to deliver on the vision in such areas as:

The Residential Strategy for Greater Hobart needs to be more fully explained in the Strategy document.

There appears to be a discrepancy between the years of supply of residential land in the region and the timing of review of the urban growth boundary.

The methodology for determining the region’s dwelling yield seems to be at odds with Council’s own calculations.

The use of market segments to estimate years of supply is of some concern as it may artificially suggest a shortage of land supply where none exists.

The draft Strategy locks in a timeline for movement of the urban growth boundary which may be premature.

The expansion areas identified would appear to have the potential to further entrench locational disadvantage.

It would be preferable to prescribe target minimum lot sizes and site density provisions rather than rely upon gross density.

#### ***Activity Centres***

Council seeks to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in the Activity Centre Network/Hierarchy to accommodate appropriate decentralisation of both State and Federal government activities to Glenorchy.

Claremont should be identified in the Strategy as a minor centre.

#### ***Social Infrastructure***

The Strategy needs to address Access for People with Disabilities, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and “Healthy by Design principles.

Further work is required to ensure greater proximity to services for social housing.

#### ***The Skyline***

While project resource constraints are recognised, the Strategy should explicitly recognise the metropolitan skyline.

The Zoning Framework needs to accommodate an appropriate transition in zoning from the Landscape and Conservation Zone to a new zone.

#### ***Coastal Issues***

The impact of coastal squeeze needs to be recognised – with its potential impact on coastal habitat and foreshore reserves as sea levels rise.

Provisions about loss of public access to the foreshore needs to be tightened.

#### ***Managing Risks and Hazards***

More guidance is required on coastal strategies when dealing with sea level rise.

Council disagrees with use of Part 5 Agreements as a mechanism for enforcing bushfire hazard management plans.

There is a need for the Strategy to recognise that “annual exceedance probability” is a dynamic concept now that climate change is with us.

***Other Issues***

Any investigation of new industrial areas needs to take account of the impact on settlement strategy, traffic flows and the market focus of the area – whether service or export.

Heritage provisions needs to explicitly recognise archaeological areas.

The spatial extent of Greater Hobart needs to be consistently defined in the Strategy.

***Detailed Officer-level comments***

Detailed officer-level comments do not form part of this report. They will be forwarded along with the Council-endorsed submission.

***Conclusion***

The STCA has submitted to Council a draft Southern Regional Land Use Strategy for Council’s consideration for endorsement for a 6 week public consultation period commencing in late October.

The draft Strategy has been prepared under a memorandum of understanding with Southern councils and the State government and is an output of the Southern Tasmania Regional Planning Project.

The STCA project officers have been at pains to involve stakeholders throughout the process of developing the draft strategy, including aldermen and councillors, general managers and senior planning staff in the region. The project team has also responded to an earlier round of stakeholder comments on a preliminary draft Regional Land Use Framework in formulating the draft Strategy.

The key strategic directions in the draft Strategy are assessed to be sound. The public exhibition period will allow the detail of the document to be tested further.

Council’s submission is generally supportive of the draft Strategy. However a number of areas of improvement are identified - particularly in relation to implementation, the settlement strategy, activity centres, social inclusion and the skyline.

**Consultations:**

Manager Environment Planning and Development  
Asset Engineer  
Stormwater Co-ordinator  
Natural Areas Co-ordinator  
Manager Community Development  
Economic Development Unit  
Heritage Officer  
Strategic Planner - Planning Scheme Review

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Consultation activities associated with the draft Regional Strategy will largely be undertaken by the STCA project team. Council's contribution to the process, in its capacity as a signatory to the MOU for the project, will be "in kind" and will be met from existing resources.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

The draft Strategy is on public exhibition until 6th December 2010. Council has assisted with consultation activities as outlined in the Community Engagement Strategy previously considered by Council on 11th October 2010.

**Recommendation:**

That Council make a submission to the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority on the *Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy 2010-2035, Draft for Public Comment* in the terms outlined in the body of this report, and set out more fully in Attachment 2 – Submission.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Land Use Planning Draft
- 2 Submission

# ENVIRONMENT

---

## 10. COMMERCIAL PRECINCT CAR PARKING PLAN

---

Author: Traffic Engineer (Angela Moore)  
 Qualified Person: Andrew Lawrence (Manager, City Assets)  
 File Reference: Commercial Precinct Car Parking Plan

### Community Plan Reference:

- 2.2.1 Develop strategies to improve and extend Council's transport infrastructure to balance the needs of all users and stakeholders in line with Council's strategic land use planning framework.
- 2.2.4 Ensure Glenorchy infrastructure does not create barriers to people accessing the community.
- 2.2.14 Develop strategies that support the provision of integrated and sustainable transport services in Glenorchy including private and public transport, bicycles and pedestrians.

### Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

- 1.3.3 Ensure Glenorchy's infrastructure facilitates community access for all.
- 3.4.1 Manage the orderly growth of the City in a way which maximises the take-up of existing infrastructure capacity.
- 3.5.1 Manage the City's transport network to promote sustainability, accessibility, choice, safety and amenity.

### Reporting Brief:

To obtain Council endorsement for the adoption of the Commercial Precinct Parking Plan.

### Proposal in Detail:

A report was put to Council at their meeting of 19 July 2010 Council where it was resolved:

- (a) *That consultation with the community and other stakeholders commence in accordance with the consultation strategy and utilising the draft Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan (June 2010).*
- (b) *The results of the consultation shall be reported back to Council prior to the Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan being formally adopted.*

This report is providing feedback on the results of the consultation process and requesting formal endorsement of the final Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan – November 2010 (included as **Attachment 1**).

During August and September 2010 an extensive community consultation exercise was undertaken using the DRAFT Commercial Precinct Car Parking Plan (July 2010):

- A letter mailed directly to:
  - o Approximately 280 properties within the Moonah study area.
  - o All businesses registered with the Moonah and Glenorchy Business Association.
  - o Those people registered as having an interest in traffic management on the Special Interest Register maintained by the Community Development area.
- All nine community precincts were notified of the DRAFT Parking Plan through their regular monthly meetings.
- A presentation was made at the September 2010 meeting of the Moonah Business Community Inc.
- Articles were printed in both the Glenorchy Gazette and The Mercury newspaper. A public notice was also placed in The Mercury newspaper on two occasions.
- The DRAFT Parking Plan was also made available for download and viewing on the Council website for the whole of the consultation period.

This consultation exercise was designed to elicit comments or concerns in relation to the Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan and, where possible, these have been addressed in the final Commercial Precinct Car Parking Plan. This should minimise the public relations impact of the implementation of the Car Parking Plan.

In total we received 12 formal responses to the consultation exercise.

- 5 of these representations relate to the park and ride issue around the Glenorchy bus mall
- 5 were opposed to the implementation of parking meters or paid parking
- 1 raised specific concerns with car parking in the Claremont area
- 1 raised specific concerns with access to private parking in Moonah

As a result of the community consultation exercise a number of small modifications have been made to the Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan. Changes include:

- The addition of an action to review the park and ride situation around the Glenorchy bus mall.
- A revision of the Executive Summary to incorporate the Moonah issues.
- Inclusion of the 2010 Moonah Car Park Occupancy Survey and results.



Once the Commercial Precinct Car Parking Plan is adopted by Council the action plan will be implemented in accordance with the timings and priorities set out in the document. This includes a quarterly review of the implementation of the Parking Plan by the Parking Working Group. The Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan will also undergo a major review by the Parking Working Group every two years.

**Consultations:**

ELT

Parking Working Group, consisting of:

- An alderman representative
- Two business representatives (from both Moonah and Glenorchy)
- General Manager
- Economic Development Coordinator
- Coordinator Planning Services
- Development Engineer
- Chief Parking Officer
- Traffic Engineer

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Any actions resulting from the implementation of the Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan will be subject to individual budget bids as necessary (when they cannot be accomplished within the existing transportation or parking budget).

A number of financial sustainability suggestions have been received that relate to car parking and these have been incorporated where possible within the Parking Action Plan.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

An extensive community consultation exercise has been undertaken to elicit comments or concerns in relation to the Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan. This should minimise the public relations impact of the implementation of the Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan.

Projects arising out of the Parking Action Plan will require additional consultation as necessary as they are acted upon.

**Recommendation:**

That Council endorse the adoption of the Commercial Precinct Car Parking Plan.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1** Commercial Precincts Car Parking Plan, November 2010

# GOVERNANCE

---

## **11. MONTHLY FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE STATISTICS**

---

Author: Corporate Accountant (Colette Usher)

Qualified Person: Corporate Accountant (Colette Usher)

File Reference: Traffic Lights

### **Community Plan Reference:**

Not mentioned specifically.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The Corporate Performance Indicators are provided to Council in accordance with Strategy:

- 4.1.5 Manage information in an integrated, secure, efficient, effective and user friendly way;
- 4.1.7 Ensure integrated strategic planning across Council;
- 4.1.8 Manage risk throughout Council; and
- 4.2.1 Manage the Council's finances to ensure sustainability service delivery through a planned approach to the funding of council's short and long term operations.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To present the Corporate Performance Indicators as at the end of September 2010 for Aldermen's information.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The Corporate Performance Indicators are attached (**Attachment 1**) along with Appendix B (**Attachment 2**). Appendix B outlines expected year to-date variances within the various Capital Works programs for this financial year.

For September month end we have presented:

- One red light relating to Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate. The indicator shows a significant variance to the benchmark. Strategies, including the formation of a Strategic OH&S working group have been implemented. The number of LTI for September was 3.
- Two yellow lights relating to: Corporate Service Revenue – delay in receipt of Grant Income; and the Works and Services expenditure is under budget. It is expected that the issues currently contributing to the variances will be resolved in the coming months.

### **Consultations:**

Relevant Corporate Services Staff.

Executive Leadership Team.

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Stated within the September Corporate Performance Indicators Report.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

None at this point.

**Recommendation:**

That the information provided by the Corporate Performance Indicators for September 2010 be accepted.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1** Corporate Performance Indicators
- 2** Appendix B

---

## **12. GLENORCHY EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN**

---

Author: Manager - Environment, Planning and Development  
(Greg French)

Qualified Person: Manager - Environment, Planning and Development  
(Greg French)

File Reference: Emergency Management Plan Review 2010

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

4.1.4 Ensure preparedness for natural disaster and pandemic by ongoing review of the City's emergency management strategies.

### **Reporting Brief:**

Council to approve the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan following an extensive review process.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The *Emergency Management Act 2006* requires Councils to have a current Emergency Management Plan (EMP) for its municipal area. The last EMP was reviewed, rewritten and approved in June 2006. Since that time the State Emergency Service has established new guidelines for the development of Municipal Emergency Management Plans and this EMP version before Council complies with those guidelines.

Council's Emergency Management Committee, chaired by Alderman Slade with Alderman King as a member, has overseen the review process and the drafting of the new EMP.

Several drafts of the EMP have been circulated to members of the Glenorchy Emergency Management Committee and this committee now recommends to Council the formal adoption of the EMP.

### **Consultations:**

Glenorchy Emergency Management Committee  
Alderman Slade Chairman Glenorchy Emergency Management Committee  
ELT

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

No additional resources are required to administer the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan. The purpose of this plan is to mitigate risk management implications.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

The Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan is a statutory plan required to be developed in consultation with emergency service stakeholder agencies and this has been done through the Glenorchy Emergency Management Committee. The format and content is in accordance with the Tasmanian Municipal Emergency Management Guidelines published by the State Emergency Service.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Council adopt the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan, Issue 7 August 2010.
- (b) That Council forward the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan, Issue 7 August 2010 to the State Emergency Management Controller for approval.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Emergency Management Plan

---

## 13. POLICY 28-1 MEETING PROCEDURES

---

Author: Manager - Governance and Performance (Trevor Jones)

Qualified Person: Manager - Governance and Performance (Trevor Jones)

File Reference: Policies - Governance and Performance

### Community Plan Reference:

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

4.1.3 Maintain fair systems and processes that result in high levels of regulatory compliance in Council and the community.

4.1.1 Manage the Council's finances to ensure sustainable service delivery through a planned approach to the funding of Council's short and long term operations.

### Reporting Brief:

To seek Council's approval of changes to the Meeting Procedures policy to accommodate meetings of the Audit and Risk Committee.

### Proposal in Detail:

Council has decided to form an Audit & Risk Committee as a special committee of Council and it resolved that the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005* (the Regulations) should apply to meetings of this committee. Section 24 (3) of the *Local Government Act 1993* states "The council is to determine the procedures relating to meetings of a special committee" so it is within Council's power to make this resolution, however the Regulations have been written to apply to Council meetings and to meetings of Council Committees, not to "special committees of Council", so some "adjustments" are necessary so that they can be used for the Audit & Risk Committee.

Council has a meeting procedures policy that contains additional procedures to complement those of the Regulations and it is via this policy that the necessary "adjustments" to the Regulations can be made. It has therefore been updated to include reference to the Audit & Risk Committee and to substitute words in the Regulations, as appropriate, to enable their application to meetings of that committee. The updated policy is included as attachment 1 with proposed changes "tracked".

The policy has also been updated to reflect the change of name from Land Use Planning Committee to Glenorchy Planning Authority.

Regulations that are specifically referred to in policy statements are reproduced in Attachment 2 for Aldermen's convenience. A full copy of the Regulations can be found at [www.thelaw.tas.gov.au](http://www.thelaw.tas.gov.au) or upon request from the Governance & Performance Department.

Council also decided that it will choose the chairperson of the Committee so this has been included in the policy.

Council has not yet considered the format of the agenda for meetings of the Audit & Risk Committee. As Council has done for the Glenorchy Planning Authority it is suggested that the Audit & Risk Committee should be entrusted to specify the format of its agenda. It is envisaged that the agenda would include:

- (a) Attendance/Apologies.
- (b) Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting.
- (c) Declaration of pecuniary interest (as per Meeting Procedures Regulation 8(7) that applies to council meetings).

**Consultations:**

Executive Leadership Team

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

There will be a cost of around \$4000 per annum associated with engaging the two independent members of the committee.

Council will allocate an annual budget to enable the Committee to undertake its role. It is anticipated that the Committee will submit a budget bid for consideration during budget deliberations.

Secretariat functions may be able to be accommodated within existing resources.

If the demands of the Committee for financial information and/or reporting are considerable it may also be necessary to engage additional accounting staff.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Meetings of the Committee will need to be advertised in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That the changes to Policy 28-1 Meeting Procedures, to accommodate meetings of the Audit and Risk Committee, be endorsed.
- (b) That the Audit & Risk Committee be authorised to configure the format of agenda for its meetings.

**Attachments/Annexures**

- 1 Meeting Procedures Policy
- 2 Meeting Procedures Regulations referred to in Policy



---

## 14. SELECTION PROCESS FOR CHAIRPERSON OF WATER AND SEWERAGE CORPORATIONS

---

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

File Reference: Southern Water

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider the approach suggested by the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) for the selection of a new Chair for the water and sewerage corporations.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

Mr Geoff Willis has recently announced his resignation as the common Chair of the water and sewerage corporations including Southern Water and Onstream. Correspondence (Attachment 1) has been received from the STCA suggesting that, in light of the Government's announcement that it will establish a Select Committee to review the structure of the water and sewerage industry in Tasmania either:

1. an interim Chair be appointed for a period of 12 months or until the conclusion of the Selection Committee review, whichever is the shorter; or
2. the existing Boards elect a Chair from among their number for each meeting, until the review is completed.

Given the uncertainty regarding the outcome of the Select Committee review, it is possible that the end result could be anywhere between retaining the existing water and sewerage industry structure or a significant restructure. The Deputy Premier has been reported in the media as favouring a single water and sewerage authority. It would therefore be inadvisable to recruit a new common Chair on a long fixed term basis until the outcome is clarified. It is suggested that the STCA's recommended approach be supported..

### **Consultations:**

Not applicable. The STCA has referred their recommendation to member councils for consideration.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

There are no direct implications. In the event of a major restructure, appointment of a new Chair on a long term fixed contract could involve a future redundancy, with any such costs likely to reduce future dividends to be received from Southern Water.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Not applicable

**Recommendation:**

That the Council inform the Owners' Representatives that in relation to the selection of a new common Chair of the water and sewerage corporations it supports the STCA's recommendation that either:

- 1 an interim Chair be appointed for a period of 12 months or until the conclusion of the Selection Committee review, whichever is the shorter; or
- 2 the existing Boards elect a Chair from among their number for each meeting, until the review is completed.

**Attachments/Annexures**

**1** Letter from STCA

3 Pages

---

## 15. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE

---

---

### 15.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMEN MATT STEVENSON AND JENNY BRANCH

---

Author: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

File Reference: Notice of Motion

#### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

#### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

#### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider a notice of motion submitted by Aldermen Matt Stevenson and Jenny Branch in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005.

#### **Proposal in Detail:**

The following notice of motion was submitted by Aldermen Matt Stevenson and Jenny Branch (Attachment 1).

#### Motion

That:

- Council prepare a report on the current Planning Scheme provisions for renewable energy structures such as solar panels and wind turbines, and how any development applications for such structures would be assessed against those provisions; and,
- Include options for facilitating further renewable energy applications in both residential and commercial sectors within the city.

#### **Qualified Advice**

As required by Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* the following qualified advice is provided to Council to facilitate decision making.

Renewable energy structures can be considered under the current Glenorchy Planning Scheme if they form part of the application. Staff can provide a report on these provisions and the assessment criteria.

**Consultations:**

Nil at this stage.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Limited research on options to facilitate renewable energy applications indicates that this would involve some form of financial incentive. Research would be required to develop credible options for both the residential and commercial sectors.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Information on Renewable Energy systems would need to be disseminated to the community to promote the positive long term benefits of what could possibly be perceived as an increase in construction costs.

**Recommendation:**

That:

- Council prepare a report on the current Planning Scheme provisions for renewable energy structures such as solar panels and wind turbines, and how any development applications for such structures would be assessed against those provisions; and,
- Include options for facilitating further renewable energy applications in both residential and commercial sectors within the city.

**1** Motion - Aldermen M. Stevenson and J. Branch

---

## 15.2 NOTICE OF MOTION 1 - ALDERMAN MATT STEVENSON

---

Author: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

File Reference: Notice of Motion

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider a notice of motion submitted by Alderman Matt Stevenson in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The following notice of notice of motion was submitted by Alderman Matt Stevenson (Attachment 1).

#### Motion

On the 16th October the Treasurer opened submissions to the 2011-12 State Budget via the *2011-12 Budget Community Consultation Process*. Submissions are open until 19th November 2010. The *2011-12 Budget Community Consultation Process* gives the community the chance to provide input into the 2011-12 Budget; this is an opportunity for the Council to also provide input into the Budget.

It is recommended that:

- Council makes a submission to the Tasmanian State Budget via the *2011-12 Budget Community Consultation Process*;
- Projects which Council has committed to undertake, but might be under risk of not being completed due to funding pressures, are weighted higher than other potential submission items when considering potential submission items; and,
- Aldermen are able to provide suggestions in guiding the submission.

### **Qualified Advice:**

As required by Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* the following qualified advice is provided to Council to facilitate decision making.

Attached for the information of Aldermen are the guidelines for making a submission in regard to the State Budget via the community consultation process. It can be seen that although it is requested to “ensure the submission is concise”, each issue that is included in the submission must also contain “supporting details, information and discussion” so the preparation of a submission will take considerable staff resources and time. As the closing date for submissions is 19th November 2010, staff would need to be diverted from their normal duties immediately to prepare a submission. The specific staff members that would need to be involved would depend upon the expertise required for each individual issue, while the number of staff involved would depend upon the number of issues contained in the submissions.

During Council’s normal budget process only projects that can be undertaken with available funds are accepted as bids. Projects that would be suggested to be put forward for external funding would be additional projects, or for ‘new’ infrastructure projects outside the normal asset replacement/renewal program. More often than not unfunded project scopes or designs are not fully developed, as the required time and effort is not invested in unfunded projects.

If Aldermen are “to provide suggestions in guiding the submission” Council will need to establish a mechanism through which they can do so.

**Consultations:**

Nil at this stage.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

There would be a considerable cost of staff time and potentially an impact upon Council’s operations, Council might also consider the likelihood of achieving any success through making a budget submission as well as the effect that doing so might have on the relationship between Council and the State Government.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

If a submission was to proceed and become successful information would be provided through the Glenorchy Gazette and Councils Web Site.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that:

- Council makes a submission to the Tasmanian State Budget via the **2011-12 Budget Community Consultation Process**;
- Projects which Council has committed to undertake, but might be under risk of not being completed due to funding pressures, are weighted higher than other potential submission items when considering potential submission items; and,
- Aldermen are able to provide suggestions in guiding the submission.

1 Motion 1 - Alderman M. Stevenson

2 Community Consultation Submission Guidelines

---

## 15.3 NOTICE OF MOTION 2 - ALDERMAN MATT STEVENSON

---

Author: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

File Reference: Notice of Motion

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider a notice of motion submitted by Alderman Matt Stevenson in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The following notice of motion was submitted by Alderman Matt Stevenson (Attachment 1).

#### Motion

That council makes formal representation to the State Government, via letter, in regard to the 2009/10 Land Tax Adjustment Factors for the City of Glenorchy noting that:

- The adjustment factors seem inconsistent with market conditions; and,
- The State Government should consider reviewing its decision within the Glenorchy City Council boundaries and look to reduce the adjustment factors.

### **Qualified Advice**

As required by Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* the following qualified advice is provided to Council to facilitate decision making.

Aldermen may be aware that a joint State Government and local government Valuation and Local Government Rating Review is currently underway and is being informed by expert advice from an independent consultant, Access Economics.

Access Economics has now provided its final report to a steering committee leading the review: Valuation and local government rating in Tasmania: A robust framework for the future. The report sets out Access Economics' findings and makes some recommendations for change.

The report also includes modelling of potential valuation and rating options in four case-study councils: the Northern Midlands, Hobart City, Latrobe and Kingborough Councils.

The report reflects the views of the independent consultants and does not necessarily reflect the views of the committee – nor of the State Government. The report is an important component of the overall review and as such the report, together with council and public consultation, will inform the final recommendations of the steering committee.

The report has been released for consultation with councils and the public, together with a consultation paper. Consultation on the report closes on 17th December 2010.

The report and consultation paper can be viewed at:

[http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/lgd/review\\_of\\_valuation\\_and\\_local\\_government\\_rating](http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/lgd/review_of_valuation_and_local_government_rating)

Responses to frequently asked questions about the Valuation and Local Government Rating Review can also be found on the pages above.

The steering committee leading the review will consider all feedback received on the report before making its recommendations to the State Government in early 2011. Any changes proposed by the State Government as a result of the review will be further consulted on in 2011.

It is proposed that Council make a formal representation through this process so it may be included in the overall rating review.

**Consultations:**

Nil at this stage.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

A staff working group may need to be formed to develop a well considered representation regarding this review.

Council does not have any evidence to support the statement “the adjustment factors seem inconsistent with market conditions” and this would be required if Council is to question the Valuer General’s assessment of property values as proposed by Alderman Stevenson. To obtain this evidence a qualified valuer would need to be engaged to research “market conditions” throughout all of Glenorchy for both residential and commercial properties and provide a comprehensive report. The cost of this exercise might be substantial.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

A community consultation strategy may be required to ensure the community is informed of the review.



**Recommendation:**

That council makes formal representation to the State Government, via letter, in regard to the 2009/10 Land Tax Adjustment Factors for the City of Glenorchy noting that:

- The adjustment factors seem inconsistent with market conditions; and,
- The State Government should consider reviewing its decision within the Glenorchy City Council boundaries and look to reduce the adjustment factors.

**1** Motion 2 - Alderman M Stevenson

---

## 15.4 NOTICE OF MOTION 3 - ALDERMAN MATT STEVENSON

---

Author: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

File Reference: Notice of Motion

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider a notice of motion submitted by Alderman Matt Stevenson in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The following notice of motion was submitted by Alderman Matt Stevenson (Attachment 1).

### Motion

That:

- Council investigates the opportunity of making an application for funding through and any programs announced by the Federal Government during, and subsequent to, the Federal election that council may qualify for, but with particular attention to \$800 million *Priority Regional Infrastructure Program*; and,
- Reports back to council on the recommended outcome of the investigation.

### **Qualified Advice**

As required by Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* the following qualified advice is provided to Council to facilitate decision making.

The Federal Government has contacted Council regarding the change to administration arrangements of their funding programs.

Many of them have been absorbed into the Priority Regional Infrastructure Fund including Regional Local Community Infrastructure Program (RLCIP), general and strategic. No other guidelines are available for this Priority Regional Infrastructure Fund at this stage, however it is anticipated that more information will be released soon.

Council staff continually seek opportunities for funding through other levels of Government.

We currently have been successful in the following grants:

RLCIP general (over 3 rounds) \$230,000 each

RLCIP Strategic – GASP boardwalk - \$2.7M

Dept of Sustainability Environment Water Population and Communities,  
National Urban Water and Desalination Plan Funding

Derwent Park Stormwater Harvesting and Reuse Project - \$9.2M.

It is recommended that staff report to Council when future, successful funding and grant applications are achieved.

**Consultations:**

Nil at this stage. However, a number of the successful applications outlined above have been or will soon be workshopped with Council.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Generally staff are continually involved in submitting grant and funding applications wherever possible. Considerable time and effort can be expended on grant applications some of which are not successful.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Substantial, successful funding and grant applications are normally outlined in the Glenorchy Gazette and in Council's Annual Report.

**Recommendation:**

That:

- Council investigates the opportunity of making an application for funding through and any programs announced by the Federal Government during, and subsequent to, the Federal election that council may qualify for, but with particular attention to \$800 million *Priority Regional Infrastructure Program*; and,
- Reports back to council on the recommended outcome of the investigation.

1 Motion 3 - Alderman M. Stevenson

---

## **15.5 NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN PETER RIDLER**

---

Author: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

Qualified Person: Acting General Manager (Emilio Reale)

File Reference: Notice of Motion

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

1.3 Encourage a strong, diverse and inclusive community.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider a notice of motion submitted by Alderman Peter Ridler in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005.

### **Proposal in Detail:**

The following notice of motion was submitted by Alderman P. Ridler (Attachment).

That the Glenorchy City Council for both Senior and Junior the Citizen of the Year award, involve the whole of council in the selection process.

### **Background**

1. At present the process of selecting the respective recipients is removed from Council and decided by staff and the mayor of the day.
2. There is no transparency of the selection process.

### **Supporting Reasons**

- 1 Council has no input in the selection process or the adoption of a recommendation to award the prestigious awards.
- 2 As part of good governance Council should be involved in the whole process and preferably workshop the selection process and this would provide transparency and accountability.
- 3 Any perceived pecuniary interest or conflict of interests should be removed.
- 4 There should be rigid selection criteria to be adhered to by the Council workshop.
- 5 Other councils either deal with the selection as a Council or delegate to a third party committee removed from Council and staff.

### **Qualified Advice**

As required by Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* the following qualified advice is provided to Council to facilitate decision making.

Council staff advertise for, and receive, nominations for Glenorchy's citizens of the year however no Council staff member is involved in the selection process.

Announcement of the Glenorchy Citizens of the Year has previously been made at the Australia Day Luncheon however, to save costs, announcements will now be made at the Australia Day citizenship ceremony with recipients notified during the first week in January 2011 so that they can make arrangements to attend.

This year nominations close on 22nd November 2010, so between the closing date and notifying the recipients there will be two Aldermen's workshops (22nd November and 20th December) and two Council meetings (6th December 2010 and 4th January 2011). Whatever process Council decides for selecting its citizens of the year it needs to fit into this timeframe and if applicable, meeting schedule. There is insufficient time, this year, to delegate selection to a committee.

No criteria have been established for the selection process however nominations must meet the following:

- Nominees must be Australian citizens and residents of the City of Glenorchy.
- Their community service or activity must be of considerable importance to the Glenorchy and/or Tasmanian community.
- The activity or service will have been carried out over a period of years, rather than months.

If Council does wish to establish "rigid selection criteria" it is suggested that there is probably insufficient time to do so for this year's evaluation.

If Aldermen wish to be involved in the selection of Glenorchy citizens of the year, consideration might be given to holding ballots, as Council does for the election of Aldermen to committees. This would provide all Aldermen with an opportunity to contribute and would be a relatively quick and efficient process.

**Consultations:**

Nil.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Nil.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Council staff will continue to advertise for and receive nominations for Glenorchy's citizens of the year.

**Recommendation:**

That the Glenorchy City Council for both Senior and Junior the Citizen of the Year award, involve the whole of council in the selection process.

**1** Notice of Motion - Alderman Peter Ridler

**CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE  
PUBLIC**

---

**16. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

---

# COMMUNITY



---

**17. CIVIC CENTRE**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(c).*

---

**18. GLENORCHY ART AND SCULPTURE PARK (GASP!)  
BOARDWALK**

---

*This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of Council by authority of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 Section 15(2)(c).*

---

**19. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE /  
WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED)**

---