



Meander Valley Council

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

ORDINARY MINUTES

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 16 January 2018

Table of Contents

1/2018	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:.....	3
2/2018	COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:.....	3
3/2018	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:	4
4/2018	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:.....	4
5/2018	TABLING OF PETITIONS:.....	4
6/2018	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	5
7/2018	COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME.....	5
8/2018	DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.....	14
9/2018	NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS.....	14
10/2018	18 INTEGRITY DRIVE, WESTBURY – LEVEL 2 ACTIVITY – MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING (AQUA FEED PRODUCTION FACILITY).....	15
11/2018	DELORAINÉ AND DISTRICTS RECREATION PRECINCT FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT.....	22
12/2018	9 JARDINE CRESCENT, PROSPECT VALE - SUBDIVISION	24
13/2018	46A BEEFEATER STREET WITH DRAINAGE WORKS THROUGH 33 TOWER HILL STREET, 38 WEST GODERICH STREET AND 35 MORIARTY STREET, DELORAINÉ – MULTIPLE DWELLINGS.....	30
14/2018	2017-2018 COMMUNITY INCENTIVE GRANTS APPLICATION ASSESSMENT – ROUND 3 – JANUARY 2018.....	32
15/2018	2018 TASMANIAN STATE ELECTION PRIORITY PROJECTS.....	34
16/2018	COUNCIL AUDIT PANEL RECEIPT OF MINUTES AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS	39
17/2018	FINANCIAL REPORTS TO 31 DECEMBER 2017	40
	ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:.....	41
18/2018	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	41
19/2018	LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	41

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Meander Valley Council held at the Council Chambers Meeting Room, 26 Lyall Street, Westbury, on Tuesday 16 January 2018 at 1.30pm.

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

APOLOGIES: Cr Ian Mackenzie

IN ATTENDANCE: Martin Gill, General Manager
Beth Williams, Administration Officer
Dino De Paoli, Director Infrastructure
Jonathan Harmey, Director Corporate Services
Matthew Millwood, Director Works
Lynette While, Director Community & Development Services
Jo Oliver, Senior Strategic Planner
Leanne Rabjohns, Town Planner
Justin Simons, Town Planner
Krista Palfreyman, Development Services Coordinator
Natasha Whiteley, Town Planner
Patrick Gambles, Community Development Manager
Justin Marshall, Senior Accountant

1/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Councillor White moved and Councillor King seconded, ***“that the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 12 December, 2017, be received and confirmed.”***

2/2018 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING:

Nil

3/2018 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR:

Tuesday 12 December 2017

Prospect High School end of year presentation evening

Wednesday 13 December 2017

End of year lunch with Premier Will Hodgman
Deloraine High School end of year presentation evening

Thursday 14 December 2017

Mole Creek Primary School end of year presentation evening

Friday 15 December 2017

Northern Police District end of year morning tea

Saturday 16 December 2017

Official opening of Kooparoona Niara Cultural Trail

Tuesday 19 December 2017

Hagley Farm Primary School end of year presentation

Thursday 21 December 2017

Ashley School end of year presentation

Sunday 7 January 2018

Fesitval of Small Halls Concert, Rosevale

Thursday 11 January 2018

Official opening, Australian Junior Darts Championship, Westbury

Saturday 13 January 2018

Australian Men's World Cup Darts Team, Westbury

4/2018 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Cr Kelly – C&DS 4

5/2018 TABLING OF PETITIONS:

Nil

6/2018 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

1. PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – DECEMBER 2017

Nil

2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – JANUARY 2018

Nil

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – JANUARY 2018

Nil

7/2018 COUNCILLOR QUESTION TIME

1. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE – DECEMBER 2017

1.1 Cr Andrew Connor

(a) Advertising costs

Can council officers advise on the yearly cost to Council of printed advertising that is required by law for activities such as Development Applications, Road Closures, animal seizures, land sales and similar advertising? A detailed cost breakdown for each category would be appreciated.

Response by Jon Harmey, Director Corporate Services

The following advertising costs are provided for the 2016/2017 financial year:

Statutory Planning Applications	\$38,633
Planning Scheme Review	\$3,453
Property Rates and Collection	\$6,852
Council Meetings and AGM	\$1,537
Animal Control	\$744
Road Closure – Deloraine Car Show	\$775
Road Closure – Westbury Cycling Criterium	\$910
Road Closure – Anzac Day Services	\$944

Additional road closure advertising has been capitalised as part of project construction costs and not identified in the above table. Additional advertising considered non-statutory have not been included.

2. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – JANUARY 2018

2.1 Cr Bob Richardson

This question concerns building activity in mid-Meander Valley. Could Council please be advised of residential building activity for each of the following postcode for the years 2000 – 2017:

- 7290 - Hadspen
- 7291 - Carrick
- 7292 - Hagley
- 7303 - Westbury

Response Martin Gill, General Manager

Council does not have electronic building data records prior to 2006. Work to extract the data from archived material for the period prior to 2006 would be resource intensive. If officers were provided a supplementary question outlining the why the data is required we may be able to provide some broader observations that address the interest in the data. For instance, state wide building approval data for the period between 2000 and 2005 shows a significant dip in building approval numbers during 2000 and 2001, followed by slow growth in the following four years and another shallow dip in 2006. However, the overall number of annual building approvals across this period is similar to the following period. This would suggest that we would not see a lot of variation to the trends observed in data we have for 2006 – 2017.

Building Approvals/Occupancy Permits				
	Carrick	Hadspen	Hagley	Westbury
2006	0	4	0	6
2007	2	10	5	9
2008	0	6	0	8
2009	5	7	1	15
2010	3	11	2	11
2011	2	3	0	14
2012	1	2	1	13
2013	2	7	0	8
2014	3	15	1	5

2015	2	28	2	11
2016	2	11	1	5
2017	3	5	0	10
Totals	25	109	13	115

Total building approvals for 'mid Meander Valley' since 2005 - 262. This is an average of 21.8 building approvals per year.

3. COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – JANUARY 2018

3.1 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?

Question taken on notice

3.2 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-sizes 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?

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

Question taken on notice

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.

Question taken on notice

3. 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 5 years ago? Or was it the Town Hall about 1933 (85 years ago)?

Question taken on notice

3.3 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.

Question taken on notice

3.4 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 changerooms, including toilets and showers.

It was stated that, at the time of demolition, the building with its attendant changeroom 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 changeroom/community centre structure?

Question taken on notice

3.5 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?

Question taken on notice

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

Question taken on notice

When I was elected to Council some 17 years ago, it is my recollection that most of Council's town deposits were held in the (AAA-rated) Commonwealth Bank of Australia. Now that investment held with CBA is just over 10%.

Could this reduction in CBA Term Deposits have been a contributing factor to the CBA Westbury Branch closure in November 2017?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

No

3.6 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"?

Question taken on notice

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?

Question taken on notice

3.7 Cr Bob Richardson

It is noted in the Deloraine Recreation Study that the study emanated because Deloraine recreational users came together to say some of the facilities are starting to age "

Is it fair to say that community and recreational facilities are very limited in the similarly-sized population centres in Hadspen and Westbury/Hagley?

Is it also fair to say that facilities in those centres also have been neglected – for example the Westbury Sports Centre, Tennis facilities and Squash Centre? And does that observation extend to the Westbury Recreation Ground pavilion and changerooms?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

Council has undertaken a number of recent upgrades to Hadspen It has been acknowledged in the recent business case for the Westbury Recreation Ground Multipurpose Function Centre that the existing facilities are tired and need attention.

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?

Question taken on notice

3.8 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?

Question taken on notice

3.9 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?

Question taken on notice

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

Question taken on notice

3.10 Cr Bob Richardson

It is reported in the agenda papers that several people have signed a letter lobbying for support of an individual project request for support funding, in this case for the \$33 million Deloraine Recreation Study (refer page 783 of the agenda).

It is noted that three of these lobbyists are Meander Valley Council officers.

Is this not irregular for Council officers to involve themselves in lobbying for a particular project when it is likely that these same officers may well be required to be involved in the evaluation of many competing submissions by many community groups across the municipality?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

The Council officers were part of working group appointed by Council to administer and manage the preparation of the Deloraine and Districts Recreation Precinct Feasibility Study (Study). The letter to Council seeking the inclusion of a recommendation from the Study in Council's election priority projects list should be viewed as advice from a Council appointed committee who have undertaken work at the direction, and on behalf of Council.

The role of the working group should be viewed as you would other Council staff, in that they have made recommendations relevant to their role, these recommendations were reviewed by the General Manager and then presented to Council to formally consider and make a decision.

Council officers regularly work on multiple projects simultaneously. In many of those projects they are required to make objective evaluations of a project looking at the merits of the project, the link to an existing Council strategy, the relationship with other projects or a Council decision. This is the nature of the work that Council officers undertake. It is not irregular for Council officers to provide advice or make recommendations on projects they are working on.

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?

Question taken on notice

Does this policy refer to Council officers?

Response by Martin Gill, General Manager

No

3.11 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?

Question taken on notice

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?

Question taken on notice

8/2018 DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Nil

9/2018 NOTICE OF MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

Nil

10/2018 18 INTEGRITY DRIVE, WESTBURY – LEVEL 2
ACTIVITY – MANUFACTURING AND
PROCESSING (AQUA FEED PRODUCTION
FACILITY)

1) Introduction

This report considers application PA\18\0018 for Level 2 Activity - Manufacturing & Processing (Aqua Feed Production Facility) on land located at 18 Integrity Drive, Westbury (CT: 174186/1).

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that the application for Use and Development for Level 2 Activity - Manufacturing & Processing (Aqua Feed Production Facility) on land located at 18 Integrity Drive, Westbury (CT: 174186/1) by Ridley AgriProducts Pty Ltd, requiring the following discretions:

- Clause F1.4.1 - Building design and siting
- Clause E4.6.1 - Use and road or rail infrastructure
- Clause E6.6.1 - Car parking numbers
- Clause E6.7.2 - Design and layout of car parking

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) AECOM Australia Pty Ltd; Date: 11 September 2017; Development Proposal and Environmental Management Proposal; Ref 60537374.**
- b) Wiley & Co Pty Ltd; Date: 17/5/2017; Project No: W20661; Issue 4; Drawing No: 00A001, 00A010 & 00A011.**
- c) Ridley; Ridley Signage; Signage Standard for Main Entrance (sheets 1 & 2) and Mill (sheet 3).**

and subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the commencement of works, stormwater drainage design drawings for the development site must be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor and must include hardstand areas discharging through a triple interceptor device to the reticulated stormwater connection point.**

- 2. Prior to the commencement of use:**

- a) **the proposed vehicle crossover must be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of Council's Director Infrastructure Services. (Refer Note 1)**
- b) **the car park shall be constructed in accordance with AS2890.1 - 2004 – Parking Facilities Part 1: Off Road Car Parking ;**
- c) **the disability car parking spaces shall be designed constructed in accordance with AS/NZ 2890.6 -2009 Parking facilities –Off-street parking for people with disabilities;**
- d) **all car parking, access strips and circulation areas must be provided with an impervious all weather seal;**
- e) **car parking spaces must be line marked; and**
- f) **construction of the approved stormwater drainage is to be completed in accordance with the endorsed stormwater design drawings, to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor.**

3. Signage must be located within the title boundary.

4. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA No 2017/01206-MVC) attached.

5. The use and development must be undertaken in accordance with Permit Part B – Permit Conditions – Environmental No. 9685 attached, issued by the Board of the Environment Protection Authority.

Notes:

1. Prior to the construction of the vehicular crossover, separate consent is required by the Road Authority. A Driveway Crossover Application Form is enclosed. All enquiries should be directed to Council's Infrastructure Department on telephone 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 does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. The following additional approvals may be required before construction commences:

- a) Building approval

b) Plumbing approval

All enquiries should be directed to Council's Permit Authority on 6393 5322 or Council's Plumbing Surveyor on 0419 510 770.

4. 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.
5. 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
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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 King moved and Cr Connor seconded that ***"the application for Use and Development for Level 2 Activity - Manufacturing & Processing (Aqua Feed Production Facility) on land located at 18 Integrity Drive, Westbury (CT: 174186/1) by Ridley AgriProducts Pty Ltd, requiring the following discretions:***

- Clause F1.4.1 - Building design and siting
- Clause E4.6.1 - Use and road or rail infrastructure
- Clause E6.6.1 - Car parking numbers
- Clause E6.7.2 - Design and layout of car parking

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) **AECOM Australia Pty Ltd; Date: 11 September 2017; Development Proposal and Environmental Management Proposal; Ref 60537374.**
- b) **Wiley & Co Pty Ltd; Date: 17/5/2017; Project No: W20661; Issue 4; Drawing No: 00A001, 00A010 & 00A011.**
- c) **Ridley; Ridley Signage; Signage Standard for Main Entrance (sheets 1 & 2) and Mill (sheet 3).**

and subject to the following conditions:

1. **Prior to the commencement of works, stormwater drainage design drawings for the development site must be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Plumbing Surveyor and must include hardstand areas discharging through a triple interceptor device to the reticulated stormwater connection point.**
2. **Prior to the commencement of use:**
 - a) **the proposed vehicle crossover must be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of Council's Director Infrastructure Services. (Refer Note 1)**
 - b) **the car park shall be constructed in accordance with AS2890.1 - 2004 – Parking Facilities Part 1: Off Road Car Parking ;**

- c) **the disability car parking spaces shall be designed constructed in accordance with AS/NZ 2890.6 -2009 Parking facilities –Off-street parking for people with disabilities;**
 - d) **all car parking, access strips and circulation areas must be provided with an impervious all weather seal;**
 - e) **car parking spaces must be line marked; and**
 - f) **construction of the approved stormwater drainage is to be completed in accordance with the endorsed stormwater design drawings, to the satisfaction of Council’s Plumbing Surveyor.**
- 3. Signage must be located within the title boundary.**
- 4. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA No 2017/01206-MVC) attached.**
- 5. The use and development must be undertaken in accordance with Permit Part B – Permit Conditions – Environmental No. 9685 attached, issued by the Board of the Environment Protection Authority.**

Notes:

- 1. Prior to the construction of the vehicular crossover, separate consent is required by the Road Authority. A Driveway Crossover Application Form is enclosed. All enquiries should be directed to Council’s Infrastructure Department on telephone 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 does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted. The following additional approvals may be required before construction commences:
- a) Building approval
 - b) Plumbing approval

All enquiries should be directed to Council’s Permit Authority on 6393 5322 or Council’s Plumbing Surveyor on 0419 510 770.

4. 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.

5. 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

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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, Perkins, Richardson, Synfield, and White voting for the motion and Councillor Temple abstaining.

Comment by Councillor Richardson

The Westbury-Hagley Development Association (WHDA) was formed in 1998 to address an imminent threat to Westbury and Hagley highway bypass.

WHDSA recognised the need for medium to long-term strategies to address that threat. In particular, it saw an opportunity, for several strategic advantages for establishment of an industrial zone to the north of Westbury. That concept, 20 years ago, showed great foresight.

That happened: three developers “put their hands up to provide resources to provide the establishment of Valley Central”.

I believe we should acknowledge the role of Council’s former Economic Development Director, Mr Rick Dunn. Through his guidance, Valley Central was established. Further, I believe it was Mr Dunn with which the current developer first contact was made.

Council’s Planning Officers have also undertaken much work to lead to this application.

The economic benefit will likely be of benefit to the whole municipality – from Prospect to Deloraine. Those benefits will include direct benefits (such as employment) as well as flow-on benefits.

Finally, I commend Ridley’s for choosing Valley Central, Westbury to establish.

11/2018 DELORAIN AND DISTRICTS RECREATION PRECINCT FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to receive the Deloraine & Districts Recreation Precinct Feasibility Study (DDRPFS) Background and Summary Reports (January 2018) prepared by recreation planning consultancy Inspiring Place, to note the recommendations from the DDRPFS Working Group and to undertake a formal period of stakeholder and community consultation and feedback.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council:

- 1. receive the Deloraine & Districts Recreation Precinct Feasibility Study Background and Summary Reports.*
- 2. notes the letter and recommendations contained within; from the DDRPFS Working Group.*
- 3. undertakes a formal period of stakeholder and community consultation and feedback to be completed prior to 13 March 2018.*

DECISION:

Cr King moved and Cr Synfield seconded that "**Council:**

- 1. receive the Deloraine & Districts Recreation Precinct Feasibility Study Background and Summary Reports.*
- 2. notes the letter and recommendations contained within; from the DDRPFS Working Group.*
- 3. undertakes a formal period of stakeholder and community consultation and feedback to be ready for consideration at the Council meeting of 13 March 2018."*

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

Comment by Councillor Richardson

There are several reasons why I believe Council should seriously consider receiving this report, the main one of which is that it raised expectations of parts of the Deloraine community that it might ever be implemented, let alone in the near future.

The first relates to needs of others sections of the municipality. The centres of main activity are:

- the urban section of Blackstone/Prospect Vale
- Hadspen
- Westbury and surrounding district, and
- Deloraine

There is a major shortfall in Council infrastructure in all three of Hadspen, Prospect/Blackstone and all three, as well as Carrick are likely growth centres. There is much catch-up needed in these areas before any of the Deloraine proposition.

Secondly, Deloraine is clearly not the demographic centre, by any means, in the municipality.

Thirdly, the comment has been made that there was a formal period of stakeholder and community consultation and feedback. There has not. Clearly this \$33 million proposition will involve subsidies from ratepayers throughout the municipality and from Council-supported State and Federal Governments submissions, which will divert funds from higher priority projects east of Deloraine.

Community consultation east of Deloraine simply has not occurred. Before broad community consultation is undertaken, there should be an inclusion of projects in population centres east of Deloraine to determine alternative projects, and a program to cater for existing shortcomings and plan to cater for growth.

12/2018 9 JARDINE CRESCENT, PROSPECT VALE - SUBDIVISION

1) Introduction

This report considers application PA\18\0087 for Subdivision (staged - 6 lots) on land located at 9 Jardine Crescent, Prospect Vale CT 169734/2.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that the application for Use and Development for Subdivision (staged - 6 lots) on land located at 9 Jardine Crescent, Prospect Vale CT 169734/2 by PDA Surveyors obo Eskleigh Foundation Inc, requiring the following discretions:

- Clause 10.4.15.1 - General Suitability
- Clause 10.4.15.2 - Lot Area, Building Envelopes and Frontage
- Clause 10.4.15.4 - Solar Orientation of Lots
- Clause 10.4.15.5 - Interaction, Safety and Security

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) **PDA Surveyors – Plan of Subdivision – PDA Reference: L17153-P05;**

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 driveway crossovers are to be constructed in accordance with LGAT Standard Drawing TSD-R09-V1 and to the satisfaction of Council's Director Infrastructure Services.**
- 3. All lots must be connected to Council's stormwater system, to the satisfaction of Council's Director Infrastructure Services.**
- 4. Prior to the sealing of the final plan of survey, the following must be completed to the satisfaction of Council:**
 - a) The developer must pay Council \$17,700.00, a sum equivalent to 5% of the unimproved value of the approved lots, as a Public Open Space contribution.**
 - b) The driveway crossovers are to be completed, as per Condition 2.**
 - c) All lots are to be connected to Council's stormwater system, as per Condition 3.**
- 5. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA No 2017/01767-MVC attached).**

Note:

- 1. Prior to the construction of the crossovers, a Driveway Crossover Application Form (enclosed) must be completed and approved by Council's Road Authority. 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.

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded that "***the application for Use and Development for Subdivision (staged - 6 lots) on land located at 9 Jardine Crescent, Prospect Vale CT 169734/2 by PDA Surveyors obo Eskleigh Foundation Inc, requiring the following discretions:***

- Clause 10.4.15.1 - General Suitability
- Clause 10.4.15.2 - Lot Area, Building Envelopes and Frontage
- Clause 10.4.15.4 - Solar Orientation of Lots

- Clause 10.4.15.5 - Interaction, Safety and Security

be APPROVED, generally in accordance with the endorsed plans:

- a) **PDA Surveyors – Plan of Subdivision – PDA Reference: L17153-P05;**

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 driveway crossovers are to be constructed in accordance with LGAT Standard Drawing TSD-R09-V1 and to the satisfaction of Council's Director Infrastructure Services.**
- 3. All lots must be connected to Council's stormwater system, to the satisfaction of Council's Director Infrastructure Services.**
- 4. Prior to the sealing of the final plan of survey, the following must be completed to the satisfaction of Council:**
 - a) The developer must pay Council \$17,700.00, a sum equivalent to 5% of the unimproved value of the approved lots, as a Public Open Space contribution.**
 - b) The driveway crossovers are to be completed, as per Condition 2.**
 - c) All lots are to be connected to Council's stormwater system, as per Condition 3.**
- 5. The development must be in accordance with the Submission to Planning Authority Notice issued by TasWater (TWDA No 2017/01767-MVC attached).**

Note:

- 1. Prior to the construction of the crossovers, a Driveway Crossover Application Form (enclosed) must be completed and approved by Council's Road Authority. 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.'

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

13/2018 46A BEEFEATER STREET WITH DRAINAGE WORKS THROUGH 33 TOWER HILL STREET, 38 WEST GODERICH STREET AND 35 MORIARTY STREET, DELORAINE – MULTIPLE DWELLINGS

1) Introduction

This report considers application PA\18\0064 for Multiple Dwellings (7 units) on land located at 46a Beefeater Street (CT 31888/3) with drainage works through 33 Tower Hill Street (CT 118654/2), 38 West Goderich Street (CT 118655/1) and 35 Moriarty Street (CT 32226/1), Deloraine.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that the application for Use and Development for Multiple dwellings (7 units) on land located at 46a Beefeater Street (CT 31888/3) with drainage works through 33 Tower Hill Street (CT 118654/2), 38 West Goderich Street (CT 118655/1) and 35 Moriarty Street (CT 32226/1), Deloraine by Rebecca Green & Associates be REFUSED, for the following reason:

- a) The safety and efficiency of Beefeater Street is significantly reduced by the increased vehicle movements associated with the use.***

DECISION

Councillor Kelly left the room at 3:12pm.

Cr Connor moved and Cr King seconded that ***"the application for Use and Development for Multiple dwellings (7 units) on land located at 46a Beefeater Street (CT 31888/3) with drainage works through 33 Tower Hill Street (CT 118654/2), 38 West Goderich Street (CT 118655/1) and 35 Moriarty Street (CT 32226/1), Deloraine by Rebecca Green & Associates be REFUSED, for the following reason:***

- a) The safety and efficiency of Beefeater Street is significantly reduced by the increased vehicle movements associated with the use."***

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

Comment by Councillor Synfield

Whilst supporting the decision to not approve this development application for the stated reason, the following comments are also relevant.

I do not believe clause 8.1.2(d) of the Interim Planning Scheme has been complied with; ie. a description of the manner in which the development will operate has not been provided, in any meaningful way.

Approval and issuing of the type of permit sought, would not mean the development could be utilized for the purpose of fruit pickers and or backpackers accommodation, in my opinion, as that would either likely constitute being ancillary to agriculture and hence be a prohibited use in the general residential zone, under the planning scheme, or alternatively would be classified as visitor accommodation and would need to be assessed accordingly and a permit issued*, if at all, prior to any such use being allowed.

*Unless qualifying for exemption under the provisions of Interim Planning Directive 2.1, any such exemption would need to be consequential to there being a genuine self-contained residence (dwelling) use existing in the first place.

Various community members have asserted that the purpose of the current development proposal remains unchanged from that of the previous application, in respect of this land and that irrespective of the reconfiguration of the buildings internally, many of the issues of the potentially negative impacts on nearby properties and residents, including amenity considerations remain.

To reiterate, those matters would need to be properly assessed, as to their merit, in relation to any application should such be made, insofar as relates to the visitor accommodation 'use class'.

The meeting adjourned for afternoon tea at 3:32pm.

The meeting resumed at 4:00pm.

14/2018 2017-2018 COMMUNITY INCENTIVE GRANTS
APPLICATION ASSESSMENT – ROUND 3 –
JANUARY 2018

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to present for Council approval, the recommendations of the Community Grants Committee for Community Incentive Grants Round 3.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council endorses the recommendations of the Community Grants Committee and approves the following allocations:

Organisation	Project	Grant Recommended \$
Blackstone Heights C N Assoc.	Establishment Grant	250
Bracknell Football Club	Electronic Score Board	2,500
Carrick Community Committee	Historical Publication	2,200
Carrick Park Pacing Club	Visual Upgrade	500
Launceston City Football Club	Media Reporting Equip.	1,500
MV Emergency Relief Scheme	Christmas Appeal	500
Mole Creek Memorial Hall	Multi-Media Upgrade	2,000
Mole Creek Swim Centre Assoc.	Season Chemicals	1,500
Prospect Hawks JFC	Senior Women's Equip	2,000
Tas Billiards & Snooker Assoc.	Ron Atkins Classic	2,000
Westbury Cricket Club	Junior Cricket Balls	1,500
Westbury Show Horse Committee	Tiered Seating	2,000
		18,450

DECISION:

Cr King moved and Cr White seconded that "***Council endorses the recommendations of the Community Grants Committee and approves the following allocations:***

Blackstone Heights C N Assoc.	Establishment Grant	250
Bracknell Football Club Inc	Electronic Scoreboard	2,500
Carrick Community Committee	Historical Publication	2,200
Carrick Park Pacing Club	Visual Upgrade	500
Launceston City Football Club	Media Reporting Equip.	1,500
MV Emergency Relief Scheme	Christmas Appeal	500
Mole Creek Memorial Hall	Multi-Media Upgrade	2,000
Mole Creek Swim Centre Assoc	Season Chemicals	1,500
Prospect Hawks JFC	Senior Women's Equip	2,000
Tas Billiards & Snooker Assoc.	Ron Atkins Classic	2,000
Westbury Cricket Club	Junior Cricket Balls	1,500
Westbury Show Horse Com.	Tiered Seating	2,000
		18,450

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

15/2018 2018 TASMANIAN STATE ELECTION PRIORITY PROJECTS

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's endorsement of proposed Priority Projects to be presented to political parties for consideration in the lead up to the 2018 Tasmanian State Election.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council endorse the Bass and Lyons Priority Projects in the table below for presentation to endorsed candidates of the political parties:

Bass Electorate Projects valued over \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Prospect Vale Park Upgrade and installation of drainage and irrigation	\$0.75m
2	Prospect Vale Park Construction of internal car parking and road network	\$1.5m
3	Hadspen Pedestrian access over South Esk River	\$3.0m
4	Hadspen Reticulated water supply infrastructure upgrade	\$1.8m
5	Hadspen New Roundabout (Scott and Bartley Street)	\$1.0m
6	Hadspen Combined Recreation & Stormwater Infrastructure	\$0.85m
7	Carrick Upgrade of Waste Water Treatment Plant	\$15m
Bass Electorate Projects valued up to \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Hadspen Erosion Treatment and parkland development of South Esk riverbank	\$400,000
2	Blackstone Heights Upgrade Blackstone Heights Park	\$100,000
3	Blackstone Heights	\$400,000

	Extension of footpath network	
4	Prospect Vale Entrance/Gateway treatment	\$100,000
5	Prospect Vale Park Upgrade of lighting infrastructure	\$250,000
Lyons Electorate Projects valued over \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Bracknell Construction of reticulated sewerage	\$5m
2	Westbury Development of multipurpose function centre	\$5m
3	Carrick Upgrade of Waste Water Treatment Plant	\$15m
4	Meander Valley Great Western Tiers Touring Route Signage	\$0.5m
5	Bracknell Reconstruction of Bracknell Memorial Hall	\$0.6
6	Deloraine Pedestrian and cyclist connectivity project	\$1.0m
Lyons Electorate Projects valued up to \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Meander Valley Short Walks Strategy	\$100,000
2	Mole Creek Refurbishment of Memorial Hall	\$60,000
3	Westbury Upgrade of Stormwater drainage system	\$300,000
4	Deloraine Lighting for River paths	\$250,000

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr Synfield seconded that "**Council endorse the Bass and Lyons Priority Projects in the table below for presentation to endorsed candidates of the political parties:**

Bass Electorate Projects valued over \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Prospect Vale Park Upgrade and installation of drainage and irrigation	\$0.75m
2	Prospect Vale Park Construction of internal car parking and road network	\$1.5m
3	Hadspen Pedestrian access over South Esk River	\$3.0m
4	Hadspen Reticulated water supply infrastructure upgrade	\$1.8m
5	Hadspen New Roundabout (Scott and Bartley Street)	\$1.0m
6	Hadspen Combined Recreation & Stormwater Infrastructure	\$0.85m
7	Carrick Upgrade of Waste Water Treatment Plant	\$15m
8	To work with industry to relocate their activity from Donalds Avenue, Prospect Vale	\$10m
Bass Electorate Projects valued up to \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Hadspen Erosion Treatment and parkland development of South Esk riverbank	\$400,000
2	Blackstone Heights Upgrade Blackstone Heights Park	\$100,000
3	Blackstone Heights Extension of footpath network	\$400,000
4	Prospect Vale Entrance/Gateway treatment	\$100,000
5	Prospect Vale Park Upgrade of lighting infrastructure	\$250,000
Lyons Electorate Projects valued over \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Bracknell Construction of reticulated sewerage	\$5m
2	Westbury Development of multipurpose function centre	\$5m

3	Carrick Upgrade of Waste Water Treatment Plant	\$15m
4	Meander Valley Great Western Tiers Touring Route Signage	\$0.5m
5	Bracknell Reconstruction of Bracknell Memorial Hall	\$0.6
6	Deloraine Stage 1 – Deloraine Sporting Precinct Projects	\$4.3m
Lyons Electorate Projects valued up to \$500,000		
No.	Project	Cost \$
1	Meander Valley Short Walks Strategy	\$100,000
2	Mole Creek Refurbishment of Memorial Hall	\$60,000
3	Westbury Upgrade of Stormwater drainage system	\$300,000
4	Deloraine Lighting for River paths	\$250,000

As an amendment to the motion, Councillor Kelly moved and Councillor Connor seconded, that “we include a request for \$500,000 to advance the proposed Meander Falls Road extension.”

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

As an amendment to the motion, Councillor Temple moved and Councillor Kelly seconded, “to construct a road to Meander Falls with track upgrades for \$4.5 million.”

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

As an amendment to the motion, Councillor Richardson moved and Councillor Connor seconded, “to construct the Hadspen Primary and Infant School.”

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

Councillor Richardson left the room at 4:54pm

Councillor Richardson returned to the room at 4:56pm.

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

16/2018 COUNCIL AUDIT PANEL RECEIPT OF MINUTES AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is for Council to receive the minutes of the Council Audit Panel meeting held on 19 December 2017 and the annual performance evaluation recommendations presented by the Audit Panel Chairman.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council:

- 1. receive the minutes of the Council Audit Panel meeting held on 19 December 2017*
- 2. receive the annual performance evaluation recommendations tabled at the Council Audit Panel meeting held on 19 December 2017*

DECISION:

Cr Connor moved and Cr White seconded that "**Council:**

- 1. receive the minutes of the Council Audit Panel meeting held on 19 December 2017*
- 2. receive the annual performance evaluation recommendations tabled at the Council Audit Panel meeting held on 19 December 2017."*

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

17/2018 FINANCIAL REPORTS TO 31 DECEMBER 2017

1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to present Council's financial reports for the period ending 31 December 2017.

2) Recommendation

It is recommended that Council receive the following financial reports for the period ended 31 December 2017:

- 1. Consolidated operating statement with accompanying operating statements for the key operational areas of Council.**
- 2. Exception and trends report.**
- 3. A detailed list of capital works project expenditure to date.**
- 4. A detailed list of capital resealing project expenditure to date.**
- 5. A detailed list of capital gravelling project expenditure to date.**
- 6. A summary of rates outstanding.**
- 7. Cash reconciliation & investments summary.**

DECISION:

Cr Richardson moved and Cr King seconded that "***Council receive the following financial reports for the period ended 31 December 2017:***

- 1. Consolidated operating statement with accompanying operating statements for the key operational areas of Council.***
- 2. Exception and trends report.***
- 3. A detailed list of capital works project expenditure to date.***
- 4. A detailed list of capital resealing project expenditure to date.***
- 5. A detailed list of capital gravelling project expenditure to date.***
- 6. A summary of rates outstanding.***
- 7. Cash reconciliation & investments summary."***

Councillor Connor left the meeting at 5:04pm

Councillor Connor returned to the meeting at 5:06pm

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

ITEMS FOR CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:

Councillor White moved and Councillor Connor 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.”***

18/2018 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Closed Session of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 12 December 2017.

19/2018 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

The meeting moved into Closed Session at 5:09pm

The meeting re-opened to the public at 5:11pm

The meeting closed at 5:11pm.

.....
CRAIG PERKINS (MAYOR)