



Meander Valley Council

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

MINUTES

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 12 May 2015

Table of Contents

290/15	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:.....	3
291/15	COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:	3
292/15	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:	4
293/15	TABLING OF PETITIONS:.....	4
294/15	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	4
295/15	COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME	4
296/15	DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	13
297/15	NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS	13
298/15	FRONTAGE FENCE & RESIDENTIAL OUTBUILDING – 7 CLASSIC DRIVE, PROSPECT VALE	14
299/15	DWELLING – 279 MAYBERRY ROAD, MAYBERRY	18
300/15	DOG REGISTRATION FEES 2015–2016	23
301/15	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FEES 2015-2016.....	25
302/15	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT	27
303/15	COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO THE AUSTRALIAN ENERGY REGULATOR	29
304/15	CUSTOMER SERVICE CHARTER	30
305/15	2014-2015 COMMUNITY GRANTS APPLICATION ASSESSMENTS – ROUND 4 – APRIL 2015	32
306/15	MEANDER SCHOOL OWNERSHIP	34
307/15	BASS HIGHWAY SIGNAGE AT WESTBURY	35
308/15	CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME 2015-2016	36
	ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:.....	39
309/15	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Minutes of the general meeting of the Meander Valley Council held at the Council Chambers Meeting Room, 26 Lyall Street, Westbury, on Tuesday 12 May 2015 at 1.33pm.

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

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 Simons, Town Planner
Natasha Whiteley, Town Planner
Craig Plaisted, Project Officer
Rob Little, Asset Management Co-ordinator
Jonathon Harmey, Senior Accountant

290/15 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Councillor Mackenzie moved and Councillor Youd seconded, *“that the minutes of the Ordinary and Closed meeting of Council held on Tuesday 21 April, 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.*

291/15 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:

Date :	Items discussed:
28 April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Capital Works Bus Tour• Presentation – Parks & Wildlife Service• Presentation – Tas Police• Westbury Recreation Ground Building Upgrade• 2015-16 Draft Capital Works Programme

292/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

305/15 2014-2015 COMMUNITY GRANTS APPLICATION ASSESSMENTS – Cr Tanya King

293/15 TABLING OF PETITIONS:

Nil

294/15 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

1. QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – APRIL 2015

Nil

2. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – MAY 2015

Nil

295/15 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

1. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – APRIL 2015

1.1 Cr Ian Mackenzie

I believe that there was an energy efficiency (CEEP) funding forum organised recently at Bracknell with no advertising at the Bracknell Roadhouse, Bracknell Hotel the venue prior to the event or Bracknell School newsletter and with the Meander Valley Gazette not distributed at Bracknell.

- a) How many community members attended?
- b) How was it advertised? and
- c) Will Council organise another event/forum for Bracknell community with appropriate advertising.

Responses by Rick Dunn, Director Economic Development & Sustainability

- (a) None*
- (b) The Workshops were promoted via Council's website, Facebook, Twitter, Meander Valley Gazette February, Meander Valley Gazette March, Examiner Newspaper, email distribution through networks, Community News and posters which in this instance was displayed at the Bracknell Roadhouse but was not on display on the noticeboard on the day of the workshop.*
- (c) Additional workshops are not planned.*

1.2 Cr Bob Richardson

a) LGAT former CEO's comments to the Legislative Council

The Examiner (Friday, 17th April, 2015) quoted former LGAT CEO (incorrectly referred to as LGAT "President") as saying:-

He was unsure the deputy mayor's role was needed.

Upon what basis might he make that comment, and has the issue been formally discussed by the Association?

Mr Garcia did raise other issues which had been of concern/interest by many Councillors of many years, including:

- Compulsory voting,
- The general managers electoral roll, and
- Combatting relatively high numbers of informal votes.

He suggested these issues be explored before next Council elections.

Will Council initiate Councillor and community views (soon) to be prepared for any Government initiatives?

Mr Garcia also indicated that "there ought to be much more transparent process to ensure Council decisions made – particularly about planning – were all above board in the future".

This implies that such decisions may not have been in the past.

In the Meander Valley, can Council representatives recall any decision regarding planning where a Council, or Councillors, have not been "above board"? And do not the interest provisions of the Local Government Act provide for such scrutiny?

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

The Mayor has spoken with Mr Garcia regarding his comments and Mr Garcia has advised that he was appearing before a Legislative Council Select Committee. His response to a series of questions was taken out of context and misquoted.

No there has been no discussion by the Association regarding the role of Deputy Mayor.

Council will need to determine if it wants to seek the community views regarding any changes if proposed by the Government.

There are no known issues regarding planning decision at Council.

Yes the interest provisions of the Act should provide scrutiny providing Councillors or staff declares their interests.

b) Cost of Collection of Clubs & Societies Council "Rents"

Will Council officers please provide information in relation to the hire/rent/lease of Council facilities by both formally constituted community clubs and organisations and by occasional users over the course of a year?

Response by Malcolm Salter, Director Corporate Services

For the financial year 2013-14 the total hire/rent/lease income for facilities subject to the Recreation Pricing Policy was \$158,653.

Could we also be provided with the cost to Council of collection of those rentals/leases/hirings including staff time and on-costs (SGC, annual, long-service and other leave provisions), overheads (office space/recurrent costs, vehicles).

(These are to be considered in conjunction with the policy related to Council recoupment of costs.)

Response by Malcolm Salter, Director Corporate Services

It is not possible to provide an actual cost as the calculation and collection of the charges forms just a minor part of the duties of various employees eg Facility managers will discuss and explain pricing as part of an overall discussion on use, risk management and other hirer obligations. Occasionally senior management (annualised salary) will need to meet with new clubs/users or where the policy is being implemented for the first time, particularly if there is disagreement or further negotiation on use and price; the Receptionist/Cashier calculates the charge using financial data within the spreadsheet model developed when the pricing policy was introduced; the Sundry Debtors Clerk will raise the actual account during the regular account raising run or occasionally this will be ad hoc. If pricing policy duties were removed the employee costs including office space and most vehicle costs would remain.

However if a "guesstimate" is provided then a figure (including labour on costs) of \$15,000 to \$20,000 p.a. would appear reasonable.

c) Price of Replacement of Facilities

What would be the replacement price to re-build the Deloraine Community (Alveston Drive) Complex now – from scratch, including planning permits, design etc.?

(It is not expected that estimates be accurate to the dollar, but so within, say, the nearest \$100,000.)

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

The reinstatement value to re-build the Deloraine Community (Alveston Drive) Complex now would be in the order of approximately \$5.0M based on Council's Insurance Valuation Report prepared by Herron Todd White in June 2014. The reinstatement value includes professional fees and costs for statutory building compliance. Council's planning application fee would be in the order of \$5,000.

d) Remuneration of Senior Staff, Meander Valley Council

Since the escalation of discussion regarding Council amalgamation, amongst issues upon which society, including elected representatives, ratepayers, "politically aware" groups and individuals and the media, have begun to focus has been that of senior Council staff.

To enable objective and informed discussion, the quantum of remunerative package of directors, mayors, deputy mayors and Councillors -

Will Council please publish the remunerative packages (including salaries, vehicle, communications equipment, superannuation and other fringe benefits) of:

- The Mayor
- The Deputy Mayor
- Councillors
- General Manager and
- Individual Directors?

Can similar remunerations be obtained for a larger Council, eg Launceston, for comparable positions?

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

Yes the information is provided in the following table for the last financial year. This information is sourced from the Annual Reports of Council, Launceston City Council and the LGAT website.

Position	Meander Valley	Launceston City
Mayor	\$48,378	\$116,107
Deputy-Mayor	\$26,952	\$54,597
Councillor	\$13,823	\$33,173
General Manager	\$180,000 to \$190,000	\$290,000 to \$310,000
Senior Staff	\$160,000 to \$170,000 \$140,000 to \$150,000 \$130,000 to \$140,000	\$190,000 to \$210,000 \$170,000 to \$190,000 \$150,000 to \$170,000
Expenses paid to Mayor, Deputy-Mayor, Councillors/Alderman	\$27,727	\$25,092

1.3 Cr Tanya King

- Supplementary to Councillor Mackenzie’s question, is it correct that Bracknell residents do not receive the Meander Valley Gazette? If so why?
- Can Council please make arrangements for Bracknell residents to receive the Gazette?
- Are there any other communities in the Municipality who are missing out?

Response by Rick Dunn, Director Economic Development & Sustainability

- We have been advised that there are no mail deliveries to homes in Bracknell, the Gazette is delivered to the Post Office, where residents collect it.*
- Refer to (a).*
- According to the producers of the Gazette, it is delivered to all homes in the municipality, unless residents live in an area such as Bracknell where it is delivered to the Post Office for collection by the residents.*

2. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – MAY 2015

3.1 Cr Deb White

In the interests of keeping Councillors informed, could the Director for Development Services include an update of the Cat Management Committee's progress in the Briefing Notes next month?

*Response by Martin Gill, Director Development Services
Yes an update will be included in the May Briefing Report.*

3. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – MAY 2015

3.1 Cr Ian Mackenzie

1) Energy Efficiency Forum – Bracknell

As I am not entirely satisfied with the answers to my questions in regards to the Energy Efficiency Forum that was held at Bracknell I have further questions. Most of these questions relate to answer b)

- a) This answer states that the EEF was advertised in examiner newspaper what day/s/date/s was this event for Bracknell advertised?

Response by Craig Plaisted, Project Officer

Editorial in Tuesday 17 February 2015, page 22 'Tips to cut electricity bills – Forums for energy awareness'.

- b) As a councillor, living in this community I didn't receive an advertising email for this event it was mentioned in a previous briefing report with all towns to receive forums. What email networks were used for Bracknell and when were these emails sent?

Response by Craig Plaisted, Project Officer

Sent to my own contact list on Tuesday 24 February 2015 –an estimated maximum distribution of 284 for this promotion – with a request to forward onto the individuals own networks. My list included MVCs Community Development Officer and Visitor Centre Manager, who both have large distribution lists.

- c) The owners of Bracknell Roadhouse have stated that they didn't advertise this event nor were they asked. I have also asked many members of the Bracknell community as to whether they saw the advertising at BRH with many stating if they saw the advertising they would have attended. When and who was asked at Bracknell Roadhouse to display this advertising?

Response by Craig Plaisted, Project Officer

Bracknell Roadhouse was not asked to display the flyer, however a flyer was pinned to the noticeboard

- d) What was the time frame for advertising prior to this forum date?

Response by Craig Plaisted, Project Officer

Promotion began approximately 4 weeks before and continued in various forms throughout the 4 week period prior to the Bracknell workshop.

e) How many EE forums were run within the Meander Valley Municipality where and how many community members attended?

Response by Craig Plaisted, Project Officer

11 workshops were held throughout Meander Valley with approximately 51 community members attending, and an additional 20 local government employees and visitors to Tasmania, for a total of 75 attendees.

2) Council Administration fees

At a previous council meeting I moved an amendment to the pricing policy to remove the administration fee at that time the administration fee was 16% of fees is this correct?

Response by Malcolm Salter, Director Corporate Services

No, the administration fee was 10%.

I also believe that at that time that 16% was a reduced fee and the administration charged on council works was 22% is this correct? If not what is the current % of administration fee?

Response by Malcolm Salter, Director Corporate Services

No. The administration charge of 10% was a reduction on the 16.6% Governance & General Administration Expense to total Operating Expense in the 2013-14 budget.

The current administration fees are 10% on Private Works, the statutory 4% on the State Fire Service contribution and an internal allocation of 4% on the Garbage and Recycling collection service.

Would it be correct in stating that the administration fee is a fee based upon the cost of council to supply its administration/corporate services?

Response by Malcolm Salter, Director Corporate Services

No. It would be more correct to say that the administration fee allocates some of Council's administration/corporate services costs to service charges. The 10% is based on what was historically allowable in Council accounts for allocating administration costs to Rating Accounts eg Water and Sewerage. The 4% internal allocation for the Garbage and Recycling collection service is to maintain consistency between the two Rating and Service Charge accounts.

3) Public Toilets

a) The public toilets here at Westbury (next door) roughly how many hours per day and how many days are they open?

Response by David Pyke, Director Governance & Community Services

The toilets are open 24/7.

b) The public toilets at Prospect Vale Park roughly how many hours per day and how many days are they open?

Question taken on notice

c) The public toilets at Bracknell roughly how many hours per day and how many days are they open?

Question taken on notice

d) Do any of these toilets have hot/tempered water?

Question taken on notice

4) Agfest

a) As we all know Agfest was held last week, is Council aware that it is estimated that Agfest contributes approximately \$30 million into the wider community?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

We are now

b) Is Council aware that there is estimated (through research) that there is 98% occupancy in accommodation places within the Meander Valley Council area during the week of Agfest, and up to 95% occupancy from Ulverstone to Launceston?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

We are now

c) Is Council aware that 95% of caterers at Agfest are community and/or service groups allowing for those funds to filter back through the wider community through these groups and ¼ of these are from the Meander Valley area?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

We are now

d) Is Council aware that Agfest is run and organised by the Rural Youth Organisation which is 98% volunteers (200+members past and present) with 4 full-time employees?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

We are now

e) Is Council aware that Agfest only runs for 3 days a year?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

Yes

f) Is Council aware that Agfest is under immense pressure economically, socially (membership) and docility (compliance) and in its current format is unsustainable due to these pressures, and others such as fire suppression, workplace OH & S, Public Health etc.?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

We are now

g) This next question is an example of compliance/economic pressure. Prior to this year's event Rural Youth installed hot water (providing tempered water) in 2 of its toilet blocks and advised me that the other 2 will be done before next year's event. This was installed as it was a Meander Valley Council directive. Over the past 2-3 months I dined at 3 places within our Municipality and none of these places had hot water in their toilet facilities and these venues are open 360-365 days per year. With this and the answers provided by Council in regards to public toilets, my question is why was it a Council requirement that Rural Youth supply hot/tempered water to its patrons in its public toilets for a 3 day event when patrons aren't supplied hot/tempered water in public toilets in our municipality which are open for a lot longer than 3 days per year?

Question taken on notice

h) Is Council aware that Agfest attendance was 56,741 which is well down on past years?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins
We are now

i) Will Council support Rural Youth to clarify and alleviate some of these pressures starting with a workshop ASAP to ascertain these issues?

Response by Martin Gill, Director Development Services
Happy to meet and discuss at a Council workshop.

3.2 Cr Andrew Connor

1. At or following the last council meeting we were advised that the council room audio/visual improvements were to have been commissioned in the week commencing 4 May (last week). What is the current expected commissioning date?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

The preliminary commissioning occurred in the weekend commencing 4 May and final commissioning will occur in the week commencing 18 May.

2. Can Council officers provide an update on the development of an implementation/action plan following on from the Prospect Vale-Blackstone Heights structure plan?

Response by Martin Gill, Director Development

A number of projects have been included in the budget for 2015-16. We are also planning to bring a draft implementation plan to the July workshop for discussion.

3. Following motions passed at the last council meeting, can the Mayor or GM provide an update on the benchmarking exercise and shared services/amalgamation talks with neighbouring councils?

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

Letters were sent out to Latrobe, Kentish and Launceston Councils inviting them to join the benchmarking project. Launceston's letter also included an offer for the Mayor and two Councillors to meet with the Mayor and two aldermen to discuss local government reform. To date only the Latrobe Mayor has responded and advised that Latrobe will continue to joint share with Kentish.

3.3 Cr Rodney Synfield

1. Will Council have a workshop regarding having a formal presence at Agfest, such as Central Highlands Council does?

Response by Martin Gill, Director Development Services
Yes we will

2. Is Council aware I have completed a dissertation on signage and will be forwarding same to Councillors and Council staff shortly?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins
Yes we are aware

3.4 Cr Bob Richardson

a) Regarding the remuneration report, I refer Council to the reply to Question 1.2(d). I do not believe that the reply answers the question as asked.

Could a reply be printed?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins

Yes I believe it has been answered. More detailed information is private and confidential.

b) Supplementary to Questions regarding Public Toilets.

Is Council aware that most (all?) of the Municipality's public toilets do not have soap?

Question taken on Notice

c) In the early 1990's, decisions were made to downgrade Meander Valley health services, including closure of the Westbury facility as a hospital.

One response of the Meander Valley community was to fund (and then run by volunteers) two community cars – one based in Deloraine and one in Westbury. These continue to provide a service to patients so that they may attend specialist appointments in Launceston.

The State Health Department also provided vehicles for patient transport. These vehicles were used for a variety of purposes including transport for hydrotherapy and for preventative health therapy.

My advice is that one of those vehicles used primarily for disabled and aged people has been removed from use by W.C.H.C. and Deloraine C.H.C.

This is impacting significantly upon W.C.H.C. programs and probably Deloraine. Use has reported to have declined since last year when patient's fees for transport were raised from \$2.00. The minimum is now \$8.00. Some fees are now up to \$ 50 a day. Little wonder patronage dropped off.

Will Council confer with management of W.C.H.C. to establish to veracity of my advice and seek was to restore the service?

Response by Greg Preece, General Manager

Yes Council will discuss with W.C.H.C.

d) Further to my question last Council meeting when I referred to the sporting feats of Westbury, can I refer to make achievements of residents of this small rural town –

- Luke Blackwell won the elite male 60kg division at the Australian Boxing championships;
- Dominic Barrett, of the Westbury Shamrocks has been selected in the Tasmanian Under 15 cricket quad;

In addition success has not been confined to sporting achievements;_

- Westbury Primary School's NAPLAN results were capped with student Noah Curtis achieving a result in the top 1% of State results; and
- Isabella Firth has won a year's scholarship to a prestigious catering/hospitality establishment in NSW.

Is Council aware of these achievements?

Response by Mayor Craig Perkins
We are now.

e) A resident of Glenore Road has requested possible kerbside collection at Glenore Road, Whitemore.

A possible solution is a detour leaving the hamlet of Whitemore and travel south via Glenore Road and Adelphi Road to Oaks Road.

Would Council please investigate?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

The Draft Waste Management Strategy is currently under review and will be discussed at a future workshop for discussion and how some of the rural areas will be managed into the future.

296/15 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Nil

297/15 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

Nil

COUNCIL MEETING AS A PLANNING AUTHORITY

The Mayor advises that for items 298/15 to 299/15 Council is acting as a Planning Authority under the provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

The Mayor advised that DEV 1 has been withdrawn by the Applicant.

298/15 FRONTAGE FENCE & RESIDENTIAL OUTBUILDING – 7 CLASSIC DRIVE, PROSPECT VALE

The Mayor invited Mr Frank Geskus to address the meeting regarding this item.

1) Introduction

This report considers the planning application PA\15\0104 for a Frontage Fence and Residential Outbuilding for land located at 7 Classic Drive, Prospect Vale (CT 160564/11).

2) Recommendation

That the application for use and development for a Residential Outbuilding, Retaining Wall and Frontage Fence for land located at 7 Classic Drive, Prospect Vale (CT 160564/11) by Prime Design, requiring the following discretions:

General Residential Zone

10.4.2 Building Envelope

10.4.7 Frontage Fence

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans and subject to the following conditions:

1. The use and/or development must be carried out as shown and described in the endorsed Plans:
 - a) Prime Design Drawing Numbers: PD10128-01, 02, 03 & 04to the satisfaction of the Council. Any other proposed development and/or use will require a separate application and assessment by Council.
2. The existing stormwater inspection pit is to be relocated within the title, clear of the proposed retaining wall and raised to the finished ground level to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor.
3. Prior to the commencement of works stormwater design drawings are to be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor. The drawings must include works required to comply with Condition 3.
4. The use of outbuilding is not permitted for human habitation and is limited to residential storage and related residential activities only.
5. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA 2015/00607-MVC attached).

Note:

1. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. At least the following additional approvals may be required before construction commences:
 - a) Building permit
 - b) Plumbing permit

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5322.

2. 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.
3. 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 at least 6 weeks prior to the expiration date.
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 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 Mackenzie moved and Cr Connor seconded *“that the application for use and development for a Residential Outbuilding, Retaining Wall and Frontage Fence for land located at 7 Classic Drive, Prospect Vale (CT 160564/11) by Prime Design, requiring the following discretions:*

General Residential Zone

- | | |
|--------|-------------------|
| 10.4.2 | Building Envelope |
| 10.4.7 | Frontage Fence |

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans and subject to the following conditions:

1. The use and/or development must be carried out as shown and described in the endorsed Plans:
 - a) Prime Design Drawing Numbers: PD10128-01, 02, 03 & 04to the satisfaction of the Council. Any other proposed development and/or use will require a separate application and assessment by Council.
2. The existing stormwater inspection pit is to be relocated within the title, clear of the proposed retaining wall and raised to the finished ground level to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor.
3. Prior to the commencement of works stormwater design drawings are to be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor. The drawings must include works required to comply with Condition 3.
4. The use of outbuilding is not permitted for human habitation and is limited to residential storage and related residential activities only.
5. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA 2015/00607-MVC attached).

Note:

1. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. At least the following additional approvals may be required before construction commences:
 - a) Building permit
 - b) Plumbing permit

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5322.

2. 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.
3. 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 at least 6 weeks prior to the expiration date.

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 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, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.*

299/15 DWELLING – 279 MAYBERRY ROAD, MAYBERRY

The Mayor invited Mr Leigh Walters to address the meeting regarding this item.

1) Introduction

This report considers application PA\15\0031 for a dwelling on land located at 279 Mayberry Road, Mayberry (CT230877/1).

2) Recommendation

That the application for use and development for a Residential dwelling on land located at 279 Mayberry Road, Mayberry (CT 230877/1), by Woolcott Surveys, requiring the following discretions:

26 Rural Resource Zone

26.3.2 New dwelling

26.4.1 Building setback for a sensitive use

E4 Road and Railway Asset Code

E4.7.2 New access

E6 Car Parking and Sustainable Transport Code

E6.7.2 Width of access

E8 Biodiversity Code

E8.6.1 Removal of native vegetation

E9 Water Quality Code

E9.6.1 Vegetation removal within 40 metres of a water course

E9.6.3 Construction of road within 50 metres of a watercourse

E15 Karst Management Code

E15.5 Setback of wastewater field to sinkhole

E15.6.1 Development within 100 metres of a karst feature

E15.6.2 Site contains high sensitivity karst feature

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans and subject to the following conditions:

1. The use and development must be carried out as shown and described in the endorsed plans and report:
 - a) Woolcott Surveys – Application for a Two Bedroom Eco-Cabin, April 2015to the satisfaction of the Council. Any other proposed development and/or use will require a separate application to and assessment by the Council.
2. Prior to the commencement of works:
 - a) an amended stormwater system is to be submitted to Council to locate a diffuse spreader downslope of the dwelling, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.

- b) a soil and water management plan is to be submitted providing detail of the treatment of the hazard management area to rehabilitate areas of bare soil and provide for long term sediment and erosion control to maintain surface water quality, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.
3. Surface disturbance beyond the extent of the driveway, parking area and building and hazard management area is to be rehabilitated with perennial ground cover, upon completion of these works, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.
4. An all-weather, trafficable driveway surface is to be provided from the access crossover to the parking area at a minimum width of 4.5 metres.
5. Vegetation to either side of the access is to be maintained to ensure a safe sight distance of 210 metres.
6. Screening vegetation is to be planted along the front boundary with Mayberry Road for a distance of 200m southwards from the existing access where there are gaps in vegetation, excluding sight distance requirements at the new access, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.

Notes:

1. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. At least the following additional approvals will be required by Council before construction commences:
 - a) Building permit
 - b) Plumbing permit
 - c) Special Plumbing Permit

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5322.

2. 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.
3. 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. A once only extension may be granted if a request is received at least 6 weeks prior to the expiration date.
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 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 Youd moved and Cr Connor seconded *“that the application for use and development for a Residential dwelling on land located at 279 Mayberry Road, Mayberry (CT 230877/1), by Woolcott Surveys, requiring the following discretions:*

26 Rural Resource Zone

26.3.2 New dwelling

26.4.1 Building setback for a sensitive use

E4 Road and Railway Asset Code

E4.7.2 New access

E6 Car Parking and Sustainable Transport Code

E6.7.2 Width of access

E8 Biodiversity Code

E8.6.1 Removal of native vegetation

E9 Water Quality Code

E9.6.1 Vegetation removal within 40 metres of a water course

E9.6.3 Construction of road within 50 metres of a watercourse

E15 Karst Management Code

E15.5 Setback of wastewater field to sinkhole

E15.6.1 Development within 100 metres of a karst feature

E15.6.2 Site contains high sensitivity karst feature

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans and subject to the following conditions:

1. The use and development must be carried out as shown and described in the endorsed plans and report:
 - a) Woolcott Surveys – Application for a Two Bedroom Eco-Cabin, April 2015

to the satisfaction of the Council. Any other proposed development and/or use will require a separate application to and assessment by the Council.

2. Prior to the commencement of works:
 - a) an amended stormwater system is to be submitted to Council to locate a diffuse spreader downslope of the dwelling, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.
 - b) a soil and water management plan is to be submitted providing detail of the treatment of the hazard management area to rehabilitate areas of bare soil and provide for long term sediment and erosion control to maintain surface water quality, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.
3. Surface disturbance beyond the extent of the driveway, parking area and building and hazard management area is to be rehabilitated with perennial ground cover, upon completion of these works, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.
4. An all-weather, trafficable driveway surface is to be provided from the access crossover to the parking area at a minimum width of 4.5 metres.
5. Vegetation to either side of the access is to be maintained to ensure a safe sight distance of 210 metres.
6. Screening vegetation is to be planted along the front boundary with Mayberry Road for a distance of 200m southwards from the existing access where there are gaps in vegetation, excluding sight distance requirements at the new access, to the satisfaction of Council's Town Planner.
7. The existing building is not to be used for human habitation or any animal keeping.

Notes:

1. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. At least the following additional approvals will be required by Council before construction commences:
 - a) Building permit
 - b) Plumbing permit
 - c) Special Plumbing Permit

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5322.

2. 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.
3. 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. A once only extension may be granted if a request is received at least 6 weeks prior to the expiration date.
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 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, Richardson, Synfield, White and Youd voting for the motion.*

Comment by Cr Bob Richardson

Whilst it cannot be considered because it has no legal status there are those who consider the development application has elements which conflict with the Karst Management Plan. That plan should be revisited – soon!!

Because the Mole Creek Karst area is characterised by voids; where they are is not fully known. Perhaps geoseismic studies may prove useful.

The Mole Creek Karst is a highly sensitive world class geomorphic feature, particularly of a cool temperate limestone feature.

As such I am ambivalent regarding this DA. There may be more suitable developments which may be more amenable to sustainability of the karst.

300/15 DOG REGISTRATION FEES 2015-2016

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to adopt dog registration fees for 2015-2016.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council adopt the following dog registration and dog management fees for the 2015-2016 financial year.

<i>Registration</i>	<i>Regular Fee</i>	<i>If paid by 31 July</i>
Domestic Dog not Desexed	\$59.50	\$43
Domestic Dog Desexed	\$27.50	\$14
Working Dog	\$19	\$8
Greyhound	\$19	\$8
Purebred (<i>for breeding</i>)	\$24.50	\$12
Pensioners Dog (<i>one per pension card</i>)	\$24.50	\$12
Guide Dog/Hearing Dog/Accredited Assistance Dog (<i>on production of suitable evidence by applicant</i>)	Nil	Nil
Dangerous Dog	\$500	Not Applicable
Guard Dog	\$59.50	\$43
<i>Other</i>		
Renewal of Kennel Licence	\$30.50	Not Applicable
New Kennel Licence	\$112.50	
Fee to make a nuisance dog complaint	\$22	
Dangerous Dog Collars	Cost + 10%	
Impounding Fee	\$30.50	
Second Time	\$51	
Daily Maintenance Fee	\$20 + GST	

The Council meeting adjourned for afternoon tea at 3.21pm
The Council meeting resumed at 3.35pm

DECISION:

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Kelly seconded *“that Council adopt the following dog registration and dog management fees for the 2015-2016 financial year:*

<i>Registration</i>	<i>Regular Fee</i>	<i>If paid by 31 July</i>
Domestic Dog not Desexed	\$59.50	\$43
Domestic Dog Desexed	\$20	\$12
Working Dog	\$20	\$12
Greyhound	\$20	\$12
Purebred (<i>for breeding</i>)	\$20	\$12
Pensioners Dog (<i>one per pension card</i>)	\$20	\$12
Guide Dog/Hearing Dog/Accredited Assistance Dog (<i>on production of suitable evidence by applicant</i>)	Nil	Nil
Dangerous Dog	\$500	Not Applicable
Guard Dog	\$59.50	\$43
<i>Other</i>		
Renewal of Kennel Licence	\$30.50	Not Applicable
New Kennel Licence	\$112.50	
Fee to make a nuisance dog complaint	\$20	
Dangerous Dog Collars	Cost + 10%	
Impounding Fee	\$30.50	
Second Time	\$51	
Daily Maintenance Fee	\$20 + GST	

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

301/15 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FEES 2015-2016

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider Environmental Health fees and charges for 2015-2016.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council adopt the proposed fees and charges as set out in the table below for 2015-16:

Food Premises: (Except for bona fide not for profit organisations)	Fees and Charges
Annual renewal of Registration	
• Low risk	\$53
• Other premises	\$158
Temporary Food Stall Registration	
• (Except for bona fide not for profit organisations)	
0 – 3 months	\$32
3 – 6 months	\$53
6 – 12 months	\$79
Late fee if not received before event	\$37
Public Health	
Places of Assembly - General	\$69
Places of Assembly - Specific Events, greater than 1 day	\$215
Other premises requiring licensing under Public Health Act 1997	\$89
Request for inspection and written reports on food premises for prospective purchasers	\$106

DECISION:

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Kelly seconded *“that Council adopt the proposed fees and charges as set out in the table below for 2015-16:*

Food Premises: (Except for bona fide not for profit organisations)	Fees and Charges
Annual renewal of Registration <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low risk• Other premises	\$53 \$158
Temporary Food Stall Registration (Except for bona fide not for profit organisations)	
0 – 3 months	\$32
3 – 6 months	\$53
6 – 12 months	\$79
Late fee if not received before event	\$37
Public Health	
Places of Assembly - General	\$69
Places of Assembly - Specific Events, greater than 1 day	\$215
Other premises requiring licensing under Public Health Act 1997	\$89
Request for inspection and written reports on food premises for prospective purchasers	\$106

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

302/15 FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to consider the impact of the Commonwealth Government's 2014 Budget decision to freeze indexation of the Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) paid to local government.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended "that Council

- a) Acknowledges the importance of federal funding through the Financial Assistance Grants program for the continued delivery of councils services and infrastructure;*
- b) Acknowledges that the council will receives \$4,721,085 million in 2014-15;*
- c) Will ensure that this federal funding and other funding provided by the Federal Government under relevant grant programs, is appropriately identified as Commonwealth grant funding in council publications, including annual reports;*
- d) Write to the Members of Parliament to highlight the specific implications of the FAGS indexation freeze; and*

DECISION:

Cr White moved and Cr Richardson seconded *"that Council*

- a) Acknowledges the importance of federal funding through the Financial Assistance Grants program for the continued delivery of councils services and infrastructure;*
- b) Acknowledges that the council will receives \$4,721,085 million in 2014-15;*
- c) Will ensure that this federal funding and other funding provided by the Federal Government under relevant grant programs, is appropriately identified as Commonwealth grant funding in council publications, including annual reports;*
- d) Write to the Members of Parliament to highlight the specific implications of the FAGS indexation freeze; and*
- e) Ask the members of Parliament to remove the moratorium on the indexation of the Financial Assistance Grants.*

*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

For many years Councils, through LGAT, have lobbied for a better funding deal for local government:-

- better in that there is greater certainty of grants amounts (eg by a set proportion of GST);
and
- Better in terms of real quantity; as Council pick up more and more responsibilities formerly funded/provided by State and Federal Governments, commensurate funds have not been provided;

I also have a difficulty with the potential to have grants tagged to specific projects. For marginal electorates this is likely to be a boon. To others, not so.

303/15 COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO THE AUSTRALIAN ENERGY REGULATOR

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to consider a Council response to an Issues Paper released by the Australian Energy Regulator (AER), which outlines the AER's approach to regulating the distribution services offered by TasNetworks.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council write a submission to the Australian Energy Regulator asking that:

- (a) Public lighting remain unregulated in Tasmania;*
- (b) The Service Performance Target Incentive Scheme applying to TasNetworks supports their proposal to reduce the revenue at risk to TasNetworks to ± 2.5 per cent of its annual smoothed revenue.*

DECISION:

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr White seconded *"that Council write a submission to the Australian Energy Regulator asking that:*

- (a) Public lighting remain unregulated in Tasmania;*
- (b) The Service Performance Target Incentive Scheme applying to TasNetworks supports their proposal to reduce the revenue at risk to TasNetworks to ± 2.5 per cent of its annual smoothed revenue.*

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

304/15 CUSTOMER SERVICE CHARTER

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to review Council's Customer Service Charter.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council adopt the revised Customer Service Charter as follows:

DECISION:

Cr King moved and Cr Connor seconded *“that Council adopt the revised Customer Service Charter.”*

Procedural motion moved by Cr White and Cr Mackenzie seconded *“that Council defer this item until the June Council meeting.”*

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

Cr King left the meeting at 4.10pm

305/15 2014-2015 COMMUNITY GRANTS APPLICATION ASSESSMENTS – ROUND 4 – APRIL 2015

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to present the recommendations of the Community Grants Committee to Council for approval.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council:

- a) *notes the Individual Sponsorships approved by the General Manager in the March quarter; and*
- b) *endorses the recommendations of the Community Grants Committee and approves the allocation of funds to the applicants as listed in the following table:*

Organisation	Project	Grant Recommended \$
Child Health Ass of Tas - Westbury	New equipment	3,000
Deloraine Golf Club Inc	Semi-auto defibrillator	1,500
Deloraine Junior Basketball	New basketballs	3,000
Meander Valley Community Radio	Equipment to broadcast live	2,295
Westbury RSL Sub Branch	Refurbish of cenotaph artillery gun	1,500
Westbury Shamrocks Cricket Club	Wicket covers	1,975
"Who Was Nellie Payne"	Research, acquire and exhibition	3,000
TOTAL		16,270

DECISION:

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Kelly seconded *"that Council:*

- a) *notes the Individual Sponsorships approved by the General Manager in the March quarter; and*

- b) *endorses the recommendations of the Community Grants Committee and approves the allocation of funds to the applicants as listed in the following table:*

Organisation	Project	Grant Recommended \$
Child Health Ass of Tas - Westbury	New equipment	3,000
Deloraine Golf Club Inc	Semi-auto defibrillator	1,500
Deloraine Junior Basketball	New basketballs	3,000
Meander Valley Community Radio	Equipment to broadcast live	2,295
Westbury RSL Sub Branch	Refurbish of cenotaph artillery gun	1,500
Westbury Shamrocks Cricket Club	Wicket covers	1,975
"Who Was Nellie Payne"	Research, acquire and exhibition	3,000
TOTAL		16,270

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

Cr King returned to the meeting at 4.19pm

306/15 MEANDER SCHOOL OWNERSHIP

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to consider an offer by the Department of Education to transfer the ownership of the former Meander Primary School to Council.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council:

- 1. Decline the Department of Education's offer to assume ownership of the former Meander Primary School*
- 2. Recommends to the Department of Education that it work closely with the Meander Community to determine a future sustainable use for the former school facility.*

DECISION:

Cr Synfield moved and Cr Youd seconded *"that Council*

- 1. Declines the current offer from the Department of Education, as contained in their letter dated 16th March 2015 to assume ownership of the former Meander Primary School;*
- 2. Has further discussions with the Department of Education and the Minister for Education so as to find an alternate arrangement where Council works collaboratively with the Department of Education and the Minister for Education to achieve the most desirable outcome for this site and its future use, ever mindful of its value and strategic importance to the local Community, and cost implications to Council;*
- 3. Request the Department of Education to furnish Council with appropriate reports, so as to better inform us, of;*
 - a) the condition and maintenance requirements of the infrastructure on the site; and*
 - b) the uses which the site may lend itself too, going into the future; and*
- 4. Request the Department of Education remove the reversionary covenant requirement and waive stamp duty, should it be the collaborative view from Point 2 that Council take ownership.*

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

307/15 BASS HIGHWAY SIGNAGE AT WESTBURY

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's decision on the most suitable option for Bass Highway signage at Westbury.

This agenda item was presented to Council at the April meeting and the decision was deferred until the May Council meeting to allow for a sub-committee to meet and discuss further.

At the time of preparing this agenda item a meeting of the sub-committee had not been conducted.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council replace the existing 'Be Bowled Over' signs with the proposed Information Signs with Temporary Events design shown in Figure 1.

DECISION:

Decision made at the April meeting

Cr Connor moved and Cr Mackenzie seconded *"that Council replace the existing 'Be Bowled Over' signs with the proposed Information signs with Temporary Events design show in Figure 1.*

As an amendment Cr White moved *"that Council replace the existing 'Be Bowled Over' signs with the proposed Information Signs with Temporary Events design show in Figure 1 and remove Historic from the 1st line and remove the 2nd line all together but retain the Great Western Tiers Touring Route sign."*

Procedural motion moved by Cr Richardson "that a decision be deferred on this issue until the May Council meeting."

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

Decision made at the May meeting

Cr Richardson moved and Cr King seconded *"that Council defer this item until a future Council meeting."*

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

308/15 CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME 2015-2016

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to consider the Capital Works Programme (CWP) proposed for the 2015-2016 financial year.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the following Capital Works Programme for 2015-2016:

DECISION:

Cr Synfield moved and Cr White seconded *“that Council approve the Capital Works Programme for 2015-2016.”*

As an amendment Cr Connor moved *“that the bridge reconstruction budget be reduced by 15%.”*

The amendment failed for want of a seconder.

As an amendment Cr Connor moved and Cr Synfield seconded *“that Council “allocate \$45,000 to establish Public Wireless Internet access at all council-owned facilities across the municipality. The council will work with the community to obtain the best outcome which retains financial and intellectual capital for this ongoing project in Meander Valley. Implementation will be completed by 1 March 2016.”*

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

As an amendment Cr Richardson moved and Cr Connor seconded *“that the bridge reconstruction budget be reduced by up to 16%.*

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

As an amendment Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr King seconded *“that no action be taken on the Public WiFi until it has been presented and further discussed at a Council Workshop.”*

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

As an amendment Cr Synfield moved and Cr Youd seconded *“that no action be taken on the Mersey Hill Road until it has been presented and further discussed at a Council Workshop.”*

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

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

Comment by Cr Bob Richardson

The Capital Works "budget" is predicated upon the perpetuation of different levels of service between population centres of similar size.

This is effected by the continued emphasis upon renewals – maintaining existing infrastructure in an adequate and serviceable condition.

There are many elements which philosophers would debate in discussion of ethical behaviour. Three of those elements are fairness, equity and "consistency".

These elements establish our attitudes towards how we deal with, say, racism, agism, sexism.

I believe it should also apply to levels of service provided to communities of similar size and whose residents pay the same general rate.

Based on this, the CWP is unfair and iniquitous. I cannot support it. CWP could be said to be discriminatory.

As a specific example, is Westbury Sports Ground the only sports facility in a sizeable town without an adequate public toilet? And what of Westbury's footpaths and open drains. And Town Hall Heating? and.....

Councillor Mackenzie moved and Councillor Youd seconded *“that pursuant to Section 15(1) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations, Council close the meeting to the public.”*

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

ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:

309/15 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The meeting closed at 5.32pm

.....
CRAIG PERKINS (MAYOR)

Nil