

COUNCIL AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, 27TH APRIL 2011



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, 11th April 2011

Purpose: To discuss:

- Tolosa Park Reservoir
- Glenorchy Citizen and Young Citizen Awards
- Strategic Planning
- 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.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	4
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)	4
7.	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS.....	4
	COMMUNITY	5
8.	TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY 22-5	6
	ENVIRONMENT.....	10
9.	SOUTHERN TASMANIA REGIONAL PLANNING PROJECT	11
10.	CHANGE OF CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM.....	14
	GOVERNANCE.....	18
11.	REVIEW OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN SOUTHERN TASMANIA	19
12.	NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE.....	22
	CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	23
13.	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	24
	COMMUNITY	24
14.	TRANSFER OF LAND - 17 GORMANSTON ROAD, MOONAH.....	24
15.	PUBLIC LAND DISPOSAL AND RATIONALISATION PROGRAM 2011/12	24
16.	POIMENA RESERVE - TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	24
17.	CADBURYS SPORTS GROUND TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY	25
	GOVERNANCE.....	25
18.	SALE OF LAND: 108A SPRINGFIELD AVENUE WEST MOONAH AND 14 RENFREW CIRCLE GOODWOOD.....	25

ECONOMIC.....25

19. GLENORCHY CIVIC PRECINCT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING25

20. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED).....25

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 28th March 2011 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)

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

COMMUNITY

8. TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY 22-5

Author: Property Officer (Chris Holm)
Qualified Person: Manger City Asset (Andrew Lawrence)
File Reference: Council Policies - Telecommunications Towers

Community Plan Reference:

- 1.2.6 Promote community awareness of their involvement in the land use planning process.
- 2.1.1 Develop strategies to maintain and improve the use of parks, public open spaces, sporting grounds, public amenities and recreation facilities in line with the Council's Sport and Recreation Strategy.

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

- 2.1.3 Promote investment by capitalising on the City's infrastructure.
- 2.1.1 Develop strategies to maintain and improve the use of parks, public open spaces, sporting grounds, public amenities and recreation facilities in line with the Council's Sport and Recreation Strategy.

Reporting Brief:

To obtain Council approval for a Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy (Policy) and Guidelines for processing the installation of Telecommunications Infrastructure on Council land (Guidelines).

Proposal in Detail:

Council has been approached by telecommunication carriers in relation to the location of telecommunications infrastructure (towers and associated facilities) on Council land. Council has comprehensive provisions in the Glenorchy Planning Scheme 1993 for the assessment of telecommunications infrastructure, however it does not have a policy regarding the location and procedure for processing proposals for telecommunications infrastructure on Council land.

At the January 2011 Council meeting, Council Aldermen passed a resolution to ensure the development of a policy with regard to Council's position on the construction of telecommunication infrastructure on Council owned land and the prospects of entering 'partnerships', 'joint ventures' or other profit sharing arrangement with telecommunications carriers.

During the last two (2) years the number of applications and inquiries to locate telecommunications infrastructure within Glenorchy has significantly increased. The increase relates to the need for carriers to maintain existing services, satisfy additional communication traffic (voice and data) and cover gaps in the system.

A review of other local Council practices indicates that they have not implemented a separate Policy relating to Telecommunications Infrastructure on their land and rely on the planning process to determine whether to grant a lease on Council land.

Furthermore, all Council's contacted appeared to encourage the prospects of rental income and strongly supported the upgrading of telecommunication infrastructure within their municipality.

Glenorchy City Council Planning Scheme 1993 (the Scheme) requires a planning permit for the installation of telecommunications infrastructure throughout the municipality unless the infrastructure is exempt (Low Impact Facilities are exempt).

Simplistically, High Impact Facilities are overhead lines, towers that are not attached to buildings, towers attached to buildings and more than 5 metres high and certain extensions to existing towers and require a Planning Permit.

It is proposed that a Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy will assist Council and Council Officers in determining whether both Low Impact Facilities and High Impact Facilities (primarily towers) should be approved on Council land from a land management perspective. Accordingly, negotiations that take place with Property Management Officers will be formalised by a Policy and Guidelines.

Telecommunication carriers can choose to erect their infrastructure on private land or public land. If they choose private land, a High Impact Facility will require a Planning Permit through the normal process. If it is a Low Impact Facility their negotiations can proceed with the owner of the land and if agreement is reached, the facility can be installed.

If the Telecommunication carrier chooses Council land the first contact is with the Property Management area in the City Assets Department.

The following Policy and Guidelines is applicable to applications for the installation of Telecommunication Facilities on Council land.

The principal justification for permitting Telecommunication infrastructure on Council land and developing a Policy are the following:

1. Facilitating a well planned network of telecommunication infrastructure (towers and associated facilities) which will satisfy present and future business and residential demands with the provision of a comprehensive and reliable communication coverage throughout the City of Glenorchy.
2. Introducing a Telecommunication Infrastructure Policy assists Council in controlling the location and design of telecommunication infrastructure and facilitate their development in a way that minimises disturbance to the environment and potential loss of amenity.
3. Introducing a Telecommunication Infrastructure Policy provides guidance to telecommunication carriers and Council Officers concerning the appropriate development of telecommunication infrastructure.
4. Telecommunication Towers are attracting between \$8,000 and \$10,000 per annum and provide an annual income for Council. The standard and affordability of the KGV lighting was largely dependent on a \$150,000 contribution from Vodafone and the ongoing rental income will continue to support KGV facilities.

The prospects for Council to enter “partnerships’, ‘joint venture’ or other profit sharing arrangements with telecommunication carriers has been explored. Discussions with various consultants acting for Telstra, Vodafone and Optus indicate that the carriers are not prepared to enter profit sharing arrangements with landowners and it would be unique for the carriers and for municipal Councils. Accordingly, Council’s involvement in the provision of telecommunication infrastructure is currently limited to leasing land for a commercial return and assisting carriers identify alternative land for development.

The proposed Policy (Attachment 1) describes the objectives for permitting Telecommunications’ Infrastructure on Council land and will assist Council in making consistent and transparent decisions associated with its land. The Policy is implemented through the Guidelines (Attachment 2). The Guidelines provides a more specific governance framework for assessing appropriate applications to occupy Council property.

Consultations:

- Property and Recreation Co-ordinator
- Planning Officer
- Sports and Recreational Development Officer
- Community Participation Co-ordinator

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The implementation of the proposed Policy will reduce time expended in processing telecommunication leases and will reduce time spent during negotiations. The Policy adds an additional layer of governance and increases the prospects of preserving significant public sites and addressing public concerns.

Leases with telecommunication carriers have been used for many years and have been developed to a high standard and address a wide array of typical legal risks. Additionally, these leases usually indemnify Council from EMF emissions, interference and other potential business risks associated with the carriers.

The carriers are usually prepared to pay for statutory advertising or legal fees.

Current Year	Nil
Next Year	Nil
Total	Nil

A reduction in the utilisation of human resource is anticipated.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

The policy has positive public relations implications. Council would be responding to community concerns and pro-actively addressing public concerns through the provision of education material (data sheets) on EMF and the location of towers as well as consulting through the development application process. This provides an opportunity for vastly improved community consultation unlike Councils that do not have a Telecommunications Policy.

A community consultation strategy will be finalised and implemented during each telecommunications infrastructure development.

Recommendation:

1. That Council approves the Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy 22-5 (Attachment 1).
2. That Council adopt the new Guidelines (Attachment 2) for assessing individual proposals for Telecommunication Infrastructure located on Council land.

Attachments/Annexures

- 1 Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy 22-5
- 2 Guidelines

ENVIRONMENT

9. SOUTHERN TASMANIA REGIONAL PLANNING PROJECT

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)
Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)
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:

To provide endorsement or comments in relation to the principles that should apply in determining the nature of an ongoing regional planning structure for Southern Tasmania.

Proposal in Detail:

The Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) is seeking endorsement or comments in relation to the draft principles that should apply in determining the nature of an ongoing regional planning structure for Southern Tasmania.

The STCA considered this matter at its meeting on 14th April 2011. A copy of the STCA's report and decision is attached (**Attachment 1**), which provides background information on the regional planning project, a number of structural options for ongoing regional planning, and a set of draft principles that could apply in determining the appropriate ongoing regional planning structure.

Comments have been sought from Tony McMullen, Council's Project Manager Planning Scheme Review. His comments relate only to the text of the STCA report, and do not impact on the draft principles. The comments are:

1. It is agreed that any regional planning authority needs to be a joint exercise between State and local government in the region.

2. On p.5.5, there is reference to the need for a separate statutory approval mechanism which is “independent from any State-level policy setting body”. Currently, the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) houses both a policy setting arm and a statutory assessment arm. It is not clear how far reaching the implications of this statement are for the TPC’s operations – as there have been suggestions that the “chinese wall” placed between its policy and assessment arms may at times be somewhat porous.
3. On p.5.6, it states that regional policy and strategy “should only be able to be over-ridden by policy and strategy set at the State level” and that the various players should be bound in respect of their “land use planning activities”. I agree with the proposition that regional policy and strategy should be binding on the key regional players – State and local government and infrastructure providers. However, there is an inference that the regional planning body would confine itself to matters of land use planning. The reality is that the great benefit of regional strategy and policy is to align the actions of regional players across a range of spheres of activity, not just land use planning. For example, for urban consolidation to work there is a need for not only a supportive planning scheme, but also improvements such as more efficient public transport, better on-ground urban design initiatives in the public domain, concentration of public service provision and a set of price signals from infrastructure providers which advantages compact development close to services. In short, it is important to determine whether the regional planning body is intended to undertake big “P” planning or small “p” planning. This is not entirely clear from the report.
4. On p. 5.8, one of the recommendations is that the “regional planning structure should provide a mechanism whereby the endorsement of councils is necessary for outputs”. This comment may be premature, however, it is not clear whether such a mechanism would rely upon consensus, or whether the majority would rule, or whether differences would be put to the statutory approval body for adjudication and resolution.
5. One thing is clear from history. That is, that the regional planning body cannot rely upon the voluntary participation of its members. There may well be winners and losers on particular regional issues – though overall it is hoped that the benefits would outweigh any disadvantages. The ability for parties to walk away has spelt the demise of previous regional planning efforts.

Consultations:

STCA
Council’s Project Manager Planning Scheme Review

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Not applicable at this stage.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Not applicable at this stage.

Recommendation:

That Council endorse the draft Principles as set out on pages 5.7 and 5.8 of Attachment 1 as an appropriate way to determine an ongoing regional planning structure.

Attachments/Annexures

1 STCA Report

11 Pages

10. CHANGE OF CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM

Author: Manager - Works and Services (Emilio Reale)

Qualified Person: Manager - Works and Services (Emilio Reale)

File Reference: Capital Works

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:

This report is to outline the current shortage of work in the Roads Capital Works Program due to delays of three major projects, and to seek approval to bring forward a number of projects to keep Works and Services staff gainfully working.

Proposal in Detail:

GASP! Shared Walkway

In the 10/11 financial year budget, the construction of a shared pathway was included in the Roads Capital Works Program. This project was successful in gaining \$1.5 million of State Government funding from Department of Economic Development Tourism and The Arts under the Urban Renewal and Heritage Fund. Originally the pathway was programmed to be completed by 30th June 2011 and resources to construct the shared pathway were allocated at the start of the financial year when all capital work's programming takes place. To date, a section of pathway which traverses through the Montrose Bay High School grounds was completed during the Christmas school holiday period.

Progress on the rest of the pathway has been delayed due to a number of issues including; an extensive consultation and negotiation process with some stakeholders, which has delayed the design process, and the approval and issuing of DIER permits.

Black Spot Project

In addition to the shared pathway, a Black Spot project to construct a new roundabout at the intersection of Bayswater Rd and Central Ave has also been delayed. This project is estimated to cost \$130,000 and is funded by the Federal Government. It was programmed to commence on the 7th March 2011 and be completed by late May. This project was delayed due to a planning appeal, and now that has been resolved there are further delays with Aurora not being able to relocate a number of power poles for around 6 weeks.

Upper Montrose Rd Project

A significant road and stormwater remediation project in Upper Montrose Rd estimated at \$270,000 has been commenced but due to a number of engineering issues will have to have more extensive design information. Works have progressed to a stage where the project can be left in a safe manner until it is fully designed and all engineering issues resolved.

Consultations:

The Infrastructure Management Group (IMG)

ELT

Corporate Accountant

Finance and Budgeting Officer

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

The main financial implication we currently face with the GASP! and Blackspot projects is that we do not have the flexibility to move new projects into their place due to the fact they are funded by Government Grants. This is not the case with Upper Montrose Rd, as this is a Council funded project. Under normal circumstances, if a Council funded project is delayed, we are able to swap another project into its place and then go back to the deferred project at a later date. These changes are reported in appendix B of the traffic light report to inform Aldermen of the changed program of works.

The only other available option would be to divert works staff into maintenance activities when they run out of work. However, this will cause significant overspends in the maintenance program budgets and is not recommended.

To commence work on the GASP! Shared walkway is still a major priority and it is expected that approvals to commence two sections of this project alongside the Brooker Highway will be received by the 2nd May. This will engage two work crews for around 6-8 weeks depending on weather conditions, etc. However, to keep our staff fully engaged in the Capital Works Program it is proposed that;

- 1 The Upper Montrose Rd project is deferred until design is completed and Fleet St reconstruction take its place from next financial year's program. Upper Montrose Rd will be completed next financial year.
- 2 The Bayswater Rd/Central Ave Roundabout project is moved into next financial year and Kestral St Stage 2a and a number of footpath replacement projects are undertaken until the GASP! walkway project can sustain two more work crews. Not all footpath projects listed would be required unless further delays are experience.
- 3 That funding for the substitute projects is brought into this financial year.

The financial implications of this are that the funding for these projects will need to be brought into this financial year, and a proportion of the Government Grant money be expended next financial year. The projects listed in Table A have been identified as the projects to be moved into this financial year.

Table A: Works to be brought into to this financial year

Project	Cost	Comments
Kestrel St Stage 2a	\$52, 821	(Excludes stabilisation and seal to be undertaken in 11/12 -\$103,439). To be done in lieu of the Bayswater Rd/Central Ave Roundabout Project.
Fleet St	\$223,972	Reconstruction of road and footpaths. To be done in lieu of Upper Montrose Rd project.
Bowden St	\$17,000	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Easton Ave	\$12,500	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Barossa Rd	\$9,000	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Cheviot Place	\$11,500	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Riperly Rd	\$17,000	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Ballard St	\$11,500	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Corinda Grove	\$15,500	Replace Asphalt Footpaths. To be done in lieu of GASP! Project.
Total	\$370,793	

Table B: Balance of works to be completed next financial year.

Project	Cost	Comments
Kestrel Stage 2b	\$103,439	Stabilisation and seal to be undertaken in 11/12, which is the balance of project.
GASP! Shared Pathway	\$852,900	Estimated balance of project
Bayswater Roundabout, Blackspot project	\$130,000	Construction of Bayswater Ave Roundabout.
Upper Montrose Rd	\$156,900	Balance of project.
Total	\$1,243,238	

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

Extensive consultation is taking place regarding the progress of the GASP! shared walkway project with all relevant stakeholders.

All other projects that have been reprogrammed will be noted in the next edition of the Glenorchy Gazette.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that:

1. The Upper Montrose Rd project is deferred until design is completed and Fleet St reconstruction take its place from next financial year's program. Upper Montrose Rd will be completed next financial year.
2. The Bayswater Rd/Central Ave Roundabout project is moved into next financial year and Kestral St Stage 2a and a number of footpath replacement projects are undertaken until the GASP! walkway project can sustain two more work crews. Not all footpath projects listed would be required unless further delays are experience.
3. That funding for the substitute projects is brought into this financial year.

Attachments/Annexures

Nil.

GOVERNANCE

11. REVIEW OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN SOUTHERN TASMANIA

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)
Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)
File Reference: Southern Waste Strategy Authority

Community Plan Reference:

5.2.7 Develop and implement environmental risk management strategies

Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:

3.4.5 Provide an environmentally-compliant and efficient waste management service which promotes waste minimisation.

Reporting Brief:

To consider the recommendations of the final report “Southern Waste Strategy Authority; Waste Management 2020 and Beyond” by consultants “Blue Environment” and provide feedback to the Southern Waste Strategy Authority.

Proposal in Detail:

The Southern Waste Strategy Authority (SWSA) has written to its member councils seeking feedback on the recommendations of the final report “Southern Waste Strategy Authority; Waste Management 2020 and Beyond” by consultants “Blue Environment”.

In particular, the SWSA is seeking comment by 30 April 2011 on the following matters:

1. Does the member agree that a regional waste authority (SWSA or another regional body) should continue to exist even if not necessarily in the current form?
2. Does the member support the introduction of a state legislated waste levy in a form approved by Local Government with all funds raised going directly to the recovery authority for waste management purposes only and to be distributed on a pre-agreed formula? and
3. Does the member support the establishment of a joint local/state recovery authority (similar in operation to Zero Waste S.A. or Sustainability Victoria) in a form approved by Local Government?
4. Does the member support discussions commencing with government, other regions and industry to achieve 2 and 3?

A copy of the SWSA’s request is provided as Attachment 1 and a copy of Blue Environment’s report is Attachment 2.

The Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) has considered the report at its meeting on 14 April 2011, and the agenda item in the STCA’s agenda provides a comprehensive summary of the history of the report and its contents. A copy of the STCA’s agenda item is included as Attachment 3.

The STCA decided that it would take no further action in this matter other than to write to member councils to see if they are interested in any further investigation of a regional joint authority to undertake regional responsibility for waste collection, resource recovery and waste disposal.

In response to the SWSA's questions:

1. Does the member agree that a regional waste authority (SWSA or another regional body) should continue to exist even if not necessarily in the current form?

It is suggested that some form of regional waste authority should continue to exist, although the scope and roles of the organisation should be extensively reviewed. The "Enhanced Regional Approach" referred to on page 4.8 of Attachment 3 (STCA agenda item) and page 83 of Attachment 2 (Blue Environment report) warrants further investigation as it seems to be the only way that a regional approach to waste collection, management and re-use/recycling can occur. It also seems to be the only way that larger scale alternative waste technologies could be realistically considered.

It is recommended that the Glenorchy City Council support further investigation of the establishment of a Joint Authority to undertake regional responsibility for waste collection, resource recovery and waste disposal.

2. Does the member support the introduction of a state legislated waste levy in a form approved by Local Government with all funds raised going directly to the recovery authority for waste management purposes only and to be distributed on a pre-agreed formula?

It is suggested that the only way for a waste levy to be collected on an equitable basis, with all landfills participating in its collection, is for the State Government to legislate for it. Legislation would allow landfills such as Copping to commence charging a waste levy on existing contracts, which would otherwise not be feasible.

The major issues appear to be:

- (a) How much should be collected?
- (b) What should it be used for?
- (c) How should it be administered and allocated?

The suggestion has been made that the existing \$2 per tonne levy should be increased to \$10 per tonne, generating around \$5m per year State wide. In the absence of a clear strategic direction as to what the future of waste management will look like and what the levy will actually be used for, it is difficult to support a notional amount of \$10 per tonne, or any other notional amount, especially at a time when other community user charges are on the increase as well.

In at least broad terms we should know what the money will be used for before deciding how much needs to be collected, and therefore how much the levy should be. A \$10 per tonne levy is unlikely to be anywhere near sufficient to justify regional or State wide investment in significant alternative waste technologies.

It is understood that the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT) at its April meeting agreed to reverse its previous opposition to a State legislated levy.

In the absence of specific purposes, the levy should be used to fund agreed EPA activities and the Regional Waste Authorities to a previously agreed formula.

3. Does the member support the establishment of a joint local/state recovery authority (similar in operation to Zero Waste S.A. or Sustainability Victoria) in a form approved by Local Government?

Discussion of a State Recovery Authority occurs at page 84 of Attachment 2 (Blue Environment Report), and it is a completely different proposal to the possible Joint Authority referred to earlier. If there is to be a State legislated waste levy, and if it is allocated on an agreed formula, there seems to be little justification for the creation of a new and separate recovery authority to oversee it. It seems that a new authority would simply add additional overheads, which would need to be funded from the levy.

4. Does the member support discussions commencing with government, other regions and industry to achieve 2 and 3?

Based on the above Council should support the commencement of discussions on the introduction of a State legislated levy to be distributed on an agreed formula.

In the absence of a significant additional role for a Recovery Authority over and above collecting and distributing the levy, Council should reserve judgement on the commencement of discussions on creating a Recovery Authority.

Council should recommend that discussions commence on further investigation of the establishment of a Joint Authority to undertake regional responsibility for waste collection, resource recovery and waste disposal.

Consultations:

Council has had the General Manager and the Manager Environment Planning and Development as members of the project steering committee.

Blue Environment visited Council during their review to seek our opinions on waste management options and to collect data.

Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:

Glenorchy already collects a \$2 per tonne waste levy at its landfill, which it provides to the SWSA as its contribution to the funding of SWSA. An increased levy would be applied to users of the landfill, and there is a risk that it would be seen as an additional Council charge over and above other waste related fee and charge increases.

The SWSA has indicated that it can fund a feasibility/business case for the establishment of a joint authority, so there should be no additional draw on member councils for such a study.

Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:

The Blue Environment project has involved consultation with councils and other waste management stakeholders.

While the introduction of a State legislated levy to generate a more equitable collection of levy funds is unlikely to be generally unpopular there are likely to be significant public relations impacts from the introduction of a larger levy, especially if we cannot tell the community what it will be spent on.

Recommendation:

That Council respond to the SWSA in accordance with the contents of this report.

Attachments/Annexures

<u>1</u>	SWSA Letter	4 Pages
<u>2</u>	Blue Environment Report	107 Pages
<u>3</u>	STCA Agenda Item	10 Pages

12. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE

**CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE
PUBLIC**

13. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

COMMUNITY

**14. TRANSFER OF LAND - 17 GORMANSTON ROAD,
MOONAH**

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)(e).

**15. PUBLIC LAND DISPOSAL AND RATIONALISATION
PROGRAM 2011/12**

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)(e).

**16. POIMENA RESERVE - TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FACILITY**

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)(d).

**17. CADBURYS SPORTS GROUND
TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY**

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)(d).

GOVERNANCE

**18. SALE OF LAND: 108A SPRINGFIELD AVENUE WEST
MOONAH AND 14 RENFREW CIRCLE GOODWOOD**

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)(j).

ECONOMIC

**19. GLENORCHY CIVIC PRECINCT MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING**

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)(e) (2)(f).

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