



Meander Valley Council

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

ORDINARY MINUTES



COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 11 September 2018

Table of Contents

155/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:.....	4
156/2018 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:.....	5
157/2018 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:	5
158/2018 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:.....	5
159/2018 TABLING OF PETITIONS:	5
160/2018 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	6
161/2018 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME.....	7
162/2018 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	14
163/2018 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS.....	14
164/2018 8 ALVESTON DRIVE, DELORAINE - SPORT & RECREATION (TWO (2) NETBALL COURTS, LIGHTS & FENCING).....	15
165/2018 61 VETERANS ROAD WESTBURY – PROPOSED CONSENT MEMORANDUM.....	20
166/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – SUBMISSION TO SENATE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS REFERENCES COMMITTEE (ACCESSIBILITY AND QUALITY OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN RURAL AND REMOTE AUSTRALIA) – CR BOB RICHARDSON.....	22
167/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – CCTV SECURITY – WESTBURY AND DELORAINE – CR BOB RICHARDSON.....	24
168/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – REVIEW OF SCHOOL INTAKE AREAS – CR BOB RICHARDSON.....	26
169/2018 PROPOSED SALE OF ANGLICAN CHURCH PROPERTIES	27
170/2018 TASWATER & COUNCILS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH STATE GOVERNMENT.....	33
ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:.....	34
171/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	34
172/2018 LEAVE OF ABSENCE	34
173/2018 CONTRACT 195 - DELORAINE COMMUNITY COMPLEX NETBALL COURTS	34
174/2018 CONTRACT 190 - PROSPECT VALE PARK AFL SPORTS LIGHTING UPGRADE	34
175/2018 CONTRACT 196 - ANNUAL SUPPLY TENDER – ROAD SEALING	34

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Meander Valley Council held at the Council Chambers Meeting Room, 26 Lyall Street, Westbury, on Tuesday 11 September 2018 at 1.35pm.

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

APOLOGIES: Nil

IN ATTENDANCE: Martin Gill, General Manager
Merrilyn Young OAM, Executive Assistant
Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services
Matthew Millwood, Director Works
Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services
Lynette While, Director Community & Development Services
Jo Oliver, Senior Strategic Planner
Leanne Rabjohns, Town Planner
Justin Simons, Town Planner
Natasha Whiteley, Town Planner
Krista Palfreyman, Development Services Co-Ordinator
Natasha Szczyglowska, Project Manager, Infrastructure
Erin Boer, Urban & Regional Planner, Northern Midlands Council
Craig Plaisted, Economic Development Project Officer
Kris Eade, Property Management Officer

155/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Councillor King moved and Councillor Mackenzie seconded, ***“that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 14 August, 2018, be received and confirmed.”***

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

156/2018 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:

Date :	Items discussed:
28 August 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tasmanian Craft Fair• Hudson Civil Products• TasWater• Proposed Sale of Anglican Church Properties• Proposal to purchase Anglican Cemetery, Westbury
4 September 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bracknell River Reserve – Reinstatement of Camping• Divestment of Council Properties• Waste Management Presentation• Digital Technology Learning Pathway• General Managers Review

157/2018 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:

Saturday 18 August 2018

Deloraine Junior Basketball Finals Gala Day

Friday 24 August 2018

NTDC Regional Economic Development Workshop

Tuesday 28 August 2018

Citizenship Ceremony

Council Workshop

Tuesday 4 September 2018

Council Workshop

Sunday 9 September 2018

Westbury Bowls Club Season opening

158/2018 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Nil

159/2018 TABLING OF PETITIONS:

Nil

160/2018 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

1. PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – AUGUST 2018

Nil

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2018

Nil

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2018

3.1 Mr F Nott, Prospect Vale

- a) In relation to a previous question concerning Entrance 2 at 10 Jardine Crescent, Prospect Vale.
Could Council advise any response/action in this matter?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

A Council officer has inspected the driveway and pedestrian crossing in Jardine Crescent and I have spoken to Mr Knott about that and I'm happy to discuss any further actions after the Council meeting with Mr Knott.

- b) As the most recent traffic study at Westbury Road, Prospect Vale and surrounds was undertaken by Midson in 2011, could Council advise if a further study is to be undertaken?
Secondly, any detail of a current traffic count for Las Vegas Drive, Bimbimbi Avenue and Jardine Crescent?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

Council officers, have through a various number of projects in Prospect Vale, been looking at traffic matters subsequent to the Midson report in 2011. Some of that work is still in draft format and we can certainly review traffic around Jardine Crescent moving forward.

161/2018 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

1. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – AUGUST 2018

1.1 Cr Bob Richardson

- (a) During the early 2000's a group of Westbury and Hagley business people, largely led by me, formed a group – the Westbury-Hagley Development Association (WHDA).

Formed initially to respond to the imminent highway bypass of Westbury and Hagley, WHDA sought to develop economic strategies for short to long-term prosperity of the mid to wider Meander Valley, thus creating jobs. It also sought to encourage social activity through engaging existing organisation and through community establishment of new organisations.

One of the principal goals was seen to establish Valley Central; the appointment of Council's economic development officer (and later) was critical in the establishment of Valley Central.

One of the major challenges was seen to be an upgrade of electricity supplies to Westbury and Valley Central. I believe that promises were made.

But they appear not to have been kept; witness the front-page article in August, 2018, Meander Valley Gazette. Even the smallest power failure, particularly during business hours, can result in significant problems for business, particularly where technology is dependent upon electricity supplies.

Regrettably, the Gazette article canvasses a 5 year wait (until 2023) for that upgrade. Businesses, as well as residents deserve much better and need much better.

Will Council senior officers and the Mayor insist (to Tas Networks) that the upgrade commence NOW for completion in early 2019?

Response from Martin Gill, General Manager

Council Officers will write to TasNetworks reiterating the importance of uninterrupted secure electricity supply and request that the upgrade be fast tracked.

- (b) In 2015 the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) found that Glyphosate (the main ingredient in Roundup) was probably a carcinogen (not possibly, but probably).

IARC is part of the World health organisation, which in turn is part of the United Nations. These WHO scientists made an assessment regarding glyphosate.

Last week a San Francisco court ruled in favour of a groundsman who submitted that he had contracted terminal cancer from the use of glyphosate. He was awarded almost A\$400m in damages.

It seems such cases are likely to become more numerous.

It is understood that Council has used, and does use, glyphosate in its spraying regime, including roadside spraying, weed control in paths and public gardens and drainage ditches (including those within towns and villages).

It seems that Council may have a future liability with its workers, contractors and ratepayers.

Indeed, glyphosate may well become the thalidomide of the 21st century.

Are alternative methods available? eg Hobart City Council is trialling alternative methods of weed control, including steam?

Will Council strongly promote the No Spray Register prior to spring spraying?

Could Council comment on these matters please?

Could we be advised how Australian Pesticides & Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) is funded?

Response from Martin Gill, General Manager

There are alternative weed control methods available.

Council will continue to advertise and promote the No Spray Register.

The matter of weed management is listed as future Council workshop.

The Australian Pesticides & Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) is an Australian Government Statutory authority. The APVMA includes the following statement on its website:

Except for a minor budgetary appropriation, the APVMA's activities are funded through cost recovery. This is in accordance with the agreement which established the National Registration Scheme. Most of the APVMA's operational income is collected from registrants of pesticides and veterinary medicines. Registrants pay application fees to register products, and an annual fee to maintain product registrations. Registrants also pay levies based on the annual wholesale sales value of registered products.

- (c) In the 2018/19 Council Budget, how many dollars have been allocated for the provision of concrete footpaths of a standard appropriate for mobility scooters?
- i) In Westbury
 - ii) In Carrick; and
 - iii) In Bracknell?

How many meters of such standard footpaths would \$561,000 produce?

Response by Dino De Paoli

The recently approved 2018/19 Capital Works Program does not include any projects with footpath works for Westbury, Carrick and Bracknell. It is noted that there is approximately \$280,000 of carried forward capital works funding from the 2017/18 Capital Works Program for footpath work in Westbury.

Assuming straight forward construction conditions approximately 3,500 lineal meters of stand footpaths could be constructed for \$561,000.

- (a) At a previous Council meeting, Council requested officers to enter into discussions with the (Westbury based) Meander Valley Football and Netball Clubs with an aim to establish netball court(s) in Westbury.

For whatever reason(s), the establishment of such netball courts has not happened.

Could Council confirm that the community of Westbury still do not have even basic facilities for netball?

Response from Martin Gill, General Manager

Basic facilities for netball are available at the Westbury Sports Centre. There is a single court space within the facility and removable goal posts.

- (e) During discussions at a recent Council workshop it was stated that the provision of upgraded squash facilities at Deloraine was a priority. In response to a comment that squash facilities were available at Westbury (with minimal expenditure to bring them up to a very good standard) it was stated that Westbury was "too far to travel".

Will Council adopt a policy regarding travel to facilities to the whole municipality, including travel of Westbury people to Deloraine? And will Council work towards addressing the (many) current anomalies? If not, why not?

Response from Martin Gill, General Manager

I note that these questions are addressed to Council, and note that Council resolved, as part of its decision with respect to item 147/2018 Deloraine and Districts Recreation Precinct Feasibility Study at the Ordinary Council Meeting August 2018, to:

use the information within the Feasibility Study to inform the development of a strategic development plan for Community and Recreation facilities in Meander Valley

I would anticipate that travelling time would be a component of any strategic development plan.

2. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2018

Nil

3. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – SEPTEMBER 2018

3.1 Cr Deborah White

In the GM's reply to Cr Richardson's question about the use of glyphosate, he states that the APVMA's income is derived from registrants of pesticides and vet medicines. Could this potential conflict of interest be included in the agenda item relating to the use of glyphosate that is coming up at the next Council workshop?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Yes Council can make some comment on that.

3.2 Cr John Temple

- (a) The Meander Valley is currently enjoying boom in the horticultural industry, particularly with the production of berry fruits. Whilst this is good for our economy, is there an opportunity cost in using prime agricultural land for this activity, especially where hydroponics are used?
- (b) Are there any risks to human health from the fungicides or pesticides used in this industry?
- (c) Is there any known impact on the soil or ground water from the chemicals used?
- (d) Have any of these chemicals been banned in other countries?

Questions taken on Notice

3.3 Cr Bob Richardson

It is noted that an invitation to Councillors to a tree planting of "native vegetation on Westbury's Town Common.

In relation to those plantings,

- a) What are the accepted guidelines with respect to visibility sight-lines in public open spaces and parklands? And will the proposed (and on-going) plantings compromise such guidelines?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The majority of plantings that are occurring down at the Westbury Common are on the river edge and so they are part of the work around improving the water quality in the Brook and making sure that are the area minimises erosion. They are not in areas where the public are expected to congregate or recreate.

- b) What was the historical purpose for the establishment of town commons, and will the proposed plantings compromise the concept of a town Common (ie for "commoners" to tend (vegetable) gardens and graze domestic animals)?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

No

- c) I have been approached by several Westbury residents regarding previous plantings on the town Common, including

- Plantings near the southern boundary of the Common have resulted in long grass during summer months creating a potential (high) fire hazard, and
- Plantings near the Common car park have created a screen preventing visibility issues across the Common.

In relation to potential fire hazards, is it not likely that native plantings are likely to produce a higher fire hazard than “exotic” plants? Given the prevailing winds are in the s-west to n-west sector, is the planting regime likely to increase the bushfire threat to Westbury?

Question taken on Notice

Has a fire hazard study been undertaken to examine potential increase in fire risk to Westbury?

Question taken on Notice

Is it it appropriate to create a “wilderness”, or “semi-wilderness” in the modern setting of Westbury with its “European” character?

Questions taken on Notice

Cr King left the meeting at 1.45pm

Cr King returned to the meeting at 1.47pm

3.1 Cr Andrew Connor

1. Waste Management

- a) Can Council briefly outline what the current Waste Infrastructure Charge on the rates notice is intended for? (\$52 charge or more if kerbside bin collected)

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

All properties in the municipality are charged the fixed \$52 waste infrastructure charge. This covers items such as the net cost of Tips and Transfer Stations and Strategic Planning for Council’s waste services. Properties receiving an existing kerbside collection are also charged an additional amount to cover the costs for the kerbside collection service.

- b) Can council provide an estimate of the liabilities involved with the safe closure of the Deloraine and Cluan tips and what their lifespan is?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services
For Cluan – worst case scenario approx. 12 months and \$960K.
For Deloraine – worst case scenario approx. 3 yrs and \$2.8M.

- c) Can Council provide an estimate/range of costs for kerbside collection if it were to be expanded to more rural properties?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services
The costs will be subject to a decision of Council and will depend on the level of service approved by Council and market costs for delivery of the service.

- d) Will kerbside recycling be expanded along with kerbside garbage collection into rural areas or to smaller townships such as Mole Creek?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services
It would be my recommendation that recycling is expanded with kerbside garbage, but that also is subject to a decision of Council

2. Blackstone Mobile Black-spot Tower

During the 2016 Federal election a mobile black-spot was identified at Blackstone Heights and subsequently received funding.

Sites are now under assessment for that tower ahead of a Development Application being lodged.

Is council aware if any consultation that will be undertaken by the applicant or their agent with nearby residents ahead of or during the DA process?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager
Council have been contacted by Vision Stream who have indicated they will be undertaking community consultation prior to submitting the Development Application.

3. 61 Veterans Row, Westbury – Appeal Costs

Council's decision from August 2018 concerning subdivision of this property has been appealed by the proponent to RMPAT.

Can council advise what costs it has incurred to date, costs expected and future costs are likely if council continues to defend its decision at RMPAT?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Costs incurred to date, although we haven't been invoiced yet would probably be approximately \$1000. Our solicitor has advised that there may be a risk, if we proceed, that costs could be awarded to the applicant which could be approx. \$4,000 - \$5,000.

162/2018 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Nil

163/2018 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

- 166/2018 Submission to Senate Community Affairs Reference Committee
(Accessibility and Quality of Mental Health Services in Rural and Remote Australia – Cr Bob Richardson)
- 167/2018 CCTV Security – Westbury & Deloraine – Cr Bob Richardson
- 168/2018 Review of School Intake Areas – Cr Bob Richardson

As a procedural motion Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded ***that Council consider a late agenda item under the provisions of Regulation 8 (6) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 and that the matter be considered after 164/2018.***

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

COUNCIL MEETING AS A PLANNING AUTHORITY

The Mayor advised that for items 164/2018 and 165/2018 Council is acting as a Planning Authority under the provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

164/2018 8 ALVESTON DRIVE, DELORAINE - SPORT & RECREATION (TWO (2) NETBALL COURTS, LIGHTS & FENCING)

1) Introduction

This report considers application PA\19\0005 for Sport & Recreation (two (2) netball courts, lights & fencing) on land located at 8 Alveston Drive, Deloraine (CT:16446A/1) (south-east of Community Complex).

2) Recommendation

That the application for Use and Development for Sport & Recreation (two (2) netball courts, lights & fencing) on land located at 8 Alveston Drive, Deloraine (CT:16446A/1) (south-east of Community Complex) by Meander Valley Council, requiring the following discretions:

- Clause 17.4.1 - Building Design and Siting
- Clause E8.6.1 - Habitat and Vegetation Management

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) Philp Lighton Architects; Date: 13/7/2018; Project Number: 18.302; Drawing No.: A01, A02, A03, A04; Revision B.
- b) Zumtobel Group (lighting layout); Date: 20/02/2018; Project Number: 7081, Drawing No.: 7081-1.

and subject to the following conditions:

1. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA 2018/01191-MVC) (attached document).

Note:

1. Any other proposed development and/or use, including amendments to this proposal, may require a separate planning application and assessment against the Planning Scheme by Council. All enquiries can be directed to Council's Community

and Development Services on 6393 5320 or via email: mail@mvc.tas.gov.au

2. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. The following additional approvals may be required before construction commences:

- a) Building approval**
- b) Plumbing approval**

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5320 or Council's Plumbing Surveyor on 0419 510 770.

3. This permit takes effect after:
- a) The 14 day appeal period expires; or
 - b) Any appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal is abandoned or determined; or.
 - c) Any other required approvals under this or any other Act are granted.
4. A planning appeal may be instituted by lodging a notice of appeal with the Registrar of the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal. A planning appeal may be instituted within 14 days of the date the Corporation serves notice of the decision on the applicant. For more information see the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal website www.rmpat.tas.gov.au
5. If an applicant is the only person with a right of appeal pursuant to section 61 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 and wishes to commence the use or development for which the permit has been granted within that 14 day period, the Council must be so notified in writing. A copy of Council's Notice to Waive Right of Appeal is attached.
6. This permit is valid for two (2) years only from the date of approval and will thereafter lapse if the development is not substantially commenced. An extension may be granted if a request is received.
7. In accordance with the legislation, all permits issued by the permit authority are public documents. Members of the public will be able

to view this permit (which includes the endorsed documents) on request, at the Council Office.

8. If any Aboriginal relics are uncovered during works;
 - a) All works are to cease within a delineated area sufficient to protect the unearthed and other possible relics from destruction,
 - b) The presence of a relic is to be reported to Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania Phone: (03) 6233 6613 or 1300 135 513 (ask for Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania Fax: (03) 6233 5555 Email: aboriginal@heritage.tas.gov.au); and
 - c) The relevant approval processes will apply with state and federal government agencies.

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr Kelly seconded ***“that the application for Use and Development for Sport & Recreation (two (2) netball courts, lights & fencing) on land located at 8 Alveston Drive, Deloraine (CT:16446A/1) (south-east of Community Complex) by Meander Valley Council, requiring the following discretions:***

- Clause 17.4.1 - Building Design and Siting
- Clause E8.6.1 - Habitat and Vegetation Management

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- c) **Philp Lighton Architects; Date: 13/7/2018; Project Number: 18.302; Drawing No.: A01, A02, A03, A04; Revision B.**
- d) **Zumtobel Group (lighting layout); Date: 20/02/2018; Project Number: 7081, Drawing No.: 7081-1.**

and subject to the following conditions:

1. **The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA 2018/01191-MVC) (attached document).**

Note:

1. **Any other proposed development and/or use, including amendments to this proposal, may require a separate planning application and assessment against the Planning Scheme by**

Council. All enquiries can be directed to Council's Community and Development Services on 6393 5320 or via email: mail@mvc.tas.gov.au

2. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. The following additional approvals may be required before construction commences:

- a) Building approval**
- b) Plumbing approval**

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5320 or Council's Plumbing Surveyor on 0419 510 770.

3. This permit takes effect after:
- a) The 14 day appeal period expires; or
 - b) Any appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal is abandoned or determined; or.
 - c) Any other required approvals under this or any other Act are granted.
4. A planning appeal may be instituted by lodging a notice of appeal with the Registrar of the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal. A planning appeal may be instituted within 14 days of the date the Corporation serves notice of the decision on the applicant. For more information see the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal website www.rmpat.tas.gov.au
5. If an applicant is the only person with a right of appeal pursuant to section 61 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 and wishes to commence the use or development for which the permit has been granted within that 14 day period, the Council must be so notified in writing. A copy of Council's Notice to Waive Right of Appeal is attached.
6. This permit is valid for two (2) years only from the date of approval and will thereafter lapse if the development is not substantially commenced. An extension may be granted if a request is received.
7. In accordance with the legislation, all permits issued by the permit authority are public documents. Members of the public will be able

to view this permit (which includes the endorsed documents) on request, at the Council Office.

8. If any Aboriginal relics are uncovered during works;
 - a) All works are to cease within a delineated area sufficient to protect the unearthed and other possible relics from destruction,
 - b) The presence of a relic is to be reported to Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania Phone: (03) 6233 6613 or 1300 135 513 (ask for Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania Fax: (03) 6233 5555 Email: aboriginal@heritage.tas.gov.au); and
 - c) The relevant approval processes will apply with state and federal government agencies.

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

165/2018 61 VETERANS ROAD WESTBURY – PROPOSED CONSENT MEMORANDUM

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider signing a Consent Memorandum seeking orders from the Resource Management and Planning Appeals Tribunal to set aside the decision to refuse the Planning Application 18\0256 (Subdivision (2 Lots) of 61 Veterans Row, Westbury, CT 248138\1).

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council resolves to authorise the General Manager to sign the consent memorandum on behalf of the Planning Authority.

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded ***“that Council resolves to authorise the General Manager to sign the consent memorandum on behalf of the Planning Authority.”***

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

Comment by Cr Ian Mackenzie

I support this motion with great regret. I support it on this occasion not as a planning matter but more a cost matter. I feel in this instance the Planning Scheme has let the people of Veterans Row and surrounding areas down. To defend what has been communicated to us as being not defensible and costly to our ratepayers. A decision of Council which I supported (and believe was right), I supported the community in its views on the amenity and characteristics of that area and it seems in this case the Performance Criteria of our Planning Scheme has led to the view that it was not defensible. More rigours arguing on the amenity and characteristics of that area may have defended Council's original decision.

Comment by Cr Tanya King

Despite the legal advice, I will not be supporting this motion, as I feel that the Planning Scheme in this instance requires challenging.

While I am sympathetic to the process, the representations received for the original application raise issues around these types of subdivisions.

**166/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – SUBMISSION TO SENATE
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS REFERENCES
COMMITTEE (ACCESSIBILITY AND QUALITY OF
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN RURAL AND
REMOTE AUSTRALIA) – CR BOB RICHARDSON**

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider a Notice of Motion from Cr Richardson.

2) Recommendation (Cr Bob Richardson)

It is recommended that Council, in conjunction with relevant parties associated with health in Meander Valley, make a submission to the Senate Community Affairs References Committee (Regional Mental Health Services) and that the submission be prepared, consistent with previous Council submissions following the loss of three Meander Valley Health Workers (including a mental health worker).

DECISION:

Cr Richardson moved and Cr Connor seconded *“that Council, in conjunction with relevant parties associated with health in Meander Valley, make a submission to the Senate Community Affairs References Committee (Regional Mental Health Services) and that the submission be prepared, consistent with previous Council submissions following the loss of three Meander Valley Health Workers (including a mental health worker).*

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

Comment by Cr Bob Richardson

The loss of three health worker positions in the Meander Valley in December 2016 due to cuts by the Federal Liberal government appears to have resulted in disturbing trends. These three (preventative) health positions had a positive effect on health in the Meander Valley over many years.

The Coalition Government instead offered un-needed funding for diabetes education. The health centre in Westbury and Deloraine – likewise.

A reliable source indicated that:-

- Suicide rates appears to be on the rise, with at least 6 cases since December 2016, and
- At least two mental health patients whose problems were being managed are now in prison. (The cost of incarceration would have gone a long way to funding these workers).

It is also being report that:-

- There seems to be a trend (upwards) in adolescent behavioural problems; and
- Assistance to (particular aged) people is proving very difficult.

These three positions need to be replaced as soon as possible on a long-term basis.

167/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – CCTV SECURITY – WESTBURY AND DELORAINE – CR BOB RICHARDSON

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider a Notice of Motion from Cr Bob Richardson.

2) Recommendation (Cr Bob Richardson)

It is recommended that Council access up to \$25,000 from consolidated funds (or other sources) to complete the CCTV project (stages 1 and 2) at the same time.

DECISION:

Cr Richardson moved and Cr Kelly ***“that Council make application to the Safer Communities Fund Round 3 for an additional \$25,000 to support stage 2 of CCTV in Westbury and Deloraine.”***

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

Comment by Cr Bob Richardson

The call for CCTV security has been made for some time, largely as a consequence of numerous break-ins and thefts from both private homes and from businesses.

Whilst several businesses have installed security coverage, there is incompatibility, in many cases, with police equipment and low clarity of vision.

Westbury, in particular, has been the subject of numerous many thefts and property damage over the past couple of years. Entry to homes as well as businesses has been common.

The proposed two-stage call-out is only suggested due to a budget shortfall (of about \$120,000). To complete the whole project requires a minimal top-up. Is it not without

precedent that Council has been able to find top-ups – eg the Mitsubishi Outlander basketball rings!!

Without completion, Westbury, in particular, remains vulnerable. There are scores of businesses which can be accessed by easily avoiding the Stage 1 suggestion.

Council should find the funds now; it can still apply for Round 3 of the Safer Community Fund.

168/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – REVIEW OF SCHOOL INTAKE AREAS – CR BOB RICHARDSON

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider a Notice of Motion from Cr Richardson.

2) Recommendation (Cr Bob Richardson)

That Council appoint a Committee to draft a submission to the Department of Education concerning intake areas for Meander Valley Schools; and

- ***That that draft be presented to the October meeting of Council for approval and/or amendment; and***
- ***That the initial committee consist of three Councillors, two Council officers as nominated by the General Manager; and***
- ***That the Committee has the power to seek input from relevant community members, including school representatives.***

DECISION:

Cr Richardson moved and Cr Connor seconded ***“that Council appoint a Committee to draft a submission to the Department of Education concerning intake areas for Meander Valley Schools; and***

- ***That that draft be presented to the October meeting of Council for approval and/or amendment; and***
- ***That the initial committee consist of three Councillors, two Council officers as nominated by the General Manager; and***
- ***That the Committee has the power to seek input from relevant community members, including school representatives.***

As a procedural motion Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr King seconded ***“that the matter be referred to the September Council Workshop.”***

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

169/2018 PROPOSED SALE OF ANGLICAN CHURCH PROPERTIES

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to approve a submission to the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania Redress Fund Ordinance community consultation process.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approves the following submission to the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania Redress Fund Ordinance community consultation process:

Introduction

The local government area of Meander Valley Council is located to the west of Launceston. There are a number of Anglican parishes within the Meander Valley. Council makes this submission on behalf of the local community, local parishioners and in particular the Parish of Quamby.

The following submission is structured to reflect the Redress Fund Ordinance Guidance for community submissions and the criteria for submissions set out in the paper.

Submission Category – Exemption from Sale

Reasons for exemption:

The property requires special consideration for some reason

History and place

There are a number of properties within the Quamby parish that require special consideration:

- St Andrews Church, Carrick
- St Andrews Church, Westbury
- St Marys Church, Rectory and Cemetery, Hagley

The three churches listed above represent a working parish with close ties to the local community. The churches within the local communities and small townships within Meander Valley play an important role in defining those communities.

Of particular note is the role of the church in place making, and the important role of providing historical continuity and defining the character of towns that are losing other cultural institutions.

The churches listed above are also an integral part of local and Tasmanian history. Each of the churches has a story that goes back to the foundation of the area and a story about parishioners who have made significant contributions to the cultural history of Tasmania.

The church at Westbury was consecrated in 1836 and is filled with wood carvings by Nellie Payne a preeminent Tasmanian artist.

The church at Carrick was built and partly endowed by Thomas Reiby, a Premier of Tasmania and archdeacon of Launceston.

Sir Richard Dry, the first Premier of Tasmania, is buried at the church and rectory which he built at Hagley. Dr Dianne Snowden adjunct researcher of history at UTAS has described the Hagley church as a significant Tasmanian heritage site because of its connection to Sir Richard Dry.

Council would submit that the story associated with each church is not only the story of our community and who we are, but it is a critical part of the story of the Anglican Church and the contribution that parishioners have made in building the church and the communities around them. This contribution by parishioners and the importance of the church as a sacred place for local communities is also a counterpoint to the tragic story of an institution that betrayed the trust of the community.

Council would also submit that each of the churches helps define the sense of place for the local community and the importance that buildings play in bringing communities together.

The displacement of parishioners

The churches listed above continue to be active and represent all the active churches in the Quamby parish. Divesting these churches would have a detrimental impact on the lives of the local parishioners. The churches in the Quamby parish have long been places of financial, emotional and spiritual investment for parishioners. Selling the churches takes away this investment and undermines the connection to local communities.

The question that Council asks is, how does the connection to place get transferred out of our community?

Reasons for exemption:

- ***Any other relevant information the community wishes to submit***

There are a number of other issues that Council believes are relevant to the process and worthy of consideration.

Process

Parishioners and community members have been frustrated and hurt by the lack of consultation undertaken by the Archdiocese. There are several ways to raise funds to pay for redress, and Council is aware that the Quamby parish are working through their options. It is most unfortunate that the Archdiocese did not see fit to explore options with parishes, before determining to sell a large proportion of assets.

Council understands that it is also been confusing and confronting for parishioners and the community that the decision to sell properties to pay for redress has been lumped in with fundraising for causes other than redress. This has been seen by many in the community as a very opportunistic action, taking advantage of the redress situation to further an alternate strategic objective held by the Archdiocese.

Ongoing impact on community

Ensuring a parish only has to go through the process once. If a parish is able to save a church then Diocese acknowledges this and commit to supporting the parish. In the case of the Quamby parish, the three churches were gifted to the community, from various sources. The act of selling these assets, and removing them from communities who have built them contributed to their maintenance, alteration, and the writing of the history, is an act of exclusion. The process has the real risk of disenfranchising these communities, undermining the church and the people who are its purpose.

It would be prudent for the diocese to engage with their parishes and provide assurances that the assets that the parishioners are working so very hard to retain, remain in the community for as long as the community see fit. It is inappropriate for the decisions to be made by people who aren't closely affected by their conclusions.

DECISION:

Cr King moved and Cr Kelly seconded ***“that Council approves the following submission to the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania Redress Fund Ordinance community consultation process:***

Introduction

The local government area of Meander Valley Council is located to the west of Launceston. There are a number of Anglican parishes within the Meander Valley. Council makes this submission on behalf of the local community, local parishioners and in particular the Parish of Quamby.

The following submission is structured to reflect the Redress Fund Ordinance Guidance for community submissions and the criteria for submissions set out in the paper.

Submission Category – Exemption from Sale

Reasons for exemption:

The property requires special consideration for some reason

History and place

There are a number of properties within the Quamby parish that require special consideration:

- St Andrews Church, Carrick
- St Andrews Church, Westbury
- St Marys Church, Rectory and Cemetery, Hagley

The three churches listed above represent a working parish with close ties to the local community. The churches within the local communities and small townships within Meander Valley play an important role in defining those communities.

Of particular note is the role of the church in place making, and the important role of providing historical continuity and defining the character of towns that are losing other cultural institutions.

The churches listed above are also an integral part of local and Tasmanian history. Each of the churches has a story that goes back to the foundation of the area and a story about parishioners who have made significant contributions to the cultural history of Tasmania.

The church at Westbury was consecrated in 1836 and is filled with wood carvings by Nellie Payne a preeminent Tasmanian artist.

The church at Carrick was built and partly endowed by Thomas Reiby, a Premier of Tasmania and archdeacon of Launceston.

Sir Richard Dry, the first Premier of Tasmania, is buried at the church and rectory which he built at Hagley. Dr Dianne Snowden adjunct researcher of history at UTAS has described the Hagley church as a significant Tasmanian heritage site because of its connection to Sir Richard Dry.

Council would submit that the story associated with each church is not only the story of our community and who we are, but it is a critical part of the story of the Anglican Church and the contribution that parishioners have made in building the church and the communities around them. This contribution by parishioners and the importance of the church as a sacred place for local communities is also a counterpoint to the tragic story of an institution that betrayed the trust of the community.

Council would also submit that each of the churches helps define the sense of place for the local community and the importance that buildings play in bringing communities together.

The displacement of parishioners

The churches listed above continue to be active and represent all the active churches in the Quamby parish. Divesting these churches would have a detrimental impact on the lives of the local parishioners. The churches in the Quamby parish have long been places of financial, emotional and spiritual investment for parishioners. Selling the churches takes away this investment and undermines the connection to local communities.

The question that Council asks is how does the connection to place get transferred out of our community?

Reasons for exemption:

- ***Any other relevant information the community wishes to submit***

There are a number of other issues that Council believes are relevant to the process and worthy of consideration.

Process

Parishioners and community members have been frustrated and hurt by the lack of consultation undertaken by the Archdiocese. There are several ways to raise funds to pay for redress, and Council is aware that the Quamby parish are working

through their options. It is most unfortunate that the Archdiocese did not see fit to explore options with parishes, before determining to sell a large proportion of assets.

Council understands that it is also been confusing and confronting for parishioners and the community that the decision to sell properties to pay for redress has been lumped in with fundraising for causes other than redress. This has been seen by many in the community as a very opportunistic action, taking advantage of the redress situation to further an alternate strategic objective held by the Archdiocese.

Ongoing impact on community

Ensuring a parish only has to go through the process once. If a parish is able to save a church then Diocese acknowledges this and commit to supporting the parish.

In the case of the Quamby parish, the three churches were gifted to the community, from various sources. The act of selling these assets, and removing them from communities who have built them contributed to their maintenance, alteration, and the writing of the history, is an act of exclusion. The process has the real risk of disenfranchising these communities, undermining the church and the people who are its purpose.

It would be prudent for the diocese to engage with their parishes and provide assurances that the assets that the parishioners are working so very hard to retain, remain in the community for as long as the community see fit. It is inappropriate for the decisions to be made by people who aren't closely affected by their conclusions.

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

Councillor Connor abstained from the vote.

Comment by Cr Tanya King

This issue is not just about religion. It's about supporting our Community groups to negotiate a difficult process, not initiated by them. It is also about the history, and the architecture, in addition to being places of worship, not to mention the issues associated with the cemeteries.

The submission has also been prepared at the invitation of the Anglican Diocese. It sums up the issues, but I will reiterate that these assets that are proposed for sale were gifted to the church by the community in the first place.

The request for appropriate consultation is also much needed.

170/2018 TASWATER & COUNCILS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH STATE GOVERNMENT

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to approve the position the Mayor will take to the TasWater Special General Meeting with regard to the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State Government.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council resolves to support the proposed resolutions for consideration at the TasWater Special General Meeting to be held on Thursday 27 September 2018, those resolutions being:

- 1. Adoption of a proposed amended Constitution***
- 2. Adoption of a proposed new Shareholders' Letter of Expectations***
- 3. Approval to enter into the Share Subscription and Implementation Agreement, including approval for the issue of shares in the Corporation to the State Government***

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded ***“that Council resolves to support the proposed resolutions for consideration at the TasWater Special General Meeting to be held on Thursday 27 September 2018, those resolutions being:***

- 1. Adoption of a proposed amended Constitution***
- 2. Adoption of a proposed new Shareholders' Letter of Expectations***
- 3. Approval to enter into the Share Subscription and Implementation Agreement, including approval for the issue of shares in the Corporation to the State Government.”***

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

The Council meeting adjourned for afternoon tea at 3.26pm

The Council meeting resumed at 3.47pm

ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:

Councillor Kelly moved and Councillor Temple seconded ***“that pursuant to Regulation 15(2)(g) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, Council close the meeting to the public to discuss the following items.”***

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

171/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Closed Session of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 14 August, 2018.

172/2018 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

173/2018 CONTRACT 195 - DELORAINE COMMUNITY COMPLEX NETBALL COURTS

174/2018 CONTRACT 190 - PROSPECT VALE PARK AFL SPORTS LIGHTING UPGRADE

175/2018 CONTRACT 196 - ANNUAL SUPPLY TENDER – ROAD SEALING

The meeting moved into Closed Session at 3.48pm

The meeting re-opened to the public at 4.07pm

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Kelly seconded "**that the following decisions were taken by Council in Closed Session and are to be released for the public's information:-**"

Contract 195 – 2018/19 Deloraine Sports Complex New Netball Courts awarded to The Baker Group following confirmation of funding commitments.

Contract 190 – 2018/19 Prospect Vale Park AFL Sports Lighting Upgrade awarded to Electrical Testing & Compliance Service following confirmation of funding commitments.

Contract 196 – 2018-19 Asphalt and Bituminous Sealing of Roads, incorporating Schedule 1 and Schedule 2, awarded to Hardings Hotmix Pty Ltd."

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

The meeting closed at 4.08pm

.....
CRAIG PERKINS (MAYOR)