



Meander Valley Council

W O R K I N G T O G E T H E R

ORDINARY MINUTES

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 8 September 2015

Table of Contents

379/2015 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:	3
380/2015 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:.....	4
381/2015 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:	4
382/2015 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:	5
383/2015 TABLING OF PETITIONS:	5
384/2015 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	5
385/2015 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME	6
386/2015 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	14
387/2015 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS.....	14
388/2015 DELORAINE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	15
389/2015 2015-2016 ANNUAL PLAN.....	16
390/2015 NOTICE OF MOTION – CR IAN MACKENZIE - COUNCIL AMALGAMATION – DEFERRED FROM JULY MEETING	17
391/2015 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM	18
392/2015 BRIDGE RENEWAL PROGRAMME.....	20
ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:.....	21
393/2015 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE CLOSED SESSION OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 11 AUGUST, 2015.....	21
394/2015 LEAVE OF ABSENCE	21
395/2015 GENERAL MANAGERS CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT.....	21
396/2015 2015-16 ANNUAL TENDER – ROAD SEALING	21

Minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Meander Valley Council held at the Council Chambers Meeting Room, 26 Lyall Street, Westbury, on Tuesday 8 September 2015 at 1.30pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Craig Perkins, Deputy Mayor Michael Kelly, Councillors Andrew Connor, Tanya King, Ian Mackenzie, Bob Richardson, Rodney Synfield, Deborah White and Rodney Youd.

APOLOGIES: Nil

IN ATTENDANCE: Greg Preece, General Manager
Merrilyn Young, Personal Assistant
Malcolm Salter, Director Corporate Services
David Pyke, Director Governance & Community Services
Rick Dunn, Director Economic Development & Sustainability
Martin Gill, Director Development Services
Matthew Millwood, Director Works
Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services
Jo Oliver, Senior Town Planner
Justin Simmons, Town Planner
Jonathan Harmey, Senior Accountant
Craig Plaisted, Economic Development Project Officer

Mayor Craig Perkins acknowledged the passing of Geoffrey Benjamin Woods, past Deloraine and Meander Valley Councillor.

379/2015 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Councillor Richardson moved and Councillor Mackenzie seconded, ***“that the minutes of the Ordinary meeting of Council held on Tuesday 11 August, 2015, and the Special meeting of Council held on Tuesday 18 August, 2015, be received and confirmed.”***

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

380/2015 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:

Date :	Items discussed:
18 August 2015	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 2015-16 DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN2. COUNCIL REPORTS3. BRIDGE ASSETS AND RENEWAL PROGRAM4. ROADS TO RECOVERY FUNDING5. REID STREET, WESTBURY
25 August 2015	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. RURAL ALIVE AND WELL PRESENTATION2. BLACKSTONE FOOTPATHS – FOOTPATH CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM3. WESTBURY RECREATION GROUND BUILDING UPGRADE4. 2016 FEDERAL ELECTION PRIORITY PROJECTS5. BUSINESS EVENTS TASMANIA PRESENTATION6. ECONOMIC RENEWAL ACTION GROUP7. CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS8. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM9. GENERAL MANAGERS CONTRACT

381/2015 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:

Sunday 16 August 2015

Ray Johnstone Centre naming

Tuesday 18 August 2015

Council workshop and Special Council meeting

Monday 24 August 2015

Andrew Lang Bio-energy presentation (region)

Tuesday 25 August 2015

Andrew Lang Bio-energy presentation (Council)

Thursday 27 August 2015

Katrena Stephenson (LGAT CEO and Council update)

TVIN Annual Dinner

Saturday 29 August 2015

Prospect Vale Park Play Space consultation

382/2015 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Nil

383/2015 TABLING OF PETITIONS:

Nil

384/2015 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

1. QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – AUGUST 2015

Nil

2. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2015

2.1 Mr N Smith, 568 Western Creek Road, Western Creek

I refer Councillors to a development application which was approved unanimously at the meeting on 14 July 2015. This is the application from G7 Generation Pty Ltd. to build a 2MW hydro generator and associated structures on the Fish River near the Mersey Forest Road.

You may remember that the agenda item included approximately 419 pages of information, much of which was dated 2012.

My question to all Councillors is “did they realise at the time they voted in favour of this development that the land in question (apart from that for the transmission line) was located inside the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area? If they did not, do they consider that it was a serious defect in the material provided by the proponent that there was no mention of the location being within the WHA, and that this omission, and that fact that some of the information provided was wrong, could have affected Council’s decision-making process?”

I have previously asked the Mayor his view and I am particularly interested to hear from their Councillors.

Question taken on Notice

385/2015 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

1. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – AUGUST 2015

1.1 Cr Bob Richardson

1. I note with great interest that this 2-day workshop cost ratepayers \$22,465. I table an attached document (for publication with the minutes) which indicates this amount could have constructed 195 metres of 1.5m wide, reinforced 1000mm thick concrete footpath for, say, use by Westbury Primary School students to better access their school.

Which does Council think ratepayers would prefer:- \$22,465 on a two-day talkfest, or something a little more practical, like 195 metres of footpath?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

I didn't consider the two days to be a talkfest, and in fact personally took considerable learning's out of both days. It is my expectation that our community would expect us to diligently consider all our expenditure.

2. It is noted that there were two facilitators who, collectively, were in attendance for some 2 ½ days. Their costs were \$10,814, or the equivalent of a daily rate of \$4325.60, or an hourly rate of over \$540 per hour.

Did they use helicopters to travel to/from the venue, and/or is the report to be issued gold plated and leather-bound?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

No the Consultants did not use helicopters and there is no gold plated report.

How does Council think ratepayers may respond to forking out \$540 an hour to such consultants?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

I am unable to answer this question as the hourly figure used in this question is incorrect.

The hourly rate for one consultant was \$120 and the second consultant charged \$200 per hour for workshop development time and \$250 per her for workshop delivery. The total cost for the second consultant also included travel and accommodation costs.

3. Could Council advise its policy relating to the length of time an employee of Council will remain as a temporary staff member (including via an employment agency) before being placed on the permanent payroll?

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

Council does not have a policy regarding length of tenure for temporary employment.

How many such employees currently exist?

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

Council currently has seven temporary employees engaged in the following departments-

- 1. Corporate Services – one (Office Administration – two year traineeship)**
- 2. Governance and Community Services – one (Work Health and Safety Officer – two year contract)**
- 3. Works – five**

The Works Department employees are engaged through the employment agency, Skilled Group Limited. Three of these five employees were initially engaged on traineeship programs with one traineeship remaining in progress. This department's temporary employee numbers and hours worked on a weekly basis has remained consistent over the last 18 months due to workers compensation related matters and other unavoidable situations. It is expected that these matters should be finalised by mid-year 2016 and therefore a clear understanding of the department's substantive labour complement will be known and consequently the employment related matters associated with temporary labour shall be addressed.

And is Council aware that being a temporary employee faces difficulties which are not immediately apparent. For example banks are hesitant to give temporary employees housing loans.

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

It is appreciated that in some circumstances it may be more difficult to secure finance for a person who has temporary employment rather than permanent status.

4. Reports to Council have indicated that the Dept of State Growth (Main Roads section) "forbids" use of websites along highway (and near highway) verges.

Is Council aware that there are two (large) signs erected by a commercial operator which display a website and which are in the Meander Valley Municipality?

Furthermore, these have been in place for some time (years?).

Could Council explain why they were allowed to be erected, and why they remain?

Response by Martin Gill, Director Development Services

The signs referred to in the question are the Ashgrove Cheese Farm signs outside of Elizabeth Town

Development application DA113/2004 proposed the replacement of two existing TVIS approved tourist signs with two larger commercial signs. They were approved by Council in October 2004.

The application was referred to the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) now State Growth. DIER provided the following comments:

It has long been the Departments standing that it is not desirous for a proliferation of signs to be located alongside State Roads, and in this case the National Highway, from a traffic safety and aesthetic point of view, particularly on rural highways outside General Urban Speed Limits.

The signs proposed are, however, beyond the reservations boundaries of the State Road and any decision on whether the proposal is appropriate for approval, including size and location, is therefore, left to Council.

Nevertheless, the Department would have concerns if a sign constituted a hazard for road users. Such concerns would include:

- ***The obscuring of sight lines for drivers***
- ***The creation of an unforgiving roadside environment***
- ***The precedent which may be set for approval of signs, illuminated or otherwise, by other businesses, including third party signs. This is considered particularly valid in light of other businesses of a similar nature operating in the area.***

The Council delegate's report supporting the approval included the following statement:

Council's recently adopted strategic direction on tourism signage allows for the establishment of advertising signs within 400m of a tourist operation, provided they are located on related titles.

The signs were approved for erection by Council.

They remain in place because they continue to have planning approval.

As the signs are not within the State Road reserve State Growth cannot enforce its policy position on the content.

5. I have been a Councillor for 1 ½ decades. I am also a keen student of local, State and Federal (and indeed international) politics.

I have noted that in the past 20 or so years that State and Federal politicians have increasingly surrounded themselves with what the general public refer to as "minders" and "spin doctors".

In my 15 years as a municipal representative I have been pleased that Council has largely not gone down the same path.

However, it has come to my notice that Meander Valley Council has apparently recently appointed a Communications Officer (or "spin doctor").

Traditionally public relations has been a component of the position descriptions of the general manager in consultation with directors and elected representatives (specifically the Mayor).

What need(s) or changes have arisen to precipitate this change?

Responses by Rick Dunn, Director Economic Development & Sustainability
The Director Economic Development and Sustainability has been responsible for the development of the Communications Strategy and the delivery of it since 8 March 2011. Prior to this the Manager of Economic Development co-ordinated Meander Valley Council's communications in close consultation with the Mayor, General Manager and Department Directors. This was the situation from 17 May 2006 to 8 March 2011.

The change occurred as a result of Council Management seeking to make best use of the skill set of the Manager of Economic Development who had skills and experience in marketing and communications and is a Certified Practising Marketer and a Fellow of the Australian Marketing Institute.

The appointment of a Communications Officer on 21 October, 2013, followed the adoption of Council's Communication Strategy and Communication Action Plan and through discussions identified a need for a dedicated communications resource.

Given that such a departure from tradition has apparently occurred, there are several questions which arise:-

- i. Why was Council not consulted?

On 16 April 2013, Council unanimously adopted the Meander Valley Council Communications Strategy 2013 – 2018. Under Financial Impact in the Agenda Report the following was stated-

"Should the strategy be adopted, it implies that Council would want to see the implementation of a Communication Action Plan and this would however require the consideration of an allocation of resources."

The need to appoint a resource to support was discussed at the 16 April Council Meeting in the context of making allowance for such in the 2013–2014 Budget.

At the 11 June 2013 Council Meeting, the 2013-2014 budget was approved by Council and this included a funding allocation to resource the position of Communications Officer. The position supports all Departments and functional operations of Council.

ii. Who made the decision to make such an appointment?

The Director of ED&S made a recommendation to appoint a Communications Officer and this was discussed with and approved by the General Manager as per the 2013-2014 budget allocation.

iii. From what financial source is the position funded?

The ED&S Annual Operational Budget

iv. Was the position advertised?

The position of Communications Officer was advertised in the Examiner Newspaper on Saturday 31 August 2013

v. Is the position part-time, casual or full-time?

The position is full time.

vi. Is the position permanent or temporary?

The position is permanent.

vii. Can Councillors be provided with a Position Description?

Yes. The Position Description will be provided at the 8 September 2015 Council Meeting marked 'Confidential – Not for Distribution'.

viii. What is the remuneration package?

This is contained in the Position Description.

ix. What are the expected benefits to the Meander Valley ratepayers?

One area highlighted for improvement by residents in the biennial survey is the ability to improve communications with Council. Having a dedicated communications resource has allowed Council to:

- **Broaden its communication channels to residents**
- **Increase its level of communication to residents**
- **Ensure that communications are well-planned and considered**

Councils Communications Officer co-ordinates and provides considerable content for the Meander Valley Gazette to inform residents of a range of activities and initiatives that Council undertakes. Since employing a Communications Officer, Council is providing information to residents and the community across more communications mediums than ever before.

6. Some months ago a decision was made (by whom?) to remove signs erected by Westbury businesses in the traffic laybys on the Bass Highway (to the west and east of Westbury). At that time I cited (to Council) several other roadside signs along the Bass Highway. I note that several still exist, including the "trailer on the hill" between Elizabeth Town and Deloraine.

It seems double standards have been exercised.

Could I, and relevant Westbury commercial enterprises be provided with an explanation? Or is it simply an anti-Westbury thrust by those involved?

Response by Martin Gill, Director Development Services

The traffic laybys on the Bass Highway are managed by the Department of State Growth but fall under the provisions of the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2013.

The Department of State Growth infrequently contact Council to ask for support in removing business signs in the State Road Reserve. On other occasions State Growth will remove signs themselves. In this case the Department of State Growth worked with Council officers to have the signs removed.

It is State Growth policy that no business advertising signs be placed in the state road reserves. In addition, State Growth argues that the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2013 does not support the erection of 'off premises signs' unless erected by State or Local Government. (These signs usually provide directions or information and occasionally display accredited tourism businesses)

This last point has been subject to some debate around the Council table.

The 'trailer on the hill', or Blake's Manor signage is located on private land and outside the jurisdiction of State Growth. This is the important difference and potentially explains the different approaches.

Council officers have argued that the 'trailer on the hill', is an off premises sign and its erection is not supported by the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme 2013. Council officers consider there are a number of signs along the highway that fall into this category.

Council itself does not necessarily agree with this view. There have been a number of discussions at Council workshops. A number of Councillors are concerned that the restrictions on off-premises signs are hurting local

businesses. One Councillor has a view that Council officers and Councils legal counsel are misreading the planning provisions.

This debate has not been resolved, but at the February 2015 Ordinary Council Meeting the following notice of motion was carried:

"That Council writes to the Minister for Planning requesting that he exempts Meander Valley Council from implementing the provisions of the Meander Valley Interim Planning Scheme – E14 Signage Code until the new State-wide Planning Scheme is declared."

Council supported this motion and resolved to write to the Minister. No response has been received from the Minister at this point.

However, a number of businesses have taken this to mean that Council supports off-premise business signs. A number of businesses are ignoring previous requests to remove signage, others are putting new signage up, and others have taken the opportunity to improve their signs on the highway. This is happening in both Westbury and Deloraine.

There is no anti-Westbury thrust as such, however, the message provided to local businesses regarding Council Officers requests to remove signs on private land has been taken up with more vigour in the Deloraine area.

3.2 Cr Rodney Synfield

1. This question is supplementary to those (just) asked by Councillor Richardson, regarding the Communications Officer of Council. When was that position made fulltime and when was it made permanent?

Response by Rick Dunn, Director Economic Development & Sustainability
The position was made fulltime on 21 October 2013. The position was made permanent on 20 October 2014.

2. If a development application has been submitted to Council and approved and subsequent information comes to light that indicates outdated or incorrect information germane to the matter was used in the assessment, what role or responsibility does Council have to rectify or revisit the approval process, irrespective of whether an appeal into said matter has been lodged by some party?

Response by Martin Gill, Director Development Services
If Council determined that an application was not valid it could recognise that its decision was not a valid decision and therefore no decision had been made. Council could then request further information.

Section 51 (1AC) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act states:

... a valid application is an application that contains all relevant information required by the planning scheme applying to the land that is the subject of the application.

In order to say an application was not valid Council would need to be satisfied that it did not have all the relevant information required by the planning scheme at the time it considered the application.

2. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2015

Nil

3. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2015

3.1 Cr A Connor

- a) Can council officers provide an update on the project to upgrade existing and install new footpaths in Blackstone Heights and when are works expected to start?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

A consultant has been engaged to assist with the documentation for Stage 1 works along Pitcher Parade to the intersection of Panorama Road. The current project timetable allows for construction tenders to be advertised in October with a contract awarded in November. Further detail will be provided to Councillors in the next Briefing Report."

- b) Is Council aware of a situation that existed with the new Aged Care units in Moriarty Street, Deloraine, where residents moved in during early 2015 but had been waiting ever since for the NBN to be connected? Is Council further aware that this situation has been resolved just this week after the tireless work of Dawn Vallance and Rosanne Roles and after it was raised to the highest levels of the NBN Company.

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

We are now

- c) Can the Mayor provide an update the on meeting held on July 21st on between multiple councils in the northern region to discuss Amalgamation and Shared Services? Who was present, what was tabled, what were outcomes of the meeting? Was amalgamation even discussed at all?

Question taken on Notice

3.2 Cr D White

In the July Briefing Notes, we were informed of a new app entitled "Paddock to Plate" which seeks to facilitate marketing of local produced foods. The organisers were seeking Council support for the dissemination of new about this app – is Council able to do this.

***Response by Rick Dunn, Director Economic Development & Sustainability
Council can certainly assist with the promotion of this app.***

386/2015 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Nil

387/2015 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

390/2015 CR IAN MACKENZIE – COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

388/2015 DELORAINE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider retaining the Deloraine Outline Development Plan (ODP) as a project for delivery in Council's 2015 – 2016 Annual Plan.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that the Deloraine Outline Development Plan project remain in Council's 2015-2016 Annual Plan.

DECISION:

Cr White moved and Cr Kelly seconded ***“that the Deloraine Outline Development Plan project remain in Council's 2015-2016 Annual Plan.”***

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

Comment by Cr Bob Richardson

Whilst a long-term forward vision is to be commended, concern is expressed concerning the potential to raise expectations beyond council's capability to meet those expectations.

Other ODP's need to be addressed first.

The Hadspen ODP presents significant demands after the planning submission is approved.

389/2015 2015-2016 ANNUAL PLAN

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to adopt the 2015-2016 Annual Plan.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council adopt the Annual Plan as submitted for the 2015-2016 financial year.

DECISION:

Cr White moved and Cr Connor seconded ***“that Council adopt the Annual Plan as submitted for the 2015-2016 financial year.”***

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

390/2015 NOTICE OF MOTION – CR IAN MACKENZIE - COUNCIL AMALGAMATION – DEFERRED FROM JULY MEETING

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to continue consideration of a Notice of Motion from Councillor Mackenzie in relation to Council amalgamation that was discussed at the July 2015 meeting of Council and deferred to the September meeting.

2) Recommendation (Councillor Ian Mackenzie)

It is recommended that Council does not support any conversations or discussions around Council amalgamations until there is State Government led financial/social modelling providing a pathway for the future.

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Kelly seconded ***“that Council continues involvement in the shared services project but does not support any conversations or discussions around Council amalgamations until there is State Government led financial/social modelling providing a pathway for the future for Tasmania as a whole.”***

As an amendment Cr Connor moved and Cr Synfield seconded ***“that Council write to the Minister for Local Government requesting such modelling is performed by the State Government or their consultants and provided to councils within 6 months.***

The amendment was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

The amended motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

391/2015 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to further consider engaging in a benchmarking project involving all councils in northern Tasmania.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council –

- 1. Endorse engagement in a benchmarking project involving Councils in Northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing comparative data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and identifies areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between Council; and*
- 2. The General Manager be authorised to engage a project consultant.*
- 3. Support the tender process for the feasibility study being open to additional consultants that are not included on the list of four consultants identified on the Tender Panel put forward by the State Government.*

DECISION:

Cr Synfield moved and Cr Connor seconded *“that Council -*

- 1. Endorse engagement in a benchmarking project in the manner conveyed in the attached project brief dated July 2015, or as amended from time to time, involving Councils in Northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing comparative data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and identifies areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between Council; and*
- 2. The General Manager be authorised to engage a project consultant in consultation (consensus) with the other General Managers involved.*

- 3. Support the tender process for the feasibility study being open to additional consultants that are not included on the list of four consultants identified on the Tender Panel put forward by the State Government.**

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.



Project Brief

Investigation of Shared Service Model

July 2015

1. Background:

The Tasmanian State Government, by way of a proposal presented by the Minister for Planning and Local Government, Peter Gutwein MP in February 2015, has asked local government within Tasmania to look at opportunities for voluntary amalgamation and/or resource sharing/shared service opportunities.

Eight Councils from the northern region of Tasmania – Break O’ Day, Dorset, Flinders, George Town, Launceston City, Meander Valley, Northern Midlands and West Tamar have had initial informal discussions regarding possible resource sharing/shared services within the context of improving their financial sustainability.

Minister Gutwein’s proposal outlined four principles that must be met for amalgamations/shared services to be considered. Pursuant to these principles, amalgamations must:

- Be in the best interest of ratepayers
- Improve the level of services for communities
- Preserve and maintain local representation and
- Ensure the financial status of the entities is strengthened

Launceston City Council is the largest of the eight Councils. Three out of the eight Council’s (Meander Valley, Northern Midlands and West Tamar) are all deemed to be medium sized Councils, however each vary in population, area and rateable assessments. The remaining Councils (Break O’ Day, Dorset, Flinders and George Town) are classified as small Councils. Please see demographics in the table below:

Council	Break O’ Day	Dorset	Flinders	George Town	Launceston City	Meander Valley	Northern Midlands	West Tamar
Population	6,430	7,158	784	6,828	67,035	19,543	12,754	23,012
Rateable assessments	6,357	5,207	1,207	4,442	30,831	9,678	6,713	11,300
Area Size in Square Kilometres	3,526	3,228	1,997	653	1,414	3,330	5,137	691

From initial discussions, it has been agreed that the first steps in this process should be a benchmarking exercise, looking into the financial and service delivery measures of each

Council. This should be undertaken by an independent consultant who has experience in local government areas.

2. Objective:

The objective of the consultancy is to undertake a benchmarking process involving Councils in northern Tasmania which establishes a standardised evidence base providing data on both quantitative and qualitative aspects of operations and which additionally identifies from the data areas of potential for resource sharing and other collaboration between the Councils.

3. Required Outcomes:

The required outcomes of the consultancy are:

1. Review the base data utilised to establish Council's KPIs as identified in the Tasmanian Auditor General's report to ensure that the specific base data provides an apples for apples comparison for each Council.
2. Benchmark Council's KPIs as identified in the Tasmanian Auditor General's report, in addition to any other KPIs considered relevant
3. Identify the services provided by each Council and to what level these services are provided including any relevant contextual information on service differentials
4. Compare the services identified in point 3 and conduct comparison with the benchmark base line identified in point 2
5. Make recommendations on where improvements/efficiencies can be made in each area of each Council
6. Recommend resource sharing/service collaboration opportunities

4. Methodology:

The methodology of the consultancy should include:

- Establish a review team within each Council
- Analyse existing data (ensuring that base data allows the comparison of apples for apples comparative data for each Council)
- Identify the 'gap', strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Benchmark all eight Council's
- Recommend resource sharing/service collaboration opportunities
- Report to Council's

5. Project Management :

The project will be managed by the eight General Manager's of the Council's, who will be the Steering Committee for the project and meet as required.

6. Deliverable:

The consultancy outputs shall be delivered in two stages:

- Stage One – Draft Investigation of a Benchmarking and Shared Service Model
- Stage Two – Final Investigation of Shared Service Model

7. Timeframes:

The required timeframes for the project is:

- Stage One – not more than 12 weeks after the consultant is engaged
- Stage Two – not more than 5 weeks after stage one outputs are delivered
- Or by negotiation with the Steering Committee

8. Budget and Payment Schedule:

A formal contract will be signed with the consultant.

The payment schedule will be:

- First payment (20% of total) upon commencement of the project
- Second payment (40% of total) on the satisfactory completion of stage one
- Final payment (40% of total) upon satisfactory completion of stage two

9. Deliverables:

All reports are to be presented in:

- Hard copy form and
- Soft copy by email

10. Intellectual Property Ownership and Research/Investigation Documentation:

Any intellectual property rights associated with this project will be assigned to the respective Council's. On completion of the study all materials produced in the course of the project will be delivered to the Council's.

11. Selection Criteria:

Proposals will be assessed by the Steering Committee on the basis of:

- Appreciation of the work required:
 - Details of the methodology and scope of works to be conducted. The consultant's understanding of the nature and scope of the project and the need to appreciate and manage stakeholder interests and expectations
- Experience on similar projects:

- Description of similar projects undertaken by the consultant
- Capacity to undertake the work:
 - Qualifications and availability of consultants to be assigned to the task and qualifications and availability of planned sub-consultants
- Management systems:
 - Outline of systems to manage costs, time and quality associated with the task
- Financial:
 - The proposed budget for the consultancy

12. Expressions of Interest:

Expressions of interest addressing the selection criteria have been invited from a number of selected consultants known to have done work or have an interest in work of this nature.

Expressions of interest are to be submitted to Ian Pearce by email to Ian.Pearce@wtc.tas.gov.au by 5.00pm on **XX (insert closing date)**.

13. Further Information:

Further information can be obtained from Ian Pearce of West Tamar Council on 03 6323 9344 or by emailing Ian.Pearce@wtc.tas.gov.au.

392/2015 BRIDGE RENEWAL PROGRAMME

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to approve the reallocation of funding to bridge renewal projects within the 2015-2016 Capital Works Programme.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the following changes to bridge projects within the 2015-2016 Capital Works Programme:

<i>Bridge Details</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>New Budget</i>
<i>Bridge 2162 (Western Creek, Montana Rd \$188,000). Remove this bridge from the programme. Transfer funding to Bridge 164.</i>	<i>\$188,000</i>	<i>Nil</i>
<i>Bridge 164 (Damper Creek, Montana Rd \$256,000). New bridge included in programme.</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>\$256,000</i>
<i>Bridge 158 (Quamby Brook, Byes Rd \$163,000). Transfer of funding to Bridge 164 and Brooklyn Road project.</i>	<i>\$163,000</i>	<i>\$65,000</i>
<i>Coiler Creek Tributary (Brooklyn Rd \$152,000). Additional funding through transfer from Bridge 158.</i>	<i>\$152,000</i>	<i>\$182,000</i>

DECISION:

Cr Synfield moved and Cr Mackenzie seconded ***“that Council approve the following changes to bridge projects within the 2015-2016 Capital Works Programme:***

<i>Bridge Details</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>New Budget</i>
<i>Bridge 2162 (Western Creek, Montana Rd \$188,000). Remove this bridge from the programme. Transfer funding to Bridge 164.</i>	<i>\$188,000</i>	<i>Nil</i>
<i>Bridge 164 (Damper Creek, Montana Rd \$256,000). New bridge included in programme.</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>\$256,000</i>
<i>Bridge 158 (Quamby Brook, Byes Rd \$163,000).</i>	<i>\$163,000</i>	<i>\$65,000</i>

Transfer of funding to Bridge 164 and Brooklyn Road project.		
Coiler Creek Tributary (Brooklyn Rd \$152,000). Additional funding through transfer from Bridge 158.	\$152,000	\$182,000

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

The Council meeting adjourned for afternoon tea at 2.33pm

The Council meeting resumed at 2.50pm

ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:

Councillor Mackenzie moved and Councillor King seconded ***“that Council move into Closed Session to discuss the following items.”***

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

393/2015 Confirmation of Minutes of the Closed Session of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 11 August, 2015.

394/2015 Leave of Absence

(Reference Part 2 Regulation 15(2)(h) Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015)

395/2015 General Managers Contract of Employment

(Reference Part 2 Regulation 15(2)(g) Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015).

396/2015 2015-16 Annual Tender – Road Sealing

(Reference Part 2, Regulation 15(2)(d) Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015).

The meeting moved into Closed Session at 2.51pm

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr White seconded ***“that Council move out of Closed Session.”***

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

The meeting re-opened to the public at 3.38pm

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Youd seconded ***“that the following decisions taken by Council in Closed Session are to be released for the public’s information -***

- ***approved a new four year contract of employment for the current General Manager; and***
- ***awarded Contract 153 – 2015/16 for the asphalt and bituminous sealing of roads to Venarchie Contracting Pty Ltd.”***

The motion was declared CARRIED with Councillors Connor, Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.

The meeting closed at 3.40pm

.....
CRAIG PERKINS (MAYOR)