

# MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CLARENCE CITY COUNCIL CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY, ON MONDAY 27 APRIL 2020

**HOUR CALLED:** 7.00pm

**PRESENT:** The meeting commenced at 7.00pm with the Mayor (Ald D C Chipman) in the Chair and with Aldermen:

B A Blomeley  
H Chong  
L Edmunds  
D Ewington  
R H James  
W Kennedy  
T Mulder  
J Peers  
S von Bertouch  
J Walker  
B Warren; present.

**1. APOLOGIES** Nil

**ORDER OF BUSINESS** Items 1 – 13

**IN ATTENDANCE**

General Manager  
(Mr I Nelson)

Chief Financial Officer  
(Ms M Coleman)

Group Manager Engineering Services  
(Mr R Graham)

Manager Health and Community Development  
(Mr J Toohey)

Manager City Planning  
(Mr R Lovell)

Manager Communication and Strategic Development  
(Mr A Saddler)

Executive Officer to the General Manager  
(Ms J Ellis)

The Meeting closed at 9.50pm.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Mayor made the following declaration:

*“I acknowledge the Tasmanian Aboriginal Community as the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today, and pay respect to elders, past and present”.*

The Mayor provided advice on arrangements on the conduct on tonight’s electronic Council Meeting.

**COUNCIL MEETING**  
**MONDAY 27 APRIL 2020**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1.	ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES .....	4
2.	***CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES .....	4
3.	MAYOR’S COMMUNICATION.....	4
4.	***COUNCIL WORKSHOPS.....	4
5.	DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS OF ALDERMAN OR CLOSE ASSOCIATE .....	5
6.	***TABLING OF PETITIONS .....	6
7.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	7
7.1	PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON NOTICE .....	7
7.2	ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE .....	7
7.3	ANSWERS TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .....	7
7.4	QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.....	7
8.	DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC .....	8
<b>9.</b>	<b>MOTIONS ON NOTICE</b>	
9.1	NOTICE OF MOTION - ALD MULDER UPDATE ROAD PRIORITIES LIST.....	9
10.	***REPORTS FROM OUTSIDE BODIES .....	10
	• COPPING REFUSE DISPOSAL SITE JOINT AUTHORITY	
	• TASMANIAN WATER CORPORATION	
	• GREATER HOBART COMMITTEE	
10.1	***REPORTS FROM SINGLE AND JOINT AUTHORITIES.....	10
10.2	***REPORTS FROM COUNCIL AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER REPRESENTATIVE BODIES .....	10
11.	REPORTS OF OFFICERS .....	11
11.1	***WEEKLY BRIEFING REPORTS .....	11
11.2	***DETERMINATION ON PETITIONS TABLED AT PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS .....	12

**11.3 PLANNING AUTHORITY MATTERS**

11.3.1	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001519 – 26 BLIGH STREET, ROSNY PARK - SIGNAGE .....	14
11.3.2	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2020/007334 – 15 TORRENS STREET, 12 AND 14 HENRY STREET, RICHMOND - 3 LOT SUBDIVISION AND BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT .....	17
11.3.3	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/005210 – 9 AND 11 ABERNANT WAY, CAMBRIDGE - WAREHOUSES (6 TENANCIES) .....	21
11.3.4	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001969 – 1 CREMORNE AVENUE, CREMORNE - 3 MULTIPLE DWELLINGS .....	24

**11.4 CUSTOMER SERVICE - NIL ITEMS****11.5 ASSET MANAGEMENT**

11.5.1	BRINKTOP BUSHLAND RESERVE ACTIVITY PLAN – 2020-2030 .....	29
--------	---	----

**11.6 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT - NIL ITEMS****11.7 GOVERNANCE**

11.7.1	CLARENCE KEEP CONNECTED INITIATIVE UPDATE .....	31
11.7.2	COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM ON HOLD AND REFOCUS TO COVID-19 ASSISTANCE .....	33
11.7.3	COVID-19 – CLARENCE CITY COUNCIL RESPONSE – STATUS REPORT .....	35
12.	ALDERMEN'S QUESTION TIME .....	36
12.1	QUESTIONS ON NOTICE .....	36
12.2	ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE .....	36
12.3	ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING .....	36
12.4	QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE .....	41
13.	CLOSED MEETING .....	42
13.1	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	

## 1. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

Refer to cover page.

## 2. \*\*\*CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### RECOMMENDATION:

That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 6 April 2020, as circulated, be taken as read and confirmed.

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Blomeley **SECONDED** Ald Chong

“That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 6 April 2020, as circulated, noting the following, Item 13 Ald Kennedy voted in favour of the Motion (did not abstain); Item 13.2 Ald Warren voted in favour of the Motion (did not abstain); and inclusion of the Bellerive Public Pier discussion in the Workshops conducted, be taken as read and confirmed”.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

## 3. MAYOR’S COMMUNICATION

The Mayor reported on the following meetings and attendances since the last Council Meeting:

- 8 April – Greater Hobart Mayors Forum;
- 15 April – Community Grants Program;
- 17 April – Budget Presentation Review;
- 21 April – Greater Hobart Mayors Forum; and
- 22 April – WebEx Meeting – Minister Shelton.

## 4. \*\*\*COUNCIL WORKSHOPS

In addition to the Aldermen’s Meeting Briefing (workshop) conducted on Friday immediately preceding the Council Meeting the following workshops were conducted by Council since its last ordinary Council Meeting:

PURPOSE	DATE
Budget Discussion	
Community Grants Program	
Clarence Keep Connected Update	
Review of Electronic Council Meeting	
Liquid Soap Dispensers – Public Toilets	20 April

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council notes the workshops conducted.

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Blomeley **SECONDED** Ald Chong

“That the Recommendation be adopted”.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS OF ALDERMAN OR CLOSE ASSOCIATE**

In accordance with Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 and Council’s adopted Code of Conduct, the Mayor requests Aldermen to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have a pecuniary interest (any pecuniary benefits or pecuniary detriment) or conflict of interest in any item on the Agenda.

**INTEREST DECLARED:** **NIL**

**6. \*\*\*TABLING OF PETITIONS**

Nil

**7. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Public question time at ordinary Council meetings will not exceed 15 minutes. An individual may ask questions at the meeting. Questions may be submitted to Council in writing on the Friday 10 days before the meeting or may be raised from the Public Gallery during this segment of the meeting.

The Chairman may request an Alderman or Council officer to answer a question. No debate is permitted on any questions or answers. Questions and answers are to be kept as brief as possible.

**7.1 PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

(Seven days before an ordinary Meeting, a member of the public may give written notice to the General Manager of a question to be asked at the meeting). A maximum of two questions may be submitted in writing before the meeting.

Nil.

**7.2 ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

The Mayor may address Questions on Notice submitted by members of the public.

Nil.

**7.3 ANSWERS TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

Nil.

**7.4 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

The Chairperson may invite members of the public present to ask questions without notice.

Questions are to relate to the activities of the Council. Questions without notice will be dependent on available time at the meeting.

Council Policy provides that the Chairperson may refuse to allow a question on notice to be listed or refuse to respond to a question put at a meeting without notice that relates to any item listed on the agenda for the Council meeting (note: this ground for refusal is in order to avoid any procedural fairness concerns arising in respect to any matter to be determined on the Council Meeting Agenda).

When dealing with Questions without Notice that require research and a more detailed response the Chairman may require that the question be put on notice and in writing. Wherever possible, answers will be provided at the next ordinary Council Meeting.



## **8. DEPUTATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

(In accordance with Regulation 38 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 and in accordance with Council Policy, deputation requests are invited to address the Meeting and make statements or deliver reports to Council)

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001969 – 1 CREMORNE AVENUE, CREMORNE  
– 3 MULTIPLE DWELLINGS**  
(REFER ITEM 11.3.4)

Mr Marc Hand provided a deputation regarding the above Development Application which was read out by the General Manager.

Mr Brian Bennett provided a deputation regarding the above Development Application which was read out by the General Manager.

## 9. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

### 9.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - ALD MULDER UPDATE ROAD PRIORITIES LIST

(File No 10-03-05)

In accordance with Notice given Ald Mulder intended to move the following Motion:

“That Clarence updates its list of road priorities to include:

- A. the east Richmond by-pass to link Brinktop Road to Colebrook Road; and
- B. upgrade to four lanes (two each way) the section of East Derwent Highway between Risdon Vale and the Bowen Bridge”.

With the Leave of the Meeting Ald Mulder **amended** his Motion and it was:

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Mulder **SECONDED** Ald James

“That Clarence updates its list of road priorities to include:

- A. the east Richmond by-pass to link Brinktop Road to Colebrook Road;
- B. upgrade to four lanes (two each way) the section of East Derwent Highway between Risdon Vale and the Bowen Bridge; and
- C. that this review of road priorities be listed for discussion in a May 2020 workshop to enable Alderman to consider these and other projects in the climate of post COVID19 economic stimulus spending by Federal and State Governments”.

The **MOTION** was **put** and **CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Kennedy  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald James

**10. \*\*\*REPORTS FROM OUTSIDE BODIES**

This agenda item is listed to facilitate the receipt of both informal and formal reporting from various outside bodies upon which Council has a representative involvement.

**10.1 \*\*\*REPORTS FROM SINGLE AND JOINT AUTHORITIES**

Provision is made for reports from Single and Joint Authorities if required.

Council is a participant in the following Single and Joint Authorities. These Authorities are required to provide quarterly reports to participating Councils, and these will be listed under this segment as and when received.

- **COPPING REFUSE DISPOSAL SITE JOINT AUTHORITY**

Representatives: Ald James Walker  
(Ald Luke Edmunds, Deputy Representative)

**Quarterly Reports**

March Quarterly Report pending.

**Representative Reporting**

- **TASWATER CORPORATION**

The Mayor advised that an Owners' Representative Group information session will be held on 28 April 2020.

- **GREATER HOBART COMMITTEE**

The Mayor advised that the Greater Hobart Committee is seeking a formal meeting in May and he will advise Aldermen when it will occur.

**10.2 \*\*\*REPORTS FROM COUNCIL AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER REPRESENTATIVE BODIES**

Nil.

**11. REPORTS OF OFFICERS****11.1 \*\*\*WEEKLY BRIEFING REPORTS**

The Weekly Briefing Reports of 6, 13 and 20 April 2020 have been circulated to Aldermen.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the information contained in the Weekly Briefing Reports of 6, 13 and 20 April 2020 be noted.

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Blomeley **SECONDED** Ald Chong

“That the Recommendation be adopted”.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**11.2 \*\*\*DETERMINATION ON PETITIONS TABLED AT PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS**

Nil.

### **11.3 PLANNING AUTHORITY MATTERS**

In accordance with Regulation 25 (1) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, the Mayor advises that the Council intends to act as a Planning Authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, to deal with the following items:

**11.3.1 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001519 – 26 BLIGH STREET, ROSNY PARK - SIGNAGE****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to consider the application made for a sign at 26 Bligh Street, Rosny Park.

**RELATION TO PLANNING PROVISIONS**

The land is zoned Central Business and subject to the Waterway and Coastal Protection Areas, Inundation Prone Areas, and Signs Codes under the Clarence Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (the Scheme). In accordance with the Scheme the proposal is a Discretionary development.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

The report on this item details the basis and reasons for the recommendation. Any alternative decision by Council will require a full statement of reasons in order to maintain the integrity of the Planning approval process and to comply with the requirements of the Judicial Review Act and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

Note: References to provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (the Act) are references to the former provisions of the Act as defined in Schedule 6 – Savings and Transitional Provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The former provisions apply to an interim planning scheme that was in force prior to the commencement day of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The commencement day was 17 December 2015.

Council is required to exercise a discretion within the statutory 42 day period which expires on 29 April 2020.

**CONSULTATION**

The proposal was advertised in accordance with statutory requirements and no representations were received.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- A. That the Development Application for Signage at 26 Bligh Street, Rosny Park (Cl Ref PDPLANPMTD-2019/001519) be refused for the following reason.
  - 1. The proposal does not comply with Clause E17.7.1 P1 (a), (b) and (d) as the sign is not integrated into the design of the premises or streetscape, it will dominate the streetscape, and will have an unreasonable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.
- B. That the details and conclusions included in the Associated Report be recorded as the reasons for Council's decision in respect of this matter.

/ Refer to Page 15 for Decision on this Item...

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001519 – 26 BLIGH STREET, ROSNY PARK – SIGNAGE /contd...**

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>MOVED</b> Ald Peers <b>SECONDED</b> Ald Ewington
	<p>“A That the Development Application for Signage at 26 Bligh Street, Rosny Park (C1 Ref PDPLANPMTD-2019/001519 be approved subject to the following conditions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GEN AP1 – ENDORSED PLANS.</li> <li>2. The advertising displayed must be directly related to businesses operating from the site.</li> <li>3. The electronic signage must only be operated in accordance with the conditions specified in Section 2.1 of the Traffic Engineering Assessment for the proposed electronic billboard at Eastlands Shopping Centre, dated June 2019 and prepared by TraffixGroup (Document G26629R-01A). The operating conditions specify the type, duration and intensity of images used on the display to ensure drivers are not distracted.</li> <li>4. GEN S7 – SIGN MAINTENANCE.</li> <li>5. The development must meet all required Conditions of Approval specified by TasWater notice dated 17/12/2019 and shown in Appendix A (TWDA 2019/00829-CCC).</li> </ol> <p>B. That the reasons for Council’s decisions in respect of this matter be recorded as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sign will be located in Eastlands own carpark. While it will remove five car parking spaces, Eastlands has a current credit of 111 spaces on-site. Consequently, car parking will not be adversely impacted by the sign.</li> <li>2. The Traffic Impact Assessment submitted with the application provides criteria that, if applied, mean the sign will not result in a distraction to motorists. Those requirements can be included as permit conditions.</li> </ol>

/ Decision contd on Page 16...



**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001519 – 26 BLIGH STREET, ROSNY PARK – SIGNAGE /Decision contd...**

3. In these times with the COVID-19 crisis substantially impacting our economy, and when this Council is trying to support business in Clarence, this application should be approved”.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Kennedy  
Ald Peers  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald James  
Ald Mulder  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker

**11.3.2 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2020/007334 – 15 TORRENS STREET, 12 AND 14 HENRY STREET, RICHMOND - 3 LOT SUBDIVISION AND BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to consider the application made for a 3 lot subdivision and boundary adjustment at 15 Torrens Street, 12 and 14 Henry Street, Richmond.

**RELATION TO PLANNING PROVISIONS**

The land is zoned General Residential and subject to the Road and Railway Assets, Parking and Access, Stormwater Management and Historic Heritage Codes under the Clarence Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (the Scheme). In accordance with the Scheme the proposal is a Discretionary development.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

The report on this item details the basis and reasons for the recommendation. Any alternative decision by Council will require a full statement of reasons in order to maintain the integrity of the Planning approval process and to comply with the requirements of the Judicial Review Act and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

Note: References to provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (the Act) are references to the former provisions of the Act as defined in Schedule 6 – Savings and Transitional Provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The former provisions apply to an interim planning scheme that was in force prior to the commencement day of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The commencement day was 17 December 2015.

Council is required to exercise a discretion within the statutory 42 day period which expires with the written consent of the applicant on 29 April 2020.

**CONSULTATION**

The proposal was advertised in accordance with statutory requirements and nine representations were received raising the following issues:

- lot sizes;
- impact on historic cultural heritage significance of Richmond;
- precedent;
- incompatibility of kerb and gutter with existing;
- access;
- impact upon amenity;
- stormwater drainage;
- safety;
- requirement for details of development; and
- lack of information in advertised plans.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

A. That the Development Application for a 3 Lot Subdivision and Boundary Adjustment at 15 Torrens Street, 12 and 14 Henry Street, Richmond (Cl Ref PDPLANPMTD-2020/007334) be approved subject to the following conditions and advice.

1. GEN AP1 – ENDORSED PLANS.
2. GEN POS – POS CONTRIBUTION [5%] and [Lots 1, 2 and 4].
3. ENG M2 – DESIGNS SD. Insert “in accordance with the Richmond Townscape Study and must be” after “Such designs must be”.
4. Each lot must be provided with a minimum 3.6m wide constructed and sealed access from the road carriageway to the property boundary in accordance with Standard Drawing TSD-R09 (copy available from Council). For Lot 1 and Lot 2 the 3.6m wide sealed driveway must also be constructed over the remaining length of the right-of-way to the body of the lot. This access must be inspected by Council’s Development Works Officer prior to sealing or pouring new concrete.

Following construction, the crossover must be maintained or repaired by the owner at the owner’s expense in accordance with any directions given by Council to the owner.

5. ENG A7 – REDUNDANT CROSSOVER.
6. ENG S4 – STORMWATER CONNECTION.
7. ENG S1 – INFRASTRUCTURE REPAIR.
8. ENG M8 – EASEMENTS.
9. The development must meet all required Conditions of Approval specified by TasWater notice dated 27 February 2020 (TWDA 2020/00217-CCC).

B. That the details and conclusions included in the Associated Report be recorded as the reasons for Council’s decision in respect of this matter.

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald James **SECONDED** Ald Warren

“A. That Development Application PDPLANPMTD-2020/007334 – 15 Torrens Street, 12 and 14 Henry Street, Richmond – 3 Lot Subdivision and Boundary Adjustment be refused for the following reasons.

/ Decision contd on Page 19...

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2020/007334 – 15 TORRENS STREET, 12 AND 14 HENRY STREET, RICHMOND - 3 LOT SUBDIVISION AND BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT /Decision contd...**

1. The proposal does not comply with Clause E13.8.2 and Performance Criteria P1(a) and Table E13.2 under the Heritage Precinct, as overall lot sizes are less than predominant land parcels nearby and detrimental to the historic cultural significance of the precinct.
2. The proposal does not comply with Clause E13.8.2 and Performance Criteria P1(c) and Table E13.2 in the Heritage Precinct, as Lots 3 and 4 have the greatest potential to impact upon a confused understanding of the precinct development.
3. The proposal does not comply with Clause E13.8.2 and Performance Criteria P(2) and design criteria/conservation policy listed in Table E13.2 as the scale of proposed lot sizes is a clear departure of this table.

B. That the reasons for Council's decision in respect of this matter be recorded as follows.

- The proposal does not comply with the planning scheme controls in that the subdivision is unsympathetic to the historic cultural heritage significance of the precinct".

The **MOTION** was **put** and **LOST**

**FOR**

Ald Edmunds  
Ald James  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Kennedy  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker

/ Decision contd on Page 20...

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2020/007334 – 15 TORRENS STREET, 12 AND 14 HENRY STREET, RICHMOND - 3 LOT SUBDIVISION AND BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT /Decision contd...**

**FORESHADOWED MOTION**

**MOVED** Ald Blomeley **SECONDED** Ald Peers

“That the Recommendation be adopted”.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Kennedy  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker

**AGAINST**

Ald Edmunds  
Ald James  
Ald Warren

**11.3.3 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/005210 – 9 AND 11 ABERNANT WAY, CAMBRIDGE - WAREHOUSES (6 TENANCIES)****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to consider the application made for 6 Warehouses at 9 and 11 Abernant Way, Cambridge.

**RELATION TO PLANNING PROVISIONS**

The land is zoned Light Industrial and subject to the Parking and Access and Stormwater Management Codes, and Cambridge Industrial Specific Area Plan under the Clarence Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (the Scheme). In accordance with the Scheme the proposal is a Discretionary development.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

The report on this item details the basis and reasons for the recommendation. Any alternative decision by Council will require a full statement of reasons in order to maintain the integrity of the Planning approval process and to comply with the requirements of the Judicial Review Act and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

Note: References to provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (the Act) are references to the former provisions of the Act as defined in Schedule 6 – Savings and Transitional Provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The former provisions apply to an interim planning scheme that was in force prior to the commencement day of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The commencement day was 17 December 2015.

Council is required to exercise a discretion within the statutory 42 day period which was extended with the consent of the applicant until 29 April 2020.

**CONSULTATION**

The proposal was advertised in accordance with statutory requirements one representation was received from the Department of State Growth after the advertising period which raised the following issues:

- stormwater; and
- traffic safety.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- A. That the Development Application for Warehouses at 9 and 11 Abernant Way, Cambridge (CI Ref PDPLANPMTD-2019/005210) be refused for the following reasons.
1. The proposal does not comply with Clause F15.7.2.1 P1 as the proposal is not compatible with the scale of nearby buildings and represents an overdevelopment of the site.

2. The proposal does not comply with Clause F15.7.2.4 A1 as the proposal does not provide for landscaping for the area within 4.5m of the front boundary to Kennedy Drive.

B. That the details and conclusions included in the Associated Report be recorded as the reasons for Council’s decision in respect of this matter.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>MOVED</b> Ald Peers <b>SECONDED</b> Ald Blomeley
	<p>“A That the Development Application for Warehouses at 9 and 11 Abernant Way, Cambridge (C1 Ref PDPLANPMTD-2019/005210) be approved subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GEN AP1 – ENDORSED PLANS.</li> <li>2. GEN AP3 – AMENDED PLANS [insert the building set back 5.5m from the frontage and a 4.5m landscaped setback provided along the south boundary to Kennedy Drive].</li> <li>3. GEN C1 – ON-SITE CAR PARKING [51].</li> <li>4. ENG A5 – SEALED CAR PARKING.</li> <li>5. ENG M1 –DESIGNS DA.</li> <li>6. ENG S1 – INFRASTRUCTURE REPAIR.</li> <li>7. LAND 1A – LANDSCAPE PLAN add paragraph ‘All landscape works must be maintained: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in perpetuity by the existing and future owners/occupiers of the property;</li> <li>• in a healthy state; and</li> <li>• in accordance with the approved landscape plan.</li> </ul> <p>If any of the vegetation comprising the landscaping dies or is removed, it is to be replaced with vegetation of the same species and, to the greatest extent practicable, the same maturity, as the vegetation which died or which was removed’.</p> </li> <li>8. LAND 3 – LANDSCAPE BOND (COMMERCIAL).</li> </ol>

/ Decision contd on Page 23...

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/005210 – 9 AND 11  
ABERNANT WAY, CAMBRIDGE - WAREHOUSES (6 TENANCIES) /Decision  
contd...**

9. GEN S7 – SIGN MAINTENANCE.

10. The development must meet all required Conditions of Approval specified by TasWater notice dated 12 March 2020 (TWDA 2020/00304-CCC).

B. That the reasons for Council’s decisions in respect of this matter be recorded as follows.

1. The applicant has advised in writing that a setback of 5.5m would be satisfactory and will provide an amended plan to show that.

2. Council has supported a planning scheme amendment that will reduce the standard frontage setback to 5.5m under the Specific Area Plan applying to this industrial estate. The panel hearing has concluded, and approval is expected in the coming weeks. The amendment will make the setback standard consistent with the State Planning Provisions for the Light Industrial Zone. In these circumstances it would be an appropriate compromise to accept the applicant’s offer.

3. The proposed conditions are the standard conditions that are normally applied to industrial developments in this area and are as required by the scheme”.

**CARRIED**

**FOR**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Kennedy  
Ald Mulder  
Ald Peers  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald James  
Ald von Bertouch



**11.3.4 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001969 – 1  
CREMORNE AVENUE, CREMORNE - 3 MULTIPLE DWELLINGS****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to consider the application made for 3 Multiple Dwellings at 1 Cremorne Avenue, Cremorne.

**RELATION TO PLANNING PROVISIONS**

The land is zoned Village and subject to the Inundation Prone Areas, Parking and Access, Stormwater Management Code, On-site Wastewater Management and Road and Railway Assets Codes under the Clarence Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (the Scheme). In accordance with the Scheme the proposal is a Discretionary development.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

The report on this item details the basis and reasons for the recommendation. Any alternative decision by Council will require a full statement of reasons in order to maintain the integrity of the Planning approval process and to comply with the requirements of the Judicial Review Act and the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

Note: References to provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (the Act) are references to the former provisions of the Act as defined in Schedule 6 – Savings and Transitional Provisions of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The former provisions apply to an interim planning scheme that was in force prior to the commencement day of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment (Tasmanian Planning Scheme Act) 2015. The commencement day was 17 December 2015.

Council is required to exercise a discretion within the statutory 42 day period which was extended with the consent of the applicant until 29 April 2020.

**CONSULTATION**

The proposal was advertised in accordance with statutory requirements and 20 representations were received (14 against and 6 in support) raising the following issues:

- visual impact;
- Village character;
- concerns with waste water system;
- similar to refused development;
- State Planning Provisions;
- impact on bore water;
- contamination;
- traffic;
- impact on walkway;
- support; and
- inaccuracies/misrepresentations.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

A. That the Development Application for 3 Multiple Dwellings at 1 Cremorne Avenue, Cremorne (CI Ref PDPLANPMTD-2019/001969) be approved subject to the following conditions and advice.

1. GEN AP1 – ENDORSED PLANS.
2. GEN AP3- AMENDED PLAN [showing a permanently fixed screen up to a height of 1.7m above floor level with a maximum transparency of 25% for the second storey windows on the northern elevation].
3. ENG M1 – DESIGNS DA.
4. ENG A5 – SEALED CAR PARKING.
5. Engineering drawings incorporating the appropriate modifications to the footpath around the intersection to improve sight distance of traffic in accordance with the recommendation and requirements of the Traffic Impact Assessment (Milan Prodanovic, 11 June 2019) must be submitted to and approved by Council's Group Manager Engineering Services prior to the commencement of any works.
6. Prior to any demolition on-site, or the issue of a Building Permit for demolition, a Construction Management Plan in accordance with the recommendations of the *Preliminary Site Investigation, (ES & D, February 2020)* must be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer.
7. Prior to the issue of a Building Permit for the construction of the dwellings, a Remediation and Sampling Plan in accordance with the recommendations of the *Preliminary Site Investigation, (ES & D, February 2020)* must be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer. The plan must also include sampling of the area of the site located within the road reservation.
8. Prior to the issue of a Building Permit for the construction of the dwellings, an Environmental Construction Management Plan in accordance with the recommendations of the *Preliminary Site Investigation, (ES & D, February 2020)* must be submitted to the satisfaction of Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer.

ADVICE: A separate approval will be required to undertake works carried out within the road reservation from Council prior to the commencement of works occurring within the road reservation. An application form is available on Council's website.

ADVICE: All site stormwater including water tank overflows must be maintained and managed within the property boundary.

**ADVICE:** As a consequence of the development, the street numbering allocated to each lot/unit will be as set out as follows:

Unit 1 (closest to Cremorne Avenue corner) - 1/1A Frederick Henry Parade;

Unit 2 (Middle) - 2/1A Frederick Henry Parade; and

Unit 3 (Furthest from Cremorne Avenue corner) - 3/1A Frederick Henry Parade.

- B. That the details and conclusions included in the Associated Report be recorded as the reasons for Council's decision in respect of this matter.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>MOVED</b> Ald James <b>SECONDED</b> Ald Warren
	<p>“A That the Development Application for 3 Multiple Dwellings at 1 Cremorne Avenue, Cremorne be refused for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal does not comply with Village Zone Clause 16.4.2 P2, (a), (iii) as the proposal will cause an unreasonable adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining lots by the visual impact when viewed from adjoining lots through building bulk and massing.</li> <li>2. The proposal does not comply with Village Zone Clause 16.4.2 P2, (a), (iii) as reduction in building rear and side setbacks will cause unreasonable adverse impacts on adjoining dwelling.</li> <li>3. Determining Applications (Section 8.10.1) - Representations received.</li> </ol> <p>B. That the reasons for Council's decisions in respect of this matter be recorded as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development comprising of three conjoined, three storey dwellings has greater bulk and mass than other residential buildings in the area with the proposed building footprint covers 46 per cent of the lot. The density is significantly greater than the average density of 25 per cent in the Cremorne area.</li> </ul>

/ Decision contd on Page 27...

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PDPLANPMTD-2019/001969 – 1 CREMORNE AVENUE, CREMORNE - 3 MULTIPLE DWELLINGS /Decision contd...**

- Furthermore, the proposal does not meet building setbacks as the setback to the west is proposed to be 2.1m less than minimum 4m and setback to the north is 1.5m less than minimum required of 4m. The proposal is seeking reduction in building setbacks that will have unreasonable adverse impacts on the adjoining dwelling and residential village amenity of Cremorne”.

**CARRIED****FOR**

Ald Chong  
Ald Edmunds  
Ald James  
Ald Kennedy  
Ald Peers  
Ald von Bertouch  
Ald Walker  
Ald Warren

**AGAINST**

Ald Blomeley  
Ald Chipman  
Ald Ewington  
Ald Mulder

Council now concludes its deliberations as a Planning Authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act, 1993.

<b>11.4 CUSTOMER SERVICE</b>
------------------------------

Nil Items.

**11.5 ASSET MANAGEMENT****11.5.1 BRINKTOP BUSHLAND RESERVE ACTIVITY PLAN – 2020-2030**

ECM 3783147

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

To consider the adoption of the Brinktop Bushland Reserve Activity Plan 2020-2030 following community consultation.

**RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY/PLANS**

Council's Strategic Plan 2016-2026, Clarence Bushland and Coastal Strategy 2011 and Community Participation Policy are relevant.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

Nil.

**CONSULTATION**

Extensive consultation was undertaken, involving the Coal River Valley Sustainable Living Group Inc., Richmond Advisory Committee, Richmond Primary School and the community in accordance with Council's Community Engagement Policy 2020.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The adoption of the Brinktop Bushland Reserve Activity Plan 2020-2030 has no direct financial impact. The implementation of the Brinktop Bushland Reserve Activity Plan 2020-2030 is planned to be staged over several financial years, subject to Council approval of future Annual Plans.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council adopts the Brinktop Bushland Reserve Activity Plan 2020-2030 subject to the following amendment.

A. Amend Management Action 1 as follows:

*“Conduct a feasibility assessment into modifying the existing vehicular barrier on old Brinktop Road to allow a narrow path for cyclists”.*

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Warren **SECONDED** Ald Chong

“That the Recommendation be adopted”.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

<b>11.6 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT</b>
----------------------------------

Nil Items.

**11.7 GOVERNANCE****11.7.1 CLARENCE KEEP CONNECTED INITIATIVE UPDATE****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to provide a preliminary update on the first two weeks of progress of the Clarence Keep Connected (CKC) initiative since its commencement on 3 April and up to 7 April 2020.

**RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY/PLANS**

The CKC initiative relates directly to Council's Business Continuity Plan, *Strategic Plan 2016-2026*, *Community Engagement Policy 2020*, and multiple associated plans and policies.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

There are no associated legislative requirements.

**CONSULTATION**

Several community engagement methods were used to inform the community about the project and to enable widespread community participation, for individuals to contribute to the CKC initiative.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

While the initiative does not have a specific budget allocation, current costs associated with the development and delivery of CKC are being redirected from existing budget accounts. The expenditure is within existing budget allocations.

Medium and long-term delivery of outcomes associated with the initiative, will be linked to annual Council budget discussions for next financial year 2020/2021.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council:

- A. Notes this update report on the Clarence Keep Connected initiative.
- B. Endorses the Clarence Keep Connected initiative as an important element of Council's broader community engagement strategy during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis.

Refer to Page 32 for Decision on this Item...



**CLARENCE KEEP CONNECTED INITIATIVE UPDATE /contd...**

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>MOVED</b> Ald Ewington <b>SECONDED</b> Ald Mulder	
	“A That Council notes the report.	
	B Council suspends any new spending on this program.	
	C Calls for a Council workshop to consider community consultation and development projects as part of ongoing budget deliberations with consideration of how this and other programs and services contribute to our desire to:	
	1. Conduct a strategic review of Council services to assist Aldermen determine those which are considered essential or core operations.	
	2. Reduce Council expenditure as part of our response to the reduction in revenue expected as part of the current Covid-19 impacts”.	
	<b>CARRIED</b>	
	<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
	Ald Blomeley	Ald Chipman
	Ald Edmunds	Ald Chong
	Ald Ewington	Ald von Bertouch
	Ald Kennedy	Ald Warren
	Ald Mulder	Ald James (abstained)
	Ald Peers	
	Ald Walker	

**11.7.2 COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM ON HOLD AND REFOCUS TO COVID-19 ASSISTANCE**  
(File No 09-17-02)**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

To endorse the temporary repurposing of the Community Grants Program and to refocus funds towards the COVID-19 Community Support Package.

**RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY/PLANS**

- Community Grants Policy and Program; and
- Strategic Plan 2016 – 2026.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

Nil.

**CONSULTATION**

Nil.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

No additional funds are required; however, some current budget allocations can be redirected to the community support package.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council endorses:

- A. The temporary suspension of the Community Grants program apart from the Quick Response Grants.
- B. The in-principle repurposing of existing program allocations to fund the COVID-19 Community Support Package, to a maximum allocation of \$150,000, with the General Manager to provide a further report to Council at its next meeting identifying budget reallocations for confirmation by Council.
- C. The COVID-19 Community Support Package Grants guidelines.

/ Refer to Page 34 for Decision on this Item...

**COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM ON HOLD AND REFOCUS TO COVID-19 ASSISTANCE /contd...**

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>PROCEDURAL MOTION</b>	
	<b>MOVED</b> Ald Walker <b>SECONDED</b> Ald Chong	
	“That consideration of this matter be deferred for up to 2 meetings in order to determine a prudent response”.	
	<b>CARRIED</b>	
	<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
	Ald Blomeley	Ald Mulder
	Ald Chipman	
	Ald Chong	
	Ald Edmunds	
	Ald Ewington	
	Ald James	
	Ald Kennedy	
	Ald Peers	
	Ald von Bertouch	
	Ald Walker	
	Ald Warren	

**11.7.3 COVID-19 – CLARENCE CITY COUNCIL RESPONSE – STATUS REPORT****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****PURPOSE**

To provide an update on Council's COVID-19 response for the period 6 April to 21 April 2020.

**RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY/PLANS**

Nil.

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

The *COVID-19 Disease Emergency (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2020* (Tas) and the *Local Government Act 1993* (Tas) are relevant.

**CONSULTATION**

Council, via the Mayor and key Council staff, has been keeping the Clarence community updated in relation to the evolving issues and responses to the COVID-19 pandemic.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are significant immediate and long-term financial implications associated with the COVID-19 pandemic response. These costs cannot be accurately quantified at present but are being monitored and reported via this report, which will be provided to each Council meeting during the pandemic crisis.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council notes this COVID-19 Response status report for the period 6 April to 21 April 2020.

**Decision:** **MOVED** Ald Warren **SECONDED** Ald Chong

“That the Recommendation be adopted”.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**12. ALDERMEN'S QUESTION TIME**

An Alderman may ask a question with or without notice at Council Meetings. No debate is permitted on any questions or answers.

**12.1 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

(Seven days before an ordinary Meeting, an Alderman may give written notice to the General Manager of a question in respect of which the Alderman seeks an answer at the meeting).

Nil

**12.2 ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Nil

**12.3 ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING****Ald Mulder**

My question relates to confusion where some state government instrumentalities are closing some of their reserves, some of their beaches but not all of them and Council is in the position of having to decide whether or not we follow suit. It is quite clear from the Premier's announcements that he expects us to get out there and exercise so I am wondering if there is any way of getting some consistency and clarity because if there is an idea that we close a beach or reserve because people might go there we are almost in the situation where we will have to close our footpaths because it is not possible to keep the 1.5 metres' distance so there is some confusion and I wonder if it is possible to take this up with the government to try to get some consistency across the board about when it is that you close a public area?

**ANSWER**

The Mayor advised that the General Manager has been in discussion at a senior level with the government. The conversation related to closure of parks and beaches. Essentially as I understand it the Tasmanian Government took a view that if they were closing parks and reserves that that was done on a complete basis and not with discretion in some areas and not others. The areas that have been closed for example around Clifton Beach are closed because those beaches are part of a nature reserve whereas the areas that we have control over we have our own discretion. As you suggest, we have taken a view that with the requirements relating to social distancing and exercise it is appropriate to leave those beaches and other areas open for that purpose unless it becomes untenable. So while I understand the Tasmanian Government's position and their desire to have a clean and clear message on their parks and reserves we are in a position where we can take a more nuanced approach.

Question contd...

I would just like to know the basis of those parks because if the underlying issue is social distancing 1.5m then there is no need to close those sorts of facilities. Would the Mayor go back to the Government and ask what the rationale for this is please?

**ANSWER**

The Government acknowledges there are inconsistencies. The Premier has stated clearly that he doesn't want to review the situation.

**Ald Kennedy**

How are the staff coping in their day to day work especially those that are out doing works in community spaces?

**ANSWER**

It has been a fairly trying time not just for Council employees but everyone in the community and like everyone else we have had to adapt to an enormous amount of change in terms of the way we do our work and that has affected people in quite different ways. Aldermen will all be aware that we have decanted most staff from the Council building and closed the building to walk in customers, which is a very unusual environment to be working in.

People are rapidly getting used to working from home and tele-conferencing and so forth. Within the context of the outdoor workforce we check in regularly staff across the organisation and in particular our outdoor workforce. We are very conscious and have managed to adapt to the social distancing requirements but equally have seen the necessity of maintaining services, in particular in terms of construction and maintenance as these are an important part of maintaining the city and keeping things going with a sense of normality as much as that is possible. That is our focus at the moment with staff across the board being very focussed on continuing to do what we do. It is a business as usual approach as far as that is possible just in a different way.

Some staff who have less work than they did before are being encouraged and are taking up volunteering opportunities. We are also looking at other ways to help the community while remaining at work and keep doing the things that are important to everyone in the city. So, it is a difficult time but we are trying to look for opportunities where they exist and respond to those as quickly as we can.

I must say it has been a magnificent effort. Several Aldermen have made reference to that and from my point of view it is really important to acknowledge the amount of change that people have coped with in good grace and found solutions to problems. It has been a significant effort from everyone concerned no matter where they are within the organisation.

**Ald Ewington**

What is the date proposed to remove the pontoon? If it is to be early could we keep it a bit longer if possible?

**ANSWER**

No decision on a date to remove the pontoon has been made but we will review that. We would like it to remain as long as possible to enable the public to use it because it did only go in a short time ago. We will undertake a review after Easter and I will advise Aldermen on an appropriate time to remove the pontoon.

Question contd...

Do we intend to leave the buoys there over winter?

**ANSWER**

We are going to leave the buoys there over this winter and then assess the situation.

Question contd...

Can we have a buoy attached to where the pontoon is when it is removed so it maintains the 100m?

**ANSWER**

That would be automatic so that we know where the anchor is beneath.

**Ald Walker**

I note that the ANZAC Day ceremonies and events later in this month will not be happening. I wonder if there are opportunities for more dynamic ways, for example a digital church group that are on-line with their congregations, if people could come to the Council with novel ways to conduct an ANZAC day service online within the current rules that we abide by? Would some of the money allocated to ANZAC day events still be able to be reallocated to such ideas?

**ANSWER**

The Mayor advised that this would certainly be looked at that but we wouldn't move ahead with it without doing so in partnership with an RSL subbranch.

**Ald Peers**

I know that our public toilets are open but I have an email from a ratepayer that we have no liquid soap in them. Can we trial liquid soap, however the dispenser would probably need some metal protection around it. Could we trial it to see if it works and maybe it could be installed in all our toilets eventually?

**ANSWER**

A briefing will be coming to Aldermen shortly regarding our public toilets confirming that all our 31 public toilets are open at present. Normally they do not have soap because of unwanted behaviour when we have trialled this in the past. We have made enquiries as we are unable to obtain soap dispensers and liquid soap at present so we have put soap bars in toilets as we could. We are undertaking further investigations and discussion with other councils as to what they have been able to obtain to see if we could put soap dispensers at least in our most highly used toilets. We will inform Aldermen on progress.

**Ald Edmunds**

Could the Mayor and General Manager urgently lobby members of government before Wednesday's sitting of Parliament to include our employees in the proposed Jobkeeper Program? It is very timely in terms of a decision being made on Wednesday.

**ANSWER**

There has been a significant union campaign on this issue over the last few days and I am not sure where other organisations are in terms of their position. We have certainly considered our position in quite some detail. We haven't involved ourselves in the campaign because we see ourselves sitting in a somewhat vexed position in that we can't in good faith go out and say that we need the Jobkeeper program to support continued employment at this point. We have got full employment but there are certainly parts of the business that may become more sensitive over time; for example, with the change to support finding in relation to child care and other child care related services that has changed the dynamic quite a lot. We are investigating that at the moment, but I understand that there is also a lot of activity in the child care area from local government in other States dealing with that issue. Our problems are also fairly small at the moment. We have got capacity to continue and that is our intention. In those circumstances we think it is difficult for us to advocate for inclusion in the Jobkeeper Program. Having said that, if the situation radically changed, I would expect LGAT and others to assist us fairly quickly to move an argument forward seeking support.

Both LGAT and ALGA have been very active lobbying in this area so there is not much more that we could add to the weight of local government as a sector.

**Ald von Bertouch**

1. When is Council planning to commence flu vaccination for the public and when and how will those details be communicated?

**ANSWER**

We will commence the public vaccination program for flu on 21 April. We have only been able to order the vaccine from 3 April. We intend to publicise it on our website, Facebook page and a general notice outside the Council building. The other important thing to mention is that this time around we will be doing the vaccinations by appointment rather than people just turning up. People who want to be vaccinated, those that are eligible, will need to contact Council.

2. Will there be any monitoring in the Clarence municipality regarding social distancing regarding launching of boats during the period 8 and 27 April. Bearing in mind that many boat owners live and launch boats in Clarence therefore the state government's ban announced today will not apply to these people.

**ANSWER**

While we don't have any direct or immediate head of power in terms of enforcement of the social distancing rules what we could do to assist is to erect signage encouraging correct behaviours in those places and if there are particular areas that Ald von Bertouch has pointed out like boat ramps we can alert Tasmania Police to that and ask them to take a more active role.



**Ald James**

1. Regarding graffiti removal from Council buildings or other buildings where we have a partnership with the agency etc I understand this is done by volunteers. How is our volunteer group handling the pace and also the number of volunteers that are working on those graffiti removal projects within the city?

**ANSWER**

In response to graffiti removal from our buildings, if it needs to be removed urgently we usually engage a contractor to do that. If it is not urgent our volunteers assist with that. In terms of that, as far as I am aware, there has been no change to that arrangement.

2. I received a memorandum from Council's Group Manager Engineering Services regarding security fencing of the hill top at ANZAC Park. It was quite encouraging and I would seek for that to be distributed to all of my colleagues because it provides an up to date account of where we are with that. Could the Group Manager Engineering Services outline at what stage we are with lodging a Development Application for the works?

**ANSWER**

The answer to this question will be provided in Briefing Report.

**Ald Warren**

1. In light of informal feedback I have just received regarding the success of this format for meetings, can we learn from these new experiences and work on things that might be worth keeping even after the crisis is over?

**ANSWER**

That would be a matter for discussion at a workshop once we have had a few more meetings in this format. To get to this point we have had a huge effort from a number of staff and a couple of our IT team in particular. To find the solutions, test them and work out the nuances has been an enormous effort to make this happen. It should certainly get easier but I think it is something that we should certainly talk about once we have got a better knowledge of what we are doing and how it works.

2. Regarding viewing of development plans which was able to be done at the Council offices before we closed to the public, the solution that is being provided is to view them on the website. I know that does not suit everybody and it is not always an easy way to view plans. Is there an alternative that we can provide for a way that people could view plans in large size rather than on the website particularly those people who are not very technologically savvy.

**ANSWER**

The response to this question has been updated from that provided at the meeting.

At the time of the meeting, it was our view that the relevant notice authorised plans and development applications to be advertised and accessible by electronic means or as the alternative they could be posted to the individual requesting them. We have since been advised that that notice did not apply to planning matters. On that basis we have been providing an opportunity for plans to be viewed on the display screens at the council chambers by appointment and this ensures people without access to a home computer will still be able to view advertised applications. The arrangements put in place are in accordance with hygiene and other social distancing requirements.

We have also been advised that the Minister may make further changes to advertising arrangements to respond to the current crisis and if this occurs Council will be advised.

**12.4 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

An Alderman may ask a Question without Notice of the Chairman or another Alderman or the General Manager. Note: the Chairman may refuse to accept a Question without Notice if it does not relate to the activities of the Council. A person who is asked a Question without Notice may decline to answer the question.

Questions without notice and their answers will be recorded in the following Agenda.

The Chairman may refuse to accept a question if it does not relate to Council's activities.

The Chairman may require a question without notice to be put in writing. The Chairman, an Alderman or the General Manager may decline to answer a question without notice.

### 13. CLOSED MEETING

Regulation 15 of the Local Government (Meetings Procedures) Regulations 2015 provides that Council may consider certain sensitive matters in Closed Meeting.

The following matter was listed in the Closed Meeting section of the Council Agenda in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

#### 13.1 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

In accordance with Regulation 15 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 the reports in the Closed Meeting section of the Council Agenda were dealt with on the grounds that the detail covered in the reports relates to:

- applications by Aldermen for a Leave of Absence.

**The content of reports and details of the Council decisions in respect to items listed in “Closed Meeting” are to be kept “confidential” and are not to be communicated, reproduced or published unless authorised by the Council.**

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>PROCEDURAL MOTION</b> <b>MOVED</b> Ald Blomeley <b>SECONDED</b> Ald Peers  “That the Meeting be closed to the public to consider Regulation 15 matters”.  <div style="text-align: right;"><b>CARRIED</b></div>	
	<b>FOR</b> Ald Blomeley Ald Chipman Ald Chong Ald Edmunds Ald Ewington Ald James Ald Kennedy Ald Peers Ald von Bertouch Ald Walker Ald Warren	<b>AGAINST</b> Ald Mulder (abstained)

Ald James left the Meeting at this stage (9.48pm) and did not return.