



Brighton Council

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
OF THE BRIGHTON COUNCIL HELD
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES
OLD BEACH AT 5.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY,
20th SEPTEMBER 2016**

PRESENT: Cr Foster (Mayor); Cr Curran (Deputy Mayor); 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) and
Mr J Dryburgh (Manager Development Services)

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

1.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
OF 16th AUGUST 2016.

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Gray seconded that the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of
16th August 2016 be confirmed.*

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

1.2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
OF 13TH SEPTEMBER 2016.

*Cr Gray moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting of
13th September 2016 be confirmed.*

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

1.3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AUTHORITY MEETING OF 13TH SEPTEMBER 2016.

Cr Gray moved, Cr Owen seconded that the Minutes of the Planning Authority Meeting of 13th September 2016 be confirmed.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

2. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

Cr Geard had requested leave of absence as he will be overseas.

Cr Jeffries moved, Cr Owen seconded that Cr Geard, Cr Garlick and Cr Taylor be granted leave of absence. Cr Garlick and Cr Taylor were unwell.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND DEPUTATIONS:

- Mr M Duncan addressed Council in relation to Item 11.5

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 Jeffries seconded that Item 11.5 be brought forward and discussed. For the purpose of these Minutes the items will remain in numerical order.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

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:-.

Sep	06	Meeting with Ron and Greg re Water and Sewerage issues.
Sep	07	Meeting with Brian Mitchell (Lyons MP) and Rebecca White (Lyons MHA)
Sep	08	Council workshop at the Brighton Office re the Water and Sewerage implications for our Municipality.
Sep	12	Meeting with Sandy Menadue – Acting Principal JRLF senior school.

- Sep 12 Meeting with Madeleine Ogilvie MHA shadow minister for Local Government, Rebecca White (Lyons MHA) and David Llewellyn (Lyons MHA)
- Sep 13 Meeting with Brighton Primary School Acting Principal Angela Misedes, and other members of staff.
- Sep 13 Meeting with Ron, Greg, James and Tony Harrison re w & s.
- Sep 13 Telephone discussion with Taswater Board Chairman.
- Sep 13 Finance Committee meeting
- Sep 13 Planning Authority meeting.
- Sep 14 Meeting with Belinda Clark – Centacare Evolve
- Sep 15 Meeting with Jenny Gale – Secretary of Dept of Education.
- Sep 20 Ordinary Council Meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Mayor and Deputy Mayor’s communications be received.

DECISION:

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
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 advised he recently attended a SWSBJA meeting.

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
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, a workshop was held on the 8th September 2016 at 5.00pm to discuss the Taswater dividend situation. Councillors in attendance were Cr T Foster (Mayor); Cr B Curran (Deputy Mayor); Cr L Gray; Cr M Jeffries and Cr P Owen.

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:

There were no supplementary agenda items.

9. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

9.1 FINANCE COMMITTEE – 13/9/16:

The recommendations of the Finance Committee Meeting of 13th September 2016, were submitted to Council for adoption.

DECISION:

Cr Gray moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the recommendations of the Finance Committee meeting of 13th September 2016 be adopted.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

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 items listed on the 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 Curran moved, Cr Williams seconded that the reports be received.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

11.2 DELEGATION – LAND USE PLANNING & APPROVALS ACT 1993:

FILE REFERENCE: 0056

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

Councillors may recall that this delegation was amended in June, August 2007, December 2010, March 2011 and February 2014, however there is a need to remove/add staff based on recent changes in the organisational structure.

Section 6 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, enables a planning authority to delegate some of its functions and powers to assist in the smooth and efficient running of Council affairs.

In order for Council to make a valid delegation, legislation requires:

- a. A planning authority must have authority from legislation to delegate the Function
- b. The legislation must allow the authority to delegate the Functions or powers to Delegate
- c. An authority must resolve to make the delegation
- d. Council must resolve to seal an Instrument of Delegation

Consultation:

Senior Staff.

Risk Implications:

Council may incur legal costs if demonstrated that Council's delegation/s are invalid.

Financial Implications:

None unless delegations are deemed invalid and action is taken against Council.

Other Issues:

None identified.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
 2. Do nothing.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

That the authority resolve to delegate the following functions and powers to Ron Sanderson (General Manager); Greg Davoren (Deputy General Manager); Heath Macpherson (Asset Services Manager); Janine Banks (Governance Manager); James Dryburgh (Manager Development Services) and David Allingham (Senior Planning Officer) in accordance with Section 6 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993

1.	S.43I(4A) - Extension to s.43 permit
2.	S.53(5A) - Extension to s.57 & s.58 permit
3.	S.54 - Additional information
4.	S.55 - Correction of mistakes
5.	S.56 - Minor amendments to permits not originally determined at a Council meeting
6.	S.57(2) - Application for discretionary permit – to refuse to grant a permit within 7 days
7.	S.57(5) - To extend the 14 day representation period
8.	S.57(6) - To grant a permit where no objections were received and to refuse to grant a permit for which an extension of time has not been granted by the applicant
9.	S.57(6) and 6A) - To extend the 42 day time period
10.	S.57A – Mediation
11.	S.58 - Approval of permitted applications
12.	S.63B – Notice of suspected contravention etc may be given
13.	S.64 – Civil Enforcement proceedings
14.	S.65A – Issue and serve an infringement notice
15.	S65B – Issue a notice of intention to issue enforcement notice
16.	S.65C – Enforcement Notice
17.	S.65D – Requirements of Enforcement Notice

18.	S65F - Notice of intention to cancel a permit to be issued before permit cancelled
19.	S.71 - Planning authority may enter into agreements
20.	S.73 - Bonds and guarantees
21.	S.73A - Payments and contributions for infrastructure
22.	S.74(3) - Duration of agreement
23.	S.75 - Amendment of agreements
24.	S.78 - Registration of agreements

The Delegations are made on the following conditions:

1. The Delegation is subject to the conditions or restrictions (if any) outlined in the table above.
2. The Delegation is subject to such policies, policy guidelines and directions as the authority may from time to time approve.
3. The Delegation is subject to the Council's by-laws or the provisions of any Act.
4. That the general Instruments of Delegation in relation to the Act listed above be signed and sealed by the authority.

DECISION:

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

11.3 LGAT – BY-ELECTION (SOUTHERN ELECTORAL DISTRICT):

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

The Tasmanian Electoral Commission has been requested to conduct a by-election for one member from the *Southern Electoral District* having a population of 20,000 or less councils to fill a casual vacancy.

Nominations are invited from LGAT members and must be received by the Electoral Office by 5pm on Tuesday 18th October 2016.

Election Timetable:

Nominations open	Tuesday 6 th September
Nominations close	5pm Tuesday 18 th October
Ballot material posted (if a ballot is required)	Monday 24 th October
Close of postal ballot	10am Tuesday 6 th December
Declaration of result	Tuesday 6 th December

For the information of Council, the representative on the management Committee for the Council's having a population of less than 20,000 was Cr. Deirdre Flint, as Councillors would be aware she has since resigned from Central Highlands Council.

Consultation:

Nil.

Risk Implications:

N/A.

Financial Implications:

N/A.

Other Issues:

Nil.

Assessment:

N/A

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. That no action be taken.

RECOMMENDATION:

The matter is submitted for the direction of Council.

DECISION:

Resolved that the report be received.

11.4 PETITION TO STOP CHANGES TO DOLLERY PARK:

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

The General Manager had received a Petition from Paul Manning of 1 Dollery Court, Brighton with 86 signatures on it.

The Petition was tabled in accordance with Section 58 of the *Local Government Act 1993 (LGA)*.

Consultation:

Governance Manger, General Manager and Manager Development Services.

Risk Implications:

Nil

Financial Implications:

Nil

Other Issues:

N/A

Assessment:

Section 60 of the LGA states:-

Within 42 days after the tabling of the petition –

| *(b) the council, at that meeting, is to determine any action to be taken in respect of the petition.*

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
 2. That the petition not be received.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the petition be received;
2. That the General Manager report to the October Ordinary Council meeting to determine any action to be taken in respect of the petition.

DECISION:

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

11.5 DOLLERY PARK PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY:

AUTHOR: Manager Development Services
(Mr J Dryburgh)

Background:

At Council's April 2016 Council Meeting, Council resolved to present concept plans for subdivision of sections of Dollery Park and the Play Group site to the community, as part of a potential means to fund the further redevelopment of the old hospital building and the Army Camp open space.

This consultation occurred on 24th August in two sessions, one at 10am and one at 7:30pm. Approximately 30 people attended the morning session and 40 at the evening session.

Councillors Curran, Gray and Owen attended the meetings. Council's Manager Development Services conducted the meeting with the support of Council's Municipal Engineer, Senior Planner and Planning Officer.

Those present were asked to complete feedback forms which allowed for comments and for people to rank the four options from best to worst. It is fair to say the seemingly unanimous sentiment was so strongly against any of the proposed concepts that no one provided a ranking.

Summary of feedback received:

- NOTE: Please note a petition objecting to the subdivision of Dollery Park was also lodged with Council. This is dealt with in a separate report, however it is further demonstration of the strong opposition to the proposals.
- People did not generally have any major issues with the land associated with the Play Group being sold and redeveloped for residential purposes as it is already developed and not part of the Park.
- Quite a few people stated that they wished there was no connection through to the Army Camp. The primary reason was people passing through the park at late hours and a perceived increase in crime due to the thoroughfare.
- There was effectively unanimous opposition to the proposals to subdivide sections of the Park fronting Melaluka Court.

- Some people queried why council did not simply propose “finishing the cul-de-sac” or why another concept was not Option 2 but only Lots 1, 2 and 5. Some suggested they would be okay with Lot 5 on Option 2 being subdivided as it is next to the Play Group and doesn’t impact the Park so much (see the recommendation in this report).
- Some stressed the importance of the Play Group / family day care continuing.
- Several residents explained that they had specifically bought their house because of its proximity to the park and that they use it often, particularly with young children.
- The park is considered one of the safest areas in Brighton for young children to play, with good passive and community surveillance.
- Several residents expressed their disappointment that “Council is being greedy” and has a “no care attitude towards the community.”
- Several residents queried why, if council needed land and money so badly, were they not subdividing council-owned land off Seymour Street.
- More families are moving to Brighton and there is a growing need for a range of park and recreation facilities.
- A resident said they had bought their house only a matter of weeks earlier and had asked at Council if anything was happening to the park and were told no. They would have bought elsewhere if they thought the park was going to be subdivided.
- Concern that house values will decrease.
- Some residences face the park and have direct access to the park, which would be lost.
- Some residents noted that the Park itself has heritage significance for its military history.
- The residents of 2 Melaluka object to the proposal but request first option if council does decide to subdivide and sell land next to them. Their house is oriented towards the park.
- A pedestrian corridor to connect with the Army Camp could be created between two new lots rather than where it currently is.
- Most lots in the area are quite small meaning the Park has particular significance to many and it is a rare place of peace and quiet.
- Renumbering in the past has been a major headache for residents.
- The roads are narrow and there is a perception that any additional housing would cause traffic and parking issues.
- Residents would like some play equipment in the park.
- Uniform and improved pedestrian accesses would improve the areas for disabled, elderly and young.

- Several retired residents said they had experience and know others with expertise who would work as volunteers to restore the old hospital building to assist the overall vision.

The concepts:

Option 1

Option 1 has been shown to councillors and sent to local residents previously in May 2013. At the time (three years ago) when the concept was first flagged Council did not formally own the Old Hospital building and had not begun investing in the former army camp open space, such as building Remembrance Park and planting a large number of avenue trees. Restoration of the Old Hospital had not commenced either. As such, it would have been reasonable for local residents to feel like something was been taken away with nothing tangible been given in its place. This sentiment is less-justified now.

In summary, this option maintains the linkage/pedestrian functions of Dollery Park, a wide north-south throughway and a 'pocket park' centrally located and incorporating the mature eucalypt.

This concept creates four (4) residential lots (standard size for single dwelling development) in addition to the Playgroup site. There would be some non-standard subdivision/development costs due to proposed access to Lots 1, 3 and 4.

This option shows a potential model for subdividing the Playgroup site. However, the Playgroup site could also easily be sold as one larger lot to allow a future owner/developer to consider the ideal lot layout or to develop it for multiple dwellings. In many ways, a site between two parks with great flat pedestrian access to services is ideal for medium density development.

Of the four concepts, this retains the least area of open space.

Area POS retained: approx. 1,876m²

Option 2

Option 2 creates one (1) residential lot (a large residential lot, likely capable of being developed for a 3 unit development) in addition to the Playgroup site. The bulk of the park and its main features are retained. Subdivision/development costs are likely to be minimized do to the number of new lots created and the simple frontage and access provisions.

This option leaves the Playgroup site as one large lot.

Of the four concepts, this retains the second largest area of open space.

Area POS retained: approx. 3,083m²

Option 3

Option 3 is the 'least controversial' option. It does create two lots in addition to the Playgroup site, but these are two small single dwelling lots as opposed to one larger lot capable of containing 3 dwellings. Subdivision costs are likely to be higher than for Option 2, due to the additional lot, but lower than for Option 1 and 4.

This option also shows another potential model for subdividing the Playgroup site.

Of the four concepts, this retains the largest area of open space and maintains all of the key functions and assets of the Park.

Area POS retained: approx. 3,450m²

Option 4

Option 4 is effectively Option 3, but with an additional 571m² residential lot created next to the playgroup site. In terms of lot layout and development it is a sound proposal, but it would mean the loss of the mature eucalypt and a less flowing linkage through the open space to the army camp site.

Of the four concepts, this retains the third largest area of open space.

Area POS retained: approx. 2,880m²

Discussion:

Councillors need to consider how important subdividing sections of Dollery Park to generate revenue is, both in terms of implementing their larger vision for the area, and if doing so is likely to generate enough funds to make it worthwhile within the context of negative local sentiment.

Given residential lots are worth approximately \$100,000 in Brighton and it can cost \$30-40,000 to subdivide, it would be reasonable to assume council may profit approximately \$60,000 per lot sold. This is in the context of a likely \$400,000 - \$500,000 to fully redevelop the former hospital building.

In simple terms, creating lots from the Park-proper and for a likely profit of approximately \$120,000 for two lots, the overall value is questionable. The land associated with the Play Group site is not controversial for re-development.

Council could likely create an additional lot (or additional land as part of a larger lot) in the area of proposed Lot 5 on Option 2. It is suggested that the Play Group would need to have an alternate location to operate prior to this happening.

Consultation:

Further consultation has occurred between Council's SMT, Engineering, Planning and councillors.

Risk Implications:

The Dollery Park concepts are all clearly unpopular with local residents. Council pushing ahead with subdivision of anything other than the land of or adjoining the Play Group site would likely result in a significant backlash towards Council.

It is also a risk that the former hospital building will remain a derelict building for a long time.

Financial Implications:

It is considered ethical and reasonable as a broad approach, that some public open space is given up to generate revenue for larger, improved network of open space and community facilities. Implementing such a long term plan also helps to ensure intergenerational equity with regards to council spending on public facilities.

If the proposed recommendation is implemented Council may only profit \$180,000 - \$250,000. As such, there is still a significant short fall in funding the overall former hospital redevelopment. However, Council would be in a stronger position to seek 50:50 funding.

Council should also consider the preparation of an EOI to determine if there may be private interest in investing in the former hospital site, for example, from a private child care operator.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Other, as determined by Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council endorse the preparation for sale of the land approximately shown within Lots 1, 2 and 5 on the 'Dollery Park - Option 2 - Five residential lots' and that such development does not occur until the existing play group facility is appropriately relocated.

DECISION:

Cr Gray moved, Cr Owen seconded that Council endorse the preparation for sale of the land approximately shown within Lots 1, 2 on the 'Dollery Park - Option 1' - and that such development does not occur until the existing play group facility is appropriately relocated. Council to include a covenant over the 2 parcels of land limiting construction to single dwellings.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

11.6 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):

- There are currently discussions underway with Wilson Homes, Centacare and Holmes Dyer consultants regarding potential opportunities for some of the key sites identified via the BIHC process. It is likely some concepts for further rezonings and development plans will be presented to council in the next few months, some of which may require discussion with the parties to the BIHC Agreement regarding possible amendments.

Sites are currently being sold in Herdsmans Cove under the BIHC Agreement.

Purchase and Receipt of land:

Nothing to report.

Projects:

- **5+5+5 project:** This project has stalled due to lack of participants. An amended proposal is to be submitted to Tas Community Fund to broaden the criteria for potential participants.

Discussions are also underway about whether or not Community Blitz may be able to undertake work at the Hospital site.

- **Brighton Tomorrow:** Brighton Tomorrow co-ordinator has been engaged to assist in designing concepts for upgrade of Gagebrook, Herdsmans Cove and Bridgewater pedestrian links, including shelters. Discussions are underway about partnering for this work with Centacare Evolve.

Council staff assisted Centacare Evolve in the preparation of a TCF grant for the upgrade of the pathways, however this failed.

- **Bridgewater South Master Plan:** Nothing new to report.
- **Urban Tree Strategy:** Trees have gone in at Herdsmans Cove under the new Greening Brighton Strategy and several people have received very positive feedback.

Councils Manager DS, Works Manager and Planning Officer are investigating a planting plan within the industrial estate.

- **Bridgewater Parkland Master Plan:** has been reviewed by relevant staff and taken to the July Parks and Recreation Committee meeting. The Committee endorsed the Plan.

Crown Land have now responded. Manager DS has begun discussions with Crown Land regarding the land identified as “potential development site”.

Further work is soon to be undertaken by council staff and Play Street to ensure Stage 1 of the Plan is grant-ready by end of this financial year.

- Early discussions have been had regarding a three-way master plan project for the land off Cheswick ear-marked as having development potential and land closer to the river between Council, Centacare Evolve and MONA.
- **Promoting and improving the industrial estate:** DS staff along with engineering and works are preparing a plan to improve the appearance of the industrial estate, improve legibility for businesses and a promotion plan.

Initial ideas include: upping the maintenance intensity; facilitating improved signage for the Estate as a whole and for businesses; some landscaping of key gateways, intersections and highly visible pieces of land; engaging Palmerston Council to create a TV commercial; writing to all businesses and offering to provide certain plants and even help plant them within property frontages to improve the general appearance without creating an issues for service corridors and putting the onus of ongoing maintenance on to the businesses within the area.

- **Dollery Park Meeting:** (See separate report).

Development Applications and leases on Council-owned land:

See BIHC section (potential future applications).

Council Land Subdivisions and Sales:

Corporate Services are preparing an informal expression of interest for 84 Jetty Road, Old Beach to attempt to gauge if there is market interest in a commercial development on the site. Uniting Care have been advised of this process.

Other Strategic Matters:

- **Brighton Draft Interim Planning Scheme:**
Four scheme amendments are now active: Tivoli Green Specific Area Plan; Nelson’s Building Road Rural Living area; Cove Hill new Rural Living zoning; and the General Business Zone alteration in Hurst Street.
- **State Planning Scheme:** Nothing new to report
- **HT/Centacare Land Master plan:** See BIHC section above.

Planning Professional Services:

Professional services for planning has now significantly reduced. Brighton no longer provides planning services for Glamorgan Spring Bay and Tasman. The loss in profit is actually not major given that Council has also lost the cost of a senior planner and some other ancillary costs associated with undertaking the work for these councils.

Statutory update (August 2016):

For the past month (See Attachment).

Enforcements:

Some investigations and negotiations are in process:

- 29 Brighton Road, self storage
- Wreckers in the Industrial Estate

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 Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

11.7 COMPLETE SET OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS 2015/16:

AUTHOR: Deputy General Manager
(Mr G Davoren)

The Complete set of Financial Statements for the year ending 2015/16 were formally submitted for consideration.

The Tasmanian Audit Office has given its opinion that the Financial Statements presents fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated entities' financial position as at 30 June 2016, and of its financial performance, cash flows, and changes in equity for the year then ended. The report is in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1993* and Australian Accounting Standards.

The Financial Statements have again been passed without any qualifications by the Tasmanian Audit Office.

The Tasmanian Audit Office is responsible for the report to be completed in accordance with section 84(3) of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

The report format also complies with the Australian Equivalent to International Reporting Standards (AIFRS). The format is not generally user friendly due to its compliance to these standards so a summary has been provided below.

Highlights of the General Purpose Financial Report include:

Consolidated Statement of Comprehensive Income (P/L)

- Unqualified Audit Opinion by the Tasmanian Audit Office for Brighton Council including Microwise Australia Pty Ltd and Brighton Industrial Housing Corporation.
- Recurrent Income of \$13,077,437 down from \$14,322,466 last financial year. Predominately due to a decrease of \$1,664,446 in our Financial Assistance Grant. The Federal Government changed the timing of the payment across Australia so that 50% of the 2015/16 payment was made in the previous year. (See note 3(a)(iv))
- Total Income \$14,242,241. This includes capital income from capital grants specifically for new or upgraded assets of \$454,774, net contributions from non-monetary assets of \$703,350 less a gain on disposal of assets of \$6,031. Non-monetary assets typically include subdivision infrastructure donations.
- Other Comprehensive Income, although actually significantly negative in this instance that contributed to our overall comprehensive result included a net asset revaluation decrement of \$5,817,333. This was predominately due to a revaluation of our roads. Also, a fair value adjustment on our "Available for Sale Assets" saw a revaluation of positive \$777,231. In this instance our "Ready for Sale Assets" are actually our 2.93% ownership of TasWater.

- Total Operating Expenditure was \$13,957,109 up from \$12,991,413, last year. Expenditure includes: \$2,981,652 in depreciation. The increase in expenditure predominately reflects a CPI increase, the growth of our community and includes additional expenditure for commercial activities of \$263,740 which is partly offset by an increase in revenue for commercial activities.
- A positive operating result from continuing operations of \$285,133. With the removal of non-monetary income, Brighton Council would have made a significant loss of \$418,217. However, after adjusting for the brought forward payment from the Federal Assistance Grant paid during the previous financial year then Brighton Council would have produced a healthy surplus of \$380,317. The Auditor General's key sustainability indicators further reduce this operating result by dismissing the Roads to Recovery Grant which for the 2105/16 financial year was \$455,423 to provide an underlying deficit of \$75,000. Whilst our trend underlying surplus or deficit is positive this result identifies the Council as all but break even for this financial year.
- Microwise Australia paid \$212,165 last financial year to Brighton Council by way of consultancy and fees. This amount was used to reduce Brighton Council wages, admin and IT expenditure. Brighton Council paid Microwise \$29,359 by way of software licence fees. Microwise Australia produced \$382,078 of external revenue with external expenditure of \$96,796. This represents an external profit of \$283,282 for the financial year ending June 2016. Brighton Council's total equity in Microwise Australia has risen to \$1,171,483.
- Brighton Industrial and Housing Corporation produced \$601,364 of external revenue with external expenditure of \$338,877. This represents an external profit of \$262,487 for the financial year ending June 2016. Brighton Council's total equity in Brighton Industrial and Housing Corporation is \$743,380.
- Our professional Service which supports other Councils provided a revenue stream of \$822,017 with expenditure of \$662,861. This equates to a profit to Brighton Council of \$159,156. The financial benefit of this service does not include the direct labour savings to Brighton Council. Significant savings in Brighton Council wages are achieved when Brighton staff consults to other Councils.

Consolidated Statement of Financial Position (Balance Sheet)

All our key economic indicators are in sound shape. The following balance sheet statistics provide an excellent overall picture of our financial position at year end.

- Our current assets are 285% of our current liabilities. The benchmark recognised by the Auditor General is >100%
- Our total assets have decreased from \$183,988,700 to \$179,185,139 mainly from the \$5,817,333 infrastructure asset revaluation discussed earlier.
- Our total liabilities have reduced from \$2,028,235 to \$1,984,643 which on the scale of things is considered a minor improvement mainly due to cash flow timing.

- Our total equity has decreased from \$181,960,465 to \$177,200,496 during the financial year. This equity decrease reflects the comments provided that relate to the movement in total assets and total liabilities.
- Our total cash held at the end of the year decreased from \$5,007,604 to \$3,837,741. Negative effects on Cash Flow included the once off timing adjustment of the Federal Assistance Grant of \$798,534, the Microwise purchase of 27-29 Hurst Street Bridgewater of \$625,000 and a general increase in cash outside these extraordinary items of \$253,671.

In summary, the report outlines a strong position in the key financial management ratios of Brighton Council.

I thank Councillors for their support and long term financial vision to place Brighton Council in such a strong financial position.

Consultation:

Tasmanian Audit Office

Risk Implications:

Nil

Financial Implications:

As stated

Other Issues:

Not applicable

Assessment:

Not applicable

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
 2. That Council not receive the report.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report be received.

DECISION:

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

11.8 MICROWISE - UPDATE REPORT:

FILE REFERENCE: 0838-3

AUTHOR: General Manager
(Mr R Sanderson)

The General Manager and Deputy General Manager provided an update on the progress of Microwise at the Council meeting.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
 2. Not receive the report.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report be received.

DECISION:

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

12. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE:

There were no questions on notice.

Meeting closed at 7.10pm

Confirmed: _____
(Mayor)

Date: _____
18th October 2016