



ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

TUESDAY 25 JANUARY 2022

2:00PM

Council Chambers, Triabunna


NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the next ordinary meeting of the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council will be held at the Triabunna Council Offices on Tuesday, 25 January 2022, commencing at 2:00pm

QUALIFIED PERSON CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that, in accordance with section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, any advice, information and recommendations contained in the reports related to this agenda have been prepared by persons who have the qualifications or experience necessary to give such advice, information and recommendations.

Dated this Thursday 20 January 2022



Greg Ingham
GENERAL MANAGER

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

- In response to COVID-19 restrictions, members of the public will not be able to attend the meeting. Where possible a live stream of the meeting will be made available.
- As determined by Glamorgan Spring Bay Council in April 2017 all Ordinary and Special Meetings of Council are to be audio/visually recorded and streamed live.
- A recording of the meeting will be available via the link on the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council website following the meeting.

In accordance with the *Local Government Act 1993* and Regulation 33, these video/audio files will be retained by Council for at least 6 months and made available for viewing live, as well as online within 5 days of the scheduled meeting. The written minutes of a meeting, once confirmed, prevail over the video/audio recording of the meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF MEETING	4
1.1 Acknowledgement of Country	4
1.2 Present and Apologies	4
1.3 In Attendance	4
1.4 Late Reports.....	4
1.5 Declaration of Interest or Conflict	4
2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	5
2.1 Ordinary Meeting of Council - 14 December 2021.....	5
2.3 Date and Purpose of Workshop/s Held	6
3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	7
3.1 Questions on Notice	7
3.2 Question without Notice.....	9
3.3 Response to previous Questions without Notice taken on Notice - Annual General Meeting - 14 December 2021.....	9
4. PLANNING AUTHORITY SECTION.....	10
4.1 Development Application 2021/231 - 1000 Dolphin Sands Road, Dolphin Sands.....	11
5. FINANCIAL REPORTS	31
5.1 Financial Reports for the period ending 31 December 2021	31
6. SECTION 24 COMMITTEES	32
6.1 Minutes of Natural Resource Management Committee Meeting - 8 September 2021.....	32
6.2 Minutes of Natural Resource Management Committee Meeting - 24 November 2021.....	41
7. INFORMATION REPORTS	49
7.1 Director Works and Infrastructure - Mr Peter Porch	49
8. OFFICERS' REPORT REQUIRING A DECISION	54
8.1 Covid Safety Plan.....	54
8.2 Council Advertising Policy	57
8.3 Council Workshop Policy	59
8.4 2022 National General Assembly	61
8.5 Swansea Courthouse Management Committee 2021 Annual Report	63
8.6 Stormwater System Management Plan	65
8.7 Tender Delegation to General Manager	68
8.8 Audit Panel Change in Chairperson	70
8.9 Minutes of Glamorgan Spring Bay Audit Panel.....	72
9. NOTICES OF MOTION	74
10. PETITIONS	75
11. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS	76
11.1 Questions on notice by Councillors	76
11.2 Questions without notice by Councillors.....	76
12. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS (CLOSED SESSION)	77
13. CLOSE.....	78

1. OPENING OF MEETING

The Mayor to welcome Councillors and staff and declare the meeting open at [time].

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

The Glamorgan Spring Bay Council acknowledges the Traditional Owners of our region and recognises their continuing connection to land, waters and culture. We pay our respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

1.2 Present and Apologies

1.3 In Attendance

1.4 Late Reports

1.5 Declaration of Interest or Conflict

The Mayor requests Elected Members to indicate whether they have:

- 1. any interest (personally or via a close associate) as defined in s.49 of the Local Government Act 1993; or*
- 2. any conflict as described in Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors,*

in any item included in the Agenda.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

2.1 Ordinary Meeting of Council - 14 December 2021

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 14 December 2021 at 2:00pm be confirmed as a true and correct record.

2.3 Date and Purpose of Workshop/s Held

TUESDAY 11 JANUARY 2022

In accordance with the requirements of regulation 8(2)(c) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, it is reported that a Council workshop was held from 12:30pm to 4:45pm on Tuesday 11 January 2022 via remote conference.

Present

Mayor Robert Young
Deputy Mayor Jenny Woods
Clr Cheryl Arnol
Clr Annie Browning
Clr Keith Breheny
Clr Rob Churchill
Clr Michael Symons

Apologies

Clr Grant Robinson

In Attendance

Mr Greg Ingham, General Manager
Mr Alex Woodward, Director Planning and Development
Mr Peter Porch, Director Works and Infrastructure
Mr James Bonner, Senior Planner
Mr Peter Coney, Town Planner

Guests

- Sue Nettlefold
- Greg Crump
- John Hepper

Agenda

- Spring Bay Maritime Discovery Centre
- Swanwick sewerage system and sealing of plans
- Orford Foreshore Master Plan
- Development Application – 1000 Dolphin Sands Road, Dolphin Sands (DA 2021/231)
- Processing Recyclable Materials - Establishments of a Joint Authority
- Stormwater Management Plan

RECOMMENDATION

That Council notes the information.

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Public question time gives any member of the public the opportunity to freely ask a question on any Council related matter.

Answers to questions will be given immediately if possible or taken “on notice” if an ‘on the spot’ answer is not available.

In accordance with the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) 2015 questions on notice must be provided at least 7 days prior to the Ordinary Meeting of Council at which a member of the public would like a question answered.

3.1 Questions on Notice

Mrs Jane Wing

- Q1. *Raspins Beach Surf Life Saving Club recently applied to Glamorgan Spring Bay Council for a Community Small Grant.*

A report was prepared by the responsible Council Officer for the November 2021 Council meeting which advised that “This application satisfies the necessary criteria of the relevant policy” and also recommended “That Council approve the application for Small Grant funding of \$1,000 for the Raspins Beach Surf Lifesaving Club”.

Councillors chose to amend this recommendation to “Council approve the application for Small Grant funding of \$1,000 to be paid to Surf Lifesaving Tasmania for the purposes of the Raspins Beach Surf Lifesaving Club Little Nippers Training Program”

Although it appears that Councillors did not accept that the application complied with the criteria and that therefore Councillors could not approve the Council Officer's recommendation, it was not clearly defined as to how the application did not comply. Suggestions that the club was not “a thing”, not incorporated, did not have a bank account or that Council would not know who to pay the grant to are nonsensical, not a prerequisite, incorrect and/or not information that was required in the application form.

Could Council please clearly explain exactly which section/s of the criteria, guidelines and/or Council policy with which the application did not comply?

*Jane Wing
Secretary
Raspins Beach Surf Life Saving Club, Orford*

Response from General Manager, Greg Ingham

When issuing grants Council must ensure that good governance processes are followed. The Community Small Grants Policy outlines that the General Manager will delegate to the Corporate and Community Director to provide a report on each application to be presented to Council for decisions. The decision to provide the grant is at Council's discretion and may be amended/changed. In this instance, Council was fully supportive of the application, however, has some concerns around the details of the funding recipient. It appears this has now been clarified and accordingly the funding will be provided under the small grants program.

Mr Greg Luck

I am seeking information regarding the General Manager's Electoral Roll in GSBC :

- Q1. *How many voters are listed on the Roll and how long since their eligibility has been scrutinised ? (is the Roll up to date)*
- Q2. *If rental tenants are still allowed to be on the Roll (GSBC website says they still are), how many in total (tenants) are on the Roll and how long since they have been validated given the inherent nature of moving rental populations.*
- Q3. *Is there a Maximum number of tenants for any particular address allowed on the Roll ? or could a property have 1-10 tenants enrolled should they desire ?*
- Q4. *Is there an age or other criteria limit imposed for eligibility ? and who (and how) verifies the applications.*

My concern (and many others) is that the General Manager's Roll could be easily manipulated (stacked) and skew the true voter intentions of the actual ratepayers of GSBC. It seems fair that ratepayers with their names listed on the property titles (independent of their principle residence address) should have a vote (as they have a financial interest in GSBC) but tenants should not be enrolled to vote. Having tenants able to vote plus the property owners being able to vote skews the ratepayer representation and could be a source of political interference.

With upcoming Council elections it would seem timely to clarify the above ?

Response from General Manager, Greg Ingham

The rules for public questions are governed by regulation 31 of the *Local Government Act (Meeting procedures) 2015*. Whilst Council meeting rules have a limit of two (2) questions per person, in this circumstance of four or more questions the General Manger has responded to all. This is an exception rather than the rule.

Q1. RESPONSE:

There are 984 voters on the General Manager's Electoral Roll. The Act doesn't require ongoing scrutiny or an audit of the Roll. Information in regards to the election generally and the General Manager's Electoral Roll will be circulated prior to the election. The General Manager will be contacting people on the Roll requesting them to notify of changed circumstances so that the Roll can be updated. The enrollment form for the General Manager's Roll requires elector details and eligibility declaration, which must be witnessed.

Q2. RESPONSE:

Yes, tenants are permitted on the Roll. There is no requirement to distinguish between owners and occupiers.

Q3. RESPONSE:

There is no maximum number of tenants for any particular address as long as individuals meet the eligibility criteria to be on the Roll.

Q4. RESPONSE:

One is eligible to vote over the age of 18. Section 254 of the *Local Government Act* provides further information in regards to eligibility.

Further information on Local Government elections can be found in Sections 254 – 262 of the *Local Government Act*.

3.2 Question without Notice

In response to COVID-19 social gathering regulations, Council meetings will be held remotely via video conference until further notice and therefore members of the public are unable to attend the meetings.

Glamorgan Spring Bay Council will allow questions to be provided by written notice by 12 noon the day before the ordinary council meeting by either emailing general.manager@freycinet.tas.gov.au or alternatively left in the post box outside the Council Chambers located at 9 Melbourne Street, Triabunna.

3.3 Response to previous Questions without Notice taken on Notice - Annual General Meeting - 14 December 2021

Mr John Heck

This will relate to a very recent matter. Statements were made during the discussion of Howells Hill being sold off where the land sat there unused. The land has only sat there unused to my knowledge because of the failure of the successive number of administrations failing to deliver policy. It actually had gone through Council for the formation of Spencer Street with the inclusion of the lookout, and as I said, that's the only reason why that land has sat there. Everything else had been put in place and everything else was supported. It's unfortunate that when you see so much effort put in by community groups that it is very depressing and understandable why so few new members are coming up to put their hands up to support various groups within this community when as a result all this effort can be put through and then it's sold off for a peppercorn.

What I would like to ask of the six people that voted for it, had you read the submissions that were put in and the objections to the original concept which included information from Kath Fergusson, because in there it explains it quite plainly.

I would like to ask those Councillors who did vote for it, had you read that information, were you aware of that information before you actually voted on this matter?

Response from General Manager, Greg Ingham (on behalf of Council)

During the process for the disposal of the land at Spencer Street, Triabunna Council was provided with the relevant information and any submissions made on the matter were provided to Council to assist with the decision.

4. PLANNING AUTHORITY SECTION

Under Regulation 25 of Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 the Chairperson hereby declares that the Council is now acting as a Planning Authority under the provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 for Section 4 of the Agenda.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council now acts as a Planning Authority at (Time:).

4.1 Development Application 2021/231 - 1000 Dolphin Sands Road, Dolphin Sands

Proposal	Dwelling
Applicant	S Group
Valid Date	10 August 2021
Date for decision	31 January 2022 (extended by consent of applicant)
Planning Instruments	Glamorgan Spring Bay Interim Planning Scheme 2015
Zone	34.0 Particular Purpose Zone 3 – Dolphin Sands
Codes	E5.0 Road and Railway Assets Code, E6.0 Parking and Access Code, E7.0 Stormwater Management Code, E10.0 Biodiversity Code, E16.0 Coastal Erosion Hazard Code
Specific Area Plans	N/A
Use	Residential
Development	Discretionary
Standards for discretionary consideration	
	D34.4.1 (P1) Building Height
	D34.4.2 (P4) Setback
	E6.7.3 (P1) Vehicular Passing Areas Along an Access
	E6.7.5 (P1) Layout of Parking Areas
	E6.7.6 (P1) Surface Treatment of Parking Areas
	E7.7.1 (P1) Stormwater Drainage and Disposal
	E10.7.1 (P1) Building and Works
	E16.7.1 (P1) Building and Works
Representations	3
Attachments	A – Application Documents B – Representations C – Supporting Documents
Author	Charlotte Win, Graduate Planner

Executive Summary

Planning approval is sought for a single dwelling at 1000 Dolphin Sands Road, Dolphin Sands.

The proposal was advertised for two weeks from 26 November 2021 to 10 December 2021 and three representations were received.

This report assesses the proposal against the standards of the relevant zones and codes, and considers the issues raised in the representations. The Planning Authority must consider the planner's recommendation and the matters raised in the representations and make a final determination by 31 January 2022.

The recommendation is to approve the application, subject to conditions as detailed at the end of this report.

PART ONE

1. Statutory Requirements

The Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (LUPAA) requires the planning authority to take all reasonable steps to ensure compliance with the planning scheme.

The planning scheme provides the overriding considerations for this application. Matters of policy and strategy are primarily a matter for preparing or amending the planning scheme.

The initial assessment of this application identified where the proposal met the relevant Acceptable Solutions under the planning scheme, and where discretionary consideration is required. This report addresses only the discretionary considerations, the representations and makes a final recommendation for the application.

The Planning Authority must consider the report but is not bound to it. It may:

1. Adopt the recommendation
2. Vary the recommendation
3. Replace an approval with a refusal (or vice versa).

The Judicial Review Act 2000 and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 require a full statement of reasons if an alternative decision to the recommendation is made.

2. Approving applications under the planning scheme

A Development Application must meet every relevant standard in the planning scheme to be approved. In most cases, the standards can be met in one of two ways:

1. By Acceptable Solution, or if it cannot do this,
2. By Performance Criteria.

If a proposal meets an Acceptable Solution, it does not need to satisfy the Performance Criteria.

In assessing this application, the Planning Authority must exercise sound judgement to determine whether the proposal meets the relevant Performance Criterion and must consider the issues raised in the representations.

3. The Proposal

The proposal is for the construction of a Single Dwelling with a total area of 234.97m² at 1000 Dolphin Sands Road, Dolphin Sands.




Figure 1. Site Plan (Source: application documents)

4. Risk and implications

Approval or refusal of this application should have no direct financial risk for Council, other than should an appeal against the Authority's decision be lodged or should the Planning Authority fail to determine the application within the statutory timeframe.

5. Background and past applications

The following previous planning applications are relevant.

- DA2014/161 - Driveway - approved
- DA2016/13 - Dwelling and Outbuilding - approved; building permit issued for the construction of the outbuilding. The dwelling is located in essentially the same location as the current application.
- DA2017/186 - Dwelling and Outbuilding - approved; dwelling design largely reflects the current application. Building permits for dwelling and outbuilding were not issued and the permit is taken to have lapsed.

6. Site Description

The approximately 2ha site is located between Nine Mile Beach and Dolphin Sands Road. There is a dwelling to the east and a vacant residential lot to the west. The native vegetation community known as *Acacia longifolia* coastal scrub (SAL) is scattered across the site. There is an existing gravel access from Dolphin Sands Road, gravel driveway and an outbuilding.




Figure 2 - Site and locality (Source: the LIST)

7. Planning Instruments

Glamorgan Spring Bay Interim Planning Scheme 2015

D34.0 Particular Purpose Zone 3 – Dolphin Sands

E5.0 Road and Railway Assets Code

E6.0 Parking and Access Code

E7.0 Stormwater Management Code

E10.0 Biodiversity Code

E16.0 Coastal Erosion Hazard Code

8. Easements and Services

There are no easements on the land to which this application relates. The site has access to reticulated electricity, however reticulated water and sewerage is not provided to the site.

9. Covenants

There are no covenants on the land to which this application relates.

PART TWO

10. Meeting the Standards via Acceptable Solution

The proposal has been assessed against the Acceptable Solutions provided in:

- D34.0 Particular Purpose Zone 3 – Dolphin Sands
- E5.0 Road and Railway Assets Code
- E6.0 Parking and Access Code
- E7.0 Stormwater Management Code
- E10.0 Biodiversity Code
- E16.0 Coastal Erosion Hazard Code

All standards were met by Acceptable Solution excepting those identified below. These have been assessed against the applicable Performance Criteria.

11. Meeting the Standards via Performance Criteria

The standards that were not met by Acceptable Solution will need to satisfy the relevant Performance Criteria to be approved. These are:

- D34.4.1 (P1) Building Height
- D34.4.2 (P4) Setback
- E6.7.3 (P1) Vehicular Passing Areas Along an Access
- E6.7.5 (P1) Layout of Parking Areas
- E6.7.6 (P1) Surface Treatment of Parking Areas
- E7.7.1 (P1) Stormwater Drainage and Disposal
- E10.7.1 (P1) Building and Works
- E16.7.1 (P1) Building and Works

PART THREE

12. Assessing the proposal against the Performance Criteria

D34.0 Particular Purpose Zone 3 – Dolphin Sands

34.4 Development Standards for Buildings and Works

Standard	Planner's response
Clause D34.4.1 Building Height	The acceptable solution of this clause requires the building height from the natural ground level to be no more than 5m. The proposed building exceeds this height, therefore the proposal is reliant on the performance criteria (P1), as outlined below.
P1 Building height must: (a) be unobtrusive within the surrounding landscape; (b) be consistent with the surrounding pattern of development (c) not unreasonably impact on the amenity of adjoining lots from overshadowing, overlooking or visual bulk.	<p>The proposed dwelling height from the natural ground level ranges from 4.326m to 6.533m as shown in drawings Elevations 03 and 04. This variation in height is due to the topography of the site being undulating sand dune and roof shape.</p> <p>The height above sea level has been used as this provides a good indication of how the proposed dwelling sits within the surrounding landscape and whether the proposed dwelling height is consistent with the surrounding pattern of development.</p> <p>The roof heights at the eastern and south-western section of the dwelling are 8.61m and 8.2m above sea level respectively.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed building height is not obtrusive within the surrounding landscape and is consistent with the surrounding pattern of development. This is evident from the height and siting of the adjoining dwelling (No. 1010) to the east which has a height of approximately 9m to 11m above sea level.</p> <p>With respect to (c), the proposed will not unreasonably impact on the amenity of adjoining lots from overshadowing and overlooking, noting the siting of the proposed dwelling has an approximately 50m distance from the adjoining dwelling to the east at No.1010 and may be likely to have an approximately 25m distance from the potential future dwelling to the west if it was built to meet the acceptable solution of a 10m side boundary setback requirement.</p> <p>The visual amenity drawn from the adjoining dwelling at No.1010 is mainly towards the south to Great Oyster Bay and Freycinet National Park and not towards the west where the proposed dwelling is located. It is considered that the visual bulk when viewed from a small western section of deck and kitchen of the adjoining dwelling is limited and does</p>

	<p>not impact unreasonably on the visual amenity of the adjoining property.</p> <p>The adjoining lot to the west is vacant and the impact on the amenity of the bulk of the proposal is unascertainable, though it is noted that the protrusion ranges from 0.8m to 1.5m approximately.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the performance criteria.</p>
--	---

D34.0 Particular Purpose Zone 3 – Dolphin Sands

34.4 Development Standards for Buildings and Works

Standard	Planner's response
Clause D34.4.2 Setback	The acceptable solution of this clause requires all buildings to be located in existing areas clear of native vegetation or within a building envelope shown on the title. The siting of the proposed dwelling is within areas containing native vegetation and there is no building envelope shown on the title, therefore the proposal is reliant on the performance criteria (P4), as outlined below.
P4 Buildings may be located in areas containing native vegetation where no other alternatives exist due to a lack of cleared area with suitable topography, setbacks, and having regard to bushfire hazard management.	<p>Council's NRM officer advised that should a permit be issued conditions are recommended to retain native vegetation outside the building area. The values of the habitat for threatened species are not significant, and any loss of habitat is minimal having regard to the size of the property, and that the native vegetation (SAL) would be classed as being Low Priority Values under the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the performance criteria.</p>

E6.0 Parking and Access Code

E6.7 Development Standards

Standard	Planner's response
Clause E6.7.3 Vehicular Passing Areas Along an Access	The acceptable solution of this clause requires for vehicular passing areas to be provided for an access longer than 30m at the intervals of no more than 30m along the access. It also requires the first vehicular passing area to be constructed at the kerb and the dimensions of the vehicular passing areas be 6m long, 5.5m wide, and taper to the width of

	the driveway. The driveway is more than 30m and the proposal does not show any vehicular passing areas therefore the proposal is reliant on the performance criteria (P1), as outlined below.
<p>P1</p> <p>Vehicular passing areas must be provided in sufficient number, dimension and siting so that the access is safe, efficient and convenient, having regard to all of the following:</p> <p>(a) avoidance of conflicts between users including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians;</p> <p>(b) avoidance of unreasonable interference with the flow of traffic on adjoining roads;</p> <p>(c) suitability for the type and volume of traffic likely to be generated by the use or development;</p> <p>(d) ease of accessibility and recognition for users.</p>	<p>Council's development engineer advises that should a permit be issued the permit be conditioned to require the driveway to be a minimum of 5.5m wide which is sufficient for two-way traffic.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the performance criteria.</p>
Clause E6.7.5 Layout of Parking Areas	The acceptable solution of this clause requires the layout of car parking spaces, access aisles, circulation roadways and ramps to be designed and constructed in accordance with section 2 "Design of Parking Modules, Circulation Roadways and Ramps" of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Parking Facilities Part 1 : Off-Street car parking and headroom to be in accordance with clause 5.3 "Headroom" of the same Standard. The proposal does not clearly demonstrate if it complies with required section and clause of the Standard, therefore the proposal is reliant on the performance criteria (P1), as outlined below.
<p>P1</p> <p>The layout of car parking spaces, access aisles, circulation roadways and ramps must be safe and must ensure ease of access, egress and manoeuvring on-site.</p>	<p>The layout of car parking spaces is considered safe, user-friendly and easy to manoeuvre on site.</p> <p>The proposal satisfies the performance criteria.</p>
Clause E6.7.6 Surface Treatment of Parking Areas	The acceptable solution of this clause requires the parking spaces and vehicle circulation roadways to paved and drained to an approved stormwater system. The proposal is for driveway to be of gravel, therefore the proposal is reliant on the performance criteria (P1) as outlined below.

<p>P1</p> <p>Parking spaces and vehicle circulation roadways must not unreasonably detract from the amenity of users, adjoining occupiers or the quality of the environment through dust or mud generation or sediment transport, having regard to all of the following:</p> <p>(a) the suitability of the surface treatment;</p> <p>(b) the characteristics of the use or development;</p> <p>(c) measures to mitigate mud or dust generation or sediment transport.</p>	<p>The use of gravel is considered appropriate in the area. Therefore, the proposal satisfies the performance criteria.</p>
--	---

E7.0 Stormwater Management Code

E7.7 Development Standards

Standard	Planner's response
<p>Clause E7.7.1 Stormwater Drainage and Disposal</p>	<p>The acceptable solution of this clause requires stormwater from all new impervious surfaces to be drained to public stormwater infrastructure. There is no public stormwater infrastructure in the vicinity, therefore the proposal is reliance on the performance criteria (P1) as outlined below.</p>
<p>P1</p> <p>Stormwater from new impervious surfaces must be managed by any of the following:</p> <p>(a) disposed of on-site with soakage devices having regard to the suitability of the site, the system design and water sensitive urban design principles.</p> <p>(b) collected to re-use on the site;</p> <p>(c) disposed of to public stormwater infrastructure via a pump system which is designed, maintained and managed to</p>	<p>The proposal is for stormwater from new impervious surfaces to be collected and disposed or re-used on the site. Therefore, the proposal satisfies the performance criteria.</p>

minimise the risk of failure to the satisfaction of the Council.	
---	--

E16.0 Coastal Erosion Hazard Code

E16.7 Development Standards

Standard	Planner's response
Clause E16.7.1 Building and Works	There is no acceptable solution for development within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area and therefore the proposal is reliant on the performance criteria (P1), as outlined below.
<p>P1</p> <p>Buildings and works must satisfy all of the following:</p> <p>(a) not increase the level of risk to the life of the users of the site or of hazard of adjoining or nearby properties or public infrastructure;</p> <p>(b) erosion risk arising from wave run-p, including impact and material suitability, may be mitigated to an acceptable level through structural or design methods used to avoid damage to, or loss of, buildings and works;</p> <p>(c) erosion risk is mitigated to an acceptable level through measures to modify the hazard where these measures are designed and certified by an engineer with suitable experience in coastal, civil and/or hydraulic engineering;</p> <p>(d) need for future remediation works is minimised;</p> <p>(e) health and safety of people is not placed at risk;</p> <p>(f) important natural features are adequately protected;</p> <p>(g) public foreshore access is not obstructed where the managing public authority requires it to continue to exist;</p>	<p>The proposal is supported by a coastal vulnerability assessment by a geotechnical engineering consultant which considered that erosion risks at the site are acceptable for the 2065 projected life of the building as per the assessment findings and recommendations in the assessment.</p> <p>It is a recommended condition of approval that prior to commencement of works, construction drawings demonstrate compliance with recommendations in the coastal vulnerability assessment.</p>

<p>(h) access to the site will not be lost or substantially compromised by expected future erosion whether on the proposed site or off-site;</p> <p>(i) provision of a developer contribution for required mitigation works consistent with any adopted Council Policy, prior to commencement of works;</p> <p>(j) not be located on an actively mobile landform.</p>	
--	--

PART FOUR

13. Referrals

The proposal has been referred to Council's Development Engineer for E6.0 Parking and Access Code and Stormwater Management Code, and Natural Resource Management Officer for E10.0 Biodiversity Code.

14. Representations

The Proposal has been advertised for the statutory 14 day period and 3 representations have been received. In determining an application for any permit the planning authority must, in addition to the matters required by s51(2) of the Act, take into consideration any representations received pursuant to and in conformity with s57(5) of the Act.

With respect to these representations, matters to be considered in the planning scheme are outlined below, and a response is provided. The representations in their entirety have been appended to this report.

Representation 1 points (objecting)	Response
The siting of the proposed dwelling is within an area subject to erosion. This will destabilise dunes, pose flooding risk to neighbours and impact natural groundwater supply.	See response to Clause E16.7.1 Building and Works above
The degree by which the proposed dwelling will impede on the erosion zone shown on the Figure 7 (Site Geomorphology) is referenced misleadingly on architectural diagram A101, with no actual shading or boundary shown.	The boundary of the erosion hazard area shown on Figure 7 Site Geomorphology of the Coastal Vulnerability Assessment, which is line with the LISTmap has been applied in the assessment of the proposal.

The setback of the proposed dwelling is inconsistent with that of at 1010 to the east.	The rear and side setbacks of the proposal meet the acceptable solutions A2 and A3 of the Clause 34.4.2 Setback.
The setback distance from the Nine Mile Beach boundary shown on the plans are inconsistent with that of shown on the Bushfire Hazard Management Plan and Coastal Vulnerability Report.	<p>The applicant has confirmed that the setback distance from the Nine Mile Beach is 20m which meets the acceptable solutions A3 of the Clause 34.4.2 Setback.</p> <p>It is a recommended condition that the building setback to the Nine Mile Beach Crown Reservation be no less than 20m.</p>
Failed to give any accurate details on visibility from the beach, main road, neighbouring properties and residence at 1010 to the east.	<p>The visibility from the Dolphin Sands Road will be inconspicuous due to the approximately 240m frontage setback.</p> <p>And the visibility from the immediate vicinity of the Nine Mile Beach will be limited owing to the presence of frontal sand dune. However, the degree to which the dwelling is clearly visible from the beach depends on how far away from the proposed site a person may view on the beach and how far a person may climb the dune.</p> <p>Some degree of visibility from the neighbouring properties and residence at 1010 to the east is expected due to the surrounding patterns of one dwelling per lot development.</p>
Detailed elevation calculations are needed.	The applicant has provided supporting documents with the same building design and location, which demonstrate detailed elevations above sea levels to better present to the Council and the representors.
The proposed height is approximately 7m above ground level. This is out of character.	See response to Clause D34.4.1 Building Height above.
The elevation figures are inconsistent. The North, West and South elevations reference to existing ground with the East elevation referencing NGL.	The applicant has provided supporting documents demonstrating detailed elevations above sea levels to better present to the Council and the representors.
<p>The Roof heights are only nominal estimates and only reference the finished, built up ground level, not the NGL.</p> <p>The heights appear to be understated by up to 1.4m above existing ground level and cannot be determined above NGL.</p>	<p>The applicant has provided supporting documents demonstrating detailed elevations above sea levels to better present to the Council and the representors.</p> <p>See response to Clause D34.4.1 Building Height above</p>

The setback from the boundary facing the beach and coastal reserve is insufficient and not consistent with its neighbour.	<p>The applicant has confirmed that the setback distance from the Nine Mile Beach is 20m which meets the acceptable solutions A3 of the Clause 34.4.2 Setback.</p> <p>It is a recommended condition that the building setback to the Nine Mile Beach Crown Reservation be no less than 20m.</p>
The height of the finished residence exceeds a 5m maximum height limit. It is obtrusive and not consistent with the surrounding development. It may unreasonably impact the visual amenity of the neighbouring lots.	See response to Clause D34.4.1 Building Height above
The proposed location of the dwelling is directly behind a dune that has been moved to gain vehicular access directly onto the Nine Mile Beach through the reserve.	Not Applicable.
Maximising the setback from the shoreline will protect the surrounding environment.	<p>The applicant has confirmed that the setback distance from the Nine Mile Beach is 20m which meets the acceptable solutions A3 of the Clause 34.4.2 Setback.</p> <p>It is a recommended condition that the building setback to the Nine Mile Beach Crown Reservation be no less than 20m.</p>
The elevation of the proposed dwelling and proximity to the beach will result in loss of amenity including views of natural across dunes, natural flow of dunes without visible buildings, privacy on the beach without being overlooked.	See response to Clause D34.4.1 Building Height above.
The proposal fails to address the objective of the Clause E16.0 Coastal Erosion Hazard Code in that the impact of the angle of the dwelling on changing the natural wind erosion process and the prohibition of natural landward transgression by building over a sand dune.	See response to Clause E16.7.1 Building and Works above.
Building on exposed dunes will change the dynamics. Building on dunes that lay within the coastal erosion will accelerate erosions and inundation of this and neighbouring lots, result in loss of	See response to Clause E16.7.1 Building and Works above.

usable land, contaminate bore water and render the wastewater treatment inoperable.	
Inundation due to premature erosion will increase the level of hazard for adjoining or nearby properties. Premature inundation may create a hazard as it destabilises the hill on which a neighbouring house sits.	Though E15.0 Inundation Code does not apply with specific regard to Clause 15.2, it is considered reasonable that conditions be imposed per s51(3a) of LUPAA regarding the implementation of recommendations of the Coastal Vulnerability Assessment prepared by GES 2015.
Representation 2 points (objecting)	Response
Building needs to be placed well away from where any possible future inundation may occur.	See response to representation 1 above
Anything over 5m in height does not preserve the amenity of the suburb.	See response to Clause D34.4.1 Building Height above
Heights marked 'nom C.O.S' are not good enough. IT is impossible to know the final height of this development.	The applicant has provided supporting documents with the same building design and location, which demonstrate detailed elevations above sea levels to better present to the Council and the representors.
Representation 3 points (objecting)	Response
The building height and rear boundary setback are not meet.	See response to representation 1.
Wastewater design will detrimentally impact the neighbouring land and surrounding environment before the expected life of the development is expected to end.	It is a recommended condition that the location of the on-site wastewater system be entirely outside the Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone shown on Figure 7 (Site Geomorphology) and the Inundation areas shown on Figure 10 (Site Inundation Given 1% AEP Storm Event for 2100 combined with Wind Setup Conditions) of Coastal Vulnerable Assessment by GES 2015).
Plan detail is representative of the post-build ground levels not the original ground level before disturbance.	See response to representation 1.
The building is too obtrusive.	See response to Clause D34.4.1 Building Height above
Different rear boundary setbacks have been quoted (19m and 20m) in different reports.	See response to representation 1.

The tide coming up underneath the development (Figure 14 of the Coastal Vulnerability Assessment)	See response to representation 1.
The wastewater AES bed (page 12 of the site and soil evaluation and design report) will be under water by 2065 (pages 12,16,21 of the Coastal Vulnerability assessment). This shows the septic system will fail and start contaminating Great Oyster Bay and surrounding land before this date.	It is a recommended condition that the location of the on-site wastewater system be entirely outside the Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone shown on Figure 7 (Site Geomorphology) and the Inundation areas shown on Figure 10 (Site Inundation Given 1 1% AEP Storm Event for 2100 combined with Wind Setup Conditions) of Coastal Vulnerable Assessment by GES 2015).

15. Conclusion

The assessment of the application taken in association with the representations received identifies that the proposal satisfies the relevant provisions of the planning scheme and therefore it is recommended the application is approved.

16. Recommendation

That:

Pursuant to Section 57 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and the Glamorgan Spring Bay Interim Planning Scheme 2015, development application 2021/231 be approved for reasons outlined in the officers report, subject to the following conditions.

1. Use and development must be substantially in accordance with the endorsed plans and documents unless modified by a condition of this permit.

Advice: any changes may either be deemed as substantially in accordance with the permit or may first require a formal amendment to this permit or a new permit to be issued.

2. Plans submitted for building approval must include a Soil and Water Management Plan (SWMP) and this must be implemented to ensure soil and sediment does not leave the site during the construction process.

Advice: a series of Fact Sheets on [Soil and Water Management on Building Sites](#) and how to develop a SWMP is available on the Environment Protection Authority website.

3. The developer must pay the cost of any alterations and/or reinstatement to existing services, Council's infrastructure or private property incurred as a result of the proposed development works. Any work required is to be specified or undertaken by the authority concerned.

Advice: Prior to commencement of any works, the developer must obtain a Works in Road Reserve Permit for any works within the road reserve.

4. Through the construction process to the satisfaction of Council's General Manager, and unless otherwise noted on the endorsed plans or approved in writing by Council's General Manager, the developer must:

- a) ensure soil, building waste and debris does not leave the site other than in an orderly fashion and disposed of at an approved facility;
- b) not burn debris or waste on site;

- c) ensure public land, footpaths and roads are not unreasonably obstructed by vehicles, machinery or materials or used for storage;
 - d) pay the costs associated with any alteration, extension, reinstatement and repair or cleaning of Council infrastructure or public land.
- 5. The developer must provide a commercial skip (or similar) for the storage of builders waste on site and arrange for the removal and disposal of the waste to an approved landfill site by private contract.

Advice: Builders waste, other than of a quantity and size able to be enclosed within a standard 140-litre mobile garbage bin, will not be accepted at Council's Waste Management Centres. All asbestos-based waste must be disposed of in accordance with the Code of Practice for the Safe Removal of Asbestos NOHSC: 2002(1988). No material containing asbestos may be dumped at Council's Waste Management Centres.
- 6. All external surfaces must be finished using colours with a light reflectance value not greater than 40 percent and must be natural colours such as black, grey, brown and green.
- 7. The siting of the proposed building to the Nine Mile Beach Crown Reservation must not be less than 20m.

Parking and Access

- 8. The existing crossover must be upgraded to meet the current requirements of Local Government Association Tasmania (LGAT) standard drawings TSD-R03-v3 and TSD-R04-v3.
- 9. To the satisfaction of Council's General Manager, the internal driveway and areas set aside for vehicle parking and turning must be
 - a) designed, constructed and maintained to a durable all-weather surface to avoid dust or mud generation, erosion and sediment transfer off site;
 - b) a minimum carriageway width of 5.5m; and
 - c) In accordance with the requirements of an approved Bushfire Risk Assessment prepared by Lark Creese.
- 10. To the satisfaction of Council's General Manager, surface water runoff from the internal driveway and areas set aside for vehicle parking and turning must be controlled and drained to avoid unreasonable impact to adjoining lands.

Stormwater

- 11. All stormwater run-off from roof surfaces generated as a result of the development must be collected and stored in detention tank(s) to provide a minimum total on-site capacity of 10,000 litres for on-site use.

Biodiversity

- 12. Native vegetation must not be removed, lopped, ring-barked or otherwise willfully destroyed, removed or adversely impacted on other than the minimum necessary for the construction of buildings and works, the connection of services, vehicular access and the implementation of a Bushfire Hazard Management Plan to the satisfaction of Council's General Manager.
- 13. All vehicles and equipment associated with construction of the development and/or operation must be cleaned of soil prior to entering and leaving the site to minimize the introduction and/or spread of weeds and diseases to the satisfaction of the Council's General Manager.

Inundation and Coastal Erosion Hazard

14. The location of the on-site wastewater system must be entirely outside the Coastal Erosion Hazard Overlay shown on Figure 7 (Site Geomorphology) and the future inundation overlay shown on Figure 10 (Site Inundation Given a 1% AEP Storm Event for 2100 combined with Wind Setup Conditions) of Coastal Vulnerable Assessment by Geo-Environmental Solutions (GES) dated October 2015.
15. Prior to commencement of any works, construction drawings must be provided which demonstrate compliance with recommendations of the Coastal Vulnerable Assessment by GES dated October 2015.

The following advice is provided for information and assistance only

- a. Please read all conditions of this permit and contact the planner for clarification if required.
- b. All costs associated with acting on this permit are borne by the person(s) acting on it.
- c. Further and separate approval or consent may be required for the following:
 - i. Building and plumbing approval from Council under the *Building Act 2016*
 - ii. Certificate of certifiable work for Water and sewerage from TasWater under the *Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008*
- d. The permit does not take effect until 15 days after the date it was served on you the applicant and the representor provided no appeal is lodged, as provided by s.53 of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.
- e. This permit is valid for two years from the date of approval and shall lapse unless it has been substantially commenced to the satisfaction of Council's General Manager, or otherwise extended by written consent.
- f. The permit and conditions on it are based on the information submitted in the endorsed plans and documents. The Planning Authority is not responsible or liable for any errors or omissions. I encourage you to engage a land surveyor to accurately set out the location of buildings and works.
- g. The native vegetation approved for removal is limited to that necessary for the construction of buildings and works, the connection of services, vehicular access and the implementation of the Bushfire Hazard Management Plan. Clearing or adversely impacting other native vegetation on the property at any stage in the future may require a separate planning permit and advice should be sought from the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council prior to commencing any additional works.
- h. Modification of native vegetation for bushfire hazard management or firebreaks should involve slashing rather than removal thereby minimising soil disturbance and the potential for soil erosion and weed invasion.
- i. Any gravel and earth products introduced to the site should be obtained from certified weed-free and disease-free sources.
- j. Please be advised that it is illegal to clear native vegetation on land adjoining your property that is public land, including foreshore reserves.
- k. The issue of this permit does not ensure compliance with the provisions of the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* or the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The applicant may be liable to complaints in relation to any non-compliance with these Acts and may be required to apply to the Policy and Conservation Assessment Branch of the Department of Primary Industry, Parks, Water and Environment or the Commonwealth Minister for a permit.
- l. The granting of this permit takes in no account of any civil covenants applicable to the land. The developer should make their own enquiries as to whether the

proposed development is restricted or prohibited by any such covenant and what consequences may apply.

- m. In the event that any suspected Aboriginal cultural material is inadvertently encountered during surface or sub surface disturbance, please consult the Unanticipated Discovery Plan at <http://www.aboriginalheritage.tas.gov.au/Documents/UDP.pdf>

Under Regulation 25 of Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 the Chairperson hereby declares that the Council is no longer acting as a Planning Authority under the provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 for Section 4 of the Agenda.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council no longer acts as a Planning Authority at (Time:)

5. FINANCIAL REPORTS

5.1 Financial Reports for the period ending 31 December 2021

Author: Director Corporate & Community (Mrs Elysse Blain)

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community (Mrs Elysse Blain)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Profit & Loss for the period ending 31 December 2021
2. Balance Sheet as at 31 December 2021
3. Statement of Cash Flows for the period ending 31 December 2021
4. Capital Works as at 31 December 2021

BACKGROUND/OVERVIEW

The financial reports for the period ended 31 December 2021 as attached to this report are presented for the information of Council.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB)
- International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

There are no budget implications recognised in the receipt and noting of these reports by Council.

RISK CONSIDERATIONS

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation				
There are no material risks from adopting this recommendation.				
Do not adopt the recommendation				
By not receiving and reviewing the major financial reports on a regular basis, such as the Profit & Loss, Statement of Cash Flows, Capital Works and Balance Sheet, Council risks not meeting its financial management obligations.	Likely	Likely	High	By not adopting the recommendation Council is not endorsing the financial reports for the period ending the 31 July 2021. Council needs to endorse.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council receives and notes the Financial Reports as attached to this report for the period ended 31 December 2021.

6. SECTION 24 COMMITTEES

6.1 Minutes of Natural Resource Management Committee Meeting – 8 September 2021



GSBC NRM Committee Meeting No. 70 Minutes Triabunna Community Hall Wednesday 8th September 2021, 10:00am

1. Acknowledgement of Country: Robyn Moore

2. PRESENT

David Tucker (Vice-Chair), Amanda Brooks (NRM Works Coordinator), Alex Woodward (GSBC Director of Development and Planning), Di Clark (GSBC Works Dept Admin), Jane Wing (Orford Community Group), Alan Morgan (Coles Bay), Diana Nunn (Coles Bay), Kate Hibberd (Dept of Defence), Robyn Moore (DSRA), Gary Stoward (DSRA), Jennifer Hemer (NRM South)

- Jennifer was welcomed to her first NRM Meeting representing NRM South.

3. APOLOGIES

Clr Cheryl Arnol (Chair), Terry Higgs (GSBC), Steven Heggie (PWS), Katherine Hitchcock (PWS), Nicky Meeson (GSBC)

4. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Confirmation of previous minutes from GSB NRM Committee meeting no.69:

Moved: Jane Wing. **Seconded:** Diana Nunn. Carried unanimously.

5. MATTER ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

No matters arising – refer (8) Action Items

6. COMMITTEE CORRESPONDENCE

- Hayden Dyke Resignation – Hayden's email was read out by David Tucker and the Committee acknowledged that Hayden would be a great loss.
David will prepare a letter of thanks from the committee and forward it to Hayden.

No other correspondence other than "Terms of Reference" correspondence back and forth

7. BUSINESS ARISING FROM CORRESPONDENCE

Nil

8. BUSINESS ARISING FROM ACTION ITEMS

8.1 Walking and Cycling Strategy for GSBC Municipality

- The Chair asked for an update on the progress to develop a Walking and Cycling strategy for the municipality. A strategy is needed to provide direction for the numerous projects which are being proposed by the community members throughout the municipality. Alex reported that an application has been prepared to seek funding to get a Strategy written for the municipality. A grant was applied for recently but wasn't successful. The application was for \$200,000. This funding application is ready to submit again if opportunities arise. Alex also indicated that the State Govt are currently looking for key developments across the state and Alex, Peter Porch and Adrian have a meeting with State Govt officials on the 15th September to discuss what upcoming Grants will be available and then will liaise with East Coast Tourism on a way forward. The chair expressed frustration with the delays with this project and observed that there is nothing in Council's Budget for the development of a Strategy. Alex indicated that it will be considered as part of budget development for 2022-2023.

8.2 Monitor and report on Briar Rose Listing – Nicky Meeson (Biodiversity Officer)

- Di Clark read out Nicky Meeson's response as Nicky was an apology.

"No further information has been received from DPIPWE".

8.3 Compliance of State Growth roadside slashing procedures

- Peter Porch responded with following email:

"Following up on correspondence provided by David Tucker from Mel Kelly to State Growth staff, I spoke with current staff in the relevant roles.

These staff had the history around contractor slashing environmental hygiene and understood the enquiry.

State Growth Staff advised that there was no fixed agreement with council for an ongoing program. The nature of the procedures being undertaken with their contractors were advised to me to be "a trial".

State Growth staff also advised that the trial was completed and evaluated. Their evaluation determined that the process was not a success and was not included in the contract conditions for subsequent years."

David Tucker responded by saying this was not done as a trial as it was an agreed procedure. David will find the agreed procedure document and email to Alex and Peter. The document was prepared by Dept of State Growth for slashing within GSBC. The NRM Committee said under the Weed Management Act Dept of State Growth have an obligation to comply. Council needs to request a formal response as to what State Growth are doing to prevent the spread of weeds into this municipality and Council needs to draft a letter as we feel that we have been fobbed off. David advised he has correspondence from State growth to show that the Hygiene Sites were not a trial and that the preferred direction of slashing to avoid contamination from known "hot spots" such as Break O'Day (Spanish heath) was agreed to. (correspondence to be forwarded to Alex and Peter)

8.4 Use of decontamination site at the Triabunna Marina – PWS

- No response as PWS were an apology and no other committee member has any information.

8.5 “Public Convenience Strategy” – Alex Woodward (DDP)

- Alex indicated that the strategy has not progressed, and was hoping to present strategy at the next NRM Meeting in November.
David read a draft letter that was to be sent to the then premier Will Hodgman by the NRM Committee in 2018. The draft letter was forwarded to the GM at the time (Chris Schroeder) for approval. We were informed that the letter was not sent because the then Mayor did not agree with its content.
It was then explained that the letter was requesting a round table of State and Local Government along with Crown Land Services, East Coast Tourism, PWS and NRM to agree on defining the problem and developing a strategy together, not that Council had to “fix the problem”
Alex indicated that a similar updated letter could be sent now from the current Council to commence the process before the visitor influx occurs when COVID restrictions change.
Alex will bring this up at a Council Workshop to proceed. (A copy of the draft letter to the Premier and the spreadsheet of sites with issues will be forwarded to Alex)

8.5 a Dog Management Policy – Alex Woodward

- Alex reported that Council now have a full time Dog Ranger.
- A Dog Management Policy is currently being developed. Key stakeholder consultation has commenced. Once a Draft is developed, it will be presented to the committee seeking endorsement. This will be delayed until the Orford Foreshore Masterplan has been developed as it is linked.
- The concern was raised that a Cat Policy was also needed particularly in respect to feral cats? Alex indicated that issues regarding cats should currently be referred to **9 Lives Cat Centre**. It was suggested that Council need to add more information to Council Website in respect to cat management. More education needed.
- Australian Geographic recently had a great article on the impact of cats in the environment and the use of 1080 to control both foxes and feral cats on mainland Australia.

8.5 b Orford Foreshore Master Plan

- Alex reported that Council and PWS have now awarded a contract to **Inspiring Place** to develop a Master Plan. The master Plan will include Millington’s Beach thru to Prosser River Mouth and then onto the end of Raspins Beach. The plan will address the Bird Sanctuary, Fence, and the other Infrastructure on Crown Land that Council do not currently have licences for.
- Community consultation will be conducted throughout this process and the Committee will be presented with a Draft for endorsement to Council.

8.6 Review NRM Committee TOR – Sub Committee and DDP

- The Committee presented with a draft of “NRM “Terms of Reference” prepared by the subcommittee and a report on the TOR (see attached) with a recommendation to adopt. Upon review there were some slight amendments to wording in Section 1 - **Purpose and Objectives of the Committee** specifically.
 - Re-word dot point 3.
 - removing Dot point 6 referencing Catchments to Coast.

- add a new dot point – to provide input into development of grant applications relevant to NRM

Motion: That the Draft NRM Committee “Terms of Reference” as amended at this meeting on 8th September 2021 be submitted to Council for adoption”.

Moved: Alan Morgan **Seconded:** Robyn Moore

Voting: All agreed

Motion passed.

8.7 Sewage Contamination in Coles Bay – Council

- Alan Morgan emailed the Committee prior to the Meeting with the following:

“Great News!

Attached is correspondence from Kylie Bull, who has been championing the cause for improvements to the sewage situation at Coles Bay as a member of FAI.

I thought it would speed up discussion at our meeting if members had this information beforehand.

We are delighted that progress has been made and offer particular thanks to Greg for his letter. Hopefully such a collaborative approach from Community and Council will bear fruit.”

The contamination is of Human form, and this has been conveyed to Greg Ingham. TasWater and State Govt to give funding towards a solution.”

The Committee are delighted there is now going to be a 2-pronged attack from the Council and Community and we need to maintain political pressure on the State Government and its agencies to fund and implement some positive action.

LUNCH: 12.30PM – 1.00PM

8.8 Water Management Plans for East Coast Rivers – DDP and Council

- Response from Peter Porch was “Follow Up “

Jennifer Hemer requested a copy of the Rural water Use Strategy submission. (the Chair to provide)

8.9 NRM South and “Tasmania NRM Strategy” – Committee and Council

Cindy Hull from NRM South can no longer represent NRM South and her replacement Jennifer Hemer attended her first meeting today.

Jennifer was invited to provide a report to the committee on NRM South’s activities.

- Jennifer said they are in the process of redeveloping a strategy for the whole state which will focus on land, water, and biodiversity. NRM South met with Southern Councils on the subject and went to State Govt.

- Jennifer gave a summary of the Moulting Lagoon and Apsley region projects. These projects will continue thru to 2030. There is ongoing discussion and work with Landowners to look at restoring the natural drain systems on the Wetlands and to help manage the lagoons natural resources.
- There was discussion about the potential impact of irrigation on river flow into the wetlands and that this concern was highlighted in the NRM Committee submission to the Rural Water Use Strategy.
- Jennifer indicated that she hasn't read the Submission on the "Water Use Strategy" but will endeavour to read before next Meeting. NRM are disappointed there seems to be no focus on the Swan River and there is a lack of monitoring of the water being extracted from the river. NRM South have not consulted with recreational fishers or shooting groups as that area comes under PWS. Nor do they liaise with the Aquaculture farms.

(a copy of the submission to the RWUS will be forwarded by the chair)

8.10 Review of the GSB Weed Management Plan – Nicky Meeson (Biodiversity Officer)

Di Clark read Nicky's response:

"A Draft is scheduled for March 2022 and the final document in June 2022."

The Committee wanted to know why it is taking so long ? Alex said Nicky only works 2 days a week and there are other more pressing works that needed attention. Work needs to be prioritised. A workshop with the committee will be undertaken to assist with annual work plan.

8.11 Provide Executive Summary of completed Weed Project Grants – Amanda Brooks

The Completion Summary from the **Round 1 grant**, Communities Combating Pest and Weed Impacts During Drought was circulated by email after the last meeting.

Communities Combating Pest and Weed Impacts During Drought - Biosecurity Management of Pest & Weed Executive Summary: **Round 1** \$63835 – between GSBC \$54940 and \$8895 Tasman Council

This collaborative project undertaken by local government areas (LGA's) Glamorgan Spring Bay Council (GSBC) and Tasman Council, provided assistance to 13 primary producers to manage serrated tussock infestations and undertake serrated tussock control measures that were required at a time when drought was impacting the effectiveness of their weed management programs. This project facilitated local employment, as the proposed activities were done in addition to current on-farm work activities.

The inclusive approach to the workshop / field day allowed primary producers and other neighbouring land managers to share their knowledge and experiences. Bringing together around 50 land managers to look at different and innovative ways land managers across the country are utilizing to control, manage and eradicate serrated tussock.

The funding assisted land managers to successfully conduct spot spray treatments of the large known areas of serrated tussock across approximately 1610 hectares in both LGA's to reduce these areas spreading further afield.

36 hectares of pasture has been planted with a drought and flupropanate tolerant pasture mix, across 4 properties within GSBC. This facilitates broad hectare boom spraying to control serrated tussock, removing the labour-intensive spot spraying practice. This then reduces the cost of treatment per hectare long term.

A conservation detection dog was implemented in GSBC to find outlying populations of serrated tussock. The detection dog, handler, council staff, land managers and volunteers searched for plants outside of known infestations. This was part of a strategic elimination process generated from a desktop model and local knowledge. This survey covered 244 hectares of previously unsearched area and proved successful in engaging the community to learn about the impact and invasive nature that serrated tussock has on the environment.

The project reiterated the importance of managing serrated tussock, to prevent it spreading and reduce infestations to manageable sizes that would enable future eradication by the property owner. It renewed the vigour of land managers, as it supplied much needed funds to carry out weed management in the time of drought.

Alan Morgan asked what was in the pasture mix and Amanda explained and discussion was had on how it works. Boom spraying in better than spot spraying by 90%.

9.00 GSBC NRM REPORTS

9.1 Weed Management Plan

- Covered in Item 8.2

9.2 Biodiversity – Nicky Meeson

Di Clark read out Nicky's response:

- General duties and current projects include: providing advice on development applications, providing advice to ratepayers on various biodiversity issues, writing articles on aspects of biodiversity, weekly monitoring at the Orford Bird Sanctuary with volunteers, revegetation projects at Coles Bay and Orford, organising and conducting searches for serrated tussock outliers with volunteers, managing and uploading weed data to the Natural Values Atlas.

9.3 Project Grants- Amanda Brooks

Round 2 grant, Communities Combating Pest and Weed Impacts During Drought. Combating Zone, A Priority Declared Weeds on Farms During Drought in Glamorgan Spring Bay.

- Total grant **\$174000** spread across **19 properties**

19 properties are working toward the completion of their works for the work assigned under this grant, with some work plans being delayed due to unforeseen weather events, an extension is being considered and may be required to carry out to completion all works effectively.

Tasmanian Weed Action Fund Glamorgan Spring Bay:

- Total grant to GSBC **\$55000** - \$2500 per Applicant - currently working with 10 Applicants

We have 8 applicants well under way with delivery of their projects, with 7 of these having completed the on groundwork and are working on their management plans.

There are still 2 outstanding contracts yet to be signed and returned.

There are some funds still available. I have one more landowner to discuss a project with that did not get funded through the latest WAF grant round that would like to seek funding through this as his project was not collaborative enough to be granted through the WAF grants.

Summary of Grants for Weed control in GSBC.

- **Communities Combating Pest and Weed Impacts During Drought Round 1**

Total \$63835 – between GSBC \$54940 and \$8895 Tasman Council

- **Communities Combating Pest and Weed Impacts During Drought. Round 2**

Total grant GSBC \$174000 spread across 19 properties

- **Tasmanian Weed Action Fund Glamorgan Spring Bay:**

Total grant to GSBC \$55000 - \$2500 per Applicant - currently working with 10 Applicants

David asked, are Council applying for any other Grants for weed control. Amanda said there were no other grants available at this stage.

Black Summer Bushfire Recovery Grants Program:

Applications have been called for within GSB with funds up to \$1.6 million available over a three year period . There is a focus on building resilience within our community around mental health awareness. Peter Porch will be coordinating the proposals.

Kate Hibbert indicated that D of D intend to extend the FRB on the eastern side of the BMTA to the north to Little Swanport.

There was discussion about the lack of maintenance of Tiger Trail and the fire trails which link to it in recent years. Much of Tiger Trail is now impassable as PWS don't maintain it. This trail was established between Little Swanport and Bicheno in the 80's to establish a break between private land and crown land to facilitate broad scale Fuel Reduction Burns.

It was suggested that funds to refurbish Tiger Trail and the link tracks, would be a worthwhile Recovery grant project.

10. COMMITTEE MEMBERS ROUND TABLE

Alan thanked Alex for facilitating the "Terms of Reference" review.

Robyn conveyed the Landcare Group were focusing on weed removal. After the 2019 bushfires funding has been shortlisted for 2022. Council is in the process of clearing roadside verges at Dolphin Sands. DSRA would like to map the weeds on the peninsular and develop weed management plan. Gorse is an issue in areas and now extending into Moulting Lagoon.

Funding needed and applying for Grants is a priority for DSRA and Council do not need to be involved. Ratepayers are happy to be involved in the process.

Jennifer indicated that NRM South have done aerial mapping of weeds around Moulting Lagoon. Terry and Nicky have also done on ground weed mapping in the past. NRM South may be able to share their weed mapping as well.

Diana asked about the timeline for the Coles Bay Foreshore Walkway and Council are still waiting on the design from Company involved.

Swansea Primary School children have been shown how to make wax wraps and Jane has been at Orford Primary School doing the same. Jane has also been involved in counting of the birds at the Orford Bird Sanctuary with Nicky Meeson on a weekly basis and weeding at Raspin's Beach Orford with volunteers.

Jane asked what was happening with the **No Spray Policy**, the **Illegal vegetation removal Policy** and the **Flora and Fauna Management Plans** for Council managed land. Alex indicated that all of these policies and plans were still being developed. Niki has a key role in all and her time is limited by other priorities.

David asked is there a budget allocation for NRM activities within Council including the Committee. Alex will take on Notice. There is not an individual budget for the NRM Committee as now comes under the various sections.

We also need to acknowledge the resignation of Terry Higgs who has been involved with the NRM Team over the last nine years. Terry has been an integral part of the team and will be greatly missed. We wish him well in his next adventure.

David asked if Terry will be replaced, and Alex said that a decision on how Terry's role will be filled has not been made as yet. Alex indicated that this will be looked at shortly.

Alan offered to draft a message from the Committee to Membership to alert people that the NRM Committee is still active and going strong.

11. NEXT MEETING DATE AND VENUE

Wednesday 24th November – Swansea Hall (If available)

Meeting closed at 2.00pm.

ACTION ITEMS

- Letter of thanks from the committee to Hayden Dyke. **David Tucker**
- Investigate alternative funding options including a Council Budget Allocation for the preparation of a **Walking & Cycling Strategy**. **Alex Woodward**.
- **Hygiene Protocols for Roadside Slashing** - Follow-up with State Growth re the **Hygiene Protocols** for roadside slashing within the municipality. **Peter Porch**
 - Copies of previous correspondence with SG to be forwarded to Peter Porch – **David Tucker**
- Report on level of use of Decontamination Facility at the Triabunna Marina – **PWS**
- **Public Convenience Strategy** - Forward a copy of the draft letter to the Premier and the spreadsheet to Alex. **David Tucker**
 - Take the issue to a Council Workshop to review. **Alex Woodward**
- **Dog Management Policy** – Draft to be presented to the Committee for comment. - **Alex Woodward**
- **TOR** – Amend as discussed - present to Council for ratification. **Alex Woodward**
- **Water Management Plans** – Follow up is necessary to respond to the Ministers reply. **NRM Committee & Peter Porch**
 - Copy of submissions to RWUS to Jenifer Hemer NRM South- **David Tucker**
- **Weed Management Plan** – Discuss options to speed up the review at next meeting.
- Monitor for external Funding options for additional Weed Control in the municipality. – **Amanda Brooks**
- **Black Summer Bushfire Recovery Grants Program** - consider a proposal to seek grant funds to refurbish Tiger Trail – **Alex Woodward and Peter Porch**.
- **No Spray Policy , Illegal vegetation Removal Policy, Flora and Fauna Management Plans.** Agenda items for future meetings – **NRM Chair & Di Clark**
- NRM budget update – **Alex Woodward**
- Draft message to committee members – **Alan Morgan - Cheryl Arnot**

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Natural Resource Management Committee meeting held on 8 September 2021 be received and noted.



**NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
UNOFFICIAL MINUTES No. 71**

WEDNESDAY 24 NOVEMBER 2021

SWANSEA TOWN HALL, SWANSEA

Time: 10am

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF MEETING	3
1.1 Acknowledgement of Country	3
1.2 Present and Apologies.....	3
1.3 Declaration of Interest	3
2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	4
2.1 Minutes of NRM Meeting No. 70 – 8 September	4
2.2 Matters arising from minutes	4
3. COMMITTEE CORRESPONDENCE	6
3.1 Correspondence In/Out	6
3.2 Business arising from Correspondence	6
4. INFORMATION REPORT	7
4.1 Draft Orford Foreshore Masterplan	7
4.2 Tasmanian Wild Fallow Deer Strategy	7
4.3 Environment By-Law	7
4.5 Round table	7
5. CLOSE.....	8
5.2 Next Meeting.....	8
Action Items from the meeting.....	8

1. OPENING OF MEETING

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

The NRM Committee acknowledges the Traditional Owners of our region and recognises their continuing connection to land, waters, and culture. We pay our respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

1.2 Present and Apologies

Present

David Tucker (Vice-Chair), Amanda Brooks (NRM Works Coordinator), Alex Woodward (GSBC Director of Development and Planning), Di Clark (GSBC Works Dept Admin), Jane Wing (Orford Community Group), Alan Morgan (Coles Bay), Robyn Moore (DSRA), Gary Stoward (DSRA), Jennifer Hemer (NRM South) Greg Ingham in part 10:15am – 12:30pm (General Manager, GSBC)

Apologies

Clr Cheryl Arnol (Chair), Steven Heggie (PWS), Katherine Hitchcock (PWS), Nicky Meeson (GSBC), Steve Heggie (PWS), Kate Hibberd (Dept of Defence)
David Tucker will be standing in as Chair and Clr Cheryl Arnol is an apology.

There were only 5 Committee Members present therefore not enough members for a Quorum. As a result, this meeting was agreed to continue as an informal meeting.

1.3 Declaration of Interest

David Tucker declared an interest in the environmental management of this Municipality which was supported by Alan Morgan and Jane Wing.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

2.1 Minutes of NRM Meeting No. 70 – 8 September

Confirmation of previous minutes were unable to be passed as Quorum was not reached.

2.2 Matters arising / Action Items from the minutes

1. Letter of thanks from the committee to Hayden Dyke - **David Tucker**
UPDATE - Letter of thanks sent to Hayden Dyke was read out by David Tucker. Alan Morgan suggested a replacement Committee Member should be sought and perhaps a "Request for Expressions of Interest" be placed, and the Committee would encourage Aboriginal or Aquaculture representation as this would mean there would be a broad range of people involved from across the Community. Experience in certain areas preferred and the appointment would be considered by the Chair and Council.
2. Investigate alternative funding options including a Council Budget Allocation for the preparation of a Walking & Cycling Strategy. **Alex Woodward**
UPDATE - There are no Grants available from Federal or State Governments regarding Walking and Cycling. The East Coast Tourism were unsuccessful in receiving any Grant monies.
Jane Wing asked whether there was a list of projects ready for when Grants are offered in the future. Alex advised that the current masterplans being prepared would assist in this matter.
3. Hygiene Protocols for Roadside Slashing - Follow-up with State Growth re the Hygiene Protocols for roadside slashing within the municipality. Copies of previous correspondence with SG to be forwarded to Peter Porch - **David Tucker**
UPDATE - Hygiene Protocols were discussed, and David is very frustrated with Council saying there will be no further action. There is evidence (photos circulated) that roadside slashing by Contractors is introducing weeds along Lake Leake Road which has been weed free in the past and that the Department of State Growth are not complying with Hygiene Protocols at the agreed Clean Down Sites. These Clean Down Sites were setup, including signage but they are not being used.

Alex said Council have approached the Department of State Growth on numerous occasions and Council cannot enforce the procedures. State Growth say it was a trial only and Council cannot control what they do. Peter Porch has correspondence on this and the NRM Committee have asked to see this.

Greg Ingham is not happy with the situation and that weeds are invading our Municipality, but he reiterated again that Council do not have control over any State Highways. They are not Zone "A" weeds and State Growth have a weed spraying program in place.
4. Report on level of use of Decontamination Facility at the Triabunna Marina - **PWS**
UPDATE - PWS are not represented today therefore there is nothing on the use of the Decontamination Facility at the Triabunna Marina
5. Public Convenience Strategy - Take the issue to a Council Workshop to review. **Alex Woodward**
UPDATE - Alex is taking the Public Convenience Strategy concept to State Govt early 2022. This essentially falls outside the remit of the committee, but they would be involved if it progresses.
6. Dog Management Policy - Draft to be presented to the Committee for comment. - **Alex Woodward**
UPDATE - Met with other Councils and agreed there is a need for more consistent signage across the whole State as people are getting confused with signage. A whole

NRM Committee Meeting No 71 – 24 November 2021

4

of State approach would keep it simple. Council now has a full-time Animal Control Officer and people are aware of him being in the Municipality. He is trying firstly to educate people first before issuing infringement notices particularly in the Bird Sanctuary (Dog Zone Area 56 Prohibited Area - Orford Sandspit, Prosser River) and other areas within our Municipality. Jane asked will people be fined when dogs are off lead? Council needs to be seen as being serious and have a consistent approach when dealing with the Public. Alex indicated that the Animal Control Officer will be on call over Xmas to deal with animal control issues.

7. **TOR** – Amend as discussed - present to Council for ratification. **Alex Woodward**
UPDATE – TOR taken to Council at the October meeting and approved.
8. **Water Management Plans** – Follow up is necessary to respond to the Minister's reply. Copy of submissions to RWUS to Jenifer Hemer NRM South- **David Tucker**
UPDATE – Push for Water Management plan for the Swan and Prosser Rivers. No monitoring is being done to see how much water is being taken from the Swan River. Water needs to be metered for customers. NRM South have no funding but can see a lot of issues and are collaborating with Landowners.
9. Review of the Weed Management Plan – Discuss options to speed up the review at next meeting.
UPDATE – Amanda and Nicky are progressing with the plan and hopefully early next year 2022 a draft will be forwarded to the Committee for input and then submitted to Council.
10. Monitor for external Funding options for additional Weed Control in the municipality. – **Amanda Brooks**
UPDATE – Funding opportunities are considered as they arise, as well as capacity for Council to commit resources to manage such projects.
11. Black Summer Bushfire Recovery Grants Program - consider a proposal to seek grant funds to refurbish Tiger Trail – **Alex Woodward and Peter Porch.**
UPDATE – Committee are hoping the TFS recognise the importance of maintaining this track. David has sent maps.
12. No Spray Policy, Illegal vegetation Removal Policy, Flora and Fauna Management Plans. Agenda items for future meetings – **NRM Chair & Di Clark**
UPDATE – Illegal vegetation policy will be addressed by the By-Law and a Policy will not be required. Flora and Fauna Management Plans will be considered as part of future annual work plans. The cost to undertake this work would be in the vicinity of \$20k.
13. NRM budget update – **Alex Woodward**
UPDATE – Instead of having a set budget for NRM, Council's NRM activities are distributed within the Organisation (i.e., Infrastructure & Works, Planning & Development etc.).
14. Draft message to committee members – **Alan Morgan - Cheryl Arrol**
UPDATE – Completed.

Committee Members are very concerned that attendance numbers are down and that the standing of the Committee within Council is significantly weakened. NRM Minutes haven't been taken to Council over the last 3 months and are questioning why? The Council Website needs updating and connecting with users is important. It was agreed the Minutes will be included on future Council Agendas.

NRM Committee Members would like to attend a Council Workshop in the future to talk about their role within our Municipality. Their observation is that no Councilor has approached the NRM Committee over the last 3 years with regard to what has transpired. Councilors not interested and the NRM Committee does not feel supported.

3. COMMITTEE CORRESPONDENCE

3.1 Correspondence In/Out

Email from the GM to the Vice Chair seeking clarification as to the involvement of NRM Committee members, specifically Hayden Dyke in the decision process of allocating grant money. Note The Chair of the committee Councilor Arnol was on sick leave, therefore the correspondence went to the Vice Chair.

The Vice Chair responded by confirming that at no stage were any committee members involved in the allocation of Weed Grant money other than the Vice Chair and previous Chair Mr John Cotton providing feedback on all grant applications to the **"GSBC Drought Weeds Grant 2020"**.

3.2 Business arising from Correspondence

Nil

LUNCH - 12.30pm - 1.00pm

4. INFORMATION REPORT

4.1 Draft Orford Foreshore Masterplan

Alex gave a presentation on the Draft Masterplan for the Orford Foreshore. The Committee were supportive of the plan but requested the opportunity to provide further comment.

Alex indicated that the draft plan be circulated to the committee once it has been presented to the Councillors.

4.2 Tasmanian Wild Fallow Deer Strategy

NRM South will make a submission.

Consensus was that given there is a small number of Deer on the East Coast, the coastal area of the East Coast should be changed to No Deer Zoning given the extent of Reserves and intensive agriculture. It was suggested the boundary be pulled back to the top of the tier (ie along M-MS-MG Road east of Lake Leake)

The solution would be to change the East coast to an eradication, the same as the west and North-West Coast.

4.3 Environment By-Law

Alex provided a brief overview of the initial draft By-Law. Alex will send new draft for feedback from NRM Committee.

4.4 Project Grants Update

Amanda has continued working on the projects since last meeting and has nearly finished with the last amount of fund money. Looking forward to next allocation of Project Funding so Council can keep encouraging Landowners to manage weeds throughout the municipality.

4.5 Round Table

- Dolphin Sands Ratepayers have approval to do Native Garden Beds to show residence suitable native species to grow on the peninsula. Amanda to work with Robyn to progress this.
- Coles Bay Sewerage – No reply to letter Council sent suggesting more signage.
- Rabbits – Need to follow up DPIPWE re rabbits
- Cat Management Policy- Jason and Alex are working with PWS and the regional cat management officer re feral cats. Council is following the State-wide Policy.

5. CLOSE

5.2 Next Meeting

The NRM Committee Meetings are proposed to be held on the 3rd Wednesday every 3 months.

16th February 2022	Triabunna
18th May 2022	Swansea
17th August 2022	Triabunna
16th November 2022	Swansea

Note: Currently meeting venues are restricted to Triabunna and Swansea until COVID restrictions are eased.

Closed meeting at 3:30pm

Action Items from the meeting

1. Alex Woodward to advertise for “expressions of interest” to join the committee in the new year.
2. Greg Ingham will write to the Department of State Growth again and refer to the procedure required and provide evidence of weed seed being spread in our Municipality. The NRM Committee would like to have input into the letter.
3. Alex is taking the Public Convenience Strategy concept to State Govt early 2022
4. Follow up with PWS representative at the next meeting re use of the washdown facility at the wharf.
5. Greg Ingham agreed to write to the Minister again with the concerns raised in respect to the need for Water Management Plans for the east coast rivers.
6. Greg Ingham to arrange joint workshop between Elected Council Members and the NRM Committee.
7. David Tucker to resketch Deer Zoning map and add worlds for Greg.
8. Native species Garden Dolphin Sands -Amanda Brooks to work with Robyn to make it happen.
9. Agenda Item for next meeting – Coastal erosion/Mitigation for discussion on Council's policy.
10. The Committee requests a detailed update on progress in respect to the Coles Bay sewerage issue.
11. Liaise with Glen Graves to include GSBC in the DPIPWE calisi virus release program for Rabbits. Alex

NRM Committee Meeting No 71 – 24 November 2021

8

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Natural Resource Management Committee meeting held on 24 November 2021 be received and noted.

7. INFORMATION REPORTS

7.1 Director Works and Infrastructure - Mr Peter Porch

Asset Management; Roads, Bridges and Footpaths; Stormwater; Waste Management; Public Amenities; Parks, Reserves and Walking Tracks; Cemeteries

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

PURPOSE

This report provides information on the ongoing tasks of the Department in relation to Asset Management; Emergency Management, Roads, Bridges and Footpaths; Stormwater; Waste Management; Public Amenities; Parks, Reserves and Walking Tracks; Cemeteries


OFFICERS COMMENTS

ASSET MANAGEMENT

Asset Management practice is the strategic driver for the activities of the department and is partnered by works that operate to maintain essential services to the community.

Sound asset management practice requires a strategic approach including the development of a hierarchy of documentation. This is particularly important in the delivery of operational services where significant funds are expended each year in service delivery. The process is also critical in managing many risks to council.

For Parks and Recreation the hierarchy will look like this:



Staff have commenced work on collating existing information and filling the gaps for documenting the Operational Service Levels, the Operations Manual and the Operational Instructions.

It is common for the information required to describe councils works to be head knowledge with little supporting information that can be relied upon and generally information is disparate, existing in various spreadsheets and documents without any linkage. To gain efficiencies, limit errors and provide consistent services to the community the establishment of these sets of information are important advances providing documented standards for operational activities.

This activity will continue over the next few years as the information for each asset class undergoes the same process, after which, the task transitions into a cycle of review.

CONSULTANT SERVICES

Consultant services are required to deliver specialized services to council for a range of generally short term requirements. Current consultant activities comprise:

- Stormwater Management Plan: Cameron Oakley continues to work through a multitude of inundation issues with the outcome to be a schedule of future works encompassing a number of years of forward works. Each of these projects will come before council for consideration in future capital works programs. Projects will be assessed on the basis of risk to form a priority for scheduling the program that will be presented to council.
The South Orford Stormwater System Study - Ongoing.
The North Orford study continued in conjunction with the Department of State Growth (DSG) who are jointly funding this project.
Holkham Crt culvert and drain works continued.
The Stormwater Management Plan is being developed for presentation to council in coming months. Development of Stormwater Policy is progressing with new information and legal opinion now provided by the Derwent Estuary Project and the LGA.
- Grant fund project delivery: Graeme Edwards is retained to deliver a range of projects funded by commonwealth Grants. A number of sub-consultants are involved in these works also. Ongoing.
- Pitt and Sherry are developing tender design and specification for Vicary Street and The Esplanade intersection in Triabunna. Ongoing.
- Andrew Walter Constructions are carrying out test pits and developing a design report to inform repair options and costs for Nugent Road.

OPERATIONAL WORKS

ROADS, BRIDGES, FOOTPATHS, KERBS

- Unsealed road inspections: 7 carried out
- Wielangta Rd and Earlham Rd maintenance grading underway – 5klms to complete
- Green Hill road maintenance grading complete
- Old Coach Road priority repairs complete
- Earlham Rd maintenance grade complete
- Rheban Rd maintenance grade scheduled for January
- Pothole repairs ongoing
- Charles St Orford temporary repairs effected
- Annual Bridge inspection Program – AusSpan – completed
- Bresnehan's Rd bridge – rubble under bridge cleared; rock armour placed as per AusSpan maintenance list works
- Roadside slashing program continued
- Nature strip mowing Orford, Triabunna, Buckland completed
- Planning for clearing of river rock at Orford Rivulet commenced

STORMWATER, DRAINAGE

- Investigations, locations and repairs continued
- Pre-rainfall event storm checklist for problem locations exercised

WASTE MANAGEMENT

- Fermentation of green waste trial No.2 planning commenced
- Coles Bay Green waste mulching completed
- Orford green waste burn completed
- Swansea tip shop arrangements – space at a premium. Stock not collected for the shop to review and return to waste stream.

PARKS, PLAYGROUNDS, RESERVES, WALKING TRACKS, CEMETERY

- 8 weekly playground inspections completed
- Nature strip and park/Reserve mowing continued

- Soft fall for playground top ups commenced.
- High risk tree hazard trimming park and reserve areas – identified tree hazards numerous areas
- Walking track maintenance ongoing – Orford, Bicheno, Triabunna, Swansea
- Memorial seat installed at Lion Park Bicheno- private works completed
- Coles Bay community group installation of 3 water fountains/dog waters – completed. (bubblers disabled as a measure for COVID management for the present)
- Boat ramp pressure cleaning completed
- Oct 2021 playground inspection report works orders generated

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT:


After hours rostering carried out as scheduled.

Placement of COVID 19 Check-In for Parks areas placed in November is creating additional work. As the photo shows the compliance with State Government Health directives are not well received by all. This is the second of these concreted in Check-In location signs that have been removed.




CUSTOMER REQUESTS

The Chart below summarises the requests received year to date by the total numbers received; the number completed; those generated by the public and those generated by officers.



The requests are sorted into categories to provide an overview of the areas showing the most interest or greatest need for attention as per the bar chart below:



Operational activities are starting to be impacted by quarantining associated with the management of the pandemic. Waste services are the first to be impacted. Priorities are being rearranged where possible to ensure standard services and facilities are available as scheduled however, there are expected to be some unplanned interruptions to service provision in the coming months as staffing is stretched and particular skills are not able to be covered.

CAPITAL WORKS

- Alma Rd completed; Fieldwick Lane drainage works to commence
- Griffiths Rivulet Bridge – concrete works to bridge completed. Road approaches to commence early January and then safety barriers to be installed.
- Bicheno BMX Track upgrade – works completed.

- Design for Triabunna School Crossing 99% - confirming details with school representatives prior to quotations
- Reseal program scope finalized. Contracts signed and works programmed for completion by 30th March 2022
- Strip Road – quotes received for concreting. Consultation with affected property owners commenced to determine acceptable timing for works. (works will require road closure for 2 days preventing access to properties)
- Old Coach Rd resheeting completed.

Grant funded

Generally the grant funded projects are experiencing delays as consultation with major stakeholders is slower to progress than anticipated.

- Swansea Main St Paving: Concept commenced Community engagement phase commenced.
- Bicheno Tasman Highway Footpath: 99% complete.
- Coles Bay Foreshore Footpath: Concept design developing to inform consultation.
- Bicheno Gulch Foreshore and Esplanade Upgrade: Awaiting approvals prior to final design.
- Bicheno Triangle Upgrade: Design and consultation ongoing

GENERAL

- A Grant application under the: Preparing Australian Communities Program (PACP) Round 1 has been lodged. The time frame for lodgement was between 10th December to 6th January. This is for the Orford Levy and associated flood mitigation works at Strawberry Hills Court, Rudd Avenue and Walters Drive Orford. If successful, the project will be within the 2022-24 time frame.
- Significant work for engineering staff resources continues to be generated by development activity with assessment of development plans and accountability of developers site works being upheld. Few developments have simple solutions for stormwater management with officers periodically relying on powers under the Urban Drainage to achieve appropriate design for proposed solutions and conformance.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council notes the information.

8. OFFICERS' REPORT REQUIRING A DECISION

8.1 Covid Safety Plan

Author: Director Planning & Development (Mr Alex Woodward)

Responsible Officer: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

ATTACHMENT/S

Nil.

PURPOSE

To provide Council with an information report on actions being undertaken in relation to COVID.

BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW

Proposal in detail:

The health and safety of our staff and community is Glamorgan Spring Bay Council's number one priority and we are actively taking measures to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic.

As a part of the initial work completed when the pandemic first commenced, Council developed a COVID Safety Plan to ensure Council best protects its employees and visitors. This plan has been reviewed as the situation continues to change.

The minimum standards within Council's COVID-19 Safety Plan are set by the Direction from the State Government for COVID-19 Workplace Plans. These require all workplaces to:

- manage the risks of a person contracting or spreading COVID-19 in the workplace
- implement and maintain a cleaning schedule across the workplace have good hygiene procedures and practices (such as washing and/or sanitising of hands)
- ensure workers who have been instructed to quarantine or self-isolate don't come to the workplace
- make sure physical distancing requirements are met by workers, contractors and others entering, leaving or moving around the workplace.
- provide information, training and supervision on how the risks of COVID-19 are to be managed and ensure all processes and procedures are applied by the workers.
- provide information and instruction to other people who attend the workplace about how they are to comply with your processes and procedures, and make sure they apply them
- all information, recommendations, directions and guidance materials relevant to the workplace (obtained from reputable sources) is reviewed regularly to ensure the control measures implemented are appropriate
- entry into the workplace is managed and controlled in a reasonable manner if someone is suspected of showing symptoms of COVID-19, or of being exposed to COVID-19 within the preceding 14 days, or being diagnosed with COVID-19
- any workplace records that would assist with notifying people who enter/leave the workplace of any potential exposure to COVID-19 must be kept for at least 28 days.

Additional actions:

In addition to requirements to the State Government requirements, management has also introduced the following measures to ensure we keep the workplace as safe as possible and for business continuity planning. These recent measures are because of the highly transmissible Omicron variant:

- implemented working from home arrangements for a number of staff to limit density limits and to ensure business continuity
- changed Council meetings and workshops to be held electronically via teams
- reduce face to face meetings with the public by holding them electronically if possible, or outside onsite.

Face masks:

It is now a requirement for people aged 12 years and older (unless exempt) in Tasmania to wear a mask in all public indoor spaces as an additional layer of protection against COVID-19. This requirement is captured in a Direction under the Public Health Act 1997.

An indoor space is one substantially enclosed by permanent or temporary roof and walls. This includes temporary structures, such as a marquee.

Individuals are responsible for providing their own mask. A mask must also be worn in Workplaces, which includes all of Council's indoor venues.

The advice from the State Government is that

“face masks must be worn over the mouth and nose and should fit securely around your face to provide protection against infection. The best face mask is a single-use surgical mask that you can buy at a chemist or pharmacy.

If you are unable to get a surgical mask, any other single-use paper or cloth masks are fine to use. The most effective cloth masks are made up of at least three layers of fabric. You can use either disposable (single use) face masks or reusable cloth masks. Research shows that wearing multilayer cloth masks can block up to 50-70% of exhaled fine droplets, particles and aerosols. Another study has found that upwards of 80% of particles could be blocked by wearers of cloth masks, with cloth masks in some studies performing on par with surgical masks”.

Council is currently compliant with these requirements and will review if the legislation changes.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Guiding Principle

7. Communicate and explain Council's decisions and reasons in an open and timely manner

Key Foundation/s

2. OUR COMMUNITY'S HEALTH & WELLBEING

3. OUR PEOPLE

What we plan to do

- Create an informed and involved community by developing relevant and accessible communication channels.
- Create a psychologically safe environment where people feel they can share ideas and raise and resolve issues or concerns.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

The COVID-19 Disease Emergency (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2020 is the legislation which Council is required to abide by. Council is fully compliant with the requirements.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

To ensure the COVID Safety Plans are implemented, there are costs associated with this. These costs have been budgeted for in Council's operational budget. Any change to the safety plans would require consideration.

RISK CONSIDERATION/S

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation				
Noting this report poses no risk consideration to Council				
Do not adopt the recommendation				

OFFICER'S COMMENT

Council is currently fully compliant with the requirements as per our COVID safety plan and is going above the requirements to ensure all staff and visitors are kept safe during this time.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council note the actions being undertaken by staff in relation to COVID safety requirements.

8.2 Council Advertising Policy

Author: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

Responsible Officer: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Draft Council Advertising Policy

PURPOSE

To recommend that Council adopts the Council Advertising Policy as attached to this agenda item.

BACKGROUND/OVERVIEW

The Council Advertising Policy establishes a standard for all Council advertising, including but not limited to development applications, events and information advertisements.

The updated Policy determines that Council when required will advertise in the appropriate daily newspaper (The Mercury and/or The Examiner), with the option to also advertise on Council's website, Council's Facebook, local media outlets and community notice boards.

Council's existing Advertising Policy was adopted in June 2019 and is now due for review. The new Policy includes all updated and related legislation, along with updated advertising locations for development applications.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- *Local Government Act 1993*
- *The Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*
- *The Glamorgan Spring Bay Interim Planning Scheme 2015*

STRATEGIC PLAN

Guiding Principle

Communicate and explain Council's decisions and reasons in an open and timely manner.

Key Foundation/s

1. OUR GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

What we plan to do

Be accountable and ensure good governance practice.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

N/A

RISK CONSIDERATIONS

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation				
Nil.				
Do not adopt the recommendation				
Policy review date overdue	Low	Low	Low	Review and amend Policy for presentation to Council at a future meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopts the Council Advertising Policy as attached to this report.

8.3 Council Workshop Policy

Author: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

Responsible Officer: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Draft Council Workshop Policy

PURPOSE

To recommend that Council adopts the draft Council Workshop Policy as attached to this agenda item.

BACKGROUND/OVERVIEW

In order to promote and continue to improve the good governance within Glamorgan Spring Bay Council, a draft Council Workshop Policy has been developed. This is a Policy commonly adopted by Australian Local Government organisations.

Council Workshops in the last twelve months have been effective and of value. This Policy adds another dimension of good practice governance.

The Policy applies to all Councillors and staff of Glamorgan Spring Bay Council and is to be applied during all Council Workshops.

The main objectives of the Policy are to establish guidelines for the conduct of Council Workshop forums, which creates an opportunity for:

1. Councillors and officers to discuss matters and obtain and exchange information; and
2. Councillors to otherwise better inform themselves about:
 - a) the implementation of previous decisions of Council;
 - b) the ongoing operations of Council;
 - c) matters raised which may be the subject of consideration at a Council meeting
 - d) upcoming Planning Authority reports

Workshops are intended to provide a valuable opportunity to enhance the decision-making process by providing an opportunity for Councillors to ask questions and seek clarification of information prior to formal meetings.

This policy provides guidance to Councillors and Council officers on the conduct and value of Council Workshops.

The draft Policy was discussed at the Council Workshop held on 7 December 2021.

If adopted by Council at the January 2022 Ordinary Meeting, the Policy will be made available on Council's website and Staff Intranet.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- *Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)*
- *Glamorgan Spring Bay Council Code of Conduct*

STRATEGIC PLAN

Guiding Principle

Communicate and explain Council's decisions and reasons in an open and timely manner.

Key Foundation/s

1. OUR GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

What we plan to do

Be accountable and ensure good governance practice.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

N/A

RISK CONSIDERATIONS

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation As Council works through implementation of this policy, initially there may be non-compliances.	Minor	Possible	Moderate	Regular reviews of the Policy are undertaken with actions to rectify non compliances in a timely manner consistent with the overall records management.
Do not adopt the recommendation By not having a Council Workshop Policy in place, governance control is reduced which may lead to confusion and ambiguity.	Low	Low	Low	Review and amend Policy for presentation to Council at a future meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopts the Council Workshop Policy as attached to this report.

8.4 2022 National General Assembly

Author: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

Responsible Officer: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. 2022 National General Assembly – discussion paper
2. 2022 Federal Election Priorities

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Glamorgan Spring Bay Council with information and the opportunity to submit a motion(s) for debate at the National General Assembly to be held in Canberra in June 2022.

BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW

As the national voice of Local Government, the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) advocates on behalf of Australia's 537 Councils for funding and policy outcomes that support local government.

The attached discussion paper has been prepared by ALGA assist council in developing motions. Councils motion(s) can address one or more of the issues identified in the discussion paper. Also attached to assist is the Federal Election Priorities document.

Motions need to meet the following criteria:

- Be relevant to the work of local government nationally;
- Be consistent with the themes of the NGA;
- Complement Tasmanian State policy objectives;
- Propose a clear action and outcome;
- Not be advanced on behalf of external third parties that may seek to use the NGA to gain national political exposure that are not in the interest of local government.

All motions should have a clear national objective, a summary of key arguments in support of the motion, and the endorsement of Council.

Also attached is a copy of ALGA'S Federal Election Priorities informed by motions passed at last years NGA and endorsed by the ALGA Board. They cover key priority portfolios of economic recovery, transport, community infrastructure, building community resilience and intergovernmental relations.

According to independent economists, and if implemented by the next Federal Government the key priorities they would create approximately 43,000 new jobs and add \$6.39 billion per annum to Australia's GDP.

Motions can be lodged online at alga.asn.au until 11:59pm on Friday 25 March 2022.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Our core purpose

6. Advocating for the region with State and Federal Government.

Key Foundations

1. Our governance and finance
2. Our community's health and wellbeing
3. Our people
4. Infrastructure and Services
5. Our environment

What we plan to do

- continue to advocate and maximise opportunities for our municipal area.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

Section 71 of the *Local Government Act 1993*

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

N/A

RISK CONSIDERATION/S

Glamorgan Spring Bay Council doesn't participate at the 2022 National General Assembly representing our region, municipality, or the greater Tasmania.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council considers the 2022 National General Assembly discussion paper and associated information as presented and submitting a motion (s) for debate at the June 2022 NGA.

8.5 Swansea Courthouse Management Committee 2021 Annual Report

Author: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

Responsible Officer: General Manager (Mr Greg Ingham)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Swansea Courthouse and Council Chambers Draft Business Plan
2. Swansea Courthouse Management Committee Terms of Reference
3. Swansea Courthouse Management Committee 2021 Annual Report

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present the Swansea Courthouse Management Committee's Annual Report to Council for consideration and noting, and to seek Council's endorsement for the Committee to manage the building for a further four years to 31 December 2025 and to consider inclusion of the Committee as a section 24 Committee.

BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW

The above attachments provide a background and timeline pertinent to this summarised report.

The Council office in Swansea, which occupied portions of the Courthouse building and an ancillary building, was officially closed in June 2014. Since this time the building (Courthouse and ancillary buildings), has been in need of major repairs including a total roof replacement and floor support structure replacement to the Courthouse. Rising damp was identified as a significant issue on the western side of the Courthouse building in 2019 and ratification works have since been completed.

Council advertised its intention to dispose of the building in early 2016 which provoked action from some in the Swansea community who felt it should be kept in Council's ownership.

At its 23 August 2016 Ordinary Meeting, Council authorised the then General Manager to advise transfer of management of the old Council building (Courthouse and ancillary buildings) to a 'Courthouse Steering Committee and East Coast Community Arts Initiative' with certain conditions.

The Glamorgan Spring Bay Council passed the following resolution at its 26 September 2017 Ordinary Meeting:

1. *The current Swansea Courthouse Management Committee for a new Management Committee with ten members selected for their skills and representative of local and wider community and business interest no later than 30 November 2017.*
2. *Terms of Reference for the committee should be established and submitted to Council within three months of the formation of the committee*
3. *That Council retain the Swansea Courthouse and Council Office in public ownership until 30 December 2018 to allow the new committee time to prove their business plan*
4. *That a review of the success of the business plan be undertaken in November 2018.*

There doesn't appear to be a record of the adoption of the draft Business Plan or a review in November 2018 as per the above resolution, on Council files.

The Swansea Courthouse Management Committee is an incorporated body and therefore able to seek external funding by way of financial assistance grants.

The Courthouse Management Committee is not a Section 24 Committee of Council, but consideration should be given to it becoming so to enable a degree of transparency and control over decisions regarding on site activities, finances and any structural alterations that occur at the council owned asset.

Covid-19 has had an impact on the use of the Courthouse during the course of 2021 and will continue to do so for foreseeable future. It is therefore difficult for the Committee to forecast long term patronage and income.

The lack of WiFi connectivity and ablution facilities that do not meet current accessibility standards are seen as hindrances to increasing the use of the Courthouse. External funding will be sought to address these matters.

The ancillary buildings have been used by a veterinarian and currently a previous Council external office is occupied by East Coast Tourism under a peppercorn rent agreement.

It should be noted that the Courthouse building is State heritage listed and as such the exterior of the building cannot be altered without the Heritage Council approval.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Guiding Principle

Provide sound community governance, practices and processes

Seek and secure additional funds, grants to augment Council finances

Manage finances and administer the Council

Key Foundation

1. Our Governance and Finance

What we plan to do

- Be accountable and ensure good governance practice

Building Asset Management Plan Goals:

- To provide safe and reliable building infrastructure for the community to enjoy
- Good governance
- Appropriate service levels
- Improved risk management
- Financial sustainability

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- *Local Government Act 1993*
- *Building Act 2016*
- *Building Regulations 2016*
- *National Construction Code*

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

External funding will continue to be sought to fund improvements and or major work to the Courthouse and Council Office. Routine maintenance can be funded from Councils annual building maintenance budget.

RISK CONSIDERATION/S

Risk associated with Council endorsing the ongoing management of the Swansea Courthouse and associated facilities is considered minimal as the initiatives identified within the Business Plan are consistent with Council's Strategic Plan and Council's adopted 2021-2022 budget.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Receives and notes the Swansea Courthouse 2021/22 Annual Report.
and
2. Endorses the Swansea Courthouse Management Committee Inc. to manage the Courthouse building for a further four years until 31 December 2025.

8.6 Stormwater System Management Plan

Author: Director Works & Infrastructure (Peter Porch)

Responsible Officer: Director Works & Infrastructure (Peter Porch)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Draft Stormwater System Management Plan

PURPOSE

To provide a draft of a proposed first version of a Stormwater System Management Plan for the Glamorgan Spring Bay Municipal Area which conforms with the Urban Drainage Act 2013, for adoption by council.

BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW

Under the Urban Drainage Act 2013, Council is required to develop a Stormwater System Management Plan:

10. Stormwater system management plans

- (1) A council must develop a stormwater system management plan for the urban area of its municipal area within 6 years after the day on which this Act commences.*
- (2) A stormwater system management plan is to specify –
 - (a) plans for the management of any assets used for the delivery of a stormwater service; and*
 - (b) the level of risk from flooding for each urban stormwater catchment in the public stormwater system; and*
 - (c) any other matters prescribed in the regulations or that the council considers appropriate.**

This requirement has been recognized and funds have been assigned to the development of the same all-be-it outside the legislated time frame.

The development and adoption of the plan is also listed as an action (Task 7) in council's Hydraulic Infrastructure Asset Management Plan.

The last 18 months has seen urban development intensify in this municipality with many developments underway. Each one will impact on the volume and transmission of stormwater from source to sea. Additionally the change being observed, measured and responded to in the pattern of rainfall and its escalation of intensity, raises the importance of developing and implementing systems of control and management for stormwater and its potential for flooding impacts.

Council's consultant Hydrological Engineer has gathered information and conducted modelling over the past year to develop a stormwater management plan to meet the requirements of the Act.

This municipal area has numerous catchments in its isolated urban areas. The information council had on hand to develop and map the impacts of stormwater flow have been limited and resources have been assigned to identify the unidentified existing systems that form the networks.

This task physically locates the pipes and pits in backyards, under sheds, in road reservations and easements. Asset condition size and depths are surveyed which enables flood maps to be developed to show the potential of rainfall event flooding to occur.

The work is probably one third complete. Orford is substantially complete with works in Bicheno, Coles Bay, Swansea and Triabunna sporadically visited to address critical issues. As a result, the plan presented is a snapshot in time and the wording in the plan reflects progress to date and provides a guide as to how further development of catchment plans may be developed.

Over the past year council staff have been adding to the identified network for stormwater particularly with additional found assets as described in the Stormwater Asset Management Improvement Plan.

The table below identifies the increase in stormwater assets picked up during this period through updating as-constructed information from development and field truthing of assets in service:

Asset Type	Original No.	No. found/added	Total
Nodes (manholes/pits)	1038	771	1809
Pipes	913	725	1638
Drains	71	165	236
Totals	2022	1661	3683

In drainage assets alone, the increase is 82% of the previous asset register quantity. The value is yet to be determined. This work is by no means complete in terms of mapping existing assets and there is a significant addition in subdivision assets also underway consistent with or exceeding asset management plan projections for new assets.

While we plan to push developers to provide modelling for the impacts of their developments on the downstream environment, council is not able to provide information to developers on the catchment above their developments. This presents some difficulties which developers are likely to object to and fight. Information on one is contingent on the provision of the other.

As the present funds are exhausted for the development of catchment investigation we have little option in the short term but to require developers to provide the modelling as no budget exists for this work. Additional funding will be sought as we go forward to enable the completion of urban catchment mapping however the completion of the task is open ended at present.

Like Asset Management Plans, this plan will be reviewed when it is timely to do so to include updated information on existing and new drainage systems being added to the system or identified as existing.

A further document which needs to be developed is a stormwater policy. While a draft has been presented to council at an earlier workshop for information, relevant new information and Legal opinion on the extent of policy consistent with LUPAA and the Urban Drainage Act has been sourced through LGAT.

This will substantially increase the draft policy content and scope. Development of the policy will continue and integrate with the Stormwater System Management Plan content.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Key Foundation: 1. Our Governance and Finance

Sound Governance and financial management that shows council is using ratepayer funds to deliver best value and impact for the GSBC community.

- Planned asset renewal expenditure based on agreed asset management plans.

Key Foundation: 4. Infrastructure and Assets

Delivering High quality, cost-effective infrastructure and services that meet the needs of our communities, residents and visitors.

- Develop plans policies and guidelines for built assets

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- Urban Drainage Act 2013
- Local Government Act (1993)

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

There are long term budget implications of a positive nature. The Stormwater System Management Plan is a strategic view of council's urban catchments and assists in setting risk based priorities on the planned expenditure of operational and capital funds.

There are no short term budget impacts associated with the adoption of the Plan.

RISK CONSIDERATION/S

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation The Draft plan becomes current. Positive risk consequence.				Positive consequence achieved. Guidance to direct a considered and consistent approach is provided.
Do not adopt the recommendation Plan establishment date further delayed – non-adoption likely due to concerns over content. Negative risk consequence.	Moderate	certain	Moderate	Review content and re-present plan to council at future meeting.

OFFICER'S ADVICE

The development of the plan is an overdue action according to the Urban Drainage Act 2013 requirements. The proposed version provides substantial information to inform future works programs and a strategic approach to stormwater system development. While stormwater system development is an ongoing activity, the adoption of the draft plan presented will meet compliance with the requirements of the Act and the plan's review will provide timely updates of the plan content.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopt the draft Glamorgan Spring Bay Stormwater System Management Plan and review the document by June 2024.

8.7 Tender Delegation to General Manager

Author Director Works & Infrastructure (Peter Porch)

Responsible Officer Director Works & Infrastructure (Peter Porch)

ATTACHMENT/S

Nil.

PURPOSE

To request a decision of council to delegate authority to the General Manager to award a tender in excess of the General Managers Delegation.

BACKGROUND/OVERVIEW

Council has a register of financial delegations under which, the General Manager has a delegation limit of \$250,000.

Presently, council has a tender in the market which will close this week. The value of the tender is likely to exceed the General Managers delegation and it is customary to bring a report to council to consider in closed session for consideration of a recommendation to award such tenders.

This particular project, Vicary and Esplanade Intersection Upgrade, which will incorporate the Cenotaph installation and the Electric Vehicle Charging Station is partially funded by Drought Grant funds of \$115,000. The balance is derived from road to recovery grant funds.

The Drought Grant fund completion dates have been extended three times and it has been made clear that they will not be extended again. The date by which these funds must be spent and the works done is the end of March 2022. This gives only 2 months to award the tender and have the project sufficiently complete to expend the grant funds.

Delays in development of the tender drawings have pushed the tender period to the present.

It is therefore critical to move to the tender review/negotiation and award process without delay.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Key Foundation/s 4.
Infrastructure and Services

Delivering high quality, cost-effective infrastructure and services that meet the needs of our communities, residents and visitors.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- *Local Government Act 1993 under Section 333A - Division 2A Tenders and Contracts for goods and services.*
- *Local Government Regulations 2015 (S.R 2015, No.37) 28. Code for Tenders and Contracts*
- *Policy - Code for Tenders and Contracts*
- *Local Government Act 1993 S64 Delegation by General Manager*

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Council has grant funds within the 2021-22 capital program from Road to Recovery for \$144,941 and Drought Relief for \$115,000 to fund works on this project.

RISK CONSIDERATIONS

Key risks to council include risks associated with tendering and contract management which incorporate required insurance certification for Public and Products Liability; Plant and Equipment; Vehicles and Workers Compensation.

Other risks include compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Act and Regulations and councils Code for Tenders and Contracts for establishing contracts and tenders over \$100,000. Council's code for tenders and contracts requires that an open tender process be undertaken for projects over \$250,000.

The tender was advertised on the 8th January 2022 in the Mercury and Examiner newspapers and is scheduled to close on the 27th January 2022. Due to delays in specification documents an addendum had to be issued shortly after tender period commencement to provide a pricing schedule.

This RFT process complies with the code for tenders and contracts and is implemented to manage these risks of non-conformance with the Act and Regulations.

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation				
Financial and legal Risks associated with tender and contract management	Moderate	Unlikely	Low	Follow governance processes including code for tenders and contracts. Staff trained and competent in managing contracts Panel established to review tenders in accord with the Code
Do not adopt the recommendation				
No alternative funding to apply to the project	Likely	Likely	High	The project will have to be abandoned until adequate funding can be sourced. Drought funding will be lost and road to recovery funds which have also been deferred will be at risk.

OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Recent information from industry experts suggests that projects are exceeding budgets developed by Quantity Surveyors by as much as 40%. It is anticipated that tenders will exceed the budget value and that negotiation with preferred tenderers will be required to modify the scope to the budget value. Potential savings have been identified to facilitate these negotiations if necessary.

The delay in contract documentation drawings has pushed the funding window to the limit. This measure is proposed as a means to expend the funds and create value for the community as intended by council with the adoption of this project in the capital works program.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council delegate authority to the General Manager to award the contract for the Capital Project: Triabunna Road Realignment re Cenotaph/RSL corner in accord with the Code for Tenders and Contracts processes.

8.8 Audit Panel Change in Chairperson

Author: Director Corporate & Community (Mrs Elysse Blain)

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community (Mrs Elysse Blain)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Audit Panel Charter

PURPOSE

To recommend that Council approve the change of Chairperson of the Audit Panel Committee to Heather Salisbury from Mike Derbyshire.

BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW

The Audit Panel is established under the Local Government Act 1993 to assist Councillors in fulfilling responsibilities relating to the review of the Council's performance and effectiveness as well as safeguarding its long-term financial position. The Panel serves as an objective party to review the financial information presented to the community. The Audit Panel Charter provides guidance on operation of the group.

Panel members are appointed by Council for a period not less than one year and not more than four years. Of the four appointed panel members, two must be independent persons, including the chairperson, who is not a Councillor, Council employee or another Council employee. These members are appointed with relevant knowledge and expertise. If the Panel includes more than one Independent Person, then Council is to directly appoint the Chairperson.

The current Panel Chairperson, Mike Derbyshire was reappointed in the role at the Ordinary Meeting 15 December 2020 for the term 1 January 2021 to 31 December 2024. At the Audit Panel Meeting 30 November 2021, Mike has advised that due to other work obligations he seeks to stepdown from the Chairman role and revert to an independent member role. At the same meeting independent Panel member Heather Salisbury, appointed for the term 1 January 2021 to 31 December 2024 has offered to take up the role as Chairperson subject to Council approval.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- Local Government Act 1993
- Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB)
- International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Nil

RISK CONSIDERATION/S

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation				
There are no material risks from adopting this recommendation.				
Do not adopt the recommendation				
Unsuitable matching of obligation and availability on the incumbent could lead to resignation on the role possibly leading to disruption of activities and unnecessary friction in the team.	Possible	Minor	Moderate	To be assessed in terms of other competing priorities and take action to fix if resources permit.

OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The current Chairperson has been in the role for more than one full term and has worked through significant change in the organization. Much appreciation should be expressed for the guidance over that time. It is good practice to bring in new expertise with fresh views and alternative experience. The request for change is supported.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Appoint Heather Salisbury to the role of Audit Panel Chairperson.
and
2. Acknowledge Mike Derbyshire's contribution as Chairperson, and accept resumption of a role of independent Panel member.

8.9 Minutes of Glamorgan Spring Bay Audit Panel

Author: Director Corporate & Community (Mrs Elysse Blain)

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community (Mrs Elysse Blain)

ATTACHMENT/S

1. Minutes of Meeting 30 November 2021

PURPOSE

To recommend that Council receives and notes the attached Minutes and Annual Report from the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council Audit Panel.

BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW

The Glamorgan Spring Bay Council Audit Panel (the Panel) plays a vital role in assisting Elected Members of the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council in fulfilling responsibilities relating to the review of the Council's performance and effectiveness as well as safeguarding its long-term financial position.

As required by the Audit act, Tasmanian councils are audited annually through submission of their financial statements to the Auditor-General via the Tasmanian Audit office (TAO). The Audit panel plays an important role in reviewing these documents and has noted in their minutes the very pleasing result for the 2020/21 financial year reports. The TAO financial audit report for June 2021 has been circulated to the elected members.

The Panel met on 30 November 2021 at the Triabunna Council Office, with one Panel member attending online via Microsoft Teams. The Panel has made a number of recommendations and a summary of the key actions are provided at the end of the Minutes. The majority of these require action by Council staff or the Chair of the Panel.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- Local Government Act 1993
- Glamorgan Spring Bay Audit Charter
- Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB)
- International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Nil

RISK CONSIDERATION/S

Risk	Consequence	Likelihood	Rating	Risk Mitigation Treatment
Adopt the recommendation				
There is no material risk from not adopting this recommendation.				
Do not adopt the recommendation				
There is no material risk from not adopting this recommendation.				

OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The audit function is recognised as a critical component in the accountability and governance framework of any local government entity, and, under the Act, all Tasmanian councils are required to establish and maintain an audit panel. Not doing so would be a breach of the Act and significantly reduce oversight of Councils finances.

The Audit Panel has been pleased to note the ongoing improvement in Councils organisational financial controls towards the resulting positive financial audit results.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receives and notes the attached Minutes of the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council Audit Panel Meetings held on the 30 November 2021.

9. NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil.

10. PETITIONS

Nil.

11. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

11.1 Questions on notice by Councillors

Nil.

11.2 Questions without notice by Councillors

12. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS (CLOSED SESSION)

In accordance with the requirements of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, the Mayor is to declare the meeting closed to the public in order to discuss the following matter/s:

Item 1: Minutes of Closed Session – Ordinary Council Meeting held on 14 December 2021

As per the provisions of regulation 15 (2) (a) and (d) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

Item 2: Processing Recyclable Materials – Establishment of a Joint Authority

As per the provisions of regulation 15 (2) (b) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

Item 3: Financial Hardship Application

As per the provisions of regulation 15 (2) (j) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council moves into closed session at (Time:).

The Mayor to confirm that the recording has been terminated.

13. CLOSE

The Mayor to declare the meeting closed at (Time).

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record.

Date:

Mayor Robert Young