



# 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,  
15<sup>th</sup> March 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) and  
Mr D Allingham (Planning Officer)

## **1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:**

1.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF 16<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2016.

*Cr Garlick moved, Cr Curran seconded that the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting  
of 16<sup>th</sup> February 2016 be confirmed.*

**CARRIED**

### VOTING RECORD

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

1.2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING OF 8<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2016.

*Cr Gray moved, Cr Curran seconded that the Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016 be confirmed.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**2. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

*Cr Gray moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that Cr Taylor be granted leave of absence as he had been admitted into Hospital for the week.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND DEPUTATIONS:**

*There was no requirement for public question time.*

**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.*

## **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:-

- Feb 22 Meeting at Council with SMT and Bright Consultants.
- Feb 24 Attended funeral service for Brighton Bowls Club former treasurer Kevin Marshall.
- Feb 26 Greg Davoren and I met with representatives of the Gymnastic Academy at Bridgewater.
- Mar 02 Meeting at Anglicare in Hobart of "Pokies" coalition members.
- Mar 03 GM, Cathy Harper and I met with Directors of Clarence Football Club to discuss involvement in the community of Bridgewater, Gagebrook and Herdsman's Cove.
- Mar 03 Microwise Board Meeting.
- Mar 08 Uniting Care, Old Beach  
Council – Sports Grounds Policy discussion  
Anzac Day consultative group meeting  
Finance Committee Meeting  
Brenton West – STCA – workshop.
- Mar 10 Meeting with Hobart Lord Mayor Sue Hickey.
- Mar 10 Meeting with Minister Rene Hidding.
- Mar 15 Ordinary Council Meeting.  
Dorise Knight Herdsman's Cove.

---

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Mayor's communications be received.

### **DECISION:**

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

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
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 Geard attended Pontville Users Group meeting recently.

Cr Curran recently attended a meeting with Anna Wilson, Councillors and a number of Brighton Businesses.

*Resolved that the reports be received.*

**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 was a workshop held on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016 at 5.55pm to hear a presentation from the Chief Executive Officer of the Southern Tasmanian Councils Association (STCA) Mr Brenton West. Councillors in attendance were: Cr Foster (Mayor); Cr Curran (Deputy Mayor); Cr Geard; Cr Garlick; Cr Gray; Cr Jeffries; Cr Owen and Cr Williams.

## 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 – 8/3/16:

The recommendations of the Finance Committee Meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016, were submitted to Council for adoption.

## DECISION:

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Garlick seconded that the recommendations be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

### VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	

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 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 Jeffries moved, Cr Williams seconded that the report be received.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**11.2 SPORTS GROUNDS – BOOKING ARRANGEMENTS & FEES  
POLICY UPDATE:**

**FILE REFERENCE:**

**AUTHOR:** Council Services Officer  
(Ms C Harper)

---

**Background:**

Council's policy relating to booking arrangements and fees charges is out of date and has been revised to accommodate new grounds and improved facilities. There has also been change in relation to the groups that are currently using the venues.

A comparative review of fees and conditions has been undertaken across four other southern councils to establish the current benchmarks for ground hire.

The costs of grounds maintenance has risen considerably; mostly due to Council now having to pay for the watering costs and hire fees have not increased at the same rate. Last financial year costs for oval maintenance were:

	2014/15 (\$)	2015/16 (to date) (\$)
Thompson Oval	44,816.94	35,992.14
Gunn Oval	67,082.72	42,610.57
Fergusson Oval	81,151.26	41,871.30
Old Beach Oval	18,572.84	13,124.13
Cove Creek Oval	10,416.28	10,950.22
Weily Park Oval	40,584.07	34,614.22
Seymour Street	44,816.94	35,992.14

### **Consultation:**

Cr Tony Foster (Mayor), Cr Peter Geard (Chairperson Parks and Rec Committee), Janine Banks (Governance Manager), Heath Macpherson (Municipal Engineer), Scott Percey (Works Manager), Cathy Harper (Council Services Officer).

### **Risk Implications:**

Nil.

### **Financial Implications:**

There would be an increase in revenue for ground hire.

### **Other Issues:**

Local Clubs are not charged for their respective training hours i.e. cricket, football. That these training hours be recorded as a donation in Council's Annual Reports.

### **Assessment:**

In recent years the cost of grounds/oval maintenance has significantly increased, along with improved facilities and even a new oval being developed. The increase in fees and charges for the use of the venues has been minimal during the time.

The facility hirers have changed over time and are updated in Council's policy to reflect the current situation.

During Championships ie. cricket, Council has to provide staff to maintain the wicket during the day; this should be chargeable and will be reflected in the Policy and annual fees & charges.

Other changes suggested in regard to conditions of hire, including cancellations will more similarly match other Council's in the region and bring Council into line with current practice.



**Options:**

1. As per the recommendation.
  2. Council approve the new policy with amendments
  3. Council not approve the policy update.
- 

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That:-

1. Council adopt updated Policy 8.1 – Sporting Ground – Usage arrangements; and
2. Training hours not currently charged to local Clubs is recorded as a donation in Council’s Annual Reports.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Geard moved, Cr Garlick seconded that the recommendation be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**11.3 STCA MEMBERSHIP:**

**FILE REFERENCE:**

**AUTHOR:** Manager Development Services  
(Mr J Dryburgh)

---

**Background:**

At Council’s February meeting, Council resolved to consider its membership of the STCA at this (March) meeting. The following background was provided in the February report:

*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 2016-7 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.*

Subsequent to this, Council's Manager Development Services attended the March STCA Board Meeting and reported back to councilors via email the discussions surrounding Brighton's membership decision by the STCA Board.

Discussions at the Board Meeting can be summarized as follows:

- The Lord Mayor expressed concern about Brighton leaving and its effect on the STCA.
- Lord Mayor was concerned it was a lack of faith in her as Chair and offered to stand down as Chair if it would help Brighton to stay in.
- Most in the room expressed concern that Brighton leaving would damage the STCA, and not be a good look when the STCA is lobbying for things, such as the Bridgewater Bridge.
- Lord Mayor said she thought it was important that Brighton remain a member for a range of projects, for example, light rail corridor, and that she thinks it should extend to Bridgewater.

- There seemed to be a perception in the room that our consideration of membership might be a political move, rather than a pragmatic of financial move.
- Lord Mayor, CEO and others recognised that the STCA performance had not been amazing of late, but that this has been recently addressed by a recent performance review of the CEO and the STCA, which has set a number of KPI's that are to be achieved in the next 12 months, many of which regard significant regional projects.
- It is particularly important to remain part of STCA in an election year for potential lobbying and funding pitching.
- Peter Gutwein had spoken prior to this discussion about planning reform amongst other things, and it was noted that Regional planning strategies are to be re-done next year, and that this was a key role of the STCA on behalf of the 12 councils.
- It was also noted that the issue of dog pounding and southern waste matters are being, and are best pursued via the STCA.
- Glenorchy also raised the issue of proposed changes to the LG Act and Building Regulations, Bushfire, etc, and the value of being able to take a regional position on some of these matters, such as new charging and fee structures that will soon need to be considered to support these changes.

**A motion was then moved as:**

Moved: Mayor Coad, Seconded: Mayor Kent

*The STCA expresses confidence in the Chair and strongly urges the Brighton Council to remain a member of the Authority, given the importance of working together as a region, and encourages the Council to work together with the STCA through its representatives to address the strategic issues impacting Southern Tasmania.*

Carried unanimously.

**In summarising the STCA Board discussions regarding Brighton Council's membership:**

There was a unanimous view at the Board meeting that the STCA will be stronger and Brighton will be stronger if Brighton Council remains a member and that we should at least give them another 12 months.

Council's Manager Development Services also spoke to the GM of Tasman and Sorell, Rob Higgins, as they were not represented at the meeting. He said that whilst some councillors have expressed concerns about the STCA and its relevance to their councils, they have no plans to withdraw their membership.

**Consultation:**

Consultation has occurred between Council's Senior Management Team, the CEO of LGAT, CEO of STCA, the Board of STCA and Brighton's 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 do 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 cancel its membership of the STCA.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council remain a member of the STCA for another year and review its ongoing membership in February 2017. Council should be more active in seeking greater value for Brighton from its membership over the next 12 months.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Curran seconded that the recommendation be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

## **11.4 SUB-REGION COLLABORATION STRATEGY:**

### **FILE REFERENCE:**

**AUTHOR:** Manager Development Services  
(Mr J Dryburgh)

---

### **Background:**

At its November Ordinary Meeting, Council endorsed the formation of a sub-region consisting of Brighton, Derwent Valley, Central Highlands and Southern Midlands Councils. Southern Midlands and Central Highlands have also endorsed the Sub-region. Derwent Valley deferred a decision, pending consideration of a strategy to frame the proposed collaboration.

Since then, relevant staff from each of the four councils have met to further develop the draft strategy, including a set of initial priorities for action (please see Attachment 1).

The purpose of this report is three-fold:

1. That Council endorse the Strategy and Initial Action Plan within it.

The Strategy and Action Plan will evolve over time as the sub-region progresses, but the attached document is considered to capture the main opportunities for collaboration at present. Alteration of the Strategy can be put back before Councils for endorsement if significant changes are deemed necessary in future.

2. That Council elect a councillor to act as the Council's representative on a Steering Committee that would be responsible for:
  - monitoring progress in respect to each of the action plans;
  - providing regular updates to Council;
  - seeking input and feedback from Council in regard to ongoing issues and opportunities that could be addressed on a sub-regional basis; and
  - referring any proposed activities to Council which may require an allocation of funds or budget consideration.
3. It is also recommended that Council be willing to further the Sub-region with Southern Midlands and Central Highlands only, if Derwent Valley choose to defer or reject pursuing collaborative projects as a sub-region. It is not necessary for the idea of the Sub-region to stall on behalf of one of the four councils and there is no reason why Derwent Valley could not join the group at a later date if this suits them better.

It is expected that a report similar to this one will be put to each of the four councils in March.

It is also expected that the first meeting of the Steering Committee will be held as soon as possible after its formation and that one of the first items for consideration will be a presentation from local consultants about a history story-telling project to attract visitation across the Sub-region. It is also expected that the Steering Committee will immediately request relevant council staff begin work on the items listed within the Action Plan.

**Consultation:**

Consultation has occurred between Council’s Manager DS, GM and the GMs of the other three councils.

**Risk Implications:**

There is no risk to Council.

**Financial Implications:**

It is expected that Council will, in collaboration with the other councils involved, invest in projects to benefit the Sub-region. However, any significant expenditure would be brought back to Council for approval.

**Options:**

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:-

1. Endorse the Sub-region Collaboration Strategy
2. Elect a Council representative for the Steering Committee of the Sub-region Group.
3. Resolve to pursue the Sub-region Group with all or any of the four councils (Southern Midlands, Central Highlands and Derwent Valley)

**DECISION:**

*Cr Curran moved, Cr Geard seconded that the recommendation be adopted, and that Council’s representative on the Steering Committee be the Mayor.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

## **11.5 ENDORSEMENT OF INFORMAL PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF THE DRAFT BRIDGEWATER PARKLAND PRECINCT MASTER PLAN:**

### **FILE REFERENCE:**

**AUTHOR:** Manager Development Services  
(Mr J Dryburgh)

---

### **Background:**

The purpose of this report is to seek council endorsement for the informal public exhibition of the Draft Bridgewater Parkland Precinct Master Plan.

Councillors should be clear that this report is not seeking an endorsement of the Master Plan itself, but merely that council allow the public the opportunity to view it and to make comment on it, which is an important step in developing the working master plan for Council endorsement.

It is recommended the Draft Master Plan be placed on exhibition for four weeks in order to give the community ample time to comment and to allow the exhibition to be advertised within the Brighton Community News.

After public submissions have been considered, by both council staff and the consultant team, and a workshop held by the Parks and Recreation Committee, the Master Plan and accompanying report will come back to Council with a recommendation that Council endorse the report as a guiding document for future development of the subject land.

### **Consultation:**

Consultation so far has been between relevant council staff, the consultant team and various representatives of community groups and organisations.

### **Risk Implications:**

There are no risk implications.

### **Financial Implications:**

There will be a community expectation that Council begin working on implementing the Master Plan in the not-to-distant future. Costing estimates have not been done yet.

### **Options:**

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council resolve to endorse the informal exhibition of the Draft Bridgewater Parkland Precinct Master Plan.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Gray moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the recommendation be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**11.6 BECOMING A COTA (COUNCIL ON THE AGEING) TAS ORGANISATIONAL MEMBER:**

**FILE REFERENCE:**

**AUTHOR:** Planning Officer  
(Mr R Cuskelly)

---

**Background:**

Tasmania's age composition is projected to become considerably older over the coming decades. At the 2011 Census, one in six Tasmanians were aged 65+ years. In 2020, it will be roughly one in five, and in 2030, roughly one in four. Though Brighton's median age is younger than the Tasmanian average, it is still experiencing the same structural ageing change.

To this end, Brighton Council Development Services were recently visited by a COTA TAS representative to outline the work of the organisation and the benefits of membership.

COTA TAS is Tasmania's peak seniors' advocacy body. The organisation consults with its organisational members, who are in turn represented when COTA TAS is invited to sit on a range of committees, advisory groups and research bodies. The organisation works to raise awareness of the World Health Organisation (WHO) age-friendly community ethos, as well as assist local governments to help develop age-friendly communities.



An age-friendly community, as defined by the WHO, is not just one that is an 'elderly-friendly'. Rather, it is one that emphasises the importance of enabling the more vulnerable members of the community to confidently participate in society.

COTA TAS have published several reports on the needs of older Tasmanians. The *Facing the Future* report, released in late 2013, was the first in an underpinning research project in a series of five to be delivered as part of the State Government's *Inclusive Ageing Strategy*. The *Finding Out – information needs of older Tasmanians* report was published by COTA TAS in mid-2015 also as part of the Strategy.

COTA TAS membership is non-binding and is simply indicative of a broad commitment to age-friendly initiatives such as:

- safe and connected pedestrian environments;
- affordable housing;
- inviting and inclusive public community spaces; &
- a supportive transportation network.

These are all initiatives that have wide-ranging benefits to the whole community.

Three other Tasmanian councils are currently organisational members of COTA TAS:

Hobart City Council  
Central Coast Council  
Southern Midlands Council

### **Consultation:**

Consultation has occurred between Council's Manager Development Services, Planning Officer and the COTA TAS representative.

### **Risk Implications:**

There are no risk implications.

### **Financial Implications:**

For Council to become an Organisational Member entails a yearly fee of \$110, or \$55 for six months. It is envisaged that there will be some staff in-kind support from time to time. However, this support is not mandatory and any requests for assistance will be determined at the time by appropriate staff.

It is considered of some value to be able to pitch Brighton as an age-friendly community in order to help attract residential growth. There are several potential development areas within the Municipal area that lend themselves to age-friendly developments.

### **ASSESSMENT:**

#### **Examples of Age-friendly Features**

##### **Outdoor spaces**

- Footpaths are continuous and accommodate wheelchairs and scooters.
- Green spaces and outdoor seating are sufficient and well-maintained.

- Services are accessible and situated together where possible.

## Transport

- Roads are well-maintained, well-lit and are supported by clearly visible signage.
- Specialised public transport is available for disabled people.
- Public transport stops are conveniently located, accessible, safe, clean, well-lit and well-marked, with adequate seating and shelter.

## Housing

- Housing is located in close proximity to services.
- Information on home modifications is readily available and easily accessed by seniors.

## Clear communication

- Clear and accessible information is provided about health and social services for older people.
- Decision-making bodies in public, private and voluntary sectors encourage and facilitate membership of older people.

## Conclusion:

Becoming an organisational member of COTA TAS demonstrates that Council is aware of the continuing ageing population trend, and acknowledges the importance of building communities that are age-friendly. It is hoped that COTA TAS Membership will assist Council in better planning and infrastructure for the elderly, improved understanding of issues and opportunities and better communication with the relevant communities.

It should also be noted that age-friendly design also tends to be much better for children and those with disabilities.

## Options:

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

---

## RECOMMENDATION:

That Council resolve to become an organisational member of COTA TAS.

## 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

## 11.7 MONTHLY PLANNING UPDATE:

### FILE REFERENCE:

**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 late March now. There is difficulty finding a supervisor at present.  
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 40<sup>0</sup> 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. Boral have advised that they have been undertaking details diamond drilling to assist in accurately defining the potential future development area. This should be finalized by the end of March.

- **UTAS MOU:** Over the next few months UTAS is going to be partnering with our planning department to undertake municipal 'social mapping', assist with statistics and trend profiling and hopefully work with the Bridgewater Trade Training Centre to undertake some design-build projects.

### **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 is under way in Old Beach.

### **Council Land Subdivisions and Sales:**

Nothing new.

### **Other Strategic Matters:**

- **Brighton Draft Interim Planning Scheme:** Urgent Amendments: An inaccurate section of the Waterway Code overlay has been removed from a site in Blackstone Drive, Old Beach.
- **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 11<sup>th</sup> February with Council staff. Draft expected in the next couple months.
- **Age friendly communities:** (Separate report put to this Council meeting)
- **Disability housing:** (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). Glamorgan Spring Bay is especially busy with a series of significant projects. Some shuffling of Brighton staff is currently underway.

**Other matters:** None

### **Statutory update (February 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 Gray moved, Cr Curran seconded that the report be received.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**11.8 REVIEW OF COUNCIL POLICIES – PART 1 (RATES & FINANCE):**

**AUTHOR:** Governance Manager  
(Mrs J Banks)

---

**Background:**

As requested at the last Council Meeting, any policies that relate to finances should be reviewed.

**Consultation:**

Deputy General Manager

**Risk Implications:**

Council Officers referring to outdated policies.

**Financial Implications:**

Policies may not reflect current financial management.

**Other Issues:**

N/A

**Assessment:**

The following Policies from Part 1 (Rates & Finance) have been reviewed by the Deputy General Manager, with minor amendments being made to Policy 1.11 - Debt Collection - Water i.e. removal of paragraphs relating to overdue water accounts. The following policies do not require any changes.

Policy 1.4	Rates - Church
Policy 1.5	Pensioner Rates remissions - application of penalty and/or interest
Policy 1.10	Debt Collection - Rates
Policy 1.13	Authority to write off bad debts
Policy 1.14	First Home Builders/Buyers Grant - financial assistance

**Options:**

1. As per the recommendation.
2. That the Policies not be reviewed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Policy No's 1.4; 1.5; 1.10; 1.13 and 1.14 remain unchanged and that Policy 1.11 is updated to reflect the administrative changes to overdue water accounts.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Garlick moved, Cr Curran seconded that the recommendation be adopted, with the exception that Policy 1.14 be revoked.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

## **11.9 REVIEW OF COUNCIL POLICIES – PART 2 (COUNCILLORS & COUNCIL ELECTION & PART 7 (MISCELLANEOUS PROCEDURES):**

**AUTHOR:** Governance Manager  
(Mrs J Banks)

---

### **Background:**

As requested at the last Council Meeting, any policies that relate to finances should be reviewed.

Policy 2.2 – Reports from Council Representatives with other Organisations, although does not relate to finances is being recommended to be revoked.

### **Consultation:**

Governance Manager

### **Risk Implications:**

Council Officers referring to outdated policies.

### **Financial Implications:**

Policies may not reflect current financial management.

### **Other Issues:**

N/A

### **Assessment:**

*Policy 2.7 – Reports from Council Representatives with other Organisations*, is being requested to be revoked. These Items have remained on the Ordinary Council Agenda template and will remain as such. Not thought relevant to have a Policy to advise that these Items be included on the Council Agendas.

*Policy 7.1 – Education Bursary – Jordan River Learning Federation*. Request that this remain the same i.e. \$500 over two years.

*Policy 7.7 – Donation – Brighton Agricultural Society*. Request that this remain the same i.e. Council remit ground hire fees for the Annual Show and Council provide a \$500 donation for prizes/trophy.

### **Options:**

1. As per the recommendation.
  2. That the Policies not be reviewed.
-

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Policy 2.7 - *Reports from Council Representatives with other Organisations* be revoked and that Policies 7.1 - *Education Bursary – Jordan River Learning Federation* and 7.7 - *Donation – Brighton Agricultural Society* remain unchanged

**DECISION:**

*Cr Gray moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the recommendation be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**11.10 HOBART – NORTHERN SUBURBS LIGHT RAIL PROJECT:**

**FILE REFERENCE:**

**AUTHOR:** General Manager  
(Mr R Sanderson)

**Background:**

Several years ago Mayor Foster was a member of a committee representing the State Government, Councils, Metro and consultants overseeing a study into the viability of a light rail service utilising the unused rail corridor from Hobart to Brighton.

An interim report concluded that the service to Brighton would be uneconomical and recommended that the line be terminated at Claremont. As Brighton was no longer being considered, Mayor Foster resigned from the committee.

There has been a resurgence of interest and support to utilise the rail corridor for transport to and from the city. Hobart and Glenorchy councils are funding a consultancy to look at developments within the catchments of a public transit system utilising the rail corridor. With state and federal elections looming there is pressure for government funding to support the development of such a system.

Mayor Foster has met with Ben Johnson (Chair of the Northern Suburbs Light Rail Project) to discuss the inclusion of Bridgewater/Brighton in any new project plans.

It is proposed that Brighton Council formally support the renewed studies into public transport systems on the unused rail corridor that extend the services to Bridgewater/Brighton.



**Consultation:**

Mayor and SMT

**Risk Implications:**

None.

**Financial Implications:**

None, as there is no financial commitment. There may be some work identified in the future that will require funding.

**Other Issues:**

If Brighton does not become actively involved in such projects the studies will not extend to our municipality.

**Assessment:**

Brighton has long been cited as an ideal place for park and ride facilities, whether it be for light rail or buses. While there is no strong support by the state government for a project at this time there is mounting pressure by the general public and councils.

Where there is any chance of funding for such a transport system, Brighton needs to be actively involved to ensure that a system crosses the river into our municipality.

**Options:**

- 1. Adopt the recommendation
- 2. Do nothing

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council formally support the renewed studies into public transport systems on the unused rail corridor that extend the services to Bridgewater/Brighton.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the recommendation be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**11.11 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 Garlick moved, Cr Gray seconded that the report be received.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Owen	
Cr Williams	

**12. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE:**

*Cr Owen has asked the following questions:-*

In relation to the raceway I wish to know answers to the following please...

**1. Does Council have any control over activities at Baskerville and if so what?**

*Yes. The ongoing use of the track must be in accordance with any permit issued by the Council. If there is no permit i.e. the racetrack was established before any permits existed then ongoing use must not substantially change or intensify without further approvals from Council. Any further development of the land or other change or intensification of the land i.e. substantially different events, substantial changes to tracks and location of tracks and events etc will require either amendment to any existing permit or require a new permit*

under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993. Any activities on the land that cause an environmental nuisance or harm to persons is regulated by the Council under the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994.

**2. Does Baskerville Raceway need permits from Council of any description to operate and what are those permits?**

The Baskerville Raceway has existing use rights. They are not required to seek or renew permits for the ongoing use of the land. Should the owner seek to change or intensify the use of the land then a new permit for such a change will be required from the Council per above. Therefore new development, such as a new track, new buildings, changes to operation hours etc will require either amendment to an existing permit or require a new permit as regulated by the Planning Scheme.

**3. Nuisance noise, tyre smoke/fumes and dust beyond the 500 metre buffer are administered/controlled by who and what is the complaint mechanism?**

Race Tracks were regarded as a 'level 2' activity under EMPCA until approximately 12 years ago when they were rescheduled as 'level 1' and managed by Council.

Any reference to the 500m buffer have been since removed from Schedule 2 of the Act and are no longer relevant.

**4. Engine horsepower and exhaust noise levels have changed significantly in the last 20 years....when we're the last noise level measurements taken and who is responsible for taking them ?**

Council has been advised by representatives from the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) that any noise readings and recommendations from 1999 (the last time they were recorded) are unreliable and should not be used.

The current Noise Regulations stipulate that a vehicle cannot be used for sport or recreational within 500m (no reference to earlier buffer) of a residence and the 'new' track being within 500m of the complainants property is therefore illegal.

Meeting closed at 6.45 pm

Confirmed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Mayor)

Date:

\_\_\_\_\_  
19<sup>th</sup> Apri 2016