



Meander Valley Council

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

ORDINARY MINUTES

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 13 February 2018

Table of Contents

20/2018	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:.....	3
21/2018	COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:.....	4
22/2018	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:	4
23/2018	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:.....	4
24/2018	TABLING OF PETITIONS:.....	4
25/2018	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	5
26/2018	COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME.....	8
27/2018	DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	24
28/2018	NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS.....	24
29/2018	26 BLACKSTONE ROAD, BLACKSTONE HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION (2 LOTS)	25
30/2018	REPRESENTATION TO DRAFT PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT 2/2017 - MEANDER VALLEY INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2013 – REZONING AND SUBDIVISION – MACE STREET AND BORDIN STREET, PROSPECT VALE.....	32
31/2018	POLICY REVIEW NO. 81 – SOCIAL MEDIA.....	34
32/2018	NOTICE OF MOTION – EXTENSION TO MEANDER FALLS ROAD – FEASIBILITY STUDY – DEPUTY MAYOR MICHAEL KELLY	39
33/2018	2017-2018 ANNUAL PLAN – QUARTERLY REVIEW – DECEMBER 2017.....	41
34/2018	REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 67 – PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION.....	42
35/2018	POLICY REVIEW – POLICY NUMBER 37 - VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	50
	ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:.....	56
36/2018	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	56
37/2018	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	56

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Meander Valley Council held at the Council Chambers Meeting Room, 26 Lyall Street, Westbury, on Tuesday 13 February 2018 at 1.33pm.

The Mayor acknowledged the recent OAM received by Mrs Sandra Atkins, a resident of Meander Valley, in the 2018 Australia Day Honours List.

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, Executive Assistant
Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services
Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services
Matthew Millwood, Director Works
Lynette While, Director Community & Development Services
Jo Oliver, Strategic Town Planner
Leanne Rabjohns, Town Planner
Justin Simons, Town Planner
Natasha Whiteley, Town Planner
Krista Palfreyman, Development Services Co-ordinator
Natasha Szczyglowska, Technical Officer
Marianne Macdonald, Communications Officer

20/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Councillor Richardson moved and Councillor White seconded, ***“that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 16 January, 2018, with amendments 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.

21/2018 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:

Date :	Items discussed:
23 January 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy 67 – Personal Information Policy• Policy 81 – Social Media• Policy 37 – Vegetation Management• State Sports & Recreation Infrastructure Strategy Discussion Paper• Council Community Forums 2018• Public Meeting – Westbury Recreation Ground Clubroom Development• A conversation with Cr Michael Kelly

22/2018 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:

Tuesday 23 January 2018
Council Workshop

Thursday 25 January 2018
Australia Day Celebration

Tuesday 30 January 2018
Hanging of Jigsaw, Aged Care Deloraine

Saturday 3 February 2018
Official Opening "Tasmanian Love Stories exhibition", Deloraine Creative Studios

Monday 5 February 2018
Ridley "ground breaking", Valley Central

Friday 9 February 2018
TasWater Owners Representative Quarterly Briefing

23/2018 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Nil

24/2018 TABLING OF PETITIONS:

Nil

25/2018 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

1. PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – JANUARY 2018

Nil

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – FEBRUARY 2018

Nil

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – FEBRUARY 2017

3.1 Mr Neil Smith

I refer Council to the item headed GOV 4 on today's agenda, being background to a motion recommending that Council allocate \$125,000 from its operating budget for the preparation of a feasibility study in to an extension of Meander Falls Road to the vicinity of Meander Falls itself, and to write to political parties for a corresponding contribution.

In the background material under the heading "Policy Implications" we find "not applicable" and under "Statutory Requirements", again, "not applicable". Item 2 asserts that "Council understands that it is not the land manager", and Item 11 suggests that a feasibility study will enable Council to engage with the landowners and key stakeholders".

I ask why there is not instead, to better inform Councillors, an explicit mention that the proposed project is entirely within the Tasmanian Wilderness Heritage Area and therefore has clear statutory requirements under the Commonwealth EPBC Act as well as Tasmanian legislation and the WHA Management Plan. Furthermore, the identity of the "landowners" and many "key stakeholders" is accordingly quite clear, without a "feasibility study". And I hope that councillors would find the policy implications considerable.

(Not only is the proposed project entirely within the WHA, but most of it, being the former Meander Forest Reserve, has been listed as World Heritage since 1989).

Does Council feel that it is most misleading and inappropriate to mention simply that the "area south of Meander" is a relatively unknown gateway to the WHA", when the **area being considered for the project** is actually entirely **WITHIN** the WHA?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

I apologise for the lack of reference to the TWWHA in the Council report. Councillors are aware that the proposal was within the TWWHA and had discussed this fact at a number of previous workshops when the proposal was considered.

The reference to Policy implications in the Council report template is a reference to internal Council policies. When it comes to decisions about undertaking a feasibility study for a proposal there are no policies that impact this action. A feasibility study would have to take into account any relevant policies.

I also ask who paid what must have been a considerable cost to obtain the Consultant's report from Phil Austin. If it was not the Council, who was it?

If the Council did pay for the study, at what meeting was the expenditure approved and how much was it?

Questions taken on Notice

3.2 Helen Hutchinson

I also refer Council to the item headed GOV 4 on today's agenda and related briefing material.

Section 8 of the background material is entitled "Community Consultation" and it is mentioned that the project was initiated "following requests to Councillors from members of the Meander Community". A presentation of the information in the consultant's report was provided to "members of the Meander community on 18 April 2016.

I ask, were the "members" who saw the report only the same people who had requested the road in the first place?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Yes, as part of process of providing feedback to the people who had initiated the idea.

The report has been made publically available through the current Council meeting and consideration of the agenda item.

I ask because I know that an organisation I belong to, Friends of the Great Western Tiers, formed in 2012 and well known as having serious interests in the area through having organised seminars in Deloraine etc., was never informed nor consulted. I am told also that the Meander Area Residents and Ratepayers Association equally knew nothing of it. There also appears to be no mention in the local newspaper "Meander Valley Gazette" or that no public meeting appears to have been advertised.

I ask, does Council consider that the "Community Consultation" mentioned in the background material sufficient and appropriate for such a far-reaching proposal?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

If Council determines to proceed with the feasibility study, it is anticipated that there will be broader and far more extensive community consultation incorporated into that process.

3.3 Deborah Lynch

I also refer Council to the item headed GOV 4 on today's agenda and related briefing material.

Parks and Wildlife has apparently been involved in "preliminary discussions" with Council relating to the Meander Falls proposal.

I ask, will Council please provide a summary of the substance of these discussions?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The letter from Parks and Wildlife included the following comments:

"The PWS looks at all proposals without and undertakes its assessments based on key legislation and policy. A proposal like the conceptual Meander Tourist Road would likely need to be assessed against a number of State Acts including the National Parks and Reserve Management Act 2002 and Nature Conversation Act 2002 as well as the relevant Commonwealth legislation such as the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Where a proposal is located within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area assessment under the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Plan of Management 2016 is also required."

26/2018 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

1. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – JANUARY 2018

1.1 Cr Bob Richardson

Some years ago, Council adopted a policy to act as a catalyst for development of education facilities in the eastern section of the municipality (the former Westbury municipal area).

Principal amongst the aims of that policy were:

- establishment of infant and primary school facilities at Hadspen; and
- establishment of secondary (and post-secondary) facilities at, or near, Westbury

(That policy did not include, but probably should have included a review of educational offerings at Blackstone and Prospect Vale, whose population far exceeds Penguin, New Norfolk, Bridgewater-Brighton, Smithton, Latrobe Yet the Education Department has no presence there!)

What progress has Council made with the Tasmanian Education Department, particularly in relation to Council policy regarding Hadspen and, to a lesser extent, Westbury?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

At the Ordinary Council Meeting July 2013 Council considered a notice of motion from Councillor Bob Richardson:

“that a working group be formed consisting of Council, community and Tasmanian Government representatives to progress the establishment of a school at Hadspen and in doing so, consider the impact this may have on schools in the area.”

The motion was carried unanimously.

Following the decision Council wrote to the then Minister for Education and Skills the Hon. Nick McKim MP inviting him and representatives from the Department of Education to a meeting to `progress` the Council decision.

The Minister acknowledged the letter stating that he was seeking `advice on the matters raised` and would write to the Mayor as soon as possible.

No correspondence was received prior to the 2014 State Government Election.

Following the State Government Election in 2014 the Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP assumed the role as the Minister for Education and training. Council secured a meeting with the Minister in late 2015.

In January 2016 Cr Bob Richardson wrote to the General Manager seeking an update on the meeting and referencing the motion he put in July 2013.

The former Director Economic Development and Sustainability provided the following advice:

The initial meeting with the Minister was to clarify a process which would allow for Council to discuss and explore future education requirements for the Meander Valley LGA with the Education Department.

Council was advised to work with the Deputy Secretary Corporate and Business Services at the Department of Education, Mr Rob Williams. The former Director Economic Development and Sustainability made a number of attempts to secure a meeting, but unfortunately, was unable to do so.

Council officers will write to the Department Secretary seeking to re-open discussions.

1.2 Cr Bob Richardson

1. Given the location of the demographic centres in the Meander Valley, and that in the extra-urban section of the municipality there are three approximately equal-sized population centres (namely Deloraine, Westbury/Hagley and Hadspen) and that growth is likely to be concentrated in the area east of Westbury, would it not make sense to concentrate capital works (both local and state government's) nearer the demographic centres?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The concept of the demographic centre is an abstract one and highly dependent on which mathematical, spatial or statistical methodology is utilised. The demographic centre of Melbourne is about 120 metres west of the Glen Iris train station. Five years ago the demographic centre of Melbourne was in Ashburton about 3.5km to the south east. Because it is a conceptual construct a demographic centre is only one part of any analysis that would be utilised to make decisions about the best location for investment.

Meander Valley is a good example of the limitations of nominating a demographic centre. The dispersal of population centres, the spatial and social

links to Launceston, the presence of a central infrastructure spine that facilitates easy movement, are all components that introduce complexity to the notion of a definable demographic centre.

It is too simplistic to treat the Meander Valley local government area as an isolated whole and then determine where the infrastructure should go by nominating a demographic centre.

Could also Council confirm that both Deloraine and Hadspen lie about 15 minutes travel from Westbury?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Westbury to Hadspen – 21min

Westbury to Deloraine – 19min

2. In the past 20 or so years, Westbury and its surrounding postcode district has experienced significant private capital investment, including \$35 to \$40 million residential investment, massive manufacturing investment of tens, if not 100's of millions of dollars, commercial renovations of \$ millions.

Is Council aware that this private investment in Westbury of hundreds of millions of dollars has remained largely totally unmatched by local and state governments?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Council officers cannot confirm the exact amount of private investment over the 20 year period but it would be unusual to expect that government would match private investment amounts or that the level of private investment would be a framework for determining government grant distribution or use of Council resources.

If the same logic to government funding was extended to Prospect Vale for instance, Council would be financially unsustainable within 12 months.

Having said that, the State Government did contribute \$500,000 towards the Valley Central Industrial Development in December 2010. Council has provided support to private investment under Council Policies 76 (Industrial Land Development) and 86 (Industrial Development Incentive). Council has also incurred costs in facilitating private investment.

In terms of capital investment in sporting, cultural and community infrastructure could Council confirm which was the last significant such Council investment in Westbury:

Was it the Westbury Sports Centre, about 45 to 50 years ago? Or was it the Town Hall about 1933 (85 years ago)?

Response by Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services
Council undertakes significant upgrade and renewal of community infrastructure works in the functions of roads, bridges and stormwater each year.

The most recent significant investment in sporting, cultural and community building infrastructure is the Public Toilets, Bus Shelter & BBQ projects at the Westbury Recreation Ground with a current cost of \$181,862 being completed in 2018. The most recent before this was a significant upgrade of the Westbury Historical Society building with a cost of \$125,507 which was completed in June 2011.

With reference to the two buildings listed in the question, the Westbury Sports Centre has an estimated completion date of 1977, a major floor upgrade to the building occurred in 2002. The Westbury Town Hall has an estimated build date of 1933, with flooring/refurbishment work in 2011 and heating upgrades in 2016.

1.3 Cr Bob Richardson

Some time ago I requested that Council inform one of the demographic centres of

- a. the whole municipality, and
- b. the section of the municipality from Hadspen westwards.

I have undertaken a (reasonably) objective analysis of population data and come to the conclusion that:

- i. Municipality's demographic centre is likely to be about at the eastern end of Carrick
- ii. The demographic centre for the area Hadspen west is about Hagley.

Could Council confirm that this is near to being accurate.

Response by Martin Gill - General Manager
The accuracy would depend on the methodology used to determine the population centre. Assuming that the methodology used is the one dimensional median centre where the points to be halved are population aggregates the demographic centre of Meander Valley would most likely be just west of Carrick.

For the section of the municipality from Hadspen westwards:

- **Including Hadspen – near Exton**
- **Excluding Hadspen- west of the Meander River in Deloraine**

If we use the point of minimum aggregate travel methodology, the point that minimises the sum of distances between the centre and all other points the demographic centre of Meander Valley would be somewhere along Sandy Lane just north west of the Meander Township.

For the section of the municipality west of Hadspen the demographic centre would be somewhere near the corner of Chestnut Road and Creeleys Road in Western Creek.

1.4 Cr Bob Richardson

In about 2006, the grandstand at Westbury Recreation Ground was demolished by Council. The area beneath the grandstand contained home and away team change rooms, including toilets and showers.

It was stated that, at the time of demolition, the building with its attendant change room facilities (and score box) were no longer serviceable.

An unofficial statement provided to me was that to replace that structure would have cost (about 10 years ago) about 1.4 to 2.0 million dollars.

Can this be confirmed as a reasonable ball-park figure?

Presumably the value of the structure had been depreciated to nil at the time of its demolition. Should not this depreciation be allocated towards the proposed change room/community centre structure?

Response by Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services

A building valuation completed 1 February 2005 provided an opinion that the replacement cost of the existing structure was \$200,000 and the market value \$45,000. Additional description of the condition at that time was "Grandstand is in poor order. In its present condition it is unsuitable for public use. The building needs extensive repairs to bring up to a suitable standard. It has not been used for many years."

A reasonable ball-park figure for a replacement structure about ten years ago is unable to be estimated. Council officers were provided with an independent condition survey and structural assessment ten and a half years ago in June 2007 which stated the grandstand could not be structurally certified either at

that time, or reinstated to its original condition due to extensive concrete deterioration, failure of the wall and columns. The timber elements had suffered severe deterioration, dry rot and were unstable as a result. Council discussed the removal of the grandstand at the January 2008 meeting.

Council first recognised depreciation in the 1993-94 financial year following the introduction of Australian Accounting Standard 27. Some depreciation would have been recognised on the building between 1994 and 2008. All of the specific details for the structure are not easily accessible, however, it is noted that \$29,105 of depreciation expense was recognised for the grandstand for the seven years between 2002 and 2008. The Market Value of \$45,000 provided in February 2005 was written down to nil following its removal in 2008.

1.5 Cr Bob Richardson

It is noted in the Financial agenda item (January 2018) that our term deposits are allocated as follows:

- in AA rated institutions 37%
- in A-rated institutions 23%
- in BBB rated institutions 34%
- in unrated institutions 5%

ie. in institutions rated less than AA, 63%.

It is acknowledged that the Australian Commonwealth Government has various guarantees in place. However can this, or will this continue, particularly given the Coalition's performance in the past three years by trebling our debt?

Response by Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services
Council officers place term deposits according to Council Policy 71 (Investment of Surplus Council Funds). There are some guarantees in place by the Australian Commonwealth Government Financial Claims Scheme for authorised deposit-taking institutions. The Scheme is currently in place and we have no indication of the Government policy in the future.

Could Council please advise what is meant by the institutional ratings of AA, BBB, A and not rated? And who provides these ratings?

Response by Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services
Institutional ratings are an indication of the credit risk of a prospective debtor. Ratings are assigned by credit rating agencies such as Standard & Poor's,

Moody's and Fitch. AA, A, BBB and NR (Not Rated) are all long-term credit ratings; the following table provides additional description for each:

Category	Definition
AA	<i>The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitments on the obligation is very strong.</i>
A	<i>The obligator is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher-rated categories. However, the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitments on the obligation is still strong.</i>
BBB	<i>The obligator exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to weaken the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitments on the obligation.</i>
NR	<i>This indicates that no rating has been requested, or that there is insufficient information on which to base a rating.</i>

1.6 Cr Bob Richardson

Frequently in Council discussions the word "community" is mentioned. And "vibrant" communities.

A commonly held view is that communities are groups of people in a particular area who work together/interact in the employment, cultural, social, recreational and other activities –from cradle to grave.

Does Council have such a definition of "community"?

Response by Martin Gill - General Manager

In 2013 Council adopted Not a Spectator Sport, A Community Development Framework. The document includes the following statement:

Community is a familiar term that has many complex meanings. For the purposes of this paper it can be expressed as 'interrelating people of all ages living in the same locality under the same government'

Page 4 of the document includes a number of concepts that complement our understanding of vibrant communities including but not limited to:

- ***Social capital - networks and shared values***
- ***Community engagement – active participation and collaboration***
- ***Community capacity-building – strengthening of skills***

- ***Sustainable communities – economically, environmentally and socially healthy and resilient***

Communities (of various sizes) also commonly have, or need facilities to enable interactions. Such facilities include educational, health (including government and private), emergency response/safety facilities (including police, SES, ambulance), recreational and cultural/social facilities, and so on.

Will Council initiate a Council workshop to prepare a discussion document for consideration by ratepayers to assist future planning at local, municipal and state levels?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Council has already begun this work; during 2017 Council had three workshops focused on preparing an understanding of each of the local communities by undertaking:

- ***A review of population and population changes***
- ***A review of capital expenditure in each settlement***
- ***An audit of existing facilities in each settlement including government, private, recreational and safety***

This work forms the basis of a discussion document.

1.7 Cr Bob Richardson

Early in 2017 Council officers estimated that the cost of building the Alveston Drive facility would be in the order of \$4.5 million.

Could that be confirmed?

Does that facility have heating and cooling facilities including in the basketball courts section?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The Herron Todd White building valuation report from July 2014 indicated that the building replacement costs for the Alveston Drive complex would be approximately \$4.6M, excluding the sports stadium timber flooring which is valued as a separate asset at approximately \$260K.

The Complex has heating and cooling with the exception of the basketball courts.

1.8 Cr Bob Richardson

May I quote from the Deloraine and Districts Recreation Study on page 377 of the documentation:

“Meander Valley has a population just under 20,000 people, which is largely static in growth. The bulk of the local population is within the eastern part of the municipality with the ability to access a diverse range of quality sporting, recreation and community facilities within the City of Launceston”.

The implication is clear – that Council should concentrate upon Deloraine and let Launceston look after the cost!

If ever there was an argument for a municipal boundary adjustment, this is it!

Is this what the Meander Valley municipality wants? ie. to include Hadspen, Blackstone and Prospect Vale in Launceston?

That is what the Deloraine community seem to want. Or is it that they only want the area of Meander Valley to the east of Deloraine to remain in the Meander Valley so they can obtain subsidies from those ratepayers?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

I cannot speak on behalf of the community but the ideas that you have raised were not part of any discussion during the preparation of the Deloraine and Districts Recreation Feasibility Study.

1.9 Cr Bob Richardson

There are some population centres, which have sporting facilities for locals to use; some of those communities also have secondary schools which commonly have many sporting facilities. There are some communities often of similar size, or larger, which have neither.

In relation to Westbury and netball facilities, there are neither.

About two (or three?) years ago an approach was made by the Meander Valley Suns Football and Netball Club, which has established netball teams but still has no netball facilities. I supported that approach – it seemed reasonable to support a community group but which clearly has a pressing need!

Could Council please advise progress on the matter of establishment of netball court(s)/facilities at Westbury? If progress has not been made, can the Suns be guaranteed inclusion in the 2018/19 Financial Capital Works budget?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

In September 2016 the Director Infrastructure Services wrote to the Meander Valley Suns Football and Netball Club indicating that the club should work with the Recreation Coordinator to discuss 'opportunities moving forward, with respect to short-term works, future capital works projects and how to take advantage of any external funding opportunities.

During the following 12 months the Recreation Coordinator worked with the Meander Valley Suns Netball Club to secure access for training at the Westbury Sports Centre and further discussions about development of the club.

In September 2017 the president of the Meander Valley Suns Netball Club met with the Recreation Coordinator to discuss the club's plans for 2018. At that point the Meander Valley Suns Netball Club indicated:

- **That the majority of players were coming from the eastern urban areas end of Meander Valley**
- **They were planning to move their training and social base to Entally Lodge in Hadspen**
- **That they were not expecting to continue the relationship with the Meander Valley Suns Football Club because the clubs were heading in different directions**

In early 2018 the clubs confirmed that they will not be merging and that the netball club had moved to Hadspen to use the indoor facilities at Entally Lodge.

Given the likelihood of residential developments at Hadspen in the near future, will Council include such similar facilities at Hadspen?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

As indicated in the previous response facilities are already available in Hadspen and the Meander Valley Suns Netball Club have established their base there.

1.10 Cr Bob Richardson

The Local Government Act (1993) outlines restrictions placed upon Councillors in regard to interest. That interest refers to Councillors who have an interest in a matter and if so, including even signing petitions who may not be involved in discussions where they have an interest.

Can Council confirm this to be the case?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The requirements regarding Conflict of Interest for Councillors is set out in Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1993 (Act) and states:

- (1) A councillor must not participate at any meeting of a council, council committee, special committee, controlling authority, single authority or joint authority in any discussion, nor vote on any matter, in respect of which the councillor–**
- (a) has an interest; or**
 - (b) is aware or ought to be aware that a close associate has an interest.**

1.11 Cr Andrew Connor

City Deal - Today the Prime Minister has been in the state handing over funds for the Launceston City deal. What projects, as part of this city deal will provide direct benefit or direct investment to Meander Valley given that almost half of the Council's residents live within the Launceston urban area?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Meander Valley will benefit from a number of projects within the Launceston City Deal program;

- **The development of a Regional Economic Development Strategy – underway**
- **The Tamar River Health Action Plan – which will include an investment plan to support stock management initiative for farmers on the Meander River that will improve river water quality – under development**
- **The implementation of the LoRaWan network and installation of LoRa gateways in Deloraine and Westbury – underway**
- **The Greater Launceston Transformation Project which includes:**
 - **Digital Spatial models of Meander Valley**
 - **People Movement Analytics**
 - **Digital opportunities for industry, e.g. Aged Care**
 - **Provision for a Smart Emergency Response system**

It might also be argued that Meander Valley Council benefits from projects that stimulate growth in Launceston because an expanded economic base provides more opportunities for the whole region.

If there are no tangible projects nor direct investment in Meander Valley's urban areas, would you consider this a failure of the Federal and State Governments to

involve Meander Valley Council or a failure of Council to proactively become involved in the deal and negotiate investment in our municipality?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

It is reasonable to say that Meander Valley Council, and for that matter West Tamar, George Town and Northern Midlands should have been invited to the table earlier. The focus of the City Deal, however, were projects of a regional nature that were already in planning and development stages, such as the relocation of UTAS, the City Heart projects identified in the Greater Launceston Plan and the Launceston Sewerage Improvement Project.

Commitments to jobs and skills, innovation and digital opportunities and governance and city planning within the City Deal program were always going to have a broader regional benefit that extend to the Meander Valley community.'

2. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – FEBRUARY 2018

Nil

3. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – FEBRUARY 2018

3.1 Cr. Deborah White

- a) Relates to January Briefing Report items CD & S 4 – World Fly Fishing Championships 2019.
We can see from this item that this will be based in Launceston, and further, from the attached newsletter on pp 97 and 98, that the venues must be within 1.5 hours travel from the event headquarters.

Which of the rivers and lakes of the Meander Valley will be included in these venues?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Initial discussions indicate that the event organisers are looking at the following venues as either pre competition training, or competition venues:

- ***Meander River – various locations (upper and mid)***
- ***Brushy Lagoon***
- ***Four Springs Lake***

- b) Memorably, this Council recently excluded the Expression of Interest from River Fly Fishing to purchase the Meander Primary School site, by making the

decision that the site was to be used only for purposes which provided "community benefit".

Perhaps we can see more clearly now how the whole Meander Valley could have stood to benefit from the establishment of a fly fishing hub in the heart of our municipality and wining a stone's throw of the finest fly fishing venues in Tasmania, instead of standing by while a relatively distant city location reaps the rewards of hosting this event.

Further this is not the only initiative we as a Council have failed to grasp. Though eminently suited to the development of mountain bike trails, this initiative has been taken up, not by us, but by Dorset, with an attendant rise in the economy of that area.

Though we are the producers of some of the finest foods in Tasmania, it is West Tamar that is hosting a Farm Gate Festival which includes gourmet dinners of local produce created by Tasmania's finest chefs.

How can we do better as a Council when it comes to making decisions about economic development in our municipality?

Question taken on Notice

- c) I believe that Cr Temple comment at a recent Council workshop on the list of Priority Projects is relevant to this question. He noted that the list failed to include visionary projects that engendered excitement, instead being made up of far too many fairly minor, and of lacklustre, items. I agree with this observation and I believe that our process in securing funding for future initiatives could be improved by using a different process to compile this list.

Will the General Manager allocate some workshop time to defining how to improve on our performance in the community and economic development, which may include refining the process by which the Priority Projects list is compiled?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Yes I will

- d) We were told at the last meeting that the position of Business Development Officer failed to draw the kind of applicants that are required, because of the failure of the title to reflect the nature of the job. I noted then that when Councillors were invited to have input on the position description, I suggest that the title be amended to reflect the part

of the role that supported community engagement in Economic Development. This suggestion was not acted upon and advertisement failed to draw suitable applicants, with the title subsequently being amended. However, in C&DS p70, I see that the title will now be Business Engagement Officer, which does not seem to me to be an improvement on the first attempt. Why are we not simply advertising for an Economic Development Officer?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The job title was selected to reflect the primary responsibilities of the role. These primary responsibilities included in the position description reflect the feedback officers received from Council at the October 2017 workshop.

- (e) Deloraine Lawn Cemetery Shelter – On Page 14 of 100 of the Capital Projects report, I read that \$0 of \$15,000 allocated in the 16/17 budget have been spent on this. Item 6306 of the Capital Works Projects update on pp 43 and 44, lists Deloraine Lawn Cemetery improvements but does not include the shelter. Can the Director, Works, tell me what is the state of play concerning the shelter?

Response by Matthew Millwood, Director Works

Councillor White is correct as nil funds have been expended on the shelter. A concept design will be commenced this quarter and when this is available, further consultation with Councillor White will occur.

- (f) Hadspen Urban Growth project (Briefing Report p48 or 100) states the desired outcome of the meeting with Landowners is to progress the development in partnership with Council. Could the GM refresh our memories with a description of Council's desired aim for this partnership?

Questions taken on Notice

- (g) TRAP Committee Action Register – The Zig Zag track on vacant land at Tower Hill Street, Deloraine: who is proposing this?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

Correspondence was received by Council from the Lions Club of Deloraine in April 2016 in relation to the creation of a pedestrian linkage from the northern end of Tower Hill Street to Westbury Place.

What evidence is there that the community wants its?

Response by Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure Services

Council responded at the time that it was not in a position to confirm commitment to undertaking a feasibility study for the project as Council will need to consider and prioritise opportunities arising from the Deloraine Outline Development Plan study.

(h) Is the TRAP Committee aware of David Enwright's 7 Day Makeover process which works with communities to redesign small neglected areas into vibrant community spaces?

Response by Andrew Connor, Councillor

The TRAP Committee is unaware of this particular process but is open to suggestions. At a recent meeting between the Committee and the Kimberley community regarding development of their town as a gateway to Meander Valley, we discussed time-frames and preparatory works such as drainage. Once initial planning and preparatory works are completed this kind of make-over could be considered to assist the community, committee and council redevelop the area.

(i) GWT Art Award: in partnership with the Launceston Art Society: what is the reason that Council holds this in partnership with a Launceston art group rather than a local arts group?

Question taken on Notice

(j) Animal Control: DPIPWE Statement – "I hope that some very positive outcomes can be achieved in relation to managing cats". Precisely what outcomes are specified in the position description?

Response by Lynette While, Director Community & Development Services

The position has a focus on assisting Council in how to manage cat problems such as complaints about cats and potentially preparing bylaws. The focus is mainly on urban areas. The role has a strong educational focus.

NRM North has advised that key projects will be:

- **Developing and implementing awareness and education programs to improve levels of responsible cat ownership across the north**
- **Providing access to practical community based information on the necessity, positive outcomes and practical means to achieve responsible cat ownership**

- **Assisting Councils in the development of policies linked to the implementation of the Tasmanian Cat Management Plan, including the potential development of by-laws.**
- **Assisting Councils within the coordinators region to develop and implement compliance programs for the Cat Management Act.**

3.2 Cr Andrew Connor

During this 2018 State election campaign I have seen very few announcements from political parties in our municipality related to Council's priority project lists for Bass and Lyons, apart from one concerning the Deloraine Recreational Precinct and some minor road improvements. This contrasts with many election announcements being made in neighbouring councils such as Launceston, Northern Midlands and West Tamar which directly improve their facilities.

What steps have the Mayor or General Manger taken to advise candidates and political parties about Council's election priority projects?

Response by Craig Perkins, Mayor

The leaders of both the Liberal and Labour political parties and their current sitting members in each electorate were provided with Councils priority project list as soon as practical after the Council meeting. In addition, I encouraged the Examiner newspaper to run a story on our priority projects, which occurred. The reality is both major political parties manage their campaigns differently.

Do you think your lobbying has been effective? Should other Councillors have been involved?

Response by Craig Perkins, Mayor

I have no doubt Councillor Connor your view will be different to mine.

The "announcements by the Mayor" section of today's Agenda does not detail any relevant meetings. A response to this now would be appreciated given the election is under way and opportunity for improvement and seeking funding is now very limited.

Response by Craig Perkins, Mayor

As indicated at the Council Meeting, I have been, and continue to be, in regular contact with members of both parties informally, reminding them of the value of our projects.

27/2018 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Nil

28/2018 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

32/2018 Extension to Meander Falls Road – Feasibility Study - Deputy Mayor
Michael Kelly

COUNCIL MEETING AS A PLANNING AUTHORITY

The Mayor advised that for items 29/2018 and 30/2018 Council is acting as a Planning Authority under the provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

29/2018 26 BLACKSTONE ROAD, BLACKSTONE HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION (2 LOTS)

The Mayor invited representatives Mr David Young and Mr Steve Ingram and Mr James Stewart from Woolcott Surveys to address Council regarding this agenda item.

1) Introduction

This report considers application PA\18\0125 for Subdivision (2 lots) on land located at 26 Blackstone Road, Blackstone Heights CT 27769/32.

2) Recommendation

That the application for Use and Development for Subdivision (2 lots) on land located at 26 Blackstone Road, Blackstone Heights CT 27769/32 by Woolcott Surveys, requiring the following discretions:

- 12.4.3.1 General Suitability
- 12.4.3.2 Lot Area, Building Envelopes and Frontage

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) Woolcott Surveys – Proposal Plan – dated 18 December 2017;***
- b) Woolcott Surveys – Bushfire Assessment Report – dated 6 December 2017;***

and subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Covenants or similar restrictive controls must not be included on or otherwise imposed on the titles to the lots created by the subdivision, permitted by this permit unless:**
 - a) Such covenants or controls are expressly authorised by the terms of this permit; or**
 - b) Such covenants or similar controls are expressly authorised by the consent in writing of Council.**
 - c) Such covenants or similar controls are submitted for and receive written approval by Council prior to submission of a Plan of Survey and associated title documentation is submitted to Council for sealing.**

- 1. The vehicular crossover servicing proposed Lot 2 must be constructed and sealed in accordance with LGAT standard drawing**

TSD-RO3-V1 and TSD-R04-V1 (attached) and to the satisfaction of Council's Director of Infrastructure Services.

- 2. Lots 1 & 2 must be connected to Council's stormwater system, to the satisfaction of Council's Infrastructure Services. An easement is required over Lot 2 in favour of Lot 1. The minimum width of any easement must be 3 m.**
- 3. Prior to the sealing of the final plan of survey, the following must be completed to the satisfaction of Council:**
 - a) The driveway crossover is to be completed, as per Condition 2.**
 - b) Lots 1 and 2 are to be connected to Council's stormwater system, as per Condition 3.**
 - c) The developer must pay to Council \$3,200.00, a sum equivalent to 5% of the unimproved value of the approved lots, as Public Open Space contribution.**
- 4. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA No2017/01973-MVC attached).**

Note:

- 1. Council is currently preparing engineering design information for a new footpath across the frontage of No 26 Blackstone Road. Prior to the construction of the vehicular access to Lot 2 separate consent is required by the Road Authority to ensure the proposed driveway will match in with the proposed footpath work. A Driveway Crossover Application Form is enclosed. All enquiries should be directed to Council's Technical Officer on 6393 5312.**
- 2. 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.**
- 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.

Cr Connor left the meeting at 1.55pm

Cr Connor returned to the meeting at 2.00pm

DECISION:

Cr Richardson moved and Cr Connor seconded ***“that the application for Use and Development for Subdivision (2 lots) on land located at 26 Blackstone Road, Blackstone Heights CT 27769/32 by Woolcott Surveys, requiring the following discretions:***

- 12.4.3.1 General Suitability
- 12.4.3.2 Lot Area, Building Envelopes and Frontage

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) Woolcott Surveys – Proposal Plan – dated 18 December 2017;***
- b) Woolcott Surveys – Bushfire Assessment Report – dated 6 December 2017;***

and subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Covenants or similar restrictive controls must not be included on or otherwise imposed on the titles to the lots created by the subdivision, permitted by this permit unless:**
 - a) Such covenants or controls are expressly authorised by the terms of this permit; or**
 - b) Such covenants or similar controls are expressly authorised by the consent in writing of Council.**
 - c) Such covenants or similar controls are submitted for and receive written approval by Council prior to submission of a Plan of Survey and associated title documentation is submitted to Council for sealing.**
- 2. The vehicular crossover servicing proposed Lot 2 must be constructed and sealed in accordance with LGAT standard drawing TSD-R03-V1 and TSD-R04-V1 (attached) and to the satisfaction of Council’s Director of Infrastructure Services.**
- 3. Lots 1 & 2 must be connected to Council’s stormwater system, to the satisfaction of Council’s Infrastructure Services. An easement is required over Lot 2 in favour of Lot 1. The minimum width of any easement must be 3 m.**
- 4. Prior to the sealing of the final plan of survey, the following must be completed to the satisfaction of Council:**
 - a) The driveway crossover is to be completed, as per Condition 2.**
 - b) Lots 1 and 2 are to be connected to Council’s stormwater system, as per Condition 3.**

- c) **The developer must pay to Council \$3,200.00, a sum equivalent to 5% of the unimproved value of the approved lots, as Public Open Space contribution.**
5. **The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA No2017/01973-MVC attached).**

Note:

1. **Council is currently preparing engineering design information for a new footpath across the frontage of No 26 Blackstone Road. Prior to the construction of the vehicular access to Lot 2 separate consent is required by the Road Authority to ensure the proposed driveway will match in with the proposed footpath work. A Driveway Crossover Application Form is enclosed. All enquiries should be directed to Council's Technical Officer on 6393 5312.**
2. **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.**
3. This permit takes effect after:
 - d) The 14 day appeal period expires; or
 - e) Any appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal is abandoned or determined; or.
 - f) 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 LOST with Councillors Connor and Perkins voting for the motion and Councillors Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Richardson, Synfield, Temple and White voting against the motion.

This item was refused by Council for the following reasons –

- The proposed subdivision will have adverse impacts on the amenity of adjoining properties
- The proposed subdivision is out of character with surrounding development
- The proposed subdivision is not consistent with the Desired Future Character Statement for Blackstone Heights

Comment by Cr Deborah White

I have voted against approving this application on the grounds that approval would severely impact on the amenity of surrounding residents and that approval does not comply with the intent of the Desired Future Character Statement.

Councillors Connor and King left the meeting at 2.38pm
Councillors Connor and King returned to the meeting at 2.41pm

30/2018 REPRESENTATION TO DRAFT PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT 2/2017 - MEANDER VALLEY INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2013 – REZONING AND SUBDIVISION – MACE STREET AND BORDIN STREET, PROSPECT VALE

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider and adopt a formal response to the representation made to the exhibition of the draft planning scheme amendment 2/2017 and development application for the:

- rezoning of land located at 7 Mace Street, Prospect Vale (CT: 8204/17) from Open Space Zone to General Residential Zone; and
- rezoning of land off Bordin Street, Prospect Vale (CT:172720/31) from General Residential Zone to Open Space Zone; and
- subdivision of 7 Mace Street into two lots (including access strip from Nanke Court).

This report is prepared in accordance with Section 39 of the former provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act (LUPAA) 1993.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that:

- 1. pursuant to Section 39(2) of the former provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, Council endorse the officer's comments as its opinion as to the merits of the representation and its recommendation in relation to the draft amendment.***
- 2. Council forward the endorsed report to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.***

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded ***“that***

- 1. pursuant to Section39(2) of the former provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, Council endorse the officer's comments as its opinion as to the merits of the representation and its recommendation in relation to the draft amendment.**
- 2. Council forward the endorsed report to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.**

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

Deputy Mayor Michael Kelly left the meeting at 2.50pm

Deputy-Mayor Michael Kelly returned to the meeting at 2.52pm

31/2018 POLICY REVIEW NO. 81 – SOCIAL MEDIA

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to review Policy No 81 – Social Media

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council confirm the continuation of Policy No. 81– Social Media amended as follows:

POLICY MANUAL

Policy Number: 81

Online Communication-(Social Media)

Purpose:

To provide direction to assist the Mayor, Councillors and Employees ~~in regard to~~ in the appropriate and productive use of Council social media.

Department:

~~Economic Development and Sustainability Governance~~

Author:

~~Leith Green~~ Marianne McDonald, Communications Officer

Council Meeting Date:

9 May 2017

Minute Number:

~~105/2014~~

Next Review Date:

January 2022

POLICY

1. Definitions

Social media - is a collection of internet based websites or applications that enable users to engage ~~and communicate through~~ by creating and sharing content ~~online~~. It can take on many forms including:

- Blogs
- Micro-blogging sites ~~(e.g Twitter)~~
- Social Networking sites ~~(e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn, MySpace, Google +)~~
- Video and photo-sharing sites ~~(e.g Flickr, Youtube, Pinterest, Instagram)~~

Council social media users - those authorised to administer Council-managed social media platforms.

Council managed social media platforms – those social media platforms created and managed by Council, such as a Meander Valley Council Facebook page, a Meander Valley Council Twitter account or a Meander Valley Council YouTube channel.

2. Objective

- To ensure appropriate and productive use of social media
- ~~And~~ To minimise risks ~~pertaining to associated with~~ Council's use of social media.

3. Scope

This policy applies to all elected members and employees of Council.

4. Policy

All Council social media users must:

- Be authorised by the General Manager, and
- Act in accordance with Council's Values and Council's Social Media Operational Guidelines.

If Council employees or Councillors ~~take part comment publicly in~~ through Council's social media ~~conversations channels on Council platforms~~ or using a personal account, the user must ~~state~~ make it clear that ~~the views~~ their comments represent their ~~own~~ opinion as a private individual or as a member of an external organisation and not ~~those~~ their opinion as a ~~of~~ Council employee or Council representative

5. Legislation and related Council Policies

Legislation:

Local Government Act 1993
Archives Act 1983
Copyright Act 1968
Right to Information Act 2009
Tasmanian Defamation Act 2005
Tasmania Anti-Discrimination Act 1998
Commonwealth Privacy Act 1988

Policies:

Risk Management Policy
Information Management Policy
Media Communications Policy
Customer Service Charter
Human Resources Policies and Procedures
Customer Service Standards

6. Responsibility

Responsibility for the operation of this policy rests with the General Manager.

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded ***“that Council confirm the continuation of Policy No. 81– Social Media, amended as follows:***

POLICY MANUAL

Policy Number: 81

Online Communication

Purpose:

To provide direction to assist the Mayor, Councillors and Employees the appropriate and productive use of Council social media.

Department:

Governance

Author:

Marianne MacDonald, Communications Officer

Council Meeting Date:

13 February 2018

Minute Number:

31/2018

Next Review Date:

January 2022

POLICY

1. Definitions

Social media - is a collection of internet based websites or applications that enable users to engage and communicate by creating and sharing content online. It can take on many forms including:

- Blogs
- Micro-blogging sites
- Social Networking sites
- Video and photo-sharing sites

Council social media users - those authorised to administer Council-managed social media platforms.

Council managed social media platforms – those social media platforms created and managed by Council, such as a Meander Valley Council Facebook page, a Meander Valley Council Twitter account or a Meander Valley Council YouTube channel.

2. Objective

- To ensure appropriate and productive use of social media
- To minimise risks associated with Council's use of social media.

3. Scope

This policy applies to all elected members and employees of Council.

4. Policy

All Council social media users must:

- Be authorised by the General Manager, and
- Act in accordance with Council's Values and Council's Social Media Operational Guidelines.

If Council employees or Councillors comment publicly through Council's social media channels or using a personal account, the user must make it clear that their comments represent their opinion as a private individual or as a member of an external organisation and not their opinion as a Council employee or Council representative

5. Legislation and related Council Policies

Legislation:

Local Government Act 1993
Archives Act 1983
Copyright Act 1968
Right to Information Act 2009
Tasmanian Defamation Act 2005
Tasmania Anti-Discrimination Act 1998
Commonwealth Privacy Act 1988

Policies:

Risk Management Policy
Information Management Policy
Media Communications Policy
Customer Service Charter
Human Resources Policies and Procedures
Customer Service Standards
Meander Valley Council Social Media Operational Guidelines 2014

6. Responsibility

Responsibility for the operation of this policy rests with the General Manager.

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

As an amendment Cr Richardson moved and Cr Mackenzie seconded ***“that the words social media be replaced with the words online communication.”***

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

As a procedural motion Cr King moved and Cr Mackenzie seconded ***“that Council now consider GOV 4 (32/2018)”***.

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

32/2018 NOTICE OF MOTION – EXTENSION TO MEANDER FALLS ROAD – FEASIBILITY STUDY – DEPUTY MAYOR MICHAEL KELLY

The Mayor invited Messrs. Kevin Knowles, Wayne Johnston, James Boxhall and Helen Hutchinson to address Council regarding this matter.

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider a Notice of Motion from Cr Michael Kelly seeking Council support to undertake a feasibility study to extend Meander Falls Road, to provide better access to Meander Falls, and for Council to write to the Tasmanian political parties seeking a financial contribution toward the study.

2) Recommendation (Deputy Mayor Michael Kelly)

It is recommended that Council:

- 1. Resolves to allocate \$125,000 in Council's operating budget for the preparation of a feasibility study for the proposal to extend Meander Falls Road, to provide better access to the Meander Falls.*
- 2. Writes to the Tasmanian political parties seeking a financial contribution to match Council's commitment.*

DECISION:

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

- 1. Resolves to allocate \$125,000 in Council's operating budget for the preparation of a feasibility study for the proposal to extend Meander Falls Road, to provide better access to the Meander Falls.*
- 2. Writes to the Tasmanian political parties seeking a financial contribution to match Council's commitment.*

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

As a procedural motion Cr Synfield moved and Cr Richardson seconded ***“that this matter be referred to the March Council workshop and be discussed by Council at the April Council meeting.”***

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

The Council meeting adjourned for afternoon tea at 3.51pm

The Council meeting resumed at 4.09pm

33/2018 2017-2018 ANNUAL PLAN – QUARTERLY REVIEW – DECEMBER 2017

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the December quarterly review of the Annual Plan.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council receive and note the Annual Plan review for the December 2017 quarter as attached.

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr Mackenzie seconded *“that Council receive and note the Annual Plan review for the December 2017 quarter as attached.”*

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

34/2018 REVIEW OF POLICY NO. 67 – PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to review Policy No. 67- Personal Information Protection.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council confirm the continuation of Policy No. 67 - Personal Information Protection as follows:-

POLICY MANUAL

Policy Number: 67

Personal Information Protection

Purpose:

This Policy sets out Council's approach to managing, handling and protecting the personal information of customers.

Department:

Governance ~~& Community Services~~

Author:

~~David Pyke Director~~ Martin Gill, General Manager

Council Meeting Date:

~~14 October 2014~~ 13 February 2018

Minute Number:

~~177/2014~~

Next Review Date:

November ~~2017~~ 2021

POLICY

1. Definitions

~~"Personal Information" — is information or opinion in any recorded format, including photographs, sound and video recordings, about an individual that readily identifies that individual. Information such as a person's name and address is personal information. Personal information does not include information that is contained in a publicly available record or publication.~~

"Personal Information" – personal information means any information or opinion in any recorded format about an individual:

- a. whose identity is apparent or is reasonably ascertainable from the information or opinion; and
- b. who is alive or has not been dead for more than 25 years.

2. Objective

The objective of this policy is to provide guidance to Council staff, elected members and contractors in relation to the management of personal information.

3. Scope

This Policy applies to all employees, elected members and contractors of the Council.

This Policy covers personal information that is collected, retained, stored and used by Council where it is necessary for one or more of Council's functions or activities.

This Policy uses the Personal Information Protection Principles at Schedule 1 of the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004* as a framework for the collection, management and disclosure of personal information.

4. Policy

Intent

Council will only collect, use and disclose of personal information as required to perform its functions and as permitted or required by law. All Council staff, elected members and contractors handling such information collected by Council will be advised of their responsibilities in this regard.

General - Information Collected

Personal Information Protection Principle 5 requires that a personal information custodian must set out in a document its policies on the management of personal information, and that the document is to be made available to any person who requests it.

The functions of the Meander Valley Council (the Council) are many and varied as provided under the *Local Government Act 1993* and other legislation and regulations made there under as well as By-laws made by the Council from time to time.

The Council collects, retains, stores and uses personal information where it is necessary for one or more of the Council's functions and activities.

Under the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004* (the Act), the Council is the custodian of that information and the collection, use and disclosure of information which is to be used by the Council is governed by the Act.

The type of personal information collected by the Council includes names, addresses and telephone numbers, together with any specific information about a person that may be required for the purpose of discharging our functions across the organisation.

The Council is committed to upholding the right to privacy of all individuals who have dealings with the Council and endeavours to ensure that the personal information we hold is accurate, complete and up to date. Where practicable, we will check on the accuracy of your personal information before we use it.

Sensitive Information

Sensitive Information includes information relating to health, criminal record, racial origin and sexual preferences.

~~Generally, the Council will only collect sensitive information with consent of the person if it is necessary, or if the collection of that information is required or permitted by law~~

Council will not collect sensitive information with consent of the person, unless the collection of that information is required by law.

Anonymity

If a person is making a general enquiry, it may not be necessary to identify themselves however, identification may be required if a person is making a specific enquiry, wishing to use a Council service or making an application to the Council.

Access to and Correction of Information Collected

The Act provides that a person can access personal information about them that is held by the Council.

A person who considers the personal information to be incorrect, incomplete, out of date or misleading, can request that the information be amended which will be processed in accordance with the provisions of the *Right to Information Act 2009*.

Depending upon the nature of the request a fee may be charged for this service.

A person who is not satisfied with the handling or outcome of a request for access to or correction of personal information, can lodge a complaint with the Ombudsman.

Use and Disclosure of Personal Information

The Council will only use personal information for the purposes for which it was collected unless with the consent of the person or if it required or authorised by law.

The Council will not reveal personal information to third parties outside the Council for their independent use unless authorised to do so, or the disclosure is required by a Court or Tribunal or allowed by law.

For example, there may be a need or requirement to disclose some or all information Council collect to contractors and agents of the Council, law enforcement agencies, courts, or other public sector bodies, or other authorised organisations under any relevant legislation.

The Council does not sell, trade or make available personal information to others.

A personal information custodian may use or disclose personal information about an individual for a purpose other than the primary purpose of collection without the individual's consent if –

- a. it is a public authority; and
- b. the information is basic personal information; and
- c. the use or disclosure is reasonably necessary for the efficient storage and use of that information; and
- d. the information is only used by, or disclosed to, another public sector body.

Some personal information Council has collected may be used in research, statistical analysis, state or national reporting, awareness programs, public statements or training, but not in a way which would identify the person to whom it relates.

Personal information in written submissions on policy matters or matters of public consultation may be disclosed in reports that are made public, unless the submission was submitted and/or accepted on a confidential basis.

Security of Personal Information

The Council uses a number of procedural, physical, and technical safeguards, including access controls, secure methods of communication and back-up and recovery systems to protect information from misuse and loss, unauthorised access, modification and disclosure.

Council Officers are only provided with access to the information that is necessary for them to carry out their functions within the Council and Council Officers are made aware of the importance of confidentiality and customer privacy.

Council will not collect sensitive information without consent of the person, unless the collection of that information is required by law.

~~Generally, information is destroyed or permanently de-identified when it is no longer required. However, under the Archives Act 1983, some information is required to be kept for specified periods or permanently.~~

Information will be destroyed or permanently de-identified when it is no longer required. However, under the Archives Act 1983, some information is required to be kept for specified periods or permanently.

Review of Policy

~~This Policy is to be reviewed on or before November 2017.~~

5. Legislation

- Privacy Act 1988
- Personal Information Protection Act 2004

6. Responsibility

Responsibility for the implementation of this policy rests with the General Manager.

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded ***“that Council confirm the continuation of Policy No. 67 - Personal Information Protection as follows:-***

POLICY MANUAL

Policy Number: 67

Personal Information Protection

Purpose:

This Policy sets out Council’s approach to managing, handling and protecting the personal information of customers.

Department:

Governance

Author:

Martin Gill, General Manager

Council Meeting Date:

13 February 2018

Minute Number:

34/2018

Next Review Date:

November 2021

POLICY

1. Definitions

“Personal Information” – personal information means any information or opinion in any recorded format about an individual:

- a. whose identity is apparent or is reasonably ascertainable from the information or opinion; and
- b. who is alive or has not been dead for more than 25 years.

2. Objective

The objective of this policy is to provide guidance to Council staff, elected members and contractors in relation to the management of personal information.

3. Scope

This Policy applies to all employees, elected members and contractors of the Council.

This Policy covers personal information that is collected, retained, stored and used by Council where it is necessary for one or more of Council's functions or activities.

This Policy uses the Personal Information Protection Principles at Schedule 1 of the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004* as a framework for the collection, management and disclosure of personal information.

4. Policy

Intent

Council will only collect, use and disclose of personal information as required to perform its functions and as permitted or required by law. All Council staff, elected members and contractors handling such information collected by Council will be advised of their responsibilities in this regard.

General - Information Collected

Personal Information Protection Principle 5 requires that a personal information custodian must set out in a document its policies on the management of personal information, and that the document is to be made available to any person who requests it.

The functions of the Meander Valley Council (the Council) are many and varied as provided under the *Local Government Act 1993* and other legislation and regulations made there under as well as By-laws made by the Council from time to time.

The Council collects, retains, stores and uses personal information where it is necessary for one or more of the Council's functions and activities.

Under the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004* (the Act), the Council is the custodian of that information and the collection, use and disclosure of information which is to be used by the Council is governed by the Act.

The type of personal information collected by the Council includes names, addresses and telephone numbers, together with any specific information about a person that may be required for the purpose of discharging our functions across the organisation.

The Council is committed to upholding the right to privacy of all individuals who have dealings with the Council and endeavours to ensure that the personal information we hold

is accurate, complete and up to date. Where practicable, we will check on the accuracy of your personal information before we use it.

Sensitive Information

Sensitive Information includes information relating to health, criminal record, racial origin and sexual preferences.

Council will not collect sensitive information with consent of the person, unless the collection of that information is required by law.

Anonymity

If a person is making a general enquiry, it may not be necessary to identify themselves however, identification may be required if a person is making a specific enquiry, wishing to use a Council service or making an application to the Council.

Access to and Correction of Information Collected

The Act provides that a person can access personal information about them that is held by the Council.

A person who considers the personal information to be incorrect, incomplete, out of date or misleading, can request that the information be amended which will be processed in accordance with the provisions of the *Right to Information Act 2009*.

Depending upon the nature of the request a fee may be charged for this service.

A person who is not satisfied with the handling or outcome of a request for access to or correction of personal information, can lodge a complaint with the Ombudsman.

Use and Disclosure of Personal Information

The Council will only use personal information for the purposes for which it was collected unless with the consent of the person or if it required or authorised by law.

The Council will not reveal personal information to third parties outside the Council for their independent use unless authorised to do so, or the disclosure is required by a Court or Tribunal or allowed by law.

For example, there may be a need or requirement to disclose some or all information Council collect to contractors and agents of the Council, law enforcement agencies, courts, or other public sector bodies, or other authorised organisations under any relevant legislation.

The Council does not sell, trade or make available personal information to others.

A personal information custodian may use or disclose personal information about an individual for a purpose other than the primary purpose of collection without the individual's consent if –

- a. it is a public authority; and
- b. the information is basic personal information; and
- c. the use or disclosure is reasonably necessary for the efficient storage and use of that information; and
- d. the information is only used by, or disclosed to, another public sector body.

Some personal information Council has collected may be used in research, statistical analysis, state or national reporting, awareness programs, public statements or training, but not in a way which would identify the person to whom it relates.

Personal information in written submissions on policy matters or matters of public consultation may be disclosed in reports that are made public, unless the submission was submitted and/or accepted on a confidential basis.

Security of Personal Information

The Council uses a number of procedural, physical, and technical safeguards, including access controls, secure methods of communication and back-up and recovery systems to protect information from misuse and loss, unauthorised access, modification and disclosure.

Council Officers are only provided with access to the information that is necessary for them to carry out their functions within the Council and Council Officers are made aware of the importance of confidentiality and customer privacy.

Council will not collect sensitive information without consent of the person, unless the collection of that information is required by law.

Information will be destroyed or permanently de-identified when it is no longer required. However, under the Archives Act 1983, some information is required to be kept for specified periods or permanently.

5. Legislation

- Privacy Act 1988
- Personal Information Protection Act 2004

6. Responsibility

Responsibility for the implementation of this policy rests with the General Manager.

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

35/2018 POLICY REVIEW – POLICY NUMBER 37 - VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to review Policy Number 37 - Vegetation Management.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council confirm the continuation of Policy No. 37 – Vegetation Management, as follows:

POLICY MANUAL

Policy Number: 37	Vegetation Management
Purpose:	To provide strategic direction for the management of vegetation on Council property and Council managed land.
Department:	Infrastructure Services & Works
Author:	Natasha Szczyglowska, Technical Officer
Council Meeting Date:	9 June 2015 13 February 2018
Minute Number:	330/2015
Next Review Date:	February 2018 February 2022

POLICY

1. Definitions

Vegetation	Trees, shrubs, grasses, sedges and herbs: generally all plant life considered collectively as a whole in a location.
Native Vegetation	A plant which is indigenous to Tasmania.
Remnant Vegetation	Native vegetation that retains the characteristics of the vegetation which existed on that site prior to settlement. It may be in good or degraded condition.
Urban Areas	Settlement areas developed for a wide range of urban purposes. Areas that have been developed for a wide range of community and civic purposes within a town, suburb or city.
Urban Forest	Vegetation within urban areas: primary component of urban ecosystems.

Biodiversity The variability among living organisms from all sources, including terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part.

2. Objective

The objectives of this policy are to:

- Sustain the character and biodiversity values of rural locations through the management of **native** vegetation;
- Manage vegetation in urban areas in a manner that improves the amenity and environmental performance of our townships, parks, reserves and roadsides; **and**
- Manage vegetation in a manner that ensures the **health** and safety of our community.

3. Scope

This policy applies to **vegetation on** Council property and Council managed land.

~~Management of vegetation includes but is not limited to planning, planting, maintenance, protection and removal.~~

4. Policy

Vegetation, including **both** remnant vegetation and plantings of **mature** native and exotic species, are important features of Meander Valley's scenic landscapes and contribute to the unique character of rural areas, townships and many **residential urban** areas.

Native vegetation plays an important role as a source of genetic diversity, ~~as a place for recreation~~ **enhancing open space** and in improving the health of waterways.

Vegetation provides an array of social, health and well-being, economic and environmental benefits to the community.

~~It is policy that Council has a strategy for managing~~ Council will develop a strategy for managing vegetation that:

Council will develop strategies for managing:

- ~~• Native vegetation that:~~
- Provides guidance for the planning, maintenance and improvement of parks, reserves and roadsides
- Assesses site suitability and use to ensure appropriate species and densities are planted and maintained
- Recognises ancillary benefits for the health and well-being of the community provided by urban forests
- Within reason ensures public safety in our parks and on our roadsides
- Promotes positive environmental outcomes
- Recognises the importance of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity
- Recognises the cultural values of vegetation and protects high value vegetation; vegetation communities and remnant vegetation

- ~~Protects high value vegetation communities and remnant vegetation~~
- Recognises the role of riparian vegetation in enhancing water quality within streams and wetlands
- Encourages the appropriate vegetation of waterways
- Recognises the role remnant vegetation has in defining the character of a place
- Recognises the important role that vegetation can play in managing landslip and salinity risks
- Within reason ensures Council works with adjoining landowners
- ~~Ensures public safety in our parks and on our roadsides~~

- ~~Heritage Vegetation that:~~
 - ~~Recognises the heritage and cultural values of identified vegetation throughout the Meander Valley region~~
 - ~~Recognises that in some cases Council will need to work with private landowners to manage and maintain identified heritage vegetation~~

- ~~Vegetation in urban areas that:~~
 - ~~Provides guidance for the maintenance and improvement of parks, reserve and roadsides~~
 - ~~Promotes positive environmental outcomes~~
 - ~~Assesses site suitability and use to ensure appropriate species and densities are planted and maintained~~
 - ~~Recognises ancillary benefits for the health and well-being of the community provided by urban forests~~
 - ~~Encourages the revegetation of waterways~~
 - ~~Recognises the important role that vegetation can play in managing landslip and salinity risks~~
 - ~~Ensures public safety in our parks and on our roadsides~~

5. Legislation and associated Council policies

- Boundary Fences Act 1908
- Threatened Species Act 1995
- Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
- Historical Cultural Heritage Act 1995
- Local Government (Highways) Act 1982
- ~~Roads and Jetties Act 1935~~
- Forest Practices Act 1985
- Nature Conservation Act 2002
- Weed Management Act 1999

6. Responsibility

The Director Infrastructure Services ~~Director Development Services and Director Works are~~ is responsible for ensuring compliance with this policy.

Cr Connor left the meeting at 4.25pm

DECISION:

Cr Mackenzie moved and Cr Connor seconded ***“that Council confirm the continuation of Policy No. 37 – Vegetation Management, as follows:***

POLICY MANUAL

Policy Number: 37	Vegetation Management
Purpose:	To provide direction for the management of vegetation on Council property and Council managed land.
Department:	Infrastructure Services
Author:	Natasha Szczyglowska, Technical Officer
Council Meeting Date:	13 February 2018
Minute Number:	35/2018
Next Review Date:	February 2022

POLICY

1. Definitions

Vegetation	Trees, shrubs, grasses, sedges and herbs: generally all plant life in a location.
Native Vegetation	A plant which is indigenous to Tasmania.
Remnant Vegetation	Native vegetation that retains the characteristics of the vegetation which existed on that site prior to settlement. It may be in good or degraded condition.
Urban Areas	Areas that have been developed for a wide range of community and civic purposes within a town, suburb or city.
Urban Forest	Vegetation within urban areas: primary component of urban ecosystems.
Biodiversity	The variability among living organisms from all sources, including terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part.

2. Objective

The objectives of this policy are to:

- Sustain the character and biodiversity values of rural locations through the management of vegetation;
- Manage vegetation in urban areas in a manner that improves the amenity and environmental performance of our townships, parks, reserves and roadsides; and
- Manage vegetation in a manner that ensures the safety of our community.

3. Scope

This policy applies to vegetation on Council property and Council managed land.

4. Policy

Vegetation, including remnant vegetation and plantings of native and exotic species, are important features of Meander Valley's scenic landscapes and contribute to the unique character of rural areas, townships and many urban areas.

Native vegetation plays an important role as a source of genetic diversity, enhancing open space and in improving the health of waterways.

Vegetation provides an array of social, health and well-being, economic and environmental benefits to the community.

Council will develop a strategy for managing vegetation that:

- Provides guidance for the planning, maintenance and improvement of parks, reserves and roadsides
- Assesses site suitability and use to ensure appropriate species and densities are planted and maintained
- Recognises ancillary benefits for the health and well-being of the community provided by urban forests
- Within reason ensures public safety in our parks and on our roadsides
- Promotes positive environmental outcomes
- Recognises the importance of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity
- Recognises the cultural values of vegetation and protects high value vegetation; vegetation communities and remnant vegetation
- Recognises the role of riparian vegetation in enhancing water quality within streams and wetlands
- Encourages the appropriate vegetation of waterways
- Recognises the role remnant vegetation has in defining the character of a place
- Recognises the important role that vegetation can play in managing landslip and salinity risks
- Within reason ensures Council works with adjoining landowners

5. Legislation and associated Council policies

- Boundary Fences Act 1908
- Threatened Species Act 1995
- Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
- Historical Cultural Heritage Act 1995

- Local Government (Highways) Act 1982
- Forest Practices Act 1985
- Nature Conservation Act 2002
- Weed Management Act 1999

6. Responsibility

The Director Infrastructure Services is responsible for ensuring compliance with this policy.

DECISION:

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

ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:

Councillor Mackenzie moved and Councillor Kelly 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 Kelly, King, Mackenzie, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, Temple and White voting for the motion.*

36/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Closed Session of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 16 January, 2018.

37/2018 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

The meeting moved into Closed Session at 4.30pm

The meeting re-opened to the public at 4.34pm

The meeting closed at 4.34pm

.....
CRAIG PERKINS (MAYOR)