



Brighton Council

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
OF THE BRIGHTON COUNCIL HELD
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES
OLD BEACH AT 5.35 P.M. ON TUESDAY,
16th February 2016**

PRESENT: Cr Foster (Mayor); Cr Curran (Deputy Mayor); Cr Garlick;
Cr Geard; Cr Gray; Cr Jeffries; Cr Owen and Cr Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr R Sanderson (General Manager); Mr G Davoren
(Deputy General Manager); Mrs J Banks (Governance
Manager); Mr H Macpherson (Municipal Engineer)

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

1.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
OF 19th January 2016.

*Cr Geard moved, Cr Curran seconded that the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of
19th January 2016 be confirmed.*

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

2. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

Cr Garlick moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that Cr Taylor be granted leave of absence.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND DEPUTATIONS:

- Mr K Turner addressed Council in relation to Item 11.4
- Mrs M Ackerley addressed Council in relation to Item 11.4
- Mr B Green addressed Council in relation to Item 11.4

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST:

In accordance with Part 5, Section 48 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, the Chairman of a meeting is to request Councillors to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have an interest in any item on the agenda; and

Part 2 Regulation 8 (7) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, the Chairman of a meeting is to request Councillors to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have, a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda.

Accordingly, Councillors are requested to advise of any interest they may have in respect to any matter appearing on the agenda, or any supplementary item to the agenda, which the Council has resolved to deal with, in accordance with Part 2 Regulation 8 (6) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

There were no declarations of interest.

Cr Owen moved, Cr Gray seconded that Item 11.4 be brought forward and discussed.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

For the purpose of these Minutes the Items will remain in numerical order.

5. REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS:

5.1 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS:

FILE REFERENCE: 0205-6

AUTHOR: Mayor
(Cr T Foster)

The Mayor's communications were as follows:-.

- Jan 25 Australia Day Civic Reception- Civic Centre
- Jan 27 James Dryburgh and I met with Minister Rene Hidding and CEO Infastructure Tasmania Alan Garcia.
- Feb 02 Municipal tour with Scott Percy.
- Feb 10 Meeting at Council with General Manager, Scott Percy Cathy Harper and representatives of CMCA re 2017 Pontville Park Rally.
- Feb 11 Meeting at Blundstone Arena with General Manager, CEO CT David Johnstone, Chairman CT Andrew Gaggin and Events Manager Rachel Fisher re future of Brighton as a possible premier league participant.
- Feb 11 Meeting at Council with Cathy Harper and Janine Banks re Anzac Day 2016.
- Feb 12 General Manager and I attended an LGAT General Meeting in Launceston.
- Feb 15 Meeting re "Pokies" coalition at Anglicare in Hobart.
- Feb 16 Ordinary Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Mayor's communications be received.

DECISION:

Cr Owen moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the report be received.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

5.2 REPORTS FROM COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS:

FILE REFERENCE: 0205-6

Southern Waste Strategy Board Joint Authority – Cr Gray representative.

DECISION:

Cr Gray attended a Regional Waste meeting on 16th February 2016 (agenda circulated to Councillors).

Cr Garlick moved, Cr Curran seconded that the report be received.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

5.3 CORRESPONDENCE FROM SOUTHERN TASMANIAN COUNCILS ASSOCIATION (STCA), LGAT, TASWATER AND JOINT AUTHORITIES:

Correspondence and reports from the STCA, LGAT, TasWater and Joint Authorities e.g. Southern Waste Authority are received periodically by Council.

If any Councillor wishes to view documents received contact should either be made with the Governance Manager or General Manager.

6. NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL WORKSHOPS:

In accordance with the requirements of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, it was reported that there were no workshops held since the last Ordinary Council Meeting.

7. NOTICE OF MOTION:

There were no notices of motion.

8. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS TO THE AGENDA:

In accordance with the requirements of Part 2 Regulation 8(6) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, the Council, by absolute majority may approve the consideration of a matter not appearing on the agenda, where the General Manager has reported:

- (a) the reason it was not possible to include the matter on the agenda, and
- (b) that the matter is urgent, and
- (c) that advice has been provided under Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council resolve by absolute majority to deal with any supplementary items not appearing on the agenda, as reported by the General Manager in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

DECISION:

The General Manager advised that there were no supplementary agenda items.

9. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

There were no Committee meetings held in January.

10. COUNCIL ACTING AS PLANNING AUTHORITY:

In accordance with the provisions of Part 2 Regulation 25 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, the intention of the Council to act as a Planning Authority pursuant to the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* is to be noted. In accordance with Regulation 25, the Council will act as a planning authority in respect to those matters appearing under Item 10 on this agenda, inclusive of any supplementary items.

There were no Planning authority items listed on this Agenda.

11. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS:

11.1 COMMON SERVICES JOINT VENTURE MONTHLY REPORTS:

AUTHOR: Manager Professional Services
(Mr G Boyd)

Background:

When the Common Services Joint Venture was formalised there was an undertaking that monthly reports would be provided to member councils. There are seven councils that have joined to date.

One report is for the overall performance of the joint venture which is provided to all member councils. The other report is council specific for each member council that is provided only to that council. The second attachment is for Brighton Council's performance for the month.

Consultation:

General Manager

Risk Implications:

Nil

Financial Implications:

See attached reports for financial information about the Common Services Joint Venture and Brighton Council.

Other Issues:

These reports provide detailed information to assist in dealing with the amalgamation program and the financial sustainability of the joint venture and individual councils.

Assessment:

The reports provide updates of proposed actions and collaborations which will build the overall capability and outputs of the group.

Options:

1. Adopt the recommendation.
 2. Do nothing.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

That the reports be received.

DECISION:

Cr Geard moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the report be received.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

11.2 STCA MEMBERSHIP:

FILE REFERENCE:

AUTHOR: Manager Development Services
(Mr J Dryburgh)

Background:

Council recently endorsed the formation of a sub-region consisting of Brighton, Derwent Valley, Central Highlands and Southern Midlands councils. It is considered that these councils have quite a few common interests that may be best pursued collaboratively as a sub-region.

The formation of this group has sharpened focus upon the value of Council remaining a member of the STCA at the same time, and whether the annual membership of \$9,600 plus resourcing costs might be better directed towards projects pursued by the new sub-region.

The matter should be considered in detail by Council, particularly given that Brighton is effectively a peri-urban municipality (whilst Brighton shares much in common with the more rural/regional councils in the sub-region it should maintain a voice in matters of greater Hobart).

Some of the common criticisms of the STCA are that it is quite Hobart-centric, does not have strong direction from its board and that it is not really delivering on any significant or tangible projects at present.

However, it can also be argued that being part of a Southern Regional body is important for Brighton; that perhaps the STCA could be pushed to provide greater value; and that it is the main body for Brighton to maintain a voice in Greater Hobart matters.

It is also worth noting that the roles of the STCA do evolve over time and as such there is some risk that Brighton could miss involvement in something of value in future, should it choose opt out. For example, there is some discussion currently about the Southern Waste Strategy Authority becoming part of the STCA. A similar example, is that the State Government have indicated that they will regularly undertake review processes for regional land use strategies – last time this process was led by the STCA.

A council must give 3 months notice to cancel membership and is not reimbursed the remainder of the financial year. As such, Brighton would have to advise the STCA of intent to cancel membership in March to ensure it does not pay membership for the 2016-17 financial year.

The matter of Council membership on regional bodies was raised as a discussion item at the LGAT general meeting on February 12. It is recommended that council discuss the outcomes of this meeting and consider Brighton's position at the March Council meeting.

Consultation:

Consultation has occurred between Council's Senior Management Team, the CEO of LGAT and Mayor.

Risk Implications:

There is some risk regarding public perception should Brighton cancel its membership with no other councils doing likewise. There would likely be speculation about the motivations for doing so and it would likely be dragged into the media amalgamation campaign.

However, this could likely be managed if council can successfully communicate the positive reasons why it would do so.

Financial Implications:

Council could save \$9,600 per year not including resourcing costs, which it could redirect to sub-regional projects or treat as a general saving.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Council does not adopt the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council consider the matter of STCA membership at its March Ordinary Council Meeting.

DECISION:

Cr Gray moved, Cr Garlick seconded that the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

11.3 MONTHLY PLANNING UPDATE:

AUTHORS: Manager Development Services
(Mr J Dryburgh)

Background:

This report is intended to provide a monthly summary of planning matters for Council.

Discussion:

Brighton Industrial and Housing Corporation (BIHC):

- All lots in Paice-Hurst Street have now been sold.
- The unit lot that Council had to transfer back to Housing Tasmania is now under consider to be used as a pilot site for disability housing.

Purchase and Receipt of land:

Nothing to report.

Projects:

- **5+5+5 project:** This may not start until early March now. There is interest in a story for national ABC radio on this project. History of the Brighton Army Camp feature article to be in March issue of Tasmania 40⁰ South, out mid-March.

- **Brighton Tomorrow:** Some more detailed design work and basic costings are underway to present to council pre budget.
- **Old hospital building:** Costing estimates for various options being prepared. Ten Days on the Island art project is likely on the site.
- **Bridgewater South Master Plan:** Plan endorsed for public exhibition, pending approval from Boral.

Development Applications and leases on Council-owned land:

Uniting Care Tasmania have gained Council's permission to develop community gardens at 84 Jetty Road, Old Beach and off Tottenham Road, Gagebrook and an MOU has been signed. Project planning is well under way.

Council Land Subdivisions and Sales:

Nothing new.

Other Strategic Matters:

- **Brighton Draft Interim Planning Scheme:** Urgent Amendments: Dromedary quarry has now been approved by the Minister.
- **Potential HT Land Master plan:** A consultant team has been engaged by Centacare, who under their agreement with Housing Tasmania need to complete a master plan within the next 12 months or so. Meeting held on 11th February with Council staff (verbal update).
- **Age friendly communities:** (In progress)
- **Disability housing:** (Verbal update - potential pilot site in Paice Street)

Planning Professional Services:

Professional services hours for planning continue to increase (more than double what they were 3 years ago). Some shuffling of Brighton staff is currently underway.

Other matters: None

Statutory update (January 2016):

For the past month (See Attachment).

Enforcements:

Some minor enforcements in process.

Consultation:

All council departments.

Risk Implications:

N/A.

Financial Implications:

N/A.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
 2. Council does not adopt the recommendation.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive the report.

DECISION:

Cr Jeffries moved, Cr Curran seconded that the report be received.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

11.4 NUISANCE – PIGEONS – MADDELENA COURT, OLD BEACH:

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

Councillors will recall that this item was previously discussed at the last Council meeting where a video was shown supporting the complaint.

It is proper for staff to undertake direct action on this matter considering there is clear instruction for staff to take appropriate action to the best of their abilities for any contravention of our by-laws or regulatory responsibilities. Therefore, this matter should be resolved by staff in accordance with Council's Environmental Health By-Law No.1 of 2015 and/or if necessary the Magistrates Court.

Consultation:

Complainant, owner of pigeons, Abetz Curtis, General Manager, Governance Manager, Environmental Health Officer, Senior Environmental Health Officer, Councillors.

Risk Implications:

Not acting in accordance with Council's By-law may set a precedent.

Financial Implications:

Nil

Other Issues:

N/A

Assessment:

Council Officers will act in accordance with Council's Environmental Health By-Law No. 1 of 2015.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. That the recommendation not be adopted.

RECOMMENDATION:

For information only.

DECISION:

Cr Owen moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the report be received and in line with the General Manager's advice that an infringement notice will not be issued at this time, as Brighton Council's Bylaw no. 1 of 2015 is not specific or robust enough in relation to a possible pigeon nuisance in Maddelena Court, Old Beach to support said notice.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

11.5 DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS – COUNCILS PRACTICES:

FILE REFERENCE:

AUTHOR: Municipal Engineer
(Mr H Macpherson)

Background:

At the December Council meeting Andrew Bullock and Jamie Wood addressed Council regarding the Material Recycling Facility located in the Brighton Industrial Estate and raised a number of concerns regarding Council practises with the disposal in materials from road reconstruction works. A report was going to be prepared for the Environment and Heritage Committee but as there was no meeting this month it is being raised at the Ordinary Council Meeting.

Below is a response to a number of points raised by Mr Bullock:

- *The remediation costs are estimated to have cost ratepayers an unbudgeted amount of \$70-100k.*
 - I can only assume that this is referring to the old tip site that operated on the corner of Briggs Road and Cove Hill Road for many years. This site was a tip that was open for the disposal of any material by the public. It has been closed for well over 20 years and later had a subdivision approved near it. Costs incurred by Council were due to the studies carried out to determine the extent of the site.
 - The location at the Cove Hill quarry is only being used by Brighton Council so that it can control what is entering the site. Some materials have been levelled, some materials have been reused and some materials have been placed there as temporary storage. The site has also been used to store and burn green waste as discussed below.
- *The practice of illegal dumping...*
 - After the original report, Council has implemented guidelines to improve its practices.
- *On 11th Feb 2014 the Heritage and Environment Committee had a meeting that lasted 10 minutes.*
 - Councillors read the report prior to the meeting and several Councillors had discussions with Council staff prior to the meeting. On-site inspections were also undertaken. It is condescending to imply that only 10 minutes was spent discussing the issue at the meeting.
- *New Landfill New Recommendations*
 - Council didn't create a landfill site. They are using an area for the disposal of clean fill, temporary storage of material and storage of green waste for later disposal.
 - The land is owned by the Crown but Council has a lease over the land.

- The material placed in the Quarry is not there as landfill. Some of the materials have been reused on other jobs for subgrade improvement. Some material have been placed there as a temporary storage. Some vegetation (such as African Box Thorns) has been placed there to later be burnt once it has dried out and the conditions are suitable for burning off.
 - The site is secured with a chain and lock and is locked up every night. The site is occasionally being left open during the day while Council Staff are using the site.
 - No asbestos has been placed at the quarry site. The suspected Asbestos referred to in the report was a fibre cement Telstra pit that was confirmed by a Telstra representative not to be Asbestos.
 - Green waste is not being land filled on the site. The green waste which contains African Box Thorns removed off Crown Land is temporarily stored on the site to be burnt at a later date once it has dried off.
 - *Burning of Green Waste*
 - When the green waste was burnt off, it was after a permit was issued (TasFire Permit No. B30802). The burn off was carried out by the Bridgewater Brigade who advised it was a good site as it is well contained.
 - The photo of the smouldering green waste also clearly shows the gate closed and begs the question why was the photographer accessing a secured site?
 - *Council Obligations and Responsibilities*
 - Council already explores innovative alternatives for waste and resource management.
- Council:
- Provide a kerbside recycling collection.
 - Free recycling at the waste transfer station.
 - Recently opened the tip shop to reduce the amount going to landfill.
 - Recycle its used concrete to a company that provides a free service to take the material and make their profit on selling the materials

Council also has the responsibility to minimise costs to its rate payers. Council also has the task of providing services to the rate payers at a cost to ensure that they use the services and don't illegally dump rubbish.

Consultation:

Municipal Engineer, General Manager, Deputy General Manager, Senior Environmental Health Officer

Risk Implications:

By implementing guidelines for the disposal of clean fill and how the Cove Hill Quarry site is used by Council, it is reducing its risks.

Financial Implications:

The information provided by Andrew Bullock has a costing estimate comparing the recycling materials and Council's current practises. The issue with this example is that it only allows for small quantities (4 Tonnes) which doesn't make it viable and it also assumes that the material once removed can be back-carted with recycled material which is rarely the case unless it is stockpiled onsite which has costs associated with it. This is why Council store the material onsite so that larger volumes can be processed at a cheaper cost.

If it was free to dispose of the materials at the Recycling facility and the money was made on the resale (like with the concrete) then Council would dispose of its material there, but while high costs are being charged it is better for Council to continue its current practices.

Other Issues:

Nil

Assessment:

Council has not created a landfill site at Cove Hill Quarry. The site is being used for a number of processes including storage of inert material, temporary storage of materials and a safe location to burn off green waste once it is appropriate. Council's Environmental Health Officer has looked at the current guidelines and practises and has recommended a few changes to the guidelines. He also raised this with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) who was happy with the proposal.

The new proposed guidelines are:

Guidelines for Clean Fill Sites used by Council:

- Fill is not to be placed in natural watercourses;
- On large sites fill is to be contained into a defined area until it is levelled and compacted;
- Access to fill sites is to be restricted with a lock so that only authorised people can get access;
- Any materials that are stored temporarily are not to be placed in low lying ground;
- If illegal material is dumped at a site, Council is to ensure that it is cleaned up within two working days of its discovery.
- The following materials are not to be placed in clean fill sites (They may be stored temporarily but should be removed within 5 working days):
 - New Asphalt
 - Geofabric
 - Concrete (including reinforcement)
 - Vegetation
 - Contaminated soils
- specific areas will be designated at the site for 'Clean Fill', 'Holding' materials and 'Vegetation' areas, so there is no risk of 'temporary' materials being inadvertently buried by the clean fill.

- Vegetation may be stored at a fill site for burning off once it has dried. Council is to ensure that the burning off does not create a nuisance.
- When selecting a site considerations should include: visual impact, effects on neighbouring properties, noise and potential dust, ease of access and visibility entering and exiting the site, drainage and ability to restrict access.
- Council is to carry out an internal risk assessment of each site prior to use.
- A site register will be developed and implemented to record:
 - All inward materials what, where and when;
 - All outward materials what, where and when.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. An alternative recommendation

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council accept the amended guidelines and continue to place inert materials in the quarry site and reuse material where possible.

DECISION:

Cr Geard moved, Cr Curran seconded that the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

11.6 BRIGHTON BOWLS & COMMUNITY CLUB – MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT:

FILE REFERENCE:

AUTHOR: Project Engineer
(Mrs A Wilson)

Background:

The Brighton Bowls and Community Club, in conjunction with Brighton Council are applying for a National Stronger Regions Fund federal grant for the redevelopment of the Club building. The proposed redevelopment will see the construction of a second large multipurpose function and event room, the installation of a commercial kitchen, new bar area, a new community meeting room, creation of two new administration offices, the redevelopment of the change rooms/toilets and dry and cool storage rooms and the reconstruction of the existing function area. The proposal will bring the building up to standard for a commercial building that is capable of holding events.

The Club has previously applied for a number of grants for this project and Council has previously committed \$200,000 to the project and another \$200,000 will be required if the application is successful. Council is assisting the Club with the current application and has had feedback from their previous applications that the project is a strong applicant for the grant. Council has had advice that a few changes will make the grant application more likely to succeed, one of these is to formally define Councils and the Clubs roles and commitments. Defining these roles and commitments at this stage of the project is useful for Council and the Club for planning and management purposes.

The agreement should be appended to the grant application which is due to be submitted on the 15th of March.

Consultation:

Municipal Engineer, Project Engineer, Bowls Club President, Grants Consultant.

Risk Implications:

There is a risk that the application will be unsuccessful. This will result in the project being delayed.

There are risks that the Club or the Council will not abide by the agreement however this will be mitigated by close communication between the parties throughout the project.

The Club president has agreed in principal to the draft agreement and will be taking it to the full Club meeting in the next week. There is a risk that they will not agree to a portion of the agreement however the President considers this unlikely and fully supports the agreement.

There is a risk that the Council and the Club do not agree to this agreement prior to the application requiring submission. This would be detrimental to the application however the application would still be able to be submitted with Council approval for its financial commitment.

Financial Implications:

If the application is successful Council will need to commit \$400,000 to the project. This has been committed in previous year's budgets but as yet there has not been a successful application.

If the project is successful and goes over budget the agreement states that the Club will pay for the first \$50,000 of excess and Council will fund any in excess of this on a dollar for dollar basis. Ongoing discussions and decisions will take place before and during the project to ensure this does not occur. Any large extensions to the project will require Council approval. The project has already commissioned a set of designs suitable to the Club and ready for a DA application and have had these fully quoted on so it is unlikely that the proposed budget will be exceeded by a great amount. Council will manage the project to further minimise this risk.

Council will put some time into assisting to develop the application and will fund the relevant Council permits if successful.

Other Issues:

As part of the agreement the Club has agreed (in principal) to hand to Council the portion of their land used as carpark on the proviso that Council continues to keep this land for car parking. This will provide Council with a large piece of land with the opportunity to significantly extend the carpark to provide parking for the northern end of the CBD of Brighton.

As part of the agreement and proposed plans the Club has also agreed (in principle) to provide public toilets in the event that the existing toilets next door to the club are permanently closed. The proposed plans show toilets accessible from the outside of the Club that may be opened and maintained by the Club as required. In future this will provide Council greater flexibility over what we can do with the Council owned block of land next door to the club that houses the existing public amenities.

Assessment:

This proposal and agreement provides Council with a number of benefits to Council and to the Community. The Bowls Club provide an excellent service to the community not replicated elsewhere in the Municipality by providing sport, recreation and social opportunities focussing on older residents. These residents have a great need for these types of community services to enhance their health and wellbeing. The Club have run themselves admirably and are committed to continuing to provide these and greater community services.

They have demonstrated this commitment by changing to Community and Bowls Club and providing a number of social events and meeting opportunities outside of Bowling. They also provide a venue for affordable and family friendly functions which will be enhanced greatly by the proposed project.

The proposal provides Council with benefits including the development of an excellent and needed community facility without ongoing costs to Council, a new public parking area and freeing up of the vacant Council owned lot next door to the Club.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Do not accept recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

Council adopts the Management Agreement between Brighton Bowls and Community Club and Brighton Council for the Redevelopment of the Brighton Bowls and Community Club.

Approve in principal support for the additional \$200,000 to be committed to the project if the grant application is successful.

DECISION:

Cr Curran moved, Cr Gray seconded that the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

11.7 MONTHLY FINANCE REPORT AS AT 31 JANUARY 2016:

FILE REFERENCE: 0103

AUTHOR: Deputy General Manager
(Mr G Davoren)

Background:

The finance reports were submitted for consideration.

They comprised the summarised financial position and revenue and expenses of the Council for the first seven months of the 2015/16 financial year.

Consultation:

Nil

Risk Implications:

Nil

Financial Implications:

Not Applicable

Other Issues:

Nil

Assessment:

Nil

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Not receive the reports.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the reports be received.

DECISION:

Cr Jeffries moved, Cr Garlick seconded that the report be received.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

| In favour | Against |
|------------------|----------------|
| Cr Curran | |
| Cr Foster | |
| Cr Garlick | |
| Cr Geard | |
| Cr Gray | |
| Cr Jeffries | |
| Cr Owen | |
| Cr Williams | |

12. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE:

There were no questions on notice.

Ordinary Council Meeting

16/2/16

Meeting closed at 7.45 pm

Confirmed:

(Mayor)

Date:

15th March 2016