



Brighton Council

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
OF THE BRIGHTON COUNCIL HELD IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, COUNCIL OFFICES, OLD BEACH
AT 5.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY,
18th MAY 2021**

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

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Dryburgh (General Manager); Mr G Davoren (Deputy General Manager); Mrs J Banks (Governance Manager); Mr D Allingham (Manager Development Services) and Mr H Macpherson (Municipal Engineer).

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY:

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

2.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF 20th APRIL 2021

Cr Owen moved, Cr Curran seconded that the Minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting of 20th April 2021, be confirmed.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

2.2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AUTHORITY MEETING OF 11th MAY 2021

Cr Gray moved, Cr Geard seconded that the Minutes of the Planning Authority meeting of 11th May 2021, be confirmed.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

3. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

All members were present.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND DEPUTATIONS:

There was no requirement for public question time.

5. 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.

6. REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS:

6.1 MAYOR’S COMMUNICATIONS:

Mayor Tony Foster provided a verbal update at the meeting.

DECISION:

Cr Garlick 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

6.2 REPORTS FROM COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS:

DECISION:

- Cr Curran attended a STCA meeting with the General Manager on 17th May 2021.
- Cr Owen attended a luncheon with the General Manager - Reconciliation collective.
- Cr Geard attended the Hobart Fire Area Committee.
- Cr Geard and Cr Curran attended the Pontville User Group meeting.

Cr Whelan 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

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

Correspondence and reports from the STCA, LGAT, TasWater and Joint Authorities.

7. NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL WORKSHOPS:

In accordance with the requirements of Section 8(2)(c) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, it was reported that a budget workshop was held at 4.00pm on the 11th May 2021. Councillors in attendance were:- Mayor Foster, Deputy Mayor Curran, Cr Garlick, Cr Geard, Cr Gray, Cr Jeffries, Cr Murtagh, Cr Owen and Cr Whelan.

8. NOTICES OF MOTION:

No 'Notices of Motion' were received for the May Ordinary Council Meeting.

9. 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.

10. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

There were no committee reports for the May Ordinary Council Meeting.

11. 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 11 on this agenda, inclusive of any supplementary items.

There were no planning reports for the May Ordinary Council Meeting.

12. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS:

12.1 BUDGET 2021 – 2022:

AUTHOR: Deputy General Manager
(Mr G Davoren)

Background:

The draft 2021-2022 budget and Fees & Charges Register has been provided to all Councillors. The budget review workshop has been undertaken and the draft budget has been completed in accordance with Councillors' demands and it is now ready to be adopted in principle.

Consultation:

Councillors, Senior Management, ratepayers and other stakeholders.

Risk Implications:

Nil

Financial/Budget Implications:

As per the budget.

Strategic Plan:

Considered within the budget.

Social Implications:

Considered within the budget.

Environmental or Climate Change Implications:

Considered within the budget.

Economic Implications:

Considered within the budget.

Other Issues:

Nil.

Assessment:

In accordance with the *Local Government Act 1993*, the budget may not be adopted more than one month before the start of that financial year. It is intended that the budget be adopted in principle only.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Review the budget and make further changes prior to adoption in principle.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the 2021-2022 budget be adopted in principle.

DECISION:

Cr Curran moved, Cr Geard 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

12.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA (LGAT) – ELECTION OF GENERAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE & PRESIDENT:

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

Nominations for the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT) election of the General Management Committee and President closed on 21st April 2021. Ballot material has been received with the following nominations for the Southern Electoral District (under 20,000):-

- Cheryl ARNOL – Glamorgan Spring Bay
- Alex GREEN – Southern Midlands

Ordinary Council Meeting

18/05/2021

- Tennille MURTAGH – Brighton
- Frank PEARCE – Derwent Valley
- Kelly SPAULDING - Tasman

Southern Electoral District (more than 20,000):-

- Flora FOX - Kingborough
- Richard JAMES – Clarence
- Bec THOMAS - Glenorchy

President:-

- Christina HOLMDAHL – West Tamar
- Ben SHAW – Derwent Valley
- Bec THOMAS – Glenorchy

Consultation:

Not applicable.

Risk Implications:

Nil.

Financial/Budget Implications:

Not applicable.

Strategic Plan:

Goal 4:

S4:2 – Be well-governed.

S4:3 – A shaping agenda facilitated through strong engagements.

Social Implications:

Not applicable.

Environmental or Climate Change Implications:

Not applicable.

Economic Implications:

Nil.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. That the Ballot material not be completed and returned to the Tasmanian Electoral Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Ballot material received by the Tasmanian Electoral Commission be completed and returned to the Commission by close of postal ballot 10am Thursday 17th June 2021.

DECISION:

Cr Owen moved, Cr Whelan 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

12.3 DOG REGISTRATION & KENNEL LICENCE FEES 2021-2022:

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

Under Brighton's Dog Management Policy 2021, Council is required to adopt dog registration and kennel licence fees annually.

It is proposed to bring fees gradually into line with the true cost involved with maintaining animal control services as well as inflation increases.

Therefore, a slight increase in dog registration and kennel licence fees is recommended for this financial year.

Consultation:

Governance Manager.

Risk Implications:

Nil.

Financial Implications:

As provided.

Assessment:

A comparison between the current (2020-21) and proposed dog registration and kennel licence fees for the 2021-2022 financial years are as follows:-

	CURRENT 2020-2021	PROPOSED DISCOUNTED 2021-2022	FULL RATE 2021-2022
	Paid by July 31	Paid by July 31	Paid after July 31
Domestic Dog (desexed)	\$31.00	\$35.00	\$50.00
Domestic Dog (not desexed)	\$83.00	\$85.00	\$100.00
Working Dog	\$47.00	\$50.00	\$65.00
TGRB registered Greyhound	\$47.00	\$50.00	\$65.00
Pure Bred Dog kept for breeding	\$47.00	\$50.00	\$65.00
Dangerous Dog (declared under the Act)	\$517.00	\$520.00	\$520.00
Assist Dog	Nil	Nil	Nil

The following concession rates can apply to **ONE** dog only per owner and a Pensioner Concession Card or Health Care Card must be sighted at the time of payment.

	CURRENT 2020-2021	PROPOSED DISCOUNTED 2021-2022	FULL RATE 2021-2022
	Paid by July 31	Paid by July 31	Paid after July 31
Concession Rates			
Domestic Dog (desexed)	\$25.00	\$30.00	\$45.00
Domestic Dog (not desexed)	\$52.00	\$55.00	\$70.00

Fees will be discounted to the above rates if registrations are paid by 31st July 2021 or otherwise the full rate will apply.

Renewal of kennel licences and other related dog/animal fees are as follows:-

Kennel Licences & Fees	CURRENT 2020-2021	PROPOSED DISCOUNTED RATE 2021-2022	FULL RATE 2021-2022
Renewal	\$134.00	\$135.00	\$165.00
Dog Complaint Fee - Reimbursed	\$93.00	\$95.00	\$95.00
Replacement Tags	\$3.00 each	\$5.00 each	\$5.00 each

Animal Agistment Fee	\$47.00 per day	\$50.00 per day	\$50.00 per day
Reclaim Fees from the Dogs Home	\$75.00 per dog	\$75.00 per dog	\$75.00 per dog

Other Issues:

Not applicable.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. That Council not adopt the Animal Control Fees for the 2021-2022 financial year.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council adopts the proposed Animal Control Fees for the 2021-2022 financial year, as listed in the report.

DECISION:

Cr Whelan 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

12.4 AUDIO RECORDING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS - POLICY:

AUTHOR: Governance Manager
(Mrs J Banks)

Background:

Councillor Owen submitted a Notice of Motion to the March 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, asking that Council return to its consideration of implementing audio recording of open Council meetings.

The following motion was passed unanimously by Council at that meeting:

Cr Owen moved, Cr Foster seconded that Council meetings be audio recorded and made public on the Brighton Council website as soon as is practically possible.

Council is currently investigating options in terms of utilising existing software and equipment to digitally audio record open meetings of Council, with a view to keeping costs to a minimum, whilst establishing a reliable and effective means of audio recording.

In preparation for the commencement of audio recording, a draft policy for the Audio Recording of Council Meetings has been prepared for Council's review and endorsement.

It is suggested that the introduction of audio recording would be the ideal time for all Councillors and senior staff members to undertake a refresher training on Council meeting procedures - *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*. Council officers will investigate recommended training providers for this topic through the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT).

It is anticipated that the audio recording of meetings will be implemented at the beginning of the new financial year, July 2021.

Consultation:

Senior Management Team, Executive Officer.

Risk Implications:

Other Councils in Tasmania that have introduced audio recording, have identified two key risks:

- Defamation
- Reticence to provide qualified officer advice 'on the spot'.

In the case of these two identified risks, the assessment is typically that these are not considered likely to occur any more frequently than if audio recording was not in place and there has not been any direct experience or evidence of this occurring at other Councils specifically due to the introduction of audio recording.

Financial Implications:

Minimal given existing microphone equipment in the Council meeting room and availability of cost effective online platforms available to digitally record meetings.

Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Strengthen our Communities.

S1.4: Support Connected Communities.

Goal 4: Ensure a Stable Organisation.

S4.2: Be well-governed.

Social Implications:

The introduction of audio recording of Council meetings typically operates on the premise that it facilitates the public's involvement and engagement in the democratic process of local government, making meetings more accessible to residents, ratepayers and members of the public.

Audio recording of meetings serves to improve perceptions of transparency given the accessibility to hear Council debate and decisions via an audio recording without needing to be physically present at a meeting. For these reasons, it is now common practice across many councils in Tasmania to digitally audio record council meetings.

Environmental or Climate Change Implications:

Not applicable.

Economic Implications:

Not applicable.

Assessment:

The introduction of audio recording of open Council meetings at Brighton Council should be a relatively simple and straight forward task, involving minimal risk and clear benefits to the public in relation to accessibility and increased transparency of the local government decision making process.

Options:

1. As per the recommendations.
2. Do not endorse draft Policy - Audio Recording of Council Meetings.

RECOMMENDATION:

Council endorses the Audio Recording of Council Meetings Policy (May 2021), to be reviewed in 2025, or earlier if required.

DECISION:

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

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour

Cr Curran
Cr Foster
Cr Garlick
Cr Geard
Cr Gray
Cr Jeffries
Cr Owen
Cr Whelan

Against

Cr Murtagh

12.5 BRIDGEWATER MEMORIAL RESERVE RELOCATION:

AUTHOR: Manager Development Services
(Mr D Allingham)

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement to relocate the Memorial Reserve adjacent to Nielsen Esplanade, Bridgewater due to the impact of the Bridgewater Bridge Project.

Background:

The Bridgewater Bridge Project Team has approached Council about possible suitable locations to relocate the Memorial Reserve currently located on Brighton Council land on the Bridgewater foreshore, adjacent to Nielsen Esplanade and downstream of the existing Bridgewater Bridge.

The Memorial Reserve is within the declared Major Project area and it is likely that the location of the Memorial Reserve will be impacted by either permanent works or temporary works during construction, and therefore there is a need for it to be relocated to a more suitable location outside the project area.

Consultation Done to Date

Early consultation on the relocation of the Memorial Reserve was undertaken in 2010 as part of the Bridgewater Bridge Replacement Study. Subsequent to that study, Brighton Council sought feedback on the proposed relocation in September and October 2010, with no issues identified.

More recently, the New Bridgewater Bridge project team have consulted with:

- Brighton Council
- Veterans Memorial Centre
- RSL Tasmania (including Claremont and Brighton/Green Ponds sub-branches)
- Broader community as part of public consultation on reference design
- Broader community through public notice at Memorial Reserve site

Key issues raised through consultation:

- The Veterans Memorial Centre have expressed interest in relocating elements of the memorial reserve (gates, trees etc) to their site at 25 Old Main Road, Bridgewater.
- The project team has concerns about this, given the limited access to the site, noting that access is via a small laneway and a locked gate.
- RSL Tasmania expressed concern about community perception that the Veterans Memorial Centre is a motorcycle club.
- RSL have also expressed their desire for the memorial to remain in Bridgewater, and to ensure that it is accessible.

Possible Locations

Council staff have identified two possible suitable locations for the memorial to be relocated on Council land within Bridgewater as below:

Option 1 - Bridgewater Parkland (adjacent to Hayfield Place)



Option 2 - Warruga Park



The Bridgewater Parkland option is the preferred option as it has greater visibility and accessibility for the public.

Next Steps

Following the endorsement of an alternative location, the New Bridgewater Bridge project team intends to run a two-week public consultation process inviting members of the community and key stakeholder groups to raise any concerns with the proposed location. This would include seeking out any members of the community who wish to work with the project team during the relocation. The consultation would be advertised via:

- New Bridgewater Bridge project webpage.
- Direct engagement with key stakeholders (RSL Tas, Veterans Memorial Centre).
- E-newsletter.
- Advertisement/article in Brighton Community News.

The project team would then undertake the work necessary to facilitate the relocation (engagement of landscape architect, preparation and submission of DA to Brighton Council, engagement of contractor to undertake the site works).

Consultation:

Council's Senior Management Team have agreed "Option 1" is the preferred location. See "next steps" above for proposed community consultation about the location.

Risk Implications:

If the memorial is not relocated during the construction phase of the Bridgewater Bridge project, it will not be accessible to the public.

There is minimal risk with relocating the Memorial Reserve that cannot be addressed through community consultation and a Development Application.

Financial/Budget Implications:

The relocation will be funded by the Bridgewater Bridge Project Team (Department of State Growth).

Maintenance on the relocated Memorial is expected to be the same as the existing one.

Social Implications:

The relocated Memorial will allow people to continue to pay their respects when the Bridgewater Bridge Project commences.

Environmental Implications:

Any impacts on the foreshore will be considered through a planning application.

Economic Implications:

Nil.

Assessment:

Relocation of the Memorial Reserve is required when construction of the new Bridgewater Bridge commences in 2022 and it is best to find a suitable location now. The memorial should remain on public land and the Bridgewater Parkland site is the preferred option subject to community consultation and a planning permit.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Nominate an alternative location for the Memorial Reserve.
3. Other

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that Council endorse the relocation of the Memorial Reserve, adjacent to Nielsen Esplanade, to the Bridgewater Parkland, adjacent to Hayfield Place, subject to further community consultation and the receipt of a planning permit.

DECISION:

Cr Curran moved, Cr Geard 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

12.6 CRIS FITZPATRICK PARK MASTER PLAN:

AUTHOR: Manager Development Services
(Mr D Allingham)

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement of the Cris Fitzpatrick Park Master Plan (the "Master Plan").

Background:

Cris Fitzpatrick Park (CFP) is the largest developed park in the suburbs of Gagebrook and Herdsman's Cove.

Historically, CFP has not been used by the local community as frequently as one would expect and has been subject to ongoing graffiti and vandalism.

In recent years, Council has attempted to continue to provide improvements to the park, such as resealing pathways, tree planting and adding soft fall around the play equipment. However, the upgrades have been somewhat ad-hoc, with no overarching plan for CFP and no real community consultation.

In May 2020, Council engaged Inspiring Place to prepare a Master Plan for CFP. The core objectives of the project were to:

- Engage with the community to gain a better understanding of the barriers to use for Cris Fitzpatrick Park and what will make the park more desirable.
- To develop a comprehensive Cris Fitzpatrick Park Master Plan that Council can implement in stages to create a more desirable playground area and community space.

The first phase of the project was to engage with the community and understand the existing use of the park and to understand what improvements the community desired.

Overall, 164 surveys were completed through a combination of face-to-face surveys at Bond place, online surveys and postal surveys. The surveys revealed that over 80% of respondents undertook recreational activities at CFP, but less than 50% visited weekly. Further, over 50% of respondents did not consider the park a safe place.

The top 3 preferred improvements from the face-to-face survey (mostly primary school students) were:

1. Flying fox
2. Climbing play equipment
3. Water play feature.

The top 3 improvements from the online and postal surveys were:

1. Water play/picnic shelter & BBQ (equal 1st).
2. Lighting
3. Seating

Other comments included:

1. Open up and clean the public toilets.
2. Fence or add barriers to Tottenham Rd to make it safer for children to use the park.
3. Add security cameras to the park.

The community feedback, as well as a broader look at demographic and recreational trends, were used to develop the Master Plan. Map 3.1 (page 23) shows the Master Plan for the whole area including connections to the surrounding area and Map 3.2 (page 25) provides a detailed plan of the fenced play area.

An Action Plan for implementing the Master Plan uses a staged approach for delivery. This section points out that the Master Plan should not be seen as a “fixed plan” but rather an aspirational plan to guide priorities and decision making.

Stage 1 of the Master Plan looks to deliver the priorities identified by the community including play equipment, fencing, lighting, shelters and seating. Council has submitted a grant application for Stage 1 of the Master Plan and surrounding trail linkages. The Government has also committed \$250K funding for Stage 1 as part of their 2021 election commitments.

Consultation:

A Steering Committee was formed to drive the project, which included the following stakeholders:

- Tennille Murtagh (Councillor, Brighton Council)
- Sonya Williams (Resident/Project Officer, Brighton Council)
- David Allingham (Manager Development Services, Brighton Council)
- Anna Wilson (Project Engineer, Brighton Council).

Engagement was undertaken with 164 people, including primary school children, sharing rich feedback on their experience and future aspirations for CFP.

Risk Implications:

Throughout the development of the Master Plan, Council staff have raised concerns that the full implementation of the Master Plan is likely to require an investment that is significantly more than what Council is willing or able to invest into a local park and that the existing infrastructure should be better utilised.

The consultants have argued that the plan is aspirational and provides a long-term vision for the park. They argue that the existing infrastructure is dated and not conducive to activating greater community use, but much of it will remain as part of Stage 1. The Master Plan provides an opportunity to boldly transform the park using a staged approach with the aim of attracting external funding.

Whilst there is a risk that the Master Plan may potentially provide an unrealistic expectation for the local community, it provides a staged approach to developing CFP, with Stage 1 delivering a significant upgrade in the short to medium term. The Master Plan has already proven a valuable tool for attracting funding during the State election.

The Master Plan is a 20-year vision for the area and it may be that Stages 2 and 3, or just certain elements of these stages, will be suitable in the future.

Having no Master Plan for CFP will mean that the ad-hoc development will continue and it will likely continue to be an underutilized asset.

Financial/Budget Implications:

There will be financial implications for developing CFP in accordance with the Master Plan and it is proposed to commit some funding to the development of Stage 1 as part of the 2021/22 budget.

The Government has already committed \$250K funding for Stage 1 as part of their 2021 election commitments and Council.

Council has submitted a grant application to deliver Stage 1 of the Master Plan, an outdoor classroom at Bond Place and 2.5km of essential linkages with a total project value of \$1.26M, of which Council has committed to \$400K.

If Council were to develop the overall vision for the Master Plan it would likely cost more than \$2.5 million which would be an overinvestment for a local park for Council if it could not attract external funding.

Social Implications:

Implementing the Master Plan will create an attractive and safe park that will encourage active lifestyles, skills development, and creative learning activities. It will provide a recreational space that the community can be proud of.

As noted above, there is a risk that the Master Plan creates an unrealistic expectation for the community if it cannot be delivered in full.

Environmental Implications:

A significant component of the Master Plan will be the provision of landscaping of predominantly native and local plants which will improve the local environment.

Economic Implications:

Delivery of the Master Plan has the potential for Gagebrook to become a more attractive place to live, work and invest.

Assessment:

The project confirmed Council's concerns that CFP is underutilised, and that the community do not see it as being a safe place.

The Master Plan provides a range of improvements that will address the safety concerns and provide desirable play features requested by the community.

The Master Plan is probably more aspirational than what was expected but provides a bold vision for CFP that can be used to attract external funding.

There is a risk that Council may not be able to deliver on the aspirational vision for CFP, however the Master Plan provides a framework for how CFP should be delivered and the priorities for its development.

Council will need to ensure that its communications about the CFP Master Plan are clear that this is an aspirational plan and that it is unlikely that it will be delivered in full without attracting significant external funding.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
 2. Endorse the Cris Fitzpatrick Master Plan with amendments
 3. Other
-

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that Council endorse the Cris Fitzpatrick Park Master Plan.

DECISION:

Cr Curran moved, Cr Whelan 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 Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

Cr Curran moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the Council resolve into closed council.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

13. CLOSED MEETING:

Regulation 15 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 provides that Council may consider certain sensitive matters in Closed Meeting.

The following matters are listed in the Closed Meeting section of the Council Agenda in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

This item was to be considered in closed session in accordance with Meeting Procedures Regulation 15(2)(a).

13.1 REVIEW OF GENERAL MANAGER’S PERFORMANCE:

Cr Curran moved, Cr Whelan seconded that Council resolve out of closed council and the decision made whilst in closed council be ratified.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour	Against
Cr Curran	
Cr Foster	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

14. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE:

There were no 'Questions on Notice' for the May Ordinary Council Meeting.

The meeting closed 7.00 pm

Confirmed: _____
(Mayor)

Date: _____
15th June 2021