



# Brighton Council

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF THE BRIGHTON COUNCIL, HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS,  
COUNCIL OFFICES, 1 TIVOLI ROAD, OLD BEACH  
AT 5.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY,  
17 MAY 2022**

**PRESENT:** Cr Gray (Mayor); Cr Curran (Deputy Mayor); Cr De La Torre; Cr Garlick; Cr Geard; Cr Jeffries, Cr Murtagh; Cr Owen and Cr Whelan.

Please Note: Cr Whelan left the meeting at 6.25pm.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr J Dryburgh (General Manager); Mr G Davoren (Deputy General Manager); Ms A Turvey (Acting Governance Manager); Mr C Pearce-Rasmussen (Manager Asset Services) and Mr D Allingham (Manager Development Services).

**1. Acknowledgement of Country  
2. Confirmation of Minutes**

2.1 Confirmation of minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of 20 April 2022.

*Cr De La Torre moved, seconded Cr Curran that the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of 20 April 2022 be confirmed.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr De La Torre	
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 10 May 2022.

*Cr Curran moved, Cr De La Torre seconded that the Minutes of the Planning Authority of 10 May 2022 be confirmed.*

**CARRIED**

### VOTING RECORD

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr De La Torre	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

## 3. Attendance, Apologies and Applications for Leave of Absence

*All members were present.*

## 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.

## 5. Public Question Time and Deputations

- 5.1 Mr Dan Skuse and Ms Min Harman from the Department of Education gave a brief update on progress with the new Brighton High School project and the JRLF School Farm in Brighton.
- 5.2 Mr Nic Hansen addressed Council regarding his cherry orchard business operating in the Brighton Municipality. This included an overall profile of the business, including statistics on employment created, annual expenditure on wages and operational costs/money expended in the Municipality by the business.

## 6. Transfer of Agenda Items

According to regulation 8 (4) of the *Local Government Act 1993*, agenda items must be conducted in the order in which they are set out in the agenda of that meeting, unless the council by absolute majority, or the council committee by simple majority, determines otherwise.

## 7. Petitions

According to regulation 57 (1) of the *Local Government Act 1993*, a person may lodge a petition with a council by presenting it to a councillor or the general manager. A general manager who has been presented with a petition or receives a petition under subsection (1)(b) is to table the petition at the next ordinary meeting of the council.

## 8. Reports from Council

### 8.1 Mayor's Communications

Author: Mayor (Cr L Gray)

The Mayor's communications were as follows:

22 April	Meeting with Mayor Wriedt and Acting General Manager Katrena Stephenson at Kingborough Council (GM in attendance).
24 April	Media engagement with Susie Bower and Jonno Duniam regarding election commitment for Ted Jeffries Memorial Park. Deputy Mayor and community members in attendance.
25 April	Anzac Day Service at Remembrance Park.
26 April	Meeting with Sue Hickey – UTAS Ambassador.
27 April	Asset Management Workshop  Councilors and senior staff tour of Municipality – budget process.
4 May	Meeting with Charmaine and Brett Mansfield – Liverpool Engineering (GM in attendance).
5 May	Meeting with GM, DGM, Gillian Brown and Callum Pearce-Rasmussen regarding 22/23 budget.
10 May	Meeting of General Manager's Performance Review Committee  Budget Workshop.  Planning Authority Meeting.  Briefing and discussions with Housing Tasmania.

- 11 May Meeting with Jetty Project – MONA , Material Institute/24 Carrot Garden and Moo Brew (GM in attendance).  
Catchup with Mayors and GMs of Derwent Valley, Central Highlands, Southern Midlands and Brighton.
- 17 May Road Safety Week breakfast.  
May Ordinary Council Meeting.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Whelan seconded that the report be received.*

CARRIED

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr De La Torre	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

**8.2 Reports from Council Representatives**

Cr Geard gave an update on the current status of the Southern Tasmania Poultry Club Inc.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Owen moved, Cr De La Torre seconded that the report be received.*

CARRIED

**VOTING RECORD**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Against</b>
Cr Curran	
Cr De La Torre	
Cr Garlick	
Cr Geard	
Cr Gray	
Cr Jeffries	
Cr Murtagh	
Cr Owen	
Cr Whelan	

### **8.3 Correspondence from Southern Tasmanian Councils Association (STCA), LGAT, TasWater and Joint Authorities**

### **8.4 Miscellaneous Correspondence**

## **9. Notification of Council Workshops**

In accordance with the requirements of Section 8(2)(c) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 it is reported that a workshop was held at 4pm on 10 May 2022, to review Council's budget for 2022-2023.

Councillors in attendance were: Mayor Leigh Gray, Deputy Mayor Curran, Cr De La Torre, Cr Garlick, Cr Jeffries, Cr Murtagh, Cr Owen and Cr Whelan.

## **10. Notices of Motion**

*There were no notices of motion.*

## **11. 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.

*There were no supplementary agenda items.*

### **DECISION:**

## **12. Reports from Committees**

*There were no committee meetings held during May 2022.*

### **13. Council Acting as a 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 13 on this agenda, inclusive of any supplementary items.

*There are no planning reports for the Ordinary Council Meeting, May 2022.*

### **14. Reports from Officers**

#### **14.1 Budget 2022-2023**

Author: Corporate Executive (G Browne)

Approved: Deputy General Manager (G Davoren)

---

#### **Background**

The draft 2022-2023 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 the Councillor's requests and it is now ready to be adopted in principle. No amendments were made to the budget as a result of the workshop held on 10 May 2022.

#### **Consultation**

Councillors and Senior Management

#### **Risk Implications**

Nil.

#### **Financial Implications**

As per the budget.

#### **Strategic Plan**

Goal 3.2: Implement Strategic Asset Management Plan (Existing and New)

Goal 4.1: Ensure Financial & Risk Sustainability

#### **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 2022-2023 budget be adopted in principle.

#### **DECISION:**

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Curran seconded that the 2022-23 budget be adopted in principle.*

**CARRIED**

#### VOTING RECORD

##### **In favour**

##### **Against**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick  
Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Murtagh  
Cr Owen  
Cr Whelan

## 14.2 Dog Registration & Kennel Licence Fees 2022-2023

Author: Corporate Executive (G Browne)

Approved: Governance Manager (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 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

Not Applicable.

### Strategic Plan

Goal 4: Ensure a Stable Organisation

4.1 Ensure Financial & Risk Sustainability

4.2 Be Well-Governed

### Social Implications

Not Applicable.

### Environmental or Climate Change Implications

Not Applicable.

### Economic Implications

Not Applicable.

### Other Issues

Nil.

### Assessment



A comparison between the current (2021-22) and proposed dog registration and kennel licence fees for the 2022-2023 financial year are as follows:-

	CURRENT 2021-2022	PROPOSED DISCOUNTED 2022-2023	FULL RATE 2022-2023
	Paid by July 31	Paid by July 31	Paid after July 31
Domestic Dog (desexed)	\$35.00	\$37.00	\$52.00
Domestic Dog (not desexed)	\$85.00	\$90.00	\$105.00
Working Dog	\$50.00	\$53.00	\$68.00
TGRB registered Greyhound	\$50.00	\$53.00	\$68.00
Pure Bred Dog kept for breeding	\$50.00	\$53.00	\$68.00
Dangerous Dog (declared under the Act)	\$520.00	\$520.00	\$520.00
Assist Dog	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

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

	CURRENT 2021-2022	PROPOSED DISCOUNTED 2022-2023	FULL RATE 2022-2023
	Paid by July 31	Paid by July 31	Paid after July 31
<b>Concession Rates</b>			
Domestic Dog (desexed)	\$30.00	\$32.00	\$47.00
Domestic Dog (not desexed)	\$55.00	\$58.00	\$73.00

Fees will be discounted to the rates listed in the previous page table if registrations are paid by 31<sup>st</sup> July 2022 or otherwise the full rate will apply.

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

Kennel Licences & Fees	CURRENT 2021-2022	PROPOSED DISCOUNTED 2022-2023	FULL RATE 2022-2023
New & Renewal	\$135.00	\$140.00	\$170.00
Dog Complaint Fee – Reimbursed	\$95.00	\$100.00	
Replacement Tags	\$5.00 each	\$5.00 each	\$5.00 each
Animal Agistment Fee	\$50.00 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

### Options

1. As per the recommendation.
2. That Council not adopt the Animal Control Fees for the 2022-2023 financial year.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council adopts the proposed Animal Control Fees for the 2022-2023 financial year, as listed in the report.

### **DECISION:**

*Cr Geard moved, Cr Curran seconded that Council adopts the proposed Animal Control Fees for the 2022-2023 financial year, as listed in the report.*

**CARRIED**

### VOTING RECORD

#### **In favour**

#### **Against**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick

Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Murtagh  
Cr Owen  
Cr Whelan

### **14.3 Old Beach Zoning Review Project - Community Consultation Summary**

Author: Planning Officer (B White)

Approved: Manager Development Services (D Allingham)

---

#### **Background**

Council recently engaged ERA Planning & Environment (ERA) to undertake the 'Old Beach Zoning Review Project' (the Project) which is an analysis of two 'precincts' of land in Old Beach, currently primarily zoned 'Rural Living', to determine whether they have the necessary conditions to accommodate further residential growth.

The Project is the outcome of the findings of the Brighton Structure Plan (BSP, 2018), which found that the Council's current supply of residentially zoned land in the municipality will not meet demand over the next 15 years. The BSP, therefore, recommended that 'greenfield' and 'infill' growth options be explored both within and outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.

The two precincts, shown as 'A' and 'B' in Figure 1 below, were identified in the BSP as future growth options within the Urban Growth Boundary which should be investigated to see if they are suitable for more intensive residential development.



Figure 1: The Precincts Identified in the BSP (Source: ERA)

## Project Methodology

The investigation is made up of two parts:

- a) Community engagement with residents living both within and outside the precincts; and
- b) Technical analysis.

The community consultation is now complete, and a summary report and presentation are provided as Attachments A and B to this report.

The technical analysis currently underway will look at those structural factors that influence whether land is amenable to more intensive residential development, such as:

- Servicing constraints (i.e., stormwater and sewer)
- Capacity of road network
- Likely future road linkages
- Natural and scenic values
- Current and future lot design
- Location of existing and future dwellings
- Ability to provide public open space and active transport linkages.

It is understood the findings of the technical analysis will be presented to Council for consideration by the end of June.

## **The Consultation Methods**

The consultation was successful in terms of resident participation with 72 responses being received from the 104 properties in the study area.

The community consultation tasks that were undertaken are summarised below.

### ***Notification Letter and Social Media***

The project commenced with a notification letter being sent to ratepayers and tenants of properties within the precincts as well as adjoining land. 200 letters were sent out with 183 to ratepayers and 17 non rate payers.

The letters contained a background to the project and provided links to the project page on Council's website, where the online survey, background reports and the booking system for the drop-in sessions could be accessed.

The project was also advertised on Council's Facebook page, where a link was provided to the project page on Council's website.

### ***Online Survey***

The online survey was conducted via 'Survey Monkey', with nine (9) questions which were addressed in some way by a total of 92 respondents. Approximately 20% of the respondents indicated they lived 'outside' of the precincts. The survey was available from 25 February to 20 March, 2022.

The fundamental goals of the survey were to ascertain what level of future growth the community within the precincts are comfortable with, what are those desirable characteristics that should be retained if future growth were to occur, and what were the key concerns with future growth.

Overall, the community was evenly split with those wanting no change (52%) and those wanting some level of change (48%). Regarding the latter: 22% were supportive of slight change such as rezoning the land to 'Low Density Residential' to allow a reduction in size from its current minimum of 5000m<sup>2</sup> to between 1,500m<sup>2</sup> to 3000m<sup>2</sup>; and 25% were supportive of 'significant change' with a lesser focus on minimum lot sizes (such as the General Residential Zone).

In terms of the characteristics that people enjoyed and wished to be maintained, having privacy (large lots), low traffic volumes and proximity to the river and foreshore were highly rated, whilst a ferry to the city and more social and public infrastructure ranked highly in terms of what people wanted to see more of in the area.

Concerns for future growth primarily focused on increased traffic and loss of privacy and rural amenity.

Refer to Attachments A and B for a summary of the survey responses.

### ***Drop-in sessions***

Two (2) separate 20-minute drop-in sessions were held at the Old Beach Cricket Club in March in which there were 14 sittings with either couples or individuals. ERA facilitated the sessions.

The discussions in the sessions revolved around key themes which were like those in the surveys such as appetite for change, desirable characteristics of the precincts, and concerns and Constraints regarding future housing growth.

Overall, the feedback from the sessions mirrored that of the surveys.

### ***Next Steps in the Project***

Once endorsed by Council, ratepayers and tenants within the study area and adjoining land will be notified via post that the consultation findings are available for viewing on Council's website.

ERA are currently undertaking the 'technical analysis' side of the project which is expected to be received by Council Officers by the end of May.

The final report, which will also discuss the community consultation, will go to a Council meeting for endorsement and public exhibition. Council Officers will then report back to Council on the submissions received during exhibition and discuss whether they warrant changes to the report and/or its recommendations.

Any future rezoning of the land will be subject to a separate planning scheme amendment process which is not within the scope of this project.

### **Risk Implications**

There is a risk that the community will feel like they have been ignored if they are not provided a summary of the feedback. To counter this risk, Council Officers will write to affected ratepayers/ residents informing them that the summary documents are available for viewing.

### **Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications because of this community consultation process.

### **Strategic Plan**

1.1: Understand/Improve Health and Wellbeing

S1.2: Create Housing/ Employment/Play/ Education (Liveability)

S1.3: Provide Public Facilities/Amenities

S1.4: Support Connected Communities

S1.5: Build a resilient community and environmentally sustainable future

S3.1: Support 30% Growth Target

S3.2: Implement Strategic Asset Management Plan (Existing and New)

S3.3: Enabling Infrastructure

S4.4: Long-term thinking & evidence-based

### **Social Implications**

There are no social implications because of this community consultation process.

### **Economic Implications**

There are no economic implications because of this community consultation process.

### **Assessment**

The Old Beach Zoning Review – Community Consultation – had a high rate of public participation with a high level of those people living in the precincts responding in some way. The consultant gained valuable information to assist them in their analysis of whether the precincts can accommodate future growth.

It is therefore recommended that the summary documents be endorsed and made publicly available.

### **Options**

1. As per the recommendation
  2. Other
- 

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Endorse the Old Beach Zoning Review – Engagement Report Summary as per Attachment A, and the Engagement Summary Presentation as per Attachment B.
2. Direct Council Officers to make the documents publicly available on Council's website.
3. Direct Council Officers to notify ratepayers and tenants within the study area and adjoining land by post that the summary documents are available for viewing.

### **DECISION:**

*Cr Curran moved, Cr Geard seconded that Council adopts the recommendations as presented.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD****In favour****Against**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick  
Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Murtagh  
Cr Owen  
Cr Whelan

**14.4 Naming Roads and Streets - "Dinosaur Park", Bridgewater**

**Author:** Manager Development Services (D Allingham)

---

**Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement for the naming of new roads in the "Dinosaur Park" subdivision in accordance with the *Place Names Act 2020*.

Section 7.11 of the Tasmanian Place Naming Guidelines (the Guidelines) states: "Road and street name proposals should be endorsed by the elected council members".

**Background**

Brighton Council approved a 44 lot subdivision (DA2019/232) on an internal lot that used to be underutilized public open space. The land has become known as "Dinosaur Park" due to its unusual shape.

As part of the approval several cul-de-sac heads will become continuous roads, including:

- Reynolds Place
- Hobden Place
- Shoobridge Place
- Fergusson Place

All of the existing properties on these roads will need to be re-numbered as the existing numbering for the cul-de-sacs were allocated in the circular fashion rather than the odd numbers on the left and even numbers on the right. Additionally, the type of each road will need to be changed from "Place".

Placenames Tasmania advised that "Fergusson" should be removed as it is a duplicate road name within the municipality.

At the March 2022 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council resolved that Council officers further consult with local residents on the proposed road name changes for the roads around the "Dinosaur Park" subdivision, with Attachment A being the preferred option.

Letters were sent to all owners and occupiers of affected properties on the 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022 advising of the preferred new road names and that all property numbers will also change.



Residents were also advised that Council will also notify the following stakeholders and appropriate departments:

- Placenames Tasmania;
- Tasmania Police & Bridgewater Police Station;
- Tasmania Fire Services & Bridgewater Fire Station;
- Tasmanian Ambulance Service;
- Valuer-General – Land Titles Office;
- Tasmanian & Australian Electoral Commission;
- Australia Post, Brighton Post Office & Bridgewater Post Office;
- Tas Networks;
- NBN Co;
- Telstra;
- TasWater.

Residents were asked to contact Council staff by May 4<sup>th</sup> if they had any concerns.

One written submission was received that objects to the changing of Fergusson Place on the following grounds:

- The name change was not on the DA plans;
- The DA plans were approved before they had a chance to have a say;
- There is no need to change the name because:
  - There will be no confusion with the Fergusson Street in Brighton, it hasn't been an issue before now; and
  - The street name can stop at the roundabout and turn into Shoobridge Place
- Why should they have to change their address with a whole range of service providers because Council doesn't think it's appropriate to have the word "Place" in their street name.
- We didn't agree to this subdivision, we didn't agree to have our safe cul-de-sac opened to be a thoroughfare to traffic, and we certainly don't agree to a name change.

One phone enquiry was received from a resident in Fergusson Place and when the reason behind the change was explained further they were satisfied.

### Consultation

Letters were sent to 62 owners and occupiers. One written submission and one verbal enquiry were received.

Placenames Tasmania has confirmed that Council can select a date when the change will take effect so that plenty of notice can be given to owners and occupiers.

The Senior Management Team were consulted.

### Risk Implications

The addressing change is likely to be disruptive to the residents and may cause some confusion and possibly distress for the residents. However, the changes are necessary to accommodate the approved subdivision.

To reduce the disruption Council will:

- Notify the owners when the change will take affect with plenty of notice.
- Notify stakeholders and appropriate departments of the changes on behalf of residents.
- Provide financial assistance as per Council's Street Numbering Policy as per below.
- Advise Centacare's community officers of the change and ask them to assist their tenants.
- Provide Council's Community Development Officer's details to residents offering further assistance to change their address details with other service providers.

### **Financial/Budget Implications**

In accordance with Council's Street Numbering Policy, Council will provide \$15 financial assistance per street number to each existing property owner for costs associated with mail redirection and updating of the numbers on houses or letter boxes.

Forty-six properties will be affected, and the cost will be approximately \$855.

Five new street name blades will also need to be installed.

### **Social Implications**

The changes are likely to be disruptive to the residents and Council will provide financial assistance and help where they can.

### **Environmental Implications**

Nil

### **Economic Implications**

Nil

### **Assessment**

Only one objection to Council's preferred option (Attachment A) was received during the consultation.

Unfortunately renaming and renumbering of the streets to accommodate the subdivision is unavoidable. Regardless of whether "Fergusson" was retained, the numbering would have to change, and their address would still need to be changed.

It is recommended that Council proceed with removing "Fergusson" as a street name as per the advice of Placenames Tasmania and that Council organise for the numbering and name change to take place as per Attachment A.

### **Options:**

1. As per the recommendation.
2. As per the recommendation, but with alternative street names.
3. Other

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That:

- (a) In accordance with section 11(2) of the *Place Names Act 2020* it is recommended that the Council endorse the proposed road names as shown in Attachment A; and
- (b) As soon as practicable, submit details of the road name(s) to the Registrar of Place Names for recording in the register and organise a suitable date for the changes to take effect that gives residents at least two weeks' notice.
- (c) Council writes to affected landowners explaining when the road name and addressing changes will occur and provide them with financial assistance as per Council's Street Numbering Policy.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Curran moved, Cr De La Torre seconded that the recommendations be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**VOTING RECORD****In favour****Against**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick  
Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Murtagh  
Cr Owen  
Cr Whelan

*Please Note: Cr Whelan left the meeting at 6.25pm.*

## 14.5 Request to Waive Planning Fees – Hindu Society of Tasmania

Author: Manager Development Services (D Allingham)

---

### Background

The Hindu Society of Tasmania has submitted a Development Application for a Cultural Hall at 6 Letitia Grove, Bridgewater (DA2022/95).

The Hindu Society has requested that Council reimburse the development application fee of \$2,567. \$407 of this fee relates to the cost of advertising the application in the Mercury.

The Hindu Society of Tasmania submits that the fees should be reimbursed on the following basis:

*“We wish to inform you that Hindu Society of Tasmania is a not-for-profit organisation consisting of migrant families originating from the Asian subcontinent (India, Nepal, Bhutan, Malaysia, Singapore, etc), as well as Tasmanian families, who are interested in various cultural activities and performing arts. One of the aims of the organisation is to teach human values and provide cultural education to the younger generation . The Hindu Society of Tasmania is also serving the various cultural and religious needs & activities of the migrant community in Tasmania. We do serve free lunch on every Sunday to the migrant communities who are basically consisting of students and new entrants.*

*The proposed development is expected to be funded from the donations from the community. Currently we are also planning to seek grants and support from various government agencies. “*

*Karun DT – Public Liaison Officer*

### Consultation

SMT

### Risk Implications

Waiving fees for this development may set a precedence for future religious groups of all persuasions and not-for-profit groups.

### Financial/Budget Implications

If the full amount of \$2,567 is reimbursed then Council will have to pay the Mercury for advertising and Council's revenue will be reduced by any other amount reimbursed.

### Social Implications

Waiving the development application fees will assist the Hindu Society of Tasmania raise the necessary funds to construct their cultural facility that will provide various social and cultural benefits to the community.

### Environmental Implications

Nil

## Economic Implications

Nil

## Assessment

The Hindu Society of Tasmania's proposed Cultural Hall will provide various social and cultural benefits to the local community and have requested that the development application fee of \$2,567 be reimbursed in full.

It is suggested that the \$407 advertising fee not be reimbursed, and that Council determine whether any of the remaining fees be reimbursed.

## Options

1. Reimburse the full amount minus the advertising fee.
2. Reimburse 50%.
3. Not reimburse
4. Other

---

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council decide whether to reimburse the Hindu Society of Tasmania any of their \$2,567 development application fees.

## **DECISION:**

*Cr Owen moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that Council reimburse the full amount minus the advertising fee to the Hindu Society of Tasmania for their development application fees.*

**CARRIED**

## VOTING RECORD

### **In favour**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick  
Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Owen

### **Against**

Cr Murtagh

## **14.6 Rates Relief - Brighton Bowls and Community Club**

Author: Deputy General Manager (G Davoren)

---

## Background

Council provided a part contribution of \$400,000 towards the improved facilities at the Brighton Bowls and Community Club during the financial year ending 2018.

The following financial year ending 2019, Council provided the bowls club with a \$1,531 rate relief to reflect the improved facilities rate increase in its first year.

Council provided additional rate relief support in the year ending June 2020 of \$2,000 and again for the year ending 2021 for \$2,000 due to an anticipated downturn following the effects of Covid. Council provided \$2,000 donation to the Club for 2021/22 and is now seeking another rate remission for 2022/23.

## Consultation

Rates officer, Executive officer

## Risk Implications

Nil.

## Financial Implications

Any donation granted will come from Council's donation budget.

## Strategic Plan

Relates to our Goal 1 to Strengthen our communities

## Social Implications

Council has a social responsibility to support our community clubs.

Communities that participate in sport and recreation develop strong social bonds, are safer places and the people who live in them are generally healthier and happier than places where physical activity isn't a priority. Sport and recreation build stronger, healthier, happier, and safer communities.

## Environmental or Climate Change Implications

Nil.

## Economic Implications

Community clubs will often require support during start up or unforeseen downturns, but clubs should ultimately seek to reach an equilibrium within the community to support their own financial independence.

## Other Issues

The club has not provided any financial statements to identify any need for financial support.

## Assessment

Ideally the Brighton Bowls and Community Club should seek to become financially independent whereby the club members and those that receive benefits from the club facilities eventually do not have to rely on other Brighton Ratepayers who do not use the facilities.

Ideally all donations should be submitted as part of the budgetary process for comparison against other donation requests.

## Options

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Seek financial statements prior to providing any donation for rate relief.
3. Adjust the amount of donation to the Brighton Bowls and Community Club.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

That a donation of \$1,000 provided to the Brighton Bowls and Community Club be submitted for recommendation as part of the budgetary process for the 2022/23 financial year. The donation will be charged against the donation account and the same amount be reported in the Brighton Council annual report.

## **DECISION:**

*Cr De La Torre moved, Cr Geard seconded that Council request the financial statements before making a decision on the remission of rates to the amount of \$1,000.*

**CARRIED**

## VOTING RECORD

### **In favour**

### **Against**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick  
Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Murtagh  
Cr Owen

## 15. Closed Meeting

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

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.

*There were no matters to be considered in Closed Council.*

## 16. Questions on Notice

### 16.1 Cr Owen – Council’s involvement with Greater Hobart Group

*What are the reasons why this Council, which to my mind clearly forms an integral part of the Derwent estuary and overall greater Hobart picture, no longer is a participant and contributor alongside Clarence, Glenorchy, Hobart and Kingborough, as was the case when Brighton and the aforementioned Councils were active members of the Hobart Metropolitan Councils Association?*

General Manager’s Response (J Dryburgh)

(Question taken on notice from April Ordinary Council Meeting)

Attachments:

1. Letter to Premier 2018
2. Letter from Premier 2019

At Council’s meeting on 20 April 2022, Cr Owen asked this question on notice. Council’s General Manager committed to providing a written response in addition to the verbal response he gave during the April meeting.

### Composition of the Greater Hobart Group

In 2009, the Hobart Metropolitan Councils Association (HMCA) was disbanded due to the Southern Tasmanian Councils Association (STCA) being created. It was formed prior to 2000. The HMCA was made up of the four ‘metro’ councils plus Brighton. The STCA was made up of all 12 southern region councils.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed in September 2016 between the Commonwealth Government and the Tasmanian Government to establish a Hobart City Deal. A Heads of Agreement was then signed in February 2018 to further the deal. These documents refer to four Councils, suggesting that the participating councils were determined prior to the signing of the initial agreement between Commonwealth and State Governments.



It has not been possible to identify exactly how the composition of the City Deal group was determined or by whom. From discussions with General Managers who were around at the time, it was suggested that the process and the structure was determined in Canberra before being presented to the four councils invited to participate. The issue of involvement of other councils within the broader Greater Hobart Region was raised by at least one General Manager at initial meetings, but it was then understood that the boundaries had been set and that the State Government was supportive of them.

The rationale for which council areas to include is not clear. One possibility is that the deal is very clearly focused on 'the city' rather than outer areas and given the clear priority in the deal for Antarctic and Southern Ocean research, this may be a reason why Kingborough was also included.

#### **Actions taken to maximise Brighton's involvement in Greater Hobart activities**

- Council wrote to the Premier in December 2018 requesting to be included within the City Deal and treated as a full member council and outlining the rationale for this (attached).
- In 2020, Council's General Manager volunteered and was elected as STCA representative to be a 'conduit' between the Greater Hobart Committee and the STCA. He meets when possible, for briefings but is not included in the formal meetings and doesn't have formal access to the process or the committee.
- Council's Mayor and General Manager have lobbied the parties to the City Deal to be more included in the City Deal activities, particularly those with strong relevance to Brighton such as regional planning, settlement strategy, public transport (all modes), freight routes and industrial sector. The most recent direct attempt was a letter to the 6 members of the City Deal regarding inclusion in ferry discussions.
- Council's Mayor and General Manager have corresponded with or met with all other relevant or influential parties regarding involvement in the City Deal and specific Brighton priorities such as ferry services and freight routes. These parties include: UTAS, Incat, Roche Brothers, MONA, RACT, the Jetty Project, local media, various government and council representatives.

Brighton Council is not a full member of the City Deal and it is extremely unlikely this will ever change. There is, however, capacity to be included in activities of the City Deal via both the 'adjunct council' provision within the Greater Hobart Act and via other less formal arrangements. It is important that Council continues to build good relationships with all relevant parties and makes every effort to be involved.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council receive and note the General Manager's response.

**DECISION:**

*Cr Jeffries moved, Cr Geard seconded that Council receive and note the General Manager's response.*

**CARRIED****VOTING RECORD****In favour****Against**

Cr Curran  
Cr De La Torre  
Cr Garlick  
Cr Geard  
Cr Gray  
Cr Jeffries  
Cr Murtagh  
Cr Owen

The meeting closed 6.50pm.

Confirmed:

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

Date:

\_\_\_\_\_  
21 June 2022