

# COUNCIL AGENDA

## Monday, 6th February 2006



### GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL

\* *The General Manager certifies that the reports contained in this Agenda have been written by qualified persons under Section 65 of the Local Government Act 1993.*

**Hour:** 6.00 p.m.

**Present:**

**In attendance:**

**Workshops held since Date:** Monday, 23rd January 2006

**last Council Meeting Purpose:** To discuss:

- Workshop Groundrules.
- Presentation by Director of Local Government on changes to the Local Government Act 1993.
- Financial policies and asset management framework.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.	APOLOGIES .....	1
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES .....	1
3.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR .....	1
4.	PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION .....	1
5.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .....	1
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES).....	2
6.1	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - QUESTIONS RECEIVED .....	2

7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS .....	3
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
8. AMY STREET TRAFFIC CALMING (BERMUKA STREET TO ELEVETH AVENUE) .....	5
9. INSTANT SCAFFOLDS DEVELOPMENT - INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.....	10
<b>SOCIAL .....</b>	<b>14</b>
10. LEASE OF 408 MAIN ROAD, GLENORCHY .....	15
11. REVIEW OF CHILDREN’S SERVICES POLICIES .....	19
12. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW.....	22
<b>ECONOMIC .....</b>	<b>24</b>
13. REFORMATION OF COUNCIL PARKING STRATEGY WORKING GROUP.....	25
<b>ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>29</b>
14. BERRIEDALE CARAVAN PARK – PERMANENT RESIDENTS .....	30
<b>ORGANISATION.....</b>	<b>33</b>
15. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT .....	34
16. MONTHLY FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE STATISTICS.....	36
17. HEALTH AND SAFETY ASSESSMENTS OF BUILDINGS USED BY SPORTING CLUBS AND COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS – OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT .....	38
18. ALDERMEN’S IT POLICY .....	42
19. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.....	44
20. RESIGNATION OF ALDERMAN BEN SLADE.....	46
<b>CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>ORGANISATION.....</b>	<b>48</b>
21. CORPORATE SOFTWARE TENDER GCC309/2005.....	49

<b>22. REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF GLENORCHY GAZETTE ADVERTISING CHARGES .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>23. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>24. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (CLOSED).....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>OPEN TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>25. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>25.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN S. SLADE.....</b>	<b>51</b>

---

**1. APOLOGIES**

---

---

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday, 9th January 2006 be confirmed.

---

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

---

---

**4. PECUNIARY INTEREST NOTIFICATION**

---

---

**5. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS  
TAKEN ON NOTICE**

---

---

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 minutes)**

---

---

### **6.1 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME - QUESTIONS RECEIVED**

---

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

File Reference: 01252

#### **Community Plan Reference:**

#### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

#### **Reporting Brief:**

To respond to questions received from the public.

#### **Proposal In Detail:**

The following questions from the public ([Attachment 1](#)) were submitted to Council for response at the Council Meeting on Monday 6th February 2006.

1. What steps have Council officers taken to prevent dogs being exercised off-leash in Poimena Reserve.
2. What other steps do Council officers propose to take to deal with this problem?

#### **Consultations:**

#### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

#### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

#### **Recommendation:**

That Council note the responses given to the questions submitted.

#### **Resolution:**

---

## **7. PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS**

---

# INFRASTRUCTURE

---

## **8. AMY STREET TRAFFIC CALMING (BERMUKA STREET TO ELEVENTH AVENUE)**

---

Author: Traffic Engineer (Ms A. Moore)

Qualified Person: Manager Roads & Recreation (Mr A. Lawrence)

File Reference: 1170

### **Community Plan Reference:**

2.2.4 Ensure Glenorchy infrastructure does not create barriers to people accessing the community.

2.2.13 Continued development and implementation of local area traffic management plans.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

2.2.4 Ensure Glenorchy infrastructure does not create barriers to people accessing the community.

2.2.13 Continued development and implementation of local area traffic management plans.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To decide on the installation of traffic calming (speed cushions) in Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue. A plan showing the details of the scheme is included as [Attachment A](#).

### **Proposal In Detail:**

#### ***Background***

A Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) Report was completed by Pitt & Sherry Consulting Engineers in October 2002 and highlighted that the local community were concerned with the speed of vehicles using Amy Street and requested a general improvement to the level of safety in the vicinity of St Therese's school. The LATM Report recommended the implementation of speed cushions in Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Charles Street to control the speeds approaching the school crossing.

The opportunity to develop a traffic calming scheme for Amy Street between Nerida Place and Eleventh Avenue was also investigated, to link into the existing speed humps between Eleventh Avenue and Cranleigh Crescent and the proposed speed cushions near the school crossing. Options for traffic calming devices include speed cushions or lane narrowing.



The two traffic calming projects were separated for the purposes of consultation, advertising and approval. The speed cushion scheme in Amy Street in the vicinity of St Therese's school crossing (between Charles Street and Bermuka Street) has been supported by the local residents with no representations being received, approved by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) and construction has commenced in order to ensure the traffic calming is in place prior to the start of the 2006 school year. The proposed traffic calming scheme for Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue is the subject of this report.

### ***Traffic Data***

A traffic survey was undertaken in Amy Street between Lyetta Court and Karingi Court during October 2005 with results as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>ADT<sup>(1)</sup> (veh/day)</b>	<b>Average Speed (km/h)</b>	<b>85%ile Speed<sup>(2)</sup> (km/h)</b>	<b>Posted Speed Limit (km/h)</b>	<b>% over Speed Limit</b>
October 2005	1,632	41	50	50	40.6%

**Notes:**

(1) ADT = Average Daily Traffic

(2) 85%ile Speed = the speed exceeded by 15% of all vehicles surveyed.

These results (indicating 40.6% of vehicles travelling at or over the 50 km/h speed limit) confirm the need for some form of traffic calming to be considered in Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue. The issue of speeding in Amy Street has also been referred to the Tasmania Police for their attention.

### ***Initial Consultation***

In May 2005 a letter and questionnaire was sent to all property owners in Amy Street (between Charles Street and Eleventh Avenue), Bermuka Street, Nerida Place, Lyetta Court and Karingi Court to gauge whether residents would like to see traffic calming extended along Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue, including their preferred type of traffic calming device. From the 185 surveys sent out, 78 completed surveys were returned with results as follows:

- 4 no change (5%)
- 40 requested additional police enforcement (51%)
- 51 in favour of speed cushions (65%)
- 8 in favour of lane narrowing (10%)
- 2 had other suggestions (3%)
- 3 expressed no preference (4%)

[Please note that percentages do not add to 100% since one or more of these options could be selected by respondents.]

A copy of the letter and survey is included as part of this report (as **Attachment B**).

### ***The Traffic Calming Scheme***

A plan showing the details of the proposed traffic calming scheme is included in this report as Attachment A. Based on the results of the survey it was decided to pursue the installation of speed cushions rather than any other form of traffic calming device.

Initially three speed cushion locations were considered for the section of Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue. However, in discussion with the DIER Traffic Engineering Branch it was decided to reduce this to two.

The location of the two speed cushions was determined to complement the existing speed humps between Cranleigh Crescent and Eleventh Avenue, as well as linking into the new speed cushions in the vicinity of the school crossing. The locations of the speed cushions and the spacings between devices was designed in accordance with the guidelines set out by Austroads in their Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice Part 10 – Local Area Traffic Management.

### ***Final Consultation***

In October 2005 Council staff attempted to contact all residents directly affected by the proposed speed cushion installations and where possible met with those residents on-site to discuss the scheme.

Under the requirements of the Local Government (Highways) Act 1982 the proposed installation of speed cushions in Amy Street was advertised in The Mercury newspaper public notices on two occasions (29 October 2004 and 2 November 2004), giving the wider public an opportunity to comment on the proposal. A follow-up letter was sent to residents, Metro and emergency services advising them of the period for representations.

A copy of the public notice and the follow-up letter are included as part of this report ([Attachment C](#) and [Attachment D](#) respectively).

### ***Representations***

Two representations were received from local residents in relation to this scheme – one does not relate to the advertised scheme and has been disregarded, the other is from the owner of a property adjacent to a proposed speed cushion location that does not support their installation.

A copy of the representation letter is attached to this report as [Attachment E](#).

A letter of support for the traffic calming scheme was also received from Metro and a copy is attached to this report as [Attachment F](#).

### ***Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources (DIER) Approval***

During the design of this traffic calming scheme, the DIER Traffic Engineering Branch and Council staff have been working closely together (through regular Traffic Management meetings) to ensure a design that meets the requirements of both parties and to ensure the scheme will result in a good outcome for the road network and the greater community.

The traffic calming scheme was submitted to DIER in December 2005 for their approval in accordance with the Traffic Act 1925. This approval was received from DIER on 20 January 2006. A copy of the approval letter is included in this report as [Attachment G](#).

### ***Council Options***

Council has two options, as follows:

1. Reject the proposed traffic calming scheme resulting in no change to the traffic management arrangements in Amy Street.
2. Accept the proposed traffic calming scheme resulting in the installation of two speed cushions and shown on the drawing included as Attachment A.

A third option to consider alternative types or sites for traffic calming devices is not considered necessary. This is because a number of devices were investigated early in the design process and for consistency with existing traffic calming and effectiveness in slowing traffic, speed cushions are considered to be the preferred traffic calming device. Alternative speed cushion sites have also been considered, however, similar representations are likely to result from those residents living adjacent to the proposed traffic calming device.

Speed cushions in Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue were supported by 65% of residents that responded to the May 2005 survey. They are supported by Metro as a suitable form of traffic calming for buses (and therefore other large vehicles). DIER has also approved the proposed traffic calming scheme in its current configuration as complying with current traffic management standards and practices. Therefore it is recommended that Council support the installation of traffic calming in the form of speed cushions in this section of Amy Street.

### **Consultations:**

CMT

DIER

Residents of Amy Street (between Charles Street and Eleventh Avenue), Bermuka Street, Nerida Place, Lyetta Court and Karingi Court

Metro

Emergency Services

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Current Year	\$52,000	(for Amy Street between Charles Street and Eleventh Avenue)
--------------	----------	---

Next Year	Nil
-----------	-----

Future Years	Nil
--------------	-----

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Extensive consultation has been undertaken as part of the design process for this traffic calming scheme. However, those residents that have submitted representations to the scheme will be notified of the Council decision on this report.

**Recommendation:**

That traffic calming (speed cushions) is installed in Amy Street between Bermuka Street and Eleventh Avenue as shown on the drawing included as Attachment A of this report.

**Resolution:**

---

## 9. INSTANT SCAFFOLDS DEVELOPMENT - INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

---

Author: Simon Bamford (Manager Work Centre and Hydraulics)

Qualified Person: Simon Bamford (Manager Work Centre and Hydraulics)

File Reference: 100094

### **Community Plan Reference:**

Reference 2.2.3 states ‘Develop strategies to improve and extend the water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure to meet the needs of the community in line with Council’s strategic and land-use planning framework.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

Council’s Strategic Plan 2005-2009 notes a strategy to “facilitate opportunities for enterprises to establish and promote the city of Glenorchy as a good place to do business.” with a range of actions that include “continue the development and implementation of a business promotion and marketing strategy for the city (including incentives) to attract investment and business growth by focussing on:

- Assistance opportunities for small businesses to expand.

### **Reporting Brief:**

Council has received a Development Application from Instant Scaffolds Pty Ltd to refurbish part of their warehouse at 5-15 Pearl St. Investigations on the location and condition of Council’s sewer services has revealed significant works that need to be addressed before the development proceeds that cannot be placed as a condition of the approval for the developer to fund.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

Reference in this report should be made to [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B](#) that shows the location and details of the sewer pipe system that serves Instant Scaffolds and adjacent commercial and residential properties.

Subsequent to the receipt of the Development Application, an investigation of the sewer pipe system confirmed that large sections run underneath the exiting warehouse concrete floor and another pipe upstream of this section also runs underneath adjacent floors of commercial buildings. The lid of manhole NB/04 has been covered by the concrete warehouse floor by previous owners of 5-15 Pearl St. CCTV surveys of both pipes was undertaken. The condition, work required and suggested responsibility for each pipe section is detailed below.

**Pipe NB/03 to NB/04 (150dia concrete, length 37M, installed 1950, expected age 60yrs) Refer Appendix A**

This pipe runs under the existing warehouse slab and has large deposits of concrete that has somehow accumulated on the invert (bottom of pipe). The pipe needs to be replaced by a method known as pipe-cracking which effectively pulls a new similar or greater size pipe through the existing pipe, at the same time destroying the original. No excavation is required but significant clear space is required at each manhole location for machinery. Manhole NB/04 needs to be exposed within the warehouse slab and brought to surface. Two sewer connections to Instant Scaffolds need to be reconnected to the new pipe, which can only be done by excavating a hole in the slab.

Total cost for this work is estimated at \$42,000 (+GST). Liability for this cost is determined to be Council as the pipe is old, in poor condition and already runs underneath the concrete slab. That is, the work is required due to the age and condition of the pipe and not as a consequence of the development.

**Pipe NB/03 to properties 58, 60 and 62 Derwent Park Rd (100dia concrete, length 75ft, installed 1950, expected age 60yrs) Refer Appendix B**

This pipe runs within the Instant Scaffolds property, but outside the existing slab. The proposed refurbishment of the warehouse would extend the slab over this section of the sewer pipe. Either the pipe needs to be replaced by a new pipe parallel to the existing but within the properties of 58, 60 and 62 Derwent Park Rd, or the new building design should be changed so that the warehouse slab does not cover this section of the existing pipe. If the pipe is relocated, reconnecting the individual house connections to the new pipe and installing a new manhole within property No58 at the 90deg turn on the line NB/03 to NB/04 will be required. The new pipe from NB/03 to NB/04 will be extended to the new manhole position during the above pipe-cracking process.

If the building line is to extend, the total cost for the new sewer pipe and a manhole is estimated at \$5,800 (+GST) plus all easement and compensation costs. Instant Scaffolds will be required to pay for this work as a condition of their Development Approval if they wish to build to the boundary line. It will also be a condition of the Approval that the developer should negotiate directly with the adjacent property owners with regards approval and compensation.

**Pipe NB/04 to NB/05 (150dia concrete, length 80M, installed 1950, expected age 60yrs) Refer Appendix A**

Council, in the past has allowed this pipe to be built over by both 5-15, 17, 19 and 21 Pearl St. CCTV show it is severely damaged under No17. The pipe is deformed and the invert of pipe is missing with sewage likely to be leaching into the ground. This needs to be replaced. The best method is pipe-cracking with individual connections to properties being reconnected. This is a significant problem where the pipe runs under buildings.

Access is required at both manholes, something that will be a greater problem to Instant Scaffolds and inconvenience to Council work once the development is underway or completed. It is noted that it is intended to include conditions in the Planning Permit requiring the developer to liaise with Council so that Council works can be programmed to coincide with demolition. Once the existing warehouse walls are removed access for pipe-cracking work will be much simpler.

Total cost for this work is estimated at \$62,500 (+GST). Liability for costs cannot be borne by other parties as Council has allowed the pipes to be built over. Therefore the full cost including all liaison with property owners and reconnection costs should be funded by Council.

In order to consider and make a decision on the Development Application, Council needs to determine the liability of necessary works and, if Council expenditure is involved, approve the expenditure of those funds. It is only in this way that the developer will have certainty on the progress of the development. Council will also be able to co-ordinate their own works around the building works so that access is maintained for pipe-cracking.

In discussions with the developer, an anticipated program of building commencing in July 2006 is planned. This means that the required Council works would need to commence in June or early July. It is suggested that the pipe-cracking contract could be tendered and awarded in June with work to commence early in July. In this way the budget for Council's work could be included in the 2006-2007 Capital Works program. It is worthy of note that sewer asset replacement modelling using ACEAM's "Predictor" software has scheduled the pipes between manholes NB/03 and NB/05 to be replaced in 2008-2009.

### **Consultations:**

General Manager, Frank Pearce  
Assistant Development Engineer, Russell Grierson  
Hydraulics Project Officer, Michael Burdon  
Tony Whitford, Instant Scaffolds Pty Ltd

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Current Year	Nil cost
Next Year	Total cost for all sewer works associated with the project is estimated at \$104,500 (+GST). However the developer will have a condition placed on any approval that he contributes \$5,800 (or whatever costs are incurred by Council for doing the works) plus any legal and surveying costs associated with creating an easement over the new pipe serving 58, 59 and 60 Derwent Park Rd.
Future Years	Nil cost

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Council has made contact with all residents or businesses affected by the works and has, or will provide written notice that they will be using powers under the Sewers and Drains Act 1954 to do the works. There has been one objection received to date through solicitors. This will be addressed, as will any other concerns that arise.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that:

- (a) Council approve the commitment to allocate a total of \$104,500 in the 2006-2007 financial year to replace sewer pipes from manholes NB/03 to NB/05 at 5-15 Pearl Street.
- (b) A condition be placed on the Planning Permit for the development of 5-15 Pearl Street that if the warehouse is extended to the boundary the developer pays Council a sum of \$5,800 or Council's costs (whichever is the greater) for replacement of the sewer pipe serving 58, 60 and 62 Derwent Park Road including cost of manholes. Costs for any compensation, survey and legal costs for the creation of an easement over this new pipe and any compensation would also be borne by the developer.

**Resolution:**



# **SOCIAL**

---

## 10. LEASE OF 408 MAIN ROAD, GLENORCHY

---

Author: Manager – Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

Qualified Person: Manager – Community Development (Narelle Calphy)

File Reference: 408 Main Road

### **Community Plan Reference:**

- 3.2.1 Maintain a range of quality, affordable services needed by the community.
- 3.2.8 Increase the provision of services to deal with critical social issues such as alcohol and other drugs and homelessness.
- 3.2.9 Increase family mediation and relationship counselling services to the City.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

As per Community Plan references.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To propose that the Council extend the lease of 406-408 Main Road Glenorchy to Anglicare Tasmania for a further term.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

Anglicare Tasmania has leased the premises situate at 406-408 Main Road Glenorchy from Council since August 2001.

Council entered into the initial agreement with Anglicare regarding the lease of these premises following the external review of Council's Youth Program in 2000 and the development of the partnership agreement between Council and the State Government in relation to the development of the PULSE Youth Health Centre. As an outcome of these processes, Council resolved to cease its direct delivery of youth services from 406-408 Main Road and to enter into a contract with Anglicare Tasmania for the delivery of specific youth and family services from the building situate at 406-408 Main Road for an initial period of 2 years with the option of a further 2 years extension. The conditions of the original lease were that the premises would be provided at no rental costs to the provider, with Council providing a one off payment to Anglicare of \$20,000 for building modifications.

The decision by Council to lease the premises at 406-408 Main Road Glenorchy to Anglicare was based on the findings of several research reports undertaken at the time including the reviews of Childrens and Youth Services and the development of the community safety strategy. These reports highlighted the fact that the Glenorchy Local Government area was significantly under resourced in relation to government and non government services compared to areas of similar geographic and demographic profile.

As a result of Council's decision to lease the premises at 406-408 Main Road Glenorchy to Anglicare, the following services are available within the City:

- Anglicare Tenancy Support which provides support to people over 25 to develop skills to maintain their tenancy/accommodation.
- Glenorchy Illicit Drug Service (GIDS) which provides counselling, education, advocacy and support to young people and their families at risk of or experiencing issues related to illicit drug use.
- ACCESS which provides case management to support people to find and maintain accommodation. Emergency relief, brokerage funds and emergency and transitional housing are provided through the ACCESS program.
- Staying Put which provides tenancy support to young people aged 16-19 years who are accessing their first tenancy.

In addition to these four services which are permanently located at 406-408 Main Road, the following visiting services are provided at the premises:

- Break Even support and counselling service for individuals and their families experiencing difficulty with gambling.
- Financial counselling which provides support for people experiencing financial difficulties.
- Family relationship counselling.
- Options mediation and family therapy program which targets families where there are issues relating to young people aged 12-25 and where there is a risk of homelessness for the young people.
- Personal support program and disability employment services.

The provision of these sessional services was a requirement of the lease agreement between Council and Anglicare.

An additional requirement of the lease agreement was the provision by Anglicare of a quarterly report in relation to a number of key performance indicators. These indicators were:

- Level of awareness of Anglicare programs and their purpose throughout the community.
- Community perception of the program.
- Number of programs and projects operating from the Centre.
- Level of use of services operating from the Centre.
- Level of satisfaction with services.
- Level of referrals to other services.
- Level of participation in service provider networks and associated working groups such as YANG and GAIN.
- Provision of 2-8 hours per week of specified sessional services.
- Level of Anglicare and non Anglicare sessional service provision provided at the Centre.
- Future service options.

These reports have been provided to the Manager Community Development on a quarterly basis for the life of the lease. The report for the quarter October – December 2005 showed that approximately 950 clients accessed the services provided by Anglicare at 406-408 Main Road, Glenorchy.

Through the presence of Anglicare at 406-408 Main Road, the Glenorchy Local Government has achieved a significant increase in the availability of support services to meet the needs of residents in the City.

In addition, the continued presence of Anglicare in Glenorchy will enable further services to be delivered within the City to meet identified service gaps. By way of example, Council has recently provided support to Anglicare in the development of a tender for the provision of JPET services within Glenorchy. JPET or Job Placement Employment and Training targets young people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and supports those young people into employment or further education and training. The lack of JPET services in Glenorchy has been an identified need for a number of years and the option of Anglicare delivering this service in Glenorchy would see a significant increase in the support available to young people in Glenorchy who are in the target group for this program.

Anglicare have formally approached Council in regard to extending the lease of 406-408 Main Road for a further term. A copy of the letter from Chris Jones, CEO, Anglicare Tasmania is attached ([Attachment 1](#)). In discussions with Chris Jones, Council's policy in regard to Leases and Licences was raised in relation to Charitable Organisations. Statement 6 of that policy indicates that "where the tenant is a charitable organisation and the premises are being used for non commercial purposes to the benefit of the community, rental to be determined at 5% of the capital value of the premises with the tenant paying normal Council rates will apply to a charity as well as fire insurance".

### **Consultations:**

Chris Jones, CEO, Anglicare Tasmania  
Property Co-ordinator

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Council currently receives no income from the lease of the property at 406-408 Main Road.

In the next financial year and subsequent years, income will be received in accordance with the formula for rental determination for charitable organisations leasing Council buildings.

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Community awareness of the presence of Anglicare in Glenorchy is strong. The utilisation rates of services offered at 406-408 Main Road Glenorchy have continued to grow since 2001 and Anglicare is a key partner agency in a number of Council initiatives including YANG, GAIN, Chance on Main to name but a few.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Council agree to extend the lease of the property situate at 406-408 Main Road Glenorchy to Anglicare Tasmania for an initial term of 2 years with an option to take one further term of 2 years commencing at the expiration of the initial term of the lease.
- (b) That the rental be in accordance with Council's Leases and Licences Policy for Charitable Organisations.
- (c) That the lease agreement requires 6 monthly written reports by Anglicare Tasmania addressing the performance indicators specified in the lease with these performance indicators being the same as those specified in the 2001 lease.

**Resolution:**

---

## 11. REVIEW OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES POLICIES

---

Author: Coordinator Children's Services (Cindy Woolley)

Qualified Person: Acting Manager Community Development (Cindy Woolley)

File Reference: 01875

### **Community Plan Reference:**

4.1.3 - Ensure the identification, research and development of children's services within the city including the availability of a diverse range of child care options.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

3.2.3 – Ensure Council's Early Childhood Long Day Care, Outside School Hours Care and Family Day Care programs are delivered at the highest quality in accordance with the relevant State Licensing requirements.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To present to Council reviewed Children's Services policies as well as two additional policies, Privacy policy and Fundraising policy.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

Below is a list of the reviewed Children's Services policies. Reviewed but un-changed policies are included in Attachment (1). Changes have been made to five of the policies and these are indicated using track changes in Attachments (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6). The changes reflect either changes in terminology, current/future practice or legislation. The two new policies Privacy policy and the Fundraising policy are Attachments (7) and (8).

Due to the volume of policies I invite Aldermen who wish to bring to the authors attention any necessary changes to the grammar or spelling in any of the policies to please do so prior to the Council meeting by contacting the Coordinator Children's Services directly.

### **Children's Services reviewed policies – No changes (Attachment 1)**

Infectious Diseases

### **Children's Services reviewed policies – Alterations (Attachments 2,3,4,5,6)**

Management of Asthma in Children  
 Involvement  
 Gender Equity  
 Administration of Medication  
 Grounds Maintenance

**Management of Asthma (Attachment 2):** This policy has been altered to reflect the change in legislation in relation to the administration of Asthma medications, which child care services now adhere to.

**Involvement (Attachment 3):** This policy combines the previous Inclusion of children with additional needs policy and the Multicultural policy. The change reflects Child Care Connections belief that **all** children should be involved in child care. It also reflects the National Child Care and Accreditation Council Quality Practice Guide 2005.

The remaining policies in this category have been altered to reflect changes in terminology and current and future practice.

### **Children's Services – Newly developed policies (Attachment 7, 8)**

Privacy

Fundraising

**Privacy (Attachment 7):** The addition of this policy is in order to adhere with the Privacy Act, which requires Children's Services to have a policy due to the personal nature of the information gathered from families in order to provide care for children.

**Fundraising (Attachment 8):** Child Care Connections Services engage in regular fundraising activities and this policy captures the essence of why we fundraise and provides procedures and guidelines for following when fundraising.

### **Consultations:**

The Children's Services management team lead the consultation process for this review. It was a timely process involving all children's services staff, family day care carers and the necessary internal departments. All current parents and families using Child Care Connections Services as well as further consultation with a sample group of parents from each Child Care Connection Service. The National Child Care and Accreditation Council and State Licensing literature and authorities. Early Childhood Australia literature and any relevant external professional/s including the TCCI, State Public Health Clinician, the Head of Paediatrics at the Tasmanian University.

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

There are no anticipated Human Resource, Risk Management or Financial implications.

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

As indicated previously extensive consultation has occurred with the current families using Child Care Connections Services. There are no anticipated public relations implications.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Council adopt the reviewed but un-changed Children's Services policy Infectious Diseases.
- (b) That Council adopt the proposed changes to the reviewed policies Administration of Medication, Management of Asthma in Children, Grounds Maintenance, Gender Equity and Involvement.
- (c) That Council adopt the newly developed policies Privacy and Fundraising.

**Resolution:**



---

## 12. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW

---

Author: Manager - Environment Planning and Development / Local Coordinator Emergency Services (Mr. G. French)

Qualified Person: Manager - Environment Planning and Development / Local Coordinator Emergency Services (Mr. G. French)

File Reference: 04486

### **Community Plan Reference:**

2.2.9 Develop and implement risk management strategies for Glenorchy infrastructure.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

C3.1.10 Maintain and improve Emergency Management Strategies. Maintain a current Emergency Management Plan through involvement with the Emergency Management Committee and staff Emergency Management Working Group.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To report on the review process undertaken to develop a new Emergency Management Plan for Glenorchy and to gain Council's endorsement of the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan (GEMP).

### **Proposal In Detail:**

Under the requirements of the Emergency Services Act 1976, Council is required to have an Emergency Management Plan. The current Emergency Management Plan was developed in 1999 and in normal circumstances is to be reviewed every two years. However the State Government undertook a major project titled the Tasmanian Emergency Risk Management (TERM) Project over a period of two and a half years and during that period suspended the necessary review process of municipal plans until the completion of the TERM Project.

Municipal Emergency Management Plans are now required to include the outcomes of the TERM Project and ensure that emergency management is based on the risk management principles of the Australian/New Zealand Standard Risk Management AS/NZS 4360:1999.

Council engaged GMCS Consulting to assist with the review of the existing Emergency Management Plan and in consultation with relevant emergency services stakeholders, prepare the documentation required to meet the new guidelines. This process has resulted in a complete rewrite of the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan, and is included in the agenda papers as a [separate document](#).

The GEMP outlines roles in emergency management and the various structures that may be involved in an event. It specifically details Council's role in an emergency event and depending on the incident, how Council may assist other agencies or how other agencies may assist Council in managing an event.

The GEMP outlines the establishment of coordination centres and the administration of such centres, together with documenting the importance of maintaining an emergency capability.

Over the past ten years Council has developed a number of operating procedures based on previous experiences and these have been incorporated in the GEMP.

Council's Emergency Management Committee met in November 2005 and endorsed "in-principle" the draft plan subject to any additional final comments coming back from the relevant emergency services. The author of this report has now finalised the GEMP.

**Consultations:**

Glenorchy Emergency Management Committee  
CMT  
Council's staff Emergency Management Working Group

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Council currently has an Emergency Management Plan and this revised version has no greater resource implications than the current plan.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

An Emergency Management Plan is a statutory requirement on all Councils, with the content and format required to be approved by the Director of Emergency Services.

No public consultation has been undertaken during this process, apart from input of the relevant emergency services personnel.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Council endorse the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan 2006.
- (b) That the Glenorchy Emergency Management Plan 2006 be submitted to the Director of Emergency Services for approval.

**Resolution:**

# ECONOMIC

---

## **13. REFORMATION OF COUNCIL PARKING STRATEGY WORKING GROUP**

---

Author: Chief Parking Officer (Kevon Griffith)

Qualified Person: Traffic Engineer (Angela Moore)

File Reference: 01753

### **Community Plan Reference:**

- 2.2.1 Develop strategies to improve and extend Council's transport infrastructure to balance the needs of all users and stakeholders in line with Council's strategic and land-use planning framework.
- 2.2.4 Ensure Glenorchy infrastructure does not create barriers to people accessing the community.
- 2.2.13 Continued development and implementation of local area traffic management plans.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

- C.4.2.7 Review and implement the Council Parking Strategy.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To elect aldermanic representation to a Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy working group.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

#### **Background:**

The *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy Stage 1* was approved by Council on 23rd March 1998. In a further report to Council on 10th January 2000, the Manager of Roads and Recreation (Andrew Lawrence) requested Council approval to form a working group to review the focus of the Parking Strategy and to develop short, medium and long term action plans. Council resolved that a working group be formed and called for expressions of interest for three aldermen to join the working group. From six nominations, three aldermen were selected by Council on 24th January 2000 to join the working group.

The Working Group comprised;

- The General Manager (David Lovell)
- The Manager of Roads & Recreation (Andrew Lawrence)
- An external Commercial Development Consultant (Andrew Tilt)
- Three Aldermen (S. Slade, L. Bradley & A. Shipley)
- Two town planners (E. Benz & M. Bresnehan)
- The Development Engineer ( P. Clark)
- The Chief Parking Officer ( K. Griffith)

At the time the working group was formed, Council did not have an incumbent Traffic Engineer. The Manager of Roads and Recreation (Andrew Lawrence) instigated the formation of the group and participated as a group member in lieu of an incumbent in that position.

The Working Group convened on two occasions and developed a number of short to medium term actions. In a report to Council on 15th May 2000, the General Manager (David Lovell) presented the changes and planned actions. Council resolved that the changes be adopted and the Strategy be reviewed annually through reporting on the implementation of the action plans.

In a reporting brief to Council on 13th December 2000, The Manager of Roads and Recreation (Andrew Lawrence) reported on the action plan progress. One of the action plan objectives was to develop a 'communication and consultation' plan to convey the proposed changes to the community. The main issue regarded as likely to be contentious at that time, being the introduction of 'pay and display' voucher parking in some of the long term car parks. It was proposed that a further report to Council be presented in January 2001.

The original working group never reconvened after David Lovell's resignation and since then, a number of the original officers and aldermen have also left Council. No further review of the Parking Strategy has been undertaken since the working group ceased to function after December 2000.

A report to Council on 27th August 2001 was presented by Council's Traffic Engineer (Keith Midson) to report on the status of the Parking Strategy. That report detailed three of the identified actions that had not been implemented at the time, namely;

1. Voucher parking in commuter car parks.
2. Reduction of time restricted parking penalties from \$35 to \$20.
3. Increased cash in lieu for new developments.

Council resolved to;

1. Rescind the decision to implement voucher parking in commuter car parks.
2. Adopt the reduction of time restricted parking penalties from \$35 to \$20.
3. Increase the cash in lieu contributions for new developments for under supply of parking from \$2,000 to \$2,500 per parking space.

This was the last Council Resolution relevant to the *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy Stage 1 (Glenorchy)*.

A *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy Stage 2 (Moonah)* exists in draft form but has yet to be submitted for adoption by Council.

**Proposal:**

It is felt that a new working group should be formed, with departmental and Council representation, to continue to review and develop the *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy Stage 1 (Glenorchy)* and *Stage 2 (Moonah)*. It would also be opportune to align the strategies with the recommendations of the 'Main Road Corridor Master Plan' (also under review) and in view of existing and proposed significant developments in the area.

The *Stage 2 Moonah* strategy should be reviewed and prepared to a final draft stage for adoption by Council. Both strategies should also be aligned with the Community and Strategic Plans.

It is suggested that a new working group comprise the following officers and two Aldermen.

The General Manager (Frank Pearce)  
The Traffic Engineer (Angela Moore)  
The Chief Parking Officer (Kevon Griffith)  
The Coordinator Planning Services (Tony McMullen)  
The Development Engineer (Phil Clark)  
The Economic Development Coordinator (John Jury)  
Two Aldermen

The designated Council officers above, have agreed to join the working group. Expressions of interest are now sought from two Aldermen willing to represent Council on the working group.

It is suggested that the working group convene at least once a month initially, until the following outcomes are achieved;

- (a) Stage 1 (Glenorchy) has been fully reviewed and recommended amendments and action plans are submitted to and approved by Council.
- (b) Stage 2 (Moonah) is reviewed and developed to a final draft and is adopted by Council including any action plans.
- (c) The extent of further *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategies* is determined i.e. should Derwent Park and/or Claremont be included?
- (d) A further review date is agreed to for the ongoing development of the parking strategy.

Consultation with affected user groups should be undertaken as and when required as part of the review process. Consultation may include but not be limited to, the GCC Access Committee, Taxi Operators Association, precinct committees, business associations, transport operators etc..

**Consultations:**

CMT

Staff nominated to the Working Group

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Minimal Human Resource implications except for staff time in attending Working Group meetings. Updating of the *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy* is part of the job description for both the Traffic Engineer and Chief Parking Officer.

There may be financial implications resulting from the implementation of the strategies.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

No Community Consultation has been undertaken regarding the reformation of the Parking Working Group. However, in reviewing the *Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy* relevant user groups will be consulted, including (but not limited to):-

- The Access Committee
- Taxi operators
- Precinct committees
- Business organisations
- Transport operators etc.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Council approve the reformation of the Commercial Precincts Parking Strategy working group.
- (b) That expressions of interest be invited from Aldermen wishing to participate on the working group to be lodged with the General Manager by the 24th February 2006 and that the selection of two aldermanic representatives be decided at the next Council meeting.

**Resolution:**

# ENVIRONMENT



---

## 14. BERRIEDALE CARAVAN PARK – PERMANENT RESIDENTS

---

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

File Reference: 01427

### **Community Plan Reference:**

An Exciting Rewarding Lifestyle

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

Continue to plan and improve public facilities and activities.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider alternative options for existing permanent residents at the Berriedale Caravan Park.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

At its meeting on 23 December 2003 Council considered the renewal of the lease for the Treasure Island Caravan Park at Berriedale. Council's decision included, among other things, "That the provision of the lease be subject to prohibition of permanent tenants (tenants occupying the site for more than 6 months) within 12 months of signing the new lease."

The proposal to renew the lease was advertised in accordance with the "public land" requirements of the *Local Government Act 1993* and Council formally resolved to renew the lease at its meeting on 15 March 2004.

Following detailed negotiations with the lessee, the lease was signed in December 2004. The lessee wrote to permanent residents in January 2006 giving them notice that they needed to vacate their sites by 18 March 2006.

Aldermen would be aware that a number of the permanent residents have since voiced their concern and there has been considerable media interest including reports in the Mercury and on A Current Affair.

A deputation of 4 permanent residents came to see me on Monday 23 January. They were concerned that:

- Glenorchy City Council was reacting to circumstances in another municipality – i.e. the closure of the Sandy Bay Caravan Park;
- they had been given such short notice to vacate;
- in one instance the resident had been allowed to move in as a permanent since the Council decision;

- they would be unable to get a reasonable price for their vans given that everyone would know that they had no choice but to sell up;
- there are two people employed by the Caravan Park who are permanent residents and who don't have to move out – where's the equity?
- they would be unable to generate the cash needed for a bond for rental accommodation and some may need some form of financial assistance – would Council provide it, because they can't get it from other sources?

I indicated that:

- while the Sandy Bay closure was one aspect of the Council decision, it was also in response to the Bass Strait ferries and the increased number of vans needing accommodation in Hobart, with an opportunity for Glenorchy to increase its tourism share;
- it was unfortunate that they hadn't been given earlier notice and Council would be prepared to allow the lessee to extend his time frame if that was needed for the residents to sell up and find alternative accommodation – while noting that it was up to the lessee whether he actually extended the time. I undertook that we would contact the lessee and inform him of this;
- if financial support were to be considered by Council it would have to be on an individual basis and a formal submission would be required to demonstrate need, including inability to access support through other channels;

I also informed them of a number of accommodation options that might be available.

The Mayor has visited the caravan park, spoken to a number of the permanent residents and has issued the attached letter ([Attachment 1](#)) which indicates that she has requested a report to Council to review the terms of the caravan park lease in the hope that Council can be flexible with current long-term residents, while still pursuing our long-term goal.

The attached *Caravan Park Issues Paper* ([Attachment 2](#)) prepared by Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading in December 2005 provides additional background information on the general issue of permanent residency in caravan parks.

An alternative to Council's December 2003 decision to have no permanent residents within 12 months of signing the lease could be to phase out permanent residency by:

- (a) not allowing the lessee to take on any additional permanent residents;
- (b) allowing the existing permanent tenants to remain for as long as they wish (subject to the normal commercial and tenancy relationships between the lessee and the residents), and when they leave;
- (c) not allowing them to be replaced by other permanent residents.

### **Consultations:**

Mayor Taylor  
Treasure Island Caravan Park lessee

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Not applicable

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Council has already faced considerable negative publicity as a result of the permanent residents receiving notice to vacate the Treasure Island Caravan Park. A phased out approach should alleviate most of the concerns that have been raised by the permanent residents and the media.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Council reiterates its intention that the Treasure Island Caravan Park at Berriedale be exclusively available for short term stays.
- (b) That the lessee of the Treasure Island Caravan Park be advised that Council wishes to amend the conditions of the lease to phase out permanent residency at the caravan park by:
  - i. not allowing the lessee to take on any additional permanent residents;
  - ii. allowing the existing permanent tenants to remain subject to the normal commercial and tenancy relationships between the lessee and the residents; and when they leave
  - iii. not allowing them to be replaced by other permanent residents.

**Resolution:**

# ORGANISATION

---

## 15. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

---

Authors: Corporate Accountant (Kim Wiggins)

Qualified Person: Corporate Accountant (Kim Wiggins)

File Reference: 00690

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Operational Plan Reference:**

Strategy 11.3.2 – Ensure Council’s strategic and operational finances are managed effectively and efficiently.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To present the ‘Financial Business and Operating Systems November 2005’ report to Council for information and to note the Management comments to the issues raised by KPMG.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

During November 2005, KPMG as Council’s internal auditor conducted this audit in accordance with their contract with Council. The report presented forms part of the Internal Audit Plan for 2005/06. The report contains detailed discussion of the material findings of the audit, ‘[Attachment 1](#)’, with other more minor findings presented in a summary form.

Council have provided responses to KPMG in respect to their recommendations and these responses are included for material issues. KPMG are satisfied that if the proposed actions are appropriately implemented they will adequately resolve their concerns.

Should the full details of the minor issues and associated proposed actions be required, the Management Report is available on request from the General Manager.

Representatives from KPMG will be in attendance at the Council meeting.

### **Consultations:**

Various Council Staff  
KPMG  
CMT

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Current Year

Next Year

Future Years

The issues raised by KPMG, coupled with the related management comments and actions will result in improvements to the existing financial procedures and processes thereby mitigating potential risk areas.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

The audit is an internal matter and implementation of KPMG's recommendations should result in an improvement to Council's internal procedures and processes. There is no perceived need for Council to consult with the community on these issues.

**Recommendation:**

That the 'Financial Business and Operating Systems November 2005' report be received, and the management comments on the issues raised therein be noted.

**Resolution:**

---

## 16. MONTHLY FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE STATISTICS

---

Author: Corporate Accountant (Mr Kim Wiggins)

Qualified Person: Corporate Accountant (Mr Kim Wiggins)

File Reference: 00685

### **Community Plan Reference:**

Not mentioned specifically.

### **Strategic or Operational Plan Reference:**

These performance statistics are provided to Council in accordance with Strategy 11.3.1. which is to maintain and improve financial reporting to Council and staff.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To present the financial performance statistics as at the end of December 2005 for Aldermen's information.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

Each month the financial performance statistics are presented to Council for information. The indicators cover income, capital and operating expenses by Department, as well as giving specific data on the staffing, human resources, insurance, water consumption and the cash flow of Council.

The indicators for December 2005 are attached ("[Attachment 1](#)") along with Appendix B ("[Attachment 2](#)"). This appendix outlines expected variances within the Capital Works program this financial year.

As usual, the traffic lights indicate the degree of concern that the Corporate Management Team (CMT) has placed on each chart, and brief explanatory information is provided against the charts themselves.

This month there are seven yellow lights, which have been identified in Attachment 1. They all relate to potential year end underspends in Capital.

### **Consultations:**

Relevant Corporate Services Staff.  
Corporate Management Team.

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Stated within the December Monthly Performance Statistics Report.

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

None at this point.

### **Recommendation:**

- (a) That the information provided by the Monthly Financial Performance Statistics for December 2005 be accepted.

**Resolution:**



---

## **17. HEALTH AND SAFETY ASSESSMENTS OF BUILDINGS USED BY SPORTING CLUBS AND COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS – OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT**

---

Author: Acting Coordinator Building and Plumbing Services  
(Mr. T. Bellette)

Qualified Person: Acting Coordinator Building and Plumbing Services  
(Mr. T. Bellette)

File Reference: 04143

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Operational Plan Reference:**

The strategic and operational plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

Council at its meeting of 18 July 2005 requested that a report be prepared on options in which the Glenorchy City Council can assist community organisations and sporting clubs with the newly introduced annual health and safety assessments of buildings.

This report considers the options and issues of such a proposal.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

#### **Background**

With the introduction of the Building Act 2000, on July 1<sup>st</sup> 2004, a requirement for all buildings (except single dwellings and outbuildings) to undertake annual maintenance of “essential health and safety features” was introduced. As part of this process it is a requirement that all existing buildings be inspected (by a suitably qualified person – generally a Building Surveyor) and that a maintenance schedule be developed for the building. An annual maintenance certificate must then be displayed, and this certificate must certify that the matters detailed on the maintenance schedule have been appropriately maintained. The first annual maintenance certificate must be displayed by July 14<sup>th</sup> 2006. It is likely that for the vast majority of buildings that once the initial inspection is undertaken and the maintenance schedule developed that there will be no future requirement for the involvement of a Building Surveyor.

Shortly after the introduction of the Building Act, Council resolved at its meeting of 2nd August 2004, that it would no longer undertake “direct” building surveying services. Thus, when Building Permit applications are submitted to Council the plans have to have been certified by a “private” Building Surveyor.

Apart from inspections of building work in relation to “existing files”, the only Building Surveying duties being undertaken by Council’s Building and Plumbing Office is the health and safety inspections of Council owned buildings and then the development of the relevant maintenance schedules.

Council has requested that a report be prepared on the possible options for assisting community organisations and sporting clubs with their requirements in regards to the health and safety assessments of buildings.

### **What are other Councils doing?**

Discussions have been held with staff from all Councils within the Hobart metropolitan region as to how they are addressing the issue of health and safety inspections of buildings. Virtually all have some role in relation to Council owned buildings, or buildings for which Council has responsibility, but for all other buildings the majority are having no involvement except for providing advice to building owners as to how they should address this matter. The two exceptions are Kingborough Council and Derwent Valley Council.

Kingborough Council is undertaking health and safety inspections at commercial rates, and this includes community and sporting organisations (if they so request). No reductions in the price of this service are provided; except that Council buildings are done at “no-charge”. Kingborough also operate a separate “community fund” so that community and sporting groups can apply to Council for funding to assist in building fees that they may have to pay. It is then up to the specific club or organisation as to whether they use Council’s building surveying service or someone from the private sector.

Derwent Valley Council indicated that formally that they would not be providing a health and safety inspection service, except for Council buildings. However, informally they expect that there may be some requests from small organisations (eg: sporting clubs and community halls) to undertake such work and they intend to deal with these as they arise. They advised that assuming the numbers are small, and with private Building Surveyors unlikely to be interested in these small jobs, then they will likely assist the relevant organisations by providing the service.

All Councils indicated that they would be providing advice to building owners (which would include community organisations and clubs) to assist them in addressing this issue.

### **Competition Issues**

Competition issues are important in relation to the provision of Building Surveying services. Under competition policy the Council has an obligation to ensure that where it is in competition for its services that it charges an appropriate fee that takes into account the “real costs”. Kingborough Council has addressed this by charging for all services, and then in other areas Council has the ability to assist organisations in meeting their costs, whether they use Council’s services or those of the private sector.

The argument could be made that Building Surveyors are unlikely to be interested in the small type work that will be involved with community and sporting organisations, however the other view could be that as members of the community they may well be prepared to take on such work.

### **What Forms of Assistance Could Council Provide?**

A brochure for distribution to affected building owners is currently being prepared by BSR (Building Standards and Regulations – State Government), and Local Government has had input into this document. It will detail the process, and will include a flowchart for building owners to use to determine whether or not they need to engage a Building Surveyor. Most Councils are intending to either distribute this document or make it available, to building owners.

Because Council has retained a qualified Building Surveyor it is in a position to provide advice, and this could involve an initial inspection of the facilities to give guidance to the relevant club or organisation. There is no reason why this could not be done to assist the relevant organisations to determine whether or not they will need to engage a Building Surveyor or not.

### **Temporary Structures**

Since Council raised this matter another issue relating to building surveying services and Council staff has arisen, and it is prudent to discuss it in the context of this report. This relates to the issue of temporary structures at public events, and the need for them to be certified by a Building Surveyor. In many cases these events are local fairs, regattas, etc. that are run by volunteer committees, with all funds raised being used for community purposes. The issue arises as to whether Council, whilst employing qualified Building Surveyor/s should assist such organisations to get the necessary approvals, or whether they should be required to engage private Building Surveyors, and then pay accordingly for their services. This issue has particularly arisen in relation to the Glenorchy Regatta/Dad's Day Out, which is a combined event, one a Council sponsored event, and one not, and both involving the use of temporary structures requiring approval.

### **Consultations:**

Hobart Metropolitan Councils  
CMT  
Building Standards and Regulations

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

To implement the recommendations will not incur any additional expense or liability. To provide a direct building surveying service to community and sporting organisations exposes Council to liability either from private building surveyors claiming that Council is breaching competition principles, or from organisations/building owners claiming professional liability against advice provided by Council.

In addition Council does not have the resources to provide this service to the community.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Council has not undertaken the role of providing this service to the private sector in the past as it is a relatively new requirement, therefore Council is not discontinuing a service. It should be conveyed to the community that this new legislative requirement forms a cost against the running of their operations.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That whilst Council employs qualified Building Surveyors, it provide a maintenance schedule and annual maintenance certificate for Council owned buildings.
- (b) That whilst Council employs qualified Building Surveyors, it provide the necessary documentation for approvals of Temporary Structures for events organised by the Glenorchy City Council.
- (c) That whilst Council employs a qualified Building Surveyor, it provides general advice to the community, including sporting and community organisations, on what those organisations need to do to comply with the requirements of the Building Act 2000. This advice does not include providing maintenance schedules and annual maintenance certificates.

**Resolution:**

---

## 18. ALDERMEN'S IT POLICY

---

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

File Reference: 00061

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider the proposed "Aldermen's Information Technology & Computer Services Usage Policy".

### **Proposal In Detail:**

The proposed policy "34-2 Aldermen's Information Technology & Computer Services Usage Policy" was presented to Council at its meetings of 28th November 2005 and 9th January 2006.

Aldermen at those meetings requested a number of changes to the proposed policy. Those changes have been made and the policy is now re-submitted as [Attachment 1](#) for Council's consideration.

A simple acknowledgement statement has been added to the policy in preference to the requirement for Aldermen to sign a separate agreement. Aldermen will be required to sign this statement and return it to the General Manager in order to be given access to Council's computer services.

### **Consultations:**

IT Co-ordinator (Rolf Miezeitis)

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Compliance with the policy by Aldermen will reduce some of the areas of risk associated with Council's computer services.

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

That policy “34-2 Aldermen’s Information Technology & Computer Services Usage Policy” be endorsed.

**Resolution:**

---

## 19. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

---

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

File Reference: 04318

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider two Aldermanic appointments.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

At the Council meeting on 9 January 2006, Council resolved among other things:

- (a) That Aldermen, subject to their agreement, who nominated for appointment to Council Committees, Special Committees, Working Groups and Steering Committees and who were unsuccessful be offered appointment as proxies to the Council Committees, Special Committees, Working Groups and Steering Committees for which they nominated with the exception of the Land Use Planning Committee, the General Manager Performance Review Committee, the Safer Communities Committee and the Youth Taskforce;
- (b) That nominations be called from Aldermen to fill the vacant proxy positions on the Land Use Planning Committee, the Southern Waste Strategy Authority and the Claremont and Austins Ferry/Granton Precincts; and
- (c) That nominations be called from Aldermen to fill the vacant Aldermanic appointment to the Austins Ferry/Granton Precinct;

Nominations to fill those positions were called from Aldermen in a memorandum dated 11 January 2006, with nominations to close on 27 January 2006.

Ald Jones has nominated to fill proxy positions on all committees that he is eligible for, which includes the vacant proxy position on the Southern Waste Strategy Authority.

Ald Guy has requested that rather than be appointed to the Access Advisory Committee as an Aldermanic proxy, she be appointed to the Committee as a community representative ([Attachment 1](#)).

If Ald Jones is appointed to the Southern Waste Strategy Authority proxy position, the remaining vacant positions will be the vacant Aldermanic appointments to the Austins Ferry/Granton Precinct and the vacant proxy positions on the Land Use Planning Committee and the Claremont and Austins Ferry/Granton Precincts.

**Consultations:**

Not applicable.

**Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Not applicable.

**Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**

- (a) That Ald Guy be appointed to the Access Advisory Committee as a community representative.
- (b) That Ald Jones be appointed to the Council's vacant proxy position on the Southern Waste Strategy Authority.

**Resolution:**



---

## **20. RESIGNATION OF ALDERMAN BEN SLADE**

---

Author: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

Qualified Person: General Manager (Frank Pearce)

File Reference:

### **Community Plan Reference:**

This item discusses a corporate management/governance issue. Since the Community Plan is outwardly focussed, there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

The strategic and annual plans are based upon the Community Plan which is outwardly focussed. Since this item discusses a management/governance issue there is no applicable reference to this matter.

### **Reporting Brief:**

To formally advise the Council of the resignation of Alderman Ben Slade.

### **Proposal In Detail:**

Alderman Ben Slade provided me with a letter of resignation from his position as an Alderman of the Glenorchy City Council on 13th January 2006.

As required by section 47(3) of the Local Government Act 1993 I immediately informed the Electoral Commissioner of the resignation.

The Act also requires me to advise the Council – hence this report to the first available meeting of the Council. Because of the time period between receipt of the resignation and the Council meeting I also emailed/faxed advice of the resignation to Aldermen on 13th January 2006.

### **Consultations:**

None applicable.

### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

Not applicable.

### **Community Consultation and Public Relations Implications:**

Not applicable.

### **Recommendation:**

That the advice regarding the resignation of Alderman Ben Slade be noted.

### **Resolution:**

# **CLOSED TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

# ORGANISATION

---

## **21. CORPORATE SOFTWARE TENDER GCC309/2005**

---

**This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of Council by authority of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations* Section 15(2)(c).**

---

## **22. REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF GLENORCHY GAZETTE ADVERTISING CHARGES**

---

**This item is to be considered at a closed meeting of Council by authority of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations* Section 15(2)(h) and (j).**

---

## **23. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

---

---

## **24. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE (Closed)**

---

# **OPEN TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

---

## **25. NOTICES OF MOTIONS – QUESTIONS ON NOTICE / WITHOUT NOTICE**

---

---

### **25.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - ALDERMAN S. SLADE**

---

Author: Alderman S. Slade  
Qualified Person: General Manager (Mr. F. Pearce)  
File Reference: 00270

#### **Community Plan Reference:**

#### **Strategic or Annual Plan Reference:**

#### **Reporting Brief:**

To consider a notice of motion submitted by Alderman S. Slade in accordance with the requirements of Section 16 of *the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005*.

#### **Proposal In Detail:**

The following noticed of motion ([Attachment 1](#)) was submitted by Alderman Slade.

“That all current permanent residents of the Treasure Island Caravan Park at Berriedale be given assurance by Council, that if they choose, they can remain living there as permanent residents.”

#### **Consultations:**

#### **Human Resource / Financial and Risk Management Implications:**

#### **Recommendation:**

That all current permanent residents of the Treasure Island Caravan Park at Berriedale be given assurance by Council, that if they choose, they can remain living there as permanent residents.

#### **Resolution:**