Confirmed Minutes
Ordinary Council Meeting
17th December 2015
FLINDERS COUNCIL ORDINARY MEETING
CONFIRMED MINUTES

DATE: Thursday 17th December 2015
VENUE: Furneaux Arts and Entertainment Centre, Whitemark
COMMENCING: 1.00 pm

PRESENT
Mayor Carol Cox
Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham
Cr Chris Rhodes
Cr Peter Rhodes
Cr Ken Stockton
Cr David Williams
Cr Gerald Willis

APOLOGIES
Nil

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE
Raoul Harper - General Manager 1.00 – 1.57pm
James Ireland - Consultant Town Planner (via phone) 1.10 – 1.42pm
Jacci Viney - Development Services Coordinator 1.00 – 1.47pm
Vicki Warden - Executive Officer (minute taker) 1.00 – 1.57pm

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
325.12.2015 Moved: Cr K Stockton Seconded: Cr P Rhodes
That the Minutes from the Ordinary Council Meeting and the Closed Council Meeting held on the 24th November 2015 be confirmed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME
Public Question 1: From Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham on behalf of Ryan Nevin
Can Council address the issue of a lack of gym facilities in Whitemark at Council’s next budget sessions in 2016? I and many others living and working in Whitemark and the northern part of the Island would use such a facility on a regular basis.

Mayor’s Response:
Gym facilities will be added to discussions during budget deliberation time.
**LATE AGENDA ITEMS**
Nil

**DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**
Nil

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**
Nil

**PETITIONS**
Nil
Workshops & Information Forums

File No: COU/0205

Council Workshop held on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2015

Council held a workshop on the following subject:

- Update from Elan Projects

Councillors Present:
Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

Apologies:
Nil

Staff and Consultants Present:
Andrew Davies (Elan Projects), Raoul Harper (General Manager), Linden Kurth (Elan Projects) and Sophie Pitchford (Corporate Services Manager).

Council Workshop held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015

Council held a workshop on the following subjects:

- Item 1: Flinders and West Tamar Council – Planning and Permit Authority Role
- Item 2: Banking Arrangements
- Item 3: Instrument of Delegation
- Item 4: Policies
- Item 5: Aviation Policy review
- Item 6: Update on Runway Developments
- Item 7: Staffing Update
- Item 8: Tourism MOU between FITBI and Council
- Item 9: Renewable Energy CONNECT 2015 Forum on King Island

Councillors Present:
Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

Apologies:
Cr Chris Rhodes

Staff and Consultants Present:
Raoul Harper (General Manager), Sophie Pitchford (Corporate Services Manager), Robyn Cox (Strategic Planner) (Item 1 only), Rolf Voss (Development Services Manager, West Tamar Council) (Item 1 only), Tim Birthisel (Group
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Agency Manager, Bendigo Bank) (Item 2 only, via phone), Russ Carrick (State Manager, Bendigo Bank) (Item 2 only), Rob Hanley (Regional Manager for Tasmania, Bendigo Bank) (Item 2 only).

As workshops and information sessions are for information and discussion purposes only, no decisions are made or foreshadowed at these proceedings.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS:
Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION:
That the Council Workshops held on 24th November and 3rd December 2015 be noted.

DECISION:
326.12.2015 Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr G Willis
That the Council Workshops held on 24th November and 3rd December 2015 be noted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
PUBLIC MEETINGS
Nil

COUNCILLORS’ QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Nil

COUNCILLORS’ QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
Question 1: Cr D Williams
How is the runway business case going?

General Manager’s Response:
The General Manager was in Melbourne last Friday and Saturday working with the consultant. There will be a preliminary draft ready to present to the Councillors mid-January.

PUBLICATIONS/REPORTS TABLED FOR COUNCIL INFORMATION
Nil
OFFICER'S REPORT (Raoul Harper, General Manager):
The unconfirmed minutes of the Lady Barron Hall and Recreational Special Committee Annual General Meeting held 23\textsuperscript{rd} November 2015 have been provided for consideration. The minutes outline what the committee has been working on to date and can now be received by Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION
That the unconfirmed minutes of the Lady Barron Hall and Recreational Special Committee Annual General Meeting held 23\textsuperscript{rd} November 2015 be noted.

DECISION:
327.12.2015 Moved: Cr D Williams Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Cobham
That the unconfirmed minutes of the Lady Barron Hall and Recreational Special Committee Annual General Meeting held 23\textsuperscript{rd} November 2015 be noted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
OFFICER'S REPORT (Raoul Harper, General Manager):
The unconfirmed minutes of the Furneaux Group Aviation Special Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd December 2015 have been provided for consideration. The minutes outline what the committee has been working on to date and can now be received by Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION
That the unconfirmed minutes of the Furneaux Group Aviation Special Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd December 2015 be noted.

DECISION:
328.12.2015 Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr P Rhodes
That the unconfirmed minutes of the Furneaux Group Aviation Special Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd December 2015 be noted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)
For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
OFFICER’S REPORT (Raoul Harper, General Manager):
The unconfirmed minutes of the Furneaux Group Shipping Special Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2015 have been provided for consideration. The minutes outline what the committee has been working on to date and can now be received by Council.

OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION
That the unconfirmed minutes of the Furneaux Group Shipping Special Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2015 be noted.

DECISION:
329.12.2015 Moved: Cr P Rhodes Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Cobham
That the unconfirmed minutes of the Furneaux Group Shipping Special Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2015 be noted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
COUNCILLORS’ REPORTS

Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham’s Report
File No:  COU/0600

ACTIVITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/11/15</td>
<td>Attended Councillor’s meeting with Telecommunications consultants re future upgrades/enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/15</td>
<td>Monthly Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/15</td>
<td>Furneaux Group Shipping Special Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/15</td>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/15</td>
<td>Met with Mayor Cox and Cr P Rhodes re latest Huitfeldt renaming proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/15</td>
<td>Councillors site visit at North East River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/15</td>
<td>Furneaux (Emita) Hall and Recreational Ground Special Committee Meeting – mainly planning for Emita Sports 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/15</td>
<td>Phone call with proponent of latest Huitfeldt renaming proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/15</td>
<td>Flinders Council AGM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION:
That the Deputy Mayor’s report be received.

DECISION:

330.12.2015  Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham  Seconded: Cr D Williams
That the Deputy Mayor’s report be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
MAYOR’S REPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROponent</td>
<td>Mayor C Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>COU/0600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED PAPERS</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPORT:

APPOINTMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19.11.15</td>
<td>King Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11.15</td>
<td>Deal Island Exhibition Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11.15</td>
<td>Yirruluka Music Evening – Gillian Wood’s fund raiser for Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.11.15</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Centre Garden Party – preview of the Aged Care Safe Garden area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.11.15</td>
<td>Met with Alan &amp; Liz Robinson re Emita (Old Jetty) Beach rename</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.11.15</td>
<td>Lady Barron Kitchen Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.11.15</td>
<td>Lady Barron Hall Special Committee Annual General Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>Meeting with Elan Project Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11.15</td>
<td>Flinders Island Tourism &amp; Business Inc. hosted evening at Mountain Seas – the Quoin Development explained and Branding discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.12.15</td>
<td>Furneaux Group Aviation Special Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.12.15</td>
<td>Furneaux Group Shipping Special Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.12.15</td>
<td>Council Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.12.15</td>
<td>Lions Christmas market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12.15</td>
<td>Briefing and site visit to North East River proposed development site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12.15</td>
<td>Meeting with Michael Buck, Chair of Flinders Island Tourism &amp; Business Inc. (FITBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.15</td>
<td>Meeting with Sports Club Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.15</td>
<td>Meeting with the Clifford’s re banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.15</td>
<td>ABC Radio interview re banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>Furneaux Community Health Special Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>Flinders Council AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>Flinders Lions Christmas Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Banking:
The State Manager of Bendigo Bank, Russ Carrick, and the Regional Manager for Tasmania, Rob Hanley, attended the Council workshop on the 3rd of December giving Councillors an outline of how a Bendigo Bank agency might
work for Whitemark. The Corporate Services Manager and I subsequently met them again the following morning after they had a chance to meet with Leanne & John Clifford. We were advised that operating an agency on the Island does not appear to have the major hurdles they had envisaged. Russ and Rob then met with community members at a meeting arranged by Flinders Island Tourism and Business Inc.

A steering group is now being put together to advance discussion and ideas on how a Bendigo Bank agency can be operated at Whitemark. A Public Forum will be held late January.

**Rubbish Bins – Lady Barron Port:**
TasPorts has been approached about the reasons for removal and possible reinstatement of the rubbish bins on the Lady Barron wharf, both through the local port staff and through the TasPorts representative on the Furneaux Group Shipping Special Committee, Rhys Cooper. The issue is yet to be resolved.

**Flinders Island Sports and RSL Club:**
A meeting occurred between Sports Club representatives, the General Manager, Cr Williams and myself. The meeting was about furthering of ideas on how an income stream could be developed that would enable the Club to be less reliant on volunteer labour and sustainable into the future. The possibility of developing some community hub type infrastructure to compliment and expand what already exists in the Community was discussed. This is seen as an option to generate rental revenue and will be explored further, as will the appropriate Zoning for the area within the impending State-wide Planning Scheme.

Council has $50,000 allocated in this year’s budget to assist in the process of developing a way forward towards sustainability of this community resource. Expenditure of the funds is dependent on the support by Councillors to further investigate proposals put forward.

**Lions:**
The Christmas function was hugely enjoyable and it was mine and other Councillors’ pleasure to be able to join the local Lions members in celebrating a year of hard work and contribution to the Community.

**Airport:**
Council works staff have prioritised their work to undertake patching on the long runway. The Aurecon consultant and the new technical inspector have both been on the Island and staff are intent on bringing the runway 14/32 up to CASA’s requirements for all weather usage. The shorter runway is unaffected by this process.
Committee Volunteers:
Council runs several Special Committees including Lady Barron and Emita Halls, Health, Aviation and Shipping and Municipal Emergency Management that rely on the input of volunteer participants for their success. These committees play an important role in connecting Council to the Community and I wish to express to the volunteer members the appreciation of Councillors for the time and energy you give to these Committees.

Wishing everybody a happy, safe and festive Christmas and New Year.

CORRESPONDENCE IN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.11.15</td>
<td>Neighbour Day Relations Manager</td>
<td>Neighbour Day 2016 – Easter Sunday 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.15</td>
<td>J Dick, Chair, Flinders Council Audit Panel</td>
<td>Affirming correctness of the 2014-15 audited financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.11.15</td>
<td>Minerals Council of Australia (MCA)</td>
<td>MCA’s latest publication “The Whole Story”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.11.15</td>
<td>National Asbestos Awareness Month</td>
<td>November is National Asbestos Awareness Month – 4th December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.11.15</td>
<td>Two Community Members</td>
<td>Re Emita (Old Jetty) Beach renaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.11.15</td>
<td>J. O’Dell, Quarantine Officer</td>
<td>Re removal of rubbish bins from Lady Barron Wharf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.11.15</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Invitation to celebrate the December Conferral Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.11.15</td>
<td>S Watson, Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT)</td>
<td>Auditor General declares all Tasmanian Councils sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.11.15</td>
<td>A Spykes, TasWater</td>
<td>Owners’ Representatives General Meeting – 12th November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.11.15</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Re Emita (Old Jetty) Beach renaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.11.15</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Re Emita (Old Jetty) Beach renaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>P Holmes</td>
<td>Re Flinders Island Connect 2016 Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>Northern Tasmania Development (NTD)</td>
<td>NTD News Update November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>T Clark, NTD</td>
<td>TasPorts 30 year Plan – from August 7th meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11.15</td>
<td>L Willscroft, TasWater</td>
<td>Media Release announcing the appointment of Chief Owners’ Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11.15</td>
<td>K Stephenson, LGAT</td>
<td>Launceston Airport Rates – Media release from Northern Midlands Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11.15</td>
<td>Tourism Tasmania</td>
<td>Change of Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11.15</td>
<td>Minister for Planning and Local Government, Hon Peter Gutwein MP</td>
<td>Invite to forum on the new building regulatory frame work - 4th December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.11.15</td>
<td>The Hon Peter Gutwein MP</td>
<td>Advice of Amendment Order to the Local Government (Audit Panels) Amendment Order 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.15 &amp; 02.12.15</td>
<td>S McDonald, nbn (National Broadband Network)</td>
<td>Community update on nbn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.15</td>
<td>Rural Alive &amp; Well</td>
<td>RAW – 2015’s Community Group of the Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.15</td>
<td>Performing Art’s Director, OPAL</td>
<td>Invite to end of year variety performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.12.15</td>
<td>G Palmer, LGAT</td>
<td>Cat Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.12.15</td>
<td>Minister for Infrastructure, Hon Rene Hidding MP</td>
<td>Re Tasmanian freight system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.12.15</td>
<td>Principal, Staff &amp; Students Flinders Island District High School (FIDS)</td>
<td>Invite to End of Year Assembly - 16th December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.12.15</td>
<td>Governor of Tasmania</td>
<td>Re visit in October of 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.12.15</td>
<td>L McDougall, Governor General’s Office</td>
<td>Advice of Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner’s visit to Flinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.12.15</td>
<td>Premier, Will Hodgman MP</td>
<td>Australia Day Great Ideas Grant application successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.12.15</td>
<td>Lions Club</td>
<td>Invite to Christmas Dinner - 9th December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.12.15</td>
<td>Australian Local Government Association</td>
<td>Successful Local Roads &amp; Transport Congress 2015 - come to 2016 event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.12.15</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management North</td>
<td>Northern Exposure – spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.12.15</td>
<td>Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment</td>
<td>Land Tasmania – Edition 11, November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12.15</td>
<td>T Clark, NTD</td>
<td>2016 meeting dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 &amp; 08.12.15</td>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>Re Killiecrankie BBQ &amp; Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.15</td>
<td>M Buck, FITBI</td>
<td>Forward Launceston airport information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>A Nikolic MP</td>
<td>Round 3 of National Stronger Regions Fund will open in January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>S Commons</td>
<td>Tasmanian Young Achiever Awards – Nominations open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>FITBI</td>
<td>Committee meeting and General Minutes from 8/9/15 forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12.15</td>
<td>T Clark, NTD</td>
<td>Re Flinders Council C8 contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORRESPONDENCE OUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.11.15</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Re Emita (Old Jetty) Beach renaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.11.15</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Re Emita (Old Jetty) Beach renaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.11.15</td>
<td>Flinders Island Adventures &amp; Flinders Island Experience</td>
<td>Re Flinders Island CONNECT 2016 accommodation and tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>FIAAI</td>
<td>Re Bendigo Bank visit to the Island – opportunity to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>M Buck, FITBI</td>
<td>Re Bendigo Bank visit to the Island – opportunity to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>J &amp; L Clifford</td>
<td>Re Bendigo Bank visit to the Island – opportunity to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.11.15</td>
<td>P Holmes</td>
<td>Re Flinders Island CONNECT 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &amp; 30.11.15</td>
<td>R Carrick, State Manager, Bendigo Bank</td>
<td>Re visit to Flinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.12.15</td>
<td>S, McDonald, nbn</td>
<td>Query re when NBN satellite available to Island Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.12.15</td>
<td>Two Community Members</td>
<td>Thank you for nomination to the Council Citizen of the Year Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.12.15</td>
<td>S McDonald, nbn</td>
<td>Request for update on Furneaux Group connection date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12.15</td>
<td>L McDougall, Governor General’s Office</td>
<td>Re Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner’s visit to Flinders in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.15</td>
<td>T Clark, NTD</td>
<td>Re Flinders Council contact for C8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.15</td>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>Re Killiecrankie Toilet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS:**
Simple Majority

**RECOMMENDATION:**
That the Mayor’s report be received.

**DECISION:**
331.12.2015 Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr G Willis
That the Mayor’s report be received.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)**

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
A. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Mayor Carol Cox announced at 1.05pm that pursuant to Section 25 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2005 the Council will now act as a Planning Authority under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.

Item A1: Development Application – (Cohen & Associates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPONENT</td>
<td>Cohen &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER</td>
<td>James Ireland (Consultant Town Planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED BY</td>
<td>Karin van Straten (Senior Consultant Town Planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>DA2015/046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED PAPERS</td>
<td>Annexure 4: Subdivision Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annexure 5: BAL Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annexure 6: Letter of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annexure 7: Natural Values Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annexure 8: Representation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: Six Lot Subdivision

Location: Coast Road, Lady Barron (CT: 139505/1)

Applicant: Cohen & Associates

Zoning: Rural Zone

Special Areas: Shorelines, water bodies and watercourses

Schedules: Schedule 7 Development in bushfire prone areas

Representations: One

INTRODUCTION:
This report considers an application for a six lot subdivision of land located at Coast Road, Lady Barron (CT: 139505/1).

Subject Site
The subject site is a 12.01 ha lot on the south side of Coast Road, 550m west of the junction with West Street. It has frontage to Coast Road of 476.33m, and a depth of 363m. The site is mostly cleared and to pasture interspersed with some scrub. It is vacant of development. A drainage channel meanders through the eastern half of the site.
To the west is a similarly sized vacant agricultural lot. To the north is a private airfield. To the east is a smaller lot with a house, also zoned rural. Across Coast Road to the south is Parks and Wildlife land. It is understood that it accommodates a bird haven.

**Zoning**
The subject property is located within the Rural Zone, pursuant to the *Flinders Planning Scheme 2000*.

---

**Statutory Timeframes**
Date Received: 16/11/15  
Advertised: 18/11/15  
Closing date for representations: 2/12/15  
Request for further information: NA  
Information received: NA  
Extension of time granted: NA  
Extension of time expires: NA  
Decision due: 28/12/15
OFFICER'S REPORT:

General
It is proposed to subdivide the subject site into six lots. The lots are roughly rectangular on a north-south alignment. They vary in size from 1.57 ha to 2.59 ha, with frontage to Coast Road of between 73.96m and 89.65m.

Assessment:
Pursuant to Section 81 of the Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous) Act 1993, subdivision requires a discretionary application.

Clause 3.10 Consideration of Applications for Planning Permits
Council shall take into consideration the following:

1. the objectives, the intent of the zone, use and development principles, any development plan affecting the land and any relevant development standards or other relevant requirements of the Scheme;

An assessment is made below:

5.8.1 Zone Intent

(a) The Rural Zone on Flinders Island is intended to maintain the existing rural character of the island which is typified by a pattern of areas of open farmland, typically with shelter belts of remnant vegetation, interspersed with irregular areas of native vegetation and substantial unspoiled landform. On other islands within the Planning Area the zone is intended to preserve the existing character which displays minimal signs of European occupation.

(b) Use and development in the Rural Zone is intended to accommodate agricultural uses and development predominantly, with some compatible non-agricultural uses and development in appropriate circumstances, including tourist operation and rural industries. Forest plantations may be appropriate where they do not adversely affect the character of an area or detract from important views.

COMMENT: The proposal is not consistent with the zone intent. In relation to (a), the site has a rural character of ‘open farmland, typically with shelter belts of remnant vegetation’. In relation to (b), for a non-agricultural use such as residential to be accommodated it must not compromise this character. This was clearly outlined by the chairman of the Resource Management Planning Appeals Tribunal in his decision of 15 April 2015 relating to another subdivision of sub minimal lots in the rural zone on Flinders Island (117/14S - North East River Road, Palana).
The proposed subdivision allows the development of the site with six houses and associated driveways and outbuildings, with minimal separation between the houses (likely in the order of 50m). Such development will not maintain the existing rural character (indeed it will transform it to a low density residential strip) and therefore the proposal is not consistent with the zone intent.

5.8.2 Desired Zone Character and Zone Guidelines

(a) The use or development of small existing rural lots for the purpose of residential living shall only be approved where such use or development is compatible with any existing or potential agricultural use of that land or surrounding lands.

(b) Use or development should enhance the rural character of the zone. Buildings should be substantial distances from the road frontage and apart, unless inappropriate for operational or topographical reasons. Where land clearance is undertaken it should be visually sympathetic; important trees (or stands of trees) should be retained, important hilltop locations should not be cleared and location of trees and shrubs along fence lines, property boundaries, watercourses and at property entrances is encouraged. Buildings and structures for aquaculture should be sited with regard to the protection of coastal scenery and compatibility with recreational use of the coastline.

(c) Land use or development and management practices shall be environmentally appropriate and shall avoid contamination or despoliation of the land, ground water, water courses, shore-lines, lagoons and marshes. Sand-dunes and coastal vegetation and ecologically important areas shall be protected from degradation.

(d) Forestry activities in the zone shall be in accordance with the Forest Practices Code

COMMENT: Criteria (a) is not applicable as this is not a small existing rural lot. It is proposed to create small rural lots. In relation to (b) the proposal does not enhance the rural character of the zone (see above under zone intent). The proposed lot sizes means that buildings cannot be “…substantial distances from the road frontage and apart.” The likely future residential use of this subdivision is likely to meet (c). Criteria (d) is not applicable.

5.8.3 Subdivision Standards

(a) The minimum lot size is 40 ha

(b) A lot less than 40 hectares may be approved at Council’s discretion for the following purposes;
   (i) For an intensive agricultural use;
(ii)  For a use, other than agriculture, that is consistent with the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines;

(iii) For an aquaculture use;

(iv) For a servicing facility, infrastructure or recreational use;

(v)  For boundary alterations where no additional titles are created and the resultant lots will comply with the intent of the zone.

(c) In considering an application under Clause 5.8.3(b) Council shall require a detailed assessment of the proposal prepared by a suitably qualified, independent, agricultural consultant that demonstrates:

(i)  In the case of lots for intensive agricultural use, the capacity of the proposed lot(s)

(ii) other cases, the agricultural capacity of the proposed lot(s) (including any balance lot) and methods which will be employed to safeguard their agricultural capacity;

(d) Before accepting an application under Clause 5.9.3(b) Council may require the applicant to submit a Development Plan for the land to which the application relates. The Development Plan should show that:

(i)  Subdivision will not fragment or diminish the agricultural potential of the land;

(ii) Subdivision will not result in ribbon development along roads and coastlines;

(iii) Development will not cause significant adverse impact on the natural environment, flora and fauna, coastal waters, watercourses or skylines;

(iv) Development or use will not be likely to result in land use conflict with existing land uses in the vicinity.

COMMENT: The proposal must rely on (b) ii) as the proposed lots are smaller than the 40ha minimum at (a). To apply this clause, a use must be attached to the subdivision proposal – the application states that the use of the new lots will be residential. An assessment of this proposed use against the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines is made under 3.10 (1.). In relation to (c), an agricultural report was provided with the application. The report concluded that the title: ‘retains some, though marginal, agricultural value and as a result it could be argued that use of the title for purposes other than agriculture is not consistent with the intent, character or guidelines in the rural zone.’ This is a clear statement, from the application itself that the proposal does not meet (c).
2. any relevant proposals, reports or requirements of any public authorities;

Not applicable. None were received.

3. any representations received following public notification where required under the Act;

One representation was received, from the neighbour to the east. They had no objection to the subdivision itself, but expressed concerns about how wet the subject site is and asked that the drainage be addressed.

4. whether any part of the land is subject to:
   
   (a) landslip, soil instability, or erosion;
   (b) excessive slope;
   (c) ponding or flooding;
   (d) bush fire hazard;
   (e) a Protected Catchment District under Water Management Act 1999;
   (f) any Special Area Provisions in Part 7;
   (g) pollution; and
   (h) other hazards to safety or health.

Council officers and Councillors with knowledge of the site provided advice that the land is subject to flooding and ponding, primarily due to groundwater/aquifer water. This is likely to limit the locations for future houses to high points at the rear of the proposed lots. The land is also subject to bushfire hazard. An assessment against Schedule 7 Development in Bushfire Prone Areas is made elsewhere in this report.

5. whether the proposed use or development is satisfactory in terms of its siting, size or appearance and levels of emissions in relation to:
   
   (a) existing site features;
   (b) adjoining land;
   (c) the streetscape and/or landscape;
   (d) the natural environment;
   (e) items of historic, architectural or scientific interest;
   (f) buffer zones, attenuation areas,
   (g) easements;
   (h) a water supply for firefighting purposes;
(i) any received pollution;
(j) the escape of pollutants into storm drains and watercourses: and
(k) isolation, separation from other lands.

An assessment of these is made elsewhere in this report.

6. whether the proposed use or development will be supplied with an adequate level of infrastructure and services, and if there is any necessity to improve deficient access, roads or road junctions, water, sewerage, electricity or transport services and the like, without detriment to existing users;

Any approval must have a condition that each lot is provided with services. It is understood that the existing infrastructure including the road network has sufficient capacity to serve the new lots.

7. whether the proposed use or development would adversely affect the existing and possible future use or development of adjacent land, and vice versa;

The development of houses on the new lots is unlikely to affect the airfield and agricultural use of adjacent land. However, there is a bird haven on the Parks and Wildlife land across Coast Road. The impact of six new houses on this is not assessed in the application documents. There is reasonably high potential for future impact on the proposed residential use, particularly from the existing airfield operation.

8. the provision of adequate landscaping, amenity facilities and illumination, and the treatment of the site generally;

Not applicable.

9. the sight distances available to and from proposed point(s) of access, together with an estimate of the speed of passing traffic;

A desk top assessment suggests the site distances available are 180m+, which meet the safe intersection sight distance requirements for an 80km/h zone (the speed limit in this section of Coast Road).

10. the design and siting of the proposal to enable reduction in energy consumption through alternative energy use or reduction in demand; and

Not applicable as no buildings are proposed.

11. the safety and well-being of the general public.
Complies.

12. Any other matter which Council is of the opinion is relevant to the particular application.

None stated.

4.1 Plans of Subdivision

4.1.1 In considering any application for the subdivision of land Council must:

(a) give consideration to the matters listed in Clauses 3.9 & 3.10 as far as they be relevant to a subdivision;

(b) in no case approve the subdivision of any lot or other block of land of a size, shape or dimension other than is provided for in Part 6 of this Scheme and required to enable all other relevant provisions of this Scheme to be met; and

(c) have regard to any other relevant matters required under this Scheme and the provisions of the Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1993;

COMMENT: In relation to (a) and (b) an assessment is provided elsewhere in this report. In relation to (c), pursuant to Section 81 of the Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous) Act 1993, subdivision requires a discretionary application.

Part 6 – Use and Development Principles

An assessment is made below against the relevant principles (those that are not applicable have been omitted for brevity):

6.0 Use and development shall be consistent with the following principles:

6.1 Use

(a) Use or development shall not unreasonably impact on any existing or intended use of development of neighbouring land.

(b) Subdivision of land shall be carried out in accordance with the subdivision provisions for the zone within which the land is located or where that is not appropriate in accordance with:

(i) the requirements of the intended use, and

(ii) the Zone Intent, or alternatively by
(iii) an approved Development Plan that has been adopted by Council and inserted as a provision in the Scheme.

COMMENT: An assessment is made elsewhere in this report.

6.2 Character

(a) Use and development shall adequately respect the character of, and future intentions for the area in which it is to be located.

(b) Subdivision layout, particularly roads, shall take adequate account of land contours and the need to avoid visual scarring.

COMMENT: The site has a rural character of ‘open farmland, typically with shelter belts of remnant vegetation’. The proposed subdivision allows the development of the site with six houses and associated driveways and outbuildings, with minimal separation (likely in the order of 50m). Such development will not maintain the existing rural character (indeed it will transform it to a low density residential strip) and therefore the proposal is not consistent with the character. If the future intentions for the subject site are residential, the subject site should be rezoned to reflect this.

6.3 Amenity

(a) Adequate public open space shall be provided in areas of new subdivision, to meet the recreational and open space requirements of the community generally and particularly the new owners of the lots created by subdivision.

COMMENT: No public open space is proposed. However it is normal for a subdivision of this size to make a cash contribution to Council in lieu.

6.4 Environment

(a) Use or development shall not be allowed to detrimentally affect the environment. All areas, and sensitive ecological and/or visual areas in particular, shall be developed in a manner and to an extent which is consistent with the protection of the values of the area.

(b) Use or Development and land management practices shall be directed towards achieving environmental sustainability, biodiversity and ecological balance, and avoiding environmental damage such as soil erosion, coastal dune erosion, loss of
important animal and plant species and increases in vermin populations.

(c) Use or Development shall not be located in areas of unacceptable risk (eg. from fire, flood or landslip). In situations where risk may exist, use and development shall be appropriately sited and designed to provide an acceptable level of protection and safety for future users. In particular.

i. Lands subject to flood risk are those subject to a greater than one in a 100 year flood interval (1% probability), and land, the natural surface level of which is below 3 metres Australian Height Datum (AHD); and

ii. Land which comprises soils of known or suspected instability, has a slope greater than 1 in 4, or is filled or reclaimed land, are deemed to constitute an unstable land hazard; and

iii. Use and development in bushfire prone areas will comply with the provisions of Schedule 7 Development in Bushfire Prone Areas or some other provisions acceptable to Council and the Tasmania Fire Service.

COMMENT: In relation to (a), the subject site is not an ecologically or visually sensitive area, although it is affected by the shorelines, water bodies and watercourses special area. Future houses should be located outside of this area (as there are flooding concerns here). In relation to (b), the proposed subdivision and likely future use of the lots is not likely to detrimentally affect the environment. In relation to (c), i) future houses should be located outside of the special area (as there flooding concerns here). Criteria ii) is not applicable. In relation to iii), the site is prone to bushfire, so Schedule 7 applies.

6.5 Heritage

COMMENT: Not applicable. The subject site is not heritage listed.

6.6 Access and Parking

(a) All new lots must be provided with satisfactory pedestrian and vehicular access to a public street.

(b) All Use or Development shall provide satisfactory pedestrian and vehicular access which is suited to the volume and needs of future users.
COMMENT: It is understood that all new lots will be able to be provided with suitable access from Coast Road.

6.7 Services

(a) Use or Development shall be provided with adequate and appropriate services which are suited to the lifestyle requirements of people, the nature of the location, and the ability of the community to provide.

(b) Lot size and arrangement shall be adequate and appropriate to ensure an acceptable level of servicing, particularly in relation to waste disposal.

(c) In areas not serviced with water use or development shall provide adequate water supply and effluent disposal systems. Each dwelling shall provide a potable water storage facility (minimum capacity of 40kl) to provide for the anticipated number of occupants, and a wastewater disposal system approved by the Council’s Environmental Health Officer.

(d) Use or Development in the bushfire prone areas will provide fire protection features and water supplies which comply with Schedule 7.

(e) Use or Development shall be appropriately sited, designed and constructed to avoid conflict with service mains (including telephone, power, sewer, water and irrigation channels/pipelines). Buildings shall not be erected over any service main or within any easement providing for same whether utilised or not.

(f) Servicing systems shall use adequate and appropriate design methods and materials to ensure an acceptable life span and allow for adequate maintenance requirements.

(g) Use or Development shall optimise efficiency in the use of energy and resources. In particular, land should be subdivided on a generally sequential basis (ie. one area is substantially developed before the next is subdivided), common trenching should be used for different services where appropriate, and solar access maximised.

COMMENT: The proposed lots are to be serviced to meet (a) and (c). The lots comply with (b), subject to environmental health approval of wastewater disposal. Criteria (d) to (f) could be addressed when development is proposed. In relation to (g), this proposal is not consistent with the subdivision of land on a sequential basis. There are approximately 10 lots of similar size to those
proposed within 700m that are undeveloped (in addition to many more smaller lots). These should be developed before subdivision of the subject site is considered.

6.8 Social Interest

1. Use or Development should demonstrate how it suits the community interest.

2. Use or Development shall have adequate and appropriate types and levels of access to social facilities and services (eg. shops, government agencies, telecommunication, health services and educational facilities).

COMMENT: The proposal provides additional housing lots on Flinders Island which anecdotally is considered to be in the community interest. The proposed location of the housing lots may not be considered in the community interest. The subdivision is within walking distance of Lady Barron (approximately 1km).

6.9 Administration

(a) In considering subdivision and/or rezoning proposals, an appropriate balance shall be maintained between current demand and stock available for use or development, and the number of new lots that would be created.

(b) Use or Development proposals should only be approved where the cost to the public of providing and maintaining services is not exceeded by the economic benefit of the use or development to the community.

(c) In considering any proposal, Council shall obtain the advice and opinion of other relevant group(s), individual(s) or organisation(s) with direct interest in the proposal.

COMMENT: In relation to (a), there is anecdotal evidence of a shortage of affordable housing lots on Flinders Island. However, there are approximately 10 lots of similar size to those proposed within 700m that are undeveloped (in addition to many more smaller lots). These should be developed before subdivision of the subject site is considered.

Part 7 – Special Area Provisions

7.5 Shorelines, Water Bodies and Watercourses Special Area
This affects a strip up to 70m wide along the full length of the frontage and up to 95m wide along part of the west boundary (as a result of the creek that runs along the boundary).

Assessment must consider the following clause:

7.5.3 In considering an application for Use or Development in Shorelines, Water Bodies and Watercourses and whether to impose conditions Council shall consider the following matters:

(a) The siting, orientation, setback, bulk, form, height, scale, materials and external finishes of buildings and structures

(b) The impact upon water quality, foreshore or streamside vegetation and wildlife habitat of building, clearing, excavation, effluent disposal, access construction, fences, firebreaks or the deposition of fill;

(c) Whether land should be acquired by Council as a condition of subdivision or otherwise, to protect the items listed in Schedule 3;

(d) Whether additional fencing or any other special works or practices are required to protect the items listed in Schedule 3;

(e) The design, content and location of signage and interpretative displays.

As the subdivision does not propose any buildings, the above matters are not strictly relevant. If a future house was proposed anywhere on a future lot including in the special area, it would be subject to a discretionary planning application. There is sufficient area outside this overlay area for a house, should this be necessary. Criteria (c) to (e) are not applicable.

Part 8 - Schedules

Schedule 7 – Development in Bushfire Prone Areas

The subdivision is within a bushfire prone area. An assessment against the schedule is made below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S7.1.0 ISSUE</th>
<th>INTENT - The design, siting and layout of subdivisions in bushfire prone areas should minimise fire risks and the potential for loss of life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S7.1.1a</td>
<td>Subdivisions are designed so that buildings are separated from the bushfire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions are designed to have lots of sufficient size and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hazard by Building Protection Zones (BPZ) and Fuel Modified Buffer Zones (FMBZ) and

| S7.1.1b | A BPZ surrounds a building and is separated from the fire hazard by a FMBZ and |
| S7.1.1c | BPZ and FMBZ can be constructed to the width measured along the ground as shown in Table 7.1 and |
| S7.1.1d | If the required width of the BPZ is exceeded, the width of the FMBZ may be reduced by that additional width, thus maintaining the same total width of fuel reduced areas. (Note the width of the BPZ cannot be reduced). |

**COMMENT:** BPZs and FMBZs are not referred to in the bushfire report so the performance criteria must be met. BAL 12.5 and BAL 19 management areas are shown on the Bushfire Hazard Management Plan (BHMP). There is sufficient remaining area on all lots to ensure that future buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire.

| S7.1.2a | FMBZ are within the boundaries of the subdivision and BPZ are within the boundaries of each lot or |
| S7.1.2b | In reticulated water supply areas, the width of the FMBZ may be reduced if it can be shown that other fire protection measures acceptable to the Tasmania Fire Service and Council are to be incorporated into the development or |
| S7.1.2c | Where the subdivision does not provide either sufficient BPZ or FMBZ for individual lots, a multi-lot solution may be proposed which may be acceptable to the Tasmania Fire Service and Council. |

Subdivisions provide all lots with sufficient fuel reduced areas around building envelopes so buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire.

**COMMENT:** FMBZs and BPZs are not referred to in the bushfire report. BAL 12.5 and BAL 19 management areas are provided and they are within the proposed lot boundaries whilst providing sufficient remaining area on all lots to ensure that future buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire.
**S7.2.0 ISSUE**  
**Access in subdivisions**

**INTENT** – Subdivisions are designed to provide safe access for emergency and other vehicles to all lots and buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.1a</strong> Subdivisions have two access roads to low bushfire hazard areas or</td>
<td>Subdivisions should have safe alternative routes to low bushfire hazard areas for emergency and other vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.2.1b</strong> Dead end roads must not exceed 200 metres in length or service more than 8 lots or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.1c</strong> Where only one road is available, the Tasmania Fire Service and Council may approve a local area development plan which provides for the eventual linking of a dead end road to a connective road network or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.1d</strong> The Tasmania Fire Service and Council may approve a non through road provided it is linked to a formed fire trail to the requirements of the Tasmania Fire Service and Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENT:** Coast Road is a through road, meeting the acceptable solution.

| **S7.2.2a** Access must be of all-weather construction and | Safe access roads shall be provided at all times. |
| **S7.2.2b** Road structures (including bridges) must have a minimum load limit of 20 tonnes and |  |
| **S7.2.2c** There must be vertical clearance to a height of 4 metres above the trafficable width of the access and |  |
| **S7.2.2d** There must be horizontal clearance from 4 metres of the centre line of any trafficable road for a height of 4 metres above the trafficable width. |  |

**COMMENT:** Without having technical details it is understood that Coast Road meets the acceptable solution.

| **S7.2.3a** A maximum gradient of 1 in 8 (12.5%) is specified. However, where a topographic difficulty occurs, an absolute maximum grade of 1 in 5 (20%) for a | The horizontal and vertical alignments, crossfall and turning areas reflect physical characteristics and major drainage functions for the site as well |
| |  |
distance no greater than 50 metres may be approved by the Tasmania Fire Service and Council. The average maximum grade must therefore not exceed 1 in 7 (14.4%) and

**S7.2.3b** Curves must have a minimum inner radius of 10 metres and

**S7.2.3c** Dips must have no more than a 1 in 8 (12.5%) entry and exit angle and

**S7.2.3d** All roads must have a maximum cross fall alignment of 1 in 33 (3%).

**COMMENT:** Coast Road is existing. Without having technical details it is understood that it meets the acceptable solution.

**S7.2.4a** At the end of all roads or access ways there must be a court bowl or cul de sac of a minimum trafficable radius of 10 metres (shoulders, seal or other consolidated edges may be acceptable) or

**S7.2.4b** At the end of all roads or access ways there must be hammerhead “T” or “Y” turnarounds with minimum 4 metres width and total length of 16 metres.

**COMMENT:** Suitable turning areas for fire suppression and other vehicles must be provided at the end of all roads and access ways.

**S7.2.5a** The minimum trafficable width for access is 6 metres which may include consolidated, formed, surfaced and drained shoulders or

**S7.2.5b** Where 8 or less lots are being serviced, an access with trafficable width of 4 metres for a maximum of 90 metres length may be provided or

**S7.2.5c** Where the access is less than 6 metres trafficable width, passing bays of a minimum length of 20 metres must be provided every 200 metres along the access. The combined width of the access and the passing bay must be a minimum 6 metres. fire suppression and other vehicles

**COMMENT:** Access should be of sufficient width to allow simultaneous access and egress for emergency and other vehicles.

**COMMENT:** No access within the lots is proposed as part of this application.
### S7.2.6a
An access road forms the perimeter of the development or

### S7.2.6b
A fire trail connected to an access road forms the perimeter of the development.

**COMMENT:** There is no access to the perimeter of the development. The performance criteria is not met.

### S7.2.7a
Fire trails are constructed to 4WD standard and

### S7.2.7b
Fire trails have a formed width of 4 metres and

### S7.2.7c
Fire trails must have vertical clearance to a height of 4 metres above the trafficable and

### S7.2.7d
Fire trails must have horizontal clearance from 3 metres of the centre line for a height of 4 metres above the trafficable width and

### S7.2.7e
Fire trails will have a maximum gradient of 1 in 6 (17%).

**COMMENT:** NA. No fire trails are proposed.

### S7.3.0 ISSUE
Water supplies for fire suppression in subdivisions

**INTENT** – To ensure adequate water supplies are available in a subdivision for landowners or emergency services to defend properties from bushfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.1a</strong> Subdivisions have a reticulated water supply with a minimum flow rate as specified by Australian Standard AS 2419 for the intended class of development as required under the Building Code of Australia or 600 litres per minute (whichever is greater) or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.1b</strong> Subdivisions have a static water supply to comply with AS 2419 for the intended class of development as required under the Building Code of Australia for fire suppression or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions have an adequate size of water supply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.1c</strong></td>
<td>For developments not specified in the Building Code of Australia in S7.3.1 b), subdivisions for lots less than 2500 square metres will have 10,000 litres of stored water for fire suppression and for lots 2500 square metres or larger, 20,000 litres of stored water for fire suppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong> A static water supply is shown on the BHMP. Details are not specified but it is assumed it will meet the performance criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.2a</strong></td>
<td>In areas where the water supply complies with S7.3.1 a), the building envelope must not be more than 130 metres from the nearest fire hydrant. The hydrant must comply with Tasmania Fire Service and Council requirements or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.2b</strong></td>
<td>In areas where the water supply does not comply with S7.3.1 a), a static supply complying with S7.3.1 b) or c) will be located within the subdivision to be accessible by emergency vehicles at all times. The supply may be from a single source or a combination of storages for either individual lots or for the entire subdivision. Storages must be accessible from all the lots they are intended to serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.3a</strong></td>
<td>All water storage tanks are constructed of non-combustible and non-rust materials such as galvanised steel and concrete and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.3b</strong></td>
<td>All above ground pipelines and fittings are either constructed of non-combustible and non-rust materials such as galvanised steel and copper, or protected from the effects of heat and flame by lagging or other means and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.3.3c</strong></td>
<td>All below-ground water pipelines are installed to a depth as specified in the National Plumbing Code AS 3500 (generally 300 mm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong> A static water supply is shown on the BHMP. Details are not specified but it is assumed it will meet the performance criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S7.3.4a If the storage is accessible and above ground, a male 64 mm 5V thread coupling to Tasmania Fire Service specifications must be installed on the storage to supply water or

S7.3.4b If the storage is accessible and below ground, there must be sufficient hard standing beside or adjacent to the storage to allow an emergency vehicle access for draughting from the storage or

S7.3.4c If the storage is not directly accessible, a remote access point may be provided which must deliver water at a minimum flow rate of 270 litres per minute at the delivery point through a male 64 mm 5V thread coupling to Tasmania Fire Service specifications.

Access to static supplies will be suitable for emergency vehicles.

COMMENT: Not applicable. Will apply to future development applications.

Referrals
The application was referred to Council’s Environmental Health Officer. They are confident wastewater treatment can be accommodated on the lots, subject to further investigation. They also advised that the front section of the lots is wet and unsuitable for wastewater treatment

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:
The application was advertised for 14 days in accordance with the Act.

POLICY/STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:
The relevant strategic focus areas of the Flinders Council Strategic Plan 2015 are:

Strategic Focus Area 1: Population Growth - Focusing on strategies, projects and policy initiatives that support the community, economic development, innovation and investment attraction.

and:

Strategic Focus Area 2: Infrastructure and Services - An Islands’ specific approach to planning and delivery to ensure community and environmental values are maintained.
COMMENT: The proposal is likely to support investment in line with strategic focus area 1; however, as it is not consistent with the rural character, it does not ensure that community and environmental values are maintained. The proposal is therefore not wholly consistent with the plan.

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Not applicable.

OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:
That the application for a six lot subdivision in the rural zone, by Cohen & Associates for land located at Coast Road, Lady Barron (CT: 139505/1) be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is not consistent with the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines for the rural zone.

2. The proposal does not meet the requirements of Clause 5.8.3 (b) of the planning scheme relating to subdivision in the rural zone.

DECISION:
332.12.2015 Moved: Cr D Williams Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Cobham
That Council discusses agenda items A1 and A2, under Section 22 (9) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr D Williams
That the application for a six lot subdivision in the rural zone, by Cohen & Associates for land located at Coast Road, Lady Barron (CT: 139505/1) be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is not consistent with the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines for the rural zone.

2. The proposal does not meet the requirements of Clause 5.8.3 (b) of the planning scheme relating to subdivision in the rural zone.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
Item A2: Development Application – (Nick Griggs & Co.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOINENT</td>
<td>Nick Griggs &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER</td>
<td>James Ireland (Consultant Town Planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED BY</td>
<td>Karin van Straten (Senior Consultant Town Planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>DA2015/016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ASSOCIATED PAPERS | Annexure 9: Subdivision Plan  
Annexure 10: Agricultural and Natural Values Report  
Annexure 11: Restoration Plan  
Annexure 12: Bushfire Hazard Management Plan  
Annexure 13: Representations |

Proposal: 24 lot staged subdivision

Location: North East River Road, Palana (CT: 237440/1 & 159958/1)

Applicant: Nick Griggs & Co.

Zoning: Rural Zone

Special Areas: Visually Sensitive Area

Representations: Two

INTRODUCTION:
This report considers an application for a 23 plus balance lot stage subdivision of land located at North East River Road, Palana (CT: 237440/1 & 159958/1).

Subject Site

The subject site comprises two lots with frontage to Edens Road in Palana. Together the lots total 392.4ha and slope down from 110m at the western end to 10m at North East River Road, which runs along the eastern edge of the site. The majority of the site - the part south of Edens Road - is a former pine plantation that has recently been harvested. The northern side of Edens Road plus small parcels in the north east corner of the site and on the east side of North East River Road have remnant vegetation. This comprises coastal scrubland and a threatened community, *Eucalyptus viminalis* - *Eucalyptus globulus* coastal forest and woodland (refer to map).

The subject site is currently vacant of development. Edens Road runs through the site but is only partially formed (it is essentially a 4WD track). To the north, west and south are eleven neighbouring lots of 40-100ha and all are zoned rural.
Six appear to be vacant and five have some development. To the east is the North East River Game Reserve through which North East River Road runs.

**Zoning**

The subject property is located within the Rural Zone, pursuant to the *Flinders Planning Scheme 1994*.

**Special Areas**

The part of the subject site above the 40m contour is affected by the visually sensitive special area. It comprises approximately 60% of the site.
Statutory Timeframes

Date Received: 20/10/15
Request for further information: 1/6/15
Information received: 20/10/15
Advertised: 28/10/14
Closing date for representations: 12/11/15
Extension of time expires: 17/12/15
Decision due: 17/12/14

OFFICER'S REPORT:

Background

The subject site has a history that is a relevant consideration here. It can be summarised as follows:

Planning Permit 18/10P

- A planning permit was issued 26 August 2010 for a 10 lot subdivision of the site. With the exception of the proposed public open space, all the lots were larger than the minimum size for the rural zone (40ha).
- There were no conditions on this permit relating to rehabilitation of the pine plantation.
- Council has determined that this permit was commenced in time (as a bond was paid to Council) and therefore this is a live permit. The owner
of the land can complete this subdivision at any time, regardless of the subsequent events described below.

Planning Application DA2014/15
- A new application was made in April 2014 for a 24 lot subdivision of the site. Of the 24 lots, 22 were sub-minimum. One representation was received.
- It was recommended for approval subject to conditions, some of which were additional to those on the 2010 permit. The motion to approve the application was carried by Flinders Councillors at the November 2014 Council meeting and a permit was issued on 13 November 2014.
- The permit applicant subsequently lodged an appeal to the Resource Management Planning Appeals Tribunal against three conditions relating to when Edens Road must be upgraded, providing underground power lines in the visually sensitive area and rehabilitating the site after the harvest of the plantation.
- A consent memorandum on the conditions was reached between the appellant and Council and submitted to the Tribunal for their decision. In such a case the Tribunal must consider the whole application, not just the application for a decision on the consent memorandum.
- The Tribunal’s decision was delivered on 15 April 2015 (117/14S). The Tribunal’s chairman determined that the Council should not have approved the application, primarily because the proposal did not meet the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines and did not meet the criteria for a sub-minimum lot.
- The Tribunal refused to issue a decision based on the consent memorandum and gave the appellant 21 days to make submissions as to why the application should not be refused.
- The applicant chose to withdraw the appeal. On this basis, the original permit, with the original conditions as issued on 13 November 2014 still stands. It has not been commenced, but will not expire until 13 November 2016 assuming no extension is sought.

Planning Application DA2015/016
- A new application was made in May 2015 for an almost identical 24 lot subdivision of the site. This is the application that is subject of this agenda item. Two representations were received.
- In light of the Tribunal’s decision referred to above, there is no choice but to recommend refusal of this application.

Proposal
It is proposed to subdivide the subject site into 24 lots, with lots varying in size from 10ha to 68.1ha. Subdivision will be staged. Lots 1 to 8 and 23 have frontage to North East River Road. Lots 9 to 22 have frontage to Edens Road,
which will require upgrading to comply with the Bushfire Code and provide convenient access. The 14.13ha balance lot (Lot 100) is located on the eastern side of North East River Road. Lot 23 also has a second access via a right of way to Edens Road through lot 21 to comply with the bushfire provisions. The lots on the ridgeline in the southern part of the site are large enough (60ha plus) to accommodate a dwelling away from the ridge line. Additional works proposed include the upgrade of Edens Road, the clearing of boundary lines and the provision of services.

It is proposed to stage the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage No.</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Lots 7, 8 and 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Lots 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Lots 1, 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Lot 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>Lots 22 and 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lots 10-13 and 17-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lots 14-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sub-stages in Stage 1 may be developed together or separately.

**Assessment:**

Pursuant to Section 81 of the *Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous) Act 1993*, subdivision requires a discretionary application.

**Clause 3.10 Consideration of Applications for Planning Permits**

Council shall take into consideration the following:

1. *the objectives, the intent of the zone, use and development principles, any development plan affecting the land and any relevant development standards or other relevant requirements of the Scheme;*

An assessment is made below:

**5.8.1 Zone Intent**

(a) The Rural Zone on Flinders Island is intended to maintain the existing rural character of the island which is typified by a pattern of areas of open farmland, typically with shelter belts of remnant vegetation, interspersed with irregular areas of native vegetation
and substantial unspoiled landform. On other islands within the Planning Area the zone is intended to preserve the existing character which displays minimal signs of European occupation.

(b) Use and development in the Rural Zone is intended to accommodate agricultural uses and development predominantly, with some compatible non-agricultural uses and development in appropriate circumstances, including tourist operation and rural industries. Forest plantations may be appropriate where they do not adversely affect the character of an area or detract from important views.

COMMENT: In relation to (a), overall the site does not have a rural character consistent with either open farmland or unspoiled landform. The site is mostly a harvested pine plantation, although a small part is unspoiled landform.

In relation to (b), for a non-agricultural use such as residential to be approved it must accommodate agricultural use. The proposed subdivision allows the development of the site with 24 houses and associated driveways and outbuildings. Such a development does not accommodate agricultural use. Whether the land is suitable for agriculture or not is not relevant to this clause. The non-existence of a rural character in accordance with (a) due to a past use (a pine plantation) does not automatically allow another, different non-agricultural use (such as residential as proposed here). This was outlined in the Tribunal’s decision given in April 2015 for essentially the same proposal on the same site (117/14S): “...the present state of non-compliance does not make the proposed sub minimal subdivision compliant, or otherwise allow it...”

On the basis of the above, the proposal is not consistent with the zone intent.

5.8.2 Desired Zone Character and Zone Guidelines

(a) The use or development of small existing rural lots for the purpose of residential living shall only be approved where such use or development is compatible with any existing or potential agricultural use of that land or surrounding lands.

(b) Use or development should enhance the rural character of the zone. Buildings should be substantial distances from the road frontage and apart, unless inappropriate for operational or topographical reasons. Where land clearance is undertaken it should be visually sympathetic; important trees (or stands of trees) should be retained, important hilltop locations should not be cleared and location of trees and shrubs along fence lines, property boundaries, watercourses and at property entrances is encouraged. Buildings and structures for aquaculture should be sited with regard to the protection of coastal scenery and compatibility with recreational use of the coastline.
(c) Land use or development and management practices shall be environmentally appropriate and shall avoid contamination or despoliation of the land, ground water, water courses, shore-lines, lagoons and marshes. Sand-dunes and coastal vegetation and ecologically important areas shall be protected from degradation.

(d) Forestry activities in the zone shall be in accordance with the Forest Practices Code

COMMENT: Criteria (a) is not applicable as this is not a small existing rural lot. It is proposed to create small lots. Whether or not the land has agricultural potential is therefore not relevant to this clause. In relation to (b) the proposal does not enhance the rural character of the zone (see above under zone intent). The large number of lots and the relatively small size of most of the lots (16 of the lots are 10-11ha when the minimum lot size in the zone is 40ha) means that buildings cannot be “...substantial distances from the road frontage and apart.” The character of most of the site will change to a low density residential one. Residential use is likely to meet (c). Criteria (d) is not applicable.

5.8.3 Subdivision Standards

(a) The minimum lot size is 40 ha

(b) A lot less than 40 hectares may be approved at Council’s discretion for the following purposes;
   (i) For an intensive agricultural use;
   (ii) For a use, other than agriculture, that is consistent with the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines;
   (iii) For an aquaculture use;
   (iv) For a servicing facility, infrastructure or recreational use;
   (v) For boundary alterations where no additional titles are created and the resultant lots will comply with the intent of the zone.

(c) In considering an application under Clause 5.8.3(b) Council shall require a detailed assessment of the proposal prepared by a suitably qualified, independent, agricultural consultant that demonstrates:
   (i) In the case of lots for intensive agricultural use, the capacity of the proposed lot(s)
   (ii) other cases, the agricultural capacity of the proposed lot(s) (including any balance lot) and methods which will be employed to safeguard their agricultural capacity;

(d) Before accepting an application under Clause 5.9.3(b) Council may require the applicant to submit a Development Plan for the
land to which the application relates. The Development Plan should show that:

(i) Subdivision will not fragment or diminish the agricultural potential of the land;
(ii) Subdivision will not result in ribbon development along roads and coastlines;
(iii) Development will not cause significant adverse impact on the natural environment, flora and fauna, coastal waters, watercourses or skylines;
(iv) Development or use will not be likely to result in land use conflict with existing land uses in the vicinity.

COMMENT: The proposal must rely on (b) ii) as 22 of the proposed 24 lots are smaller than the 40ha minimum at (a). Criteria b) i) and iii) to v) are not applicable. To apply this clause, a use must be attached to the subdivision proposal – in this case residential. An assessment of this proposed use against the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines is made under 3.10 (1.). It concludes that the application is not consistent with these.

In relation to (c), i) is not applicable. In relation to ii), a suitable agricultural report was provided with the application. The report concluded that: “The title is considered to have no agricultural value currently and no potential for development for primary industry purposes”. This conclusion means that (c) is met.

2. any relevant proposals, reports or requirements of any public authorities;

Advice from Hydro Tasmania (via Flinders Council officers) is that Underground power lines cannot be installed.

3. any representations received following public notification where required under the Act;

Two representations were received. They are summarized below, with comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Lovegrove, address supplied</td>
<td>Council should not approve this application until the restoration plan has been carried out. This report includes a recommendation for refusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The restoration plan is for the current owners, The danger is that given a new owner it will not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In any approval, the restoration plan will form part of a permit and as such is carried with the land as long as the permit is valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be practiced</td>
<td>It should be noted that it will have to be complied with only if the permit is acted on. Notwithstanding, the Forest Practices Plan (FPP) requires the removal of pine wildlings for a period of two years from the cessation of harvesting. This has not occurred and is a matter for enforcement by the Forest Practices Officer (FPO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPP has not been complied with and there is little time left to do so.</td>
<td>This is correct, but is a matter for enforcement by the FPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No written evidence with the application that re-seeding has been done.</td>
<td>It hasn’t been done. Again this is a matter for enforcement by the FPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The threatened community is quite magnificent (personal observation) and should not be subdivided as it will allow clearance for boundary lines and harvesting.</td>
<td>The subdivision design was altered based on the recommendations of the Agricultural and Natural Values Report to minimise the impact on the community. The layout now provides sufficient areas for building that are outside the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The updated reports (September 2015) rely on a past site visit (June 2014).</td>
<td>AK Consultants issued the September 2015 reports presumably in the belief they were sufficiently aware of the situation at that time. It should be noted that since the updated reports were submitted, AK consultants have been on site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Blyth, Property ID 6423493 (to the north of proposed Lots 14 and 15)

In case of fire we would like access through to Edens Road please.

|  | This is not a planning consideration. If the representor would like to pursue such an arrangement it is a civil matter between them and the landowner. Such access was not proposed in the application. It should be noted that such a proposal would require clearing of the threatened community. |

4. whether any part of the land is subject to:

   (a) landslip, soil instability, or erosion;
   (b) excessive slope;
   (c) ponding or flooding;
   (d) bush fire hazard;
   (e) a Protected Catchment District under Water Management Act 1999;
(f) any Special Area Provisions in Part 7;
(g) pollution; and
(h) other hazards to safety or health.

The land is subject to bushfire hazard. An assessment against Schedule 7 Development in Bushfire Prone Areas is made elsewhere in this report.

5. whether the proposed use or development is satisfactory in terms of its siting, size or appearance and levels of emissions in relation to:

(a) existing site features;
(b) adjoining land;
(c) the streetscape and/or landscape;
(d) the natural environment;
(e) items of historic, architectural or scientific interest;
(f) buffer zones, attenuation areas,
(g) easements;
(h) a water supply for firefighting purposes;
(i) any received pollution;
(j) the escape of pollutants into storm drains and watercourses: and
(k) isolation, separation from other lands.

An assessment of these is made elsewhere in this report.

6. whether the proposed use or development will be supplied with an adequate level of infrastructure and services, and if there is any necessity to improve deficient access, roads or road junctions, water, sewerage, electricity or transport services and the like, without detriment to existing users;

It would be a condition on a permit that each lot is provided with services. It is understood that the existing infrastructure including the road network (subject to the upgrade of Edens Road) has sufficient capacity to serve the new lots.

7. whether the proposed use or development would adversely affect the existing and possible future use or development of adjacent land, and vice versa;

There is no agricultural use on adjacent land. Notwithstanding this, the residential development of the subject site will not adversely affect any future agricultural use on adjacent land.
8. the provision of adequate landscaping, amenity facilities and illumination, and the treatment of the site generally;

Not applicable. None proposed or required.

9. the sight distances available to and from proposed point(s) of access, together with an estimate of the speed of passing traffic;

Driveway access points are not specified. However, all lots have frontages that are long enough and straight enough for accesses to be located with sufficient site distances. As gravel roads, the speed limit on both Edens Road and North East River Road is 80km/h.

10. the design and siting of the proposal to enable reduction in energy consumption through alternative energy use or reduction in demand; and

Not applicable to the subdivision. Will apply to future dwelling applications.

11. the safety and well-being of the general public.

Complies.

12. Any other matter which Council is of the opinion is relevant to the particular application.

None stated.

4.1 Plans of Subdivision

4.1.1 In considering any application for the subdivision of land Council must:

(a) give consideration to the matters listed in Clauses 3.9 & 3.10 as far as they be relevant to a subdivision;

(b) in no case approve the subdivision of any lot or other block of land of a size, shape or dimension other than is provided for in Part 6 of this Scheme and required to enable all other relevant provisions of this Scheme to be met; and

(c) have regard to any other relevant matters required under this Scheme and the provisions of the Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1993;

COMMENT: In relation to (a) and (b) an assessment is provided elsewhere in this report. In relation to (c), pursuant to Section 81 of the Local Government
(Building and Miscellaneous) Act 1993, subdivision requires a discretionary application.

Part 6 – Use and Development Principles

An assessment is made below against the relevant principles (those that are not applicable have been omitted for brevity):

6.0 Use and development shall be consistent with the following principles:

6.1 Use

(a) Use or development shall not unreasonably impact on any existing or intended use of development of neighbouring land.

(b) Subdivision of land shall be carried out in accordance with the subdivision provisions for the zone within which the land is located or where that is not appropriate in accordance with:

(i) the requirements of the intended use, and
(ii) the Zone Intent, or alternatively by
(iii) an approved Development Plan that has been adopted by Council and inserted as a provision in the Scheme.

COMMENT: An assessment is made elsewhere in this report.

6.2 Character

(a) Use and development shall adequately respect the character of, and future intentions for the area in which it is to be located.

(b) Subdivision layout, particularly roads, shall take adequate account of land contours and the need to avoid visual scarring.

COMMENT: The proposal is not consistent with the character of the site (see assessment at 3.10 1.). The road layout for the subdivision is existing. However, the location of larger (60ha) lots in the most visually sensitive area will enable (b) to be met. Any dwelling will require a discretionary planning application.

6.3 Amenity

(a) Adequate public open space shall be provided in areas of new subdivision, to meet the recreational and open space
requirements of the community generally and particularly the new owners of the lots created by subdivision.

**COMMENT:** Council prefers that a cash contribution be made in lieu of this.

**6.4 Environment**

(a) Use or development shall not be allowed to detrimentally affect the environment. All areas, and sensitive ecological and/or visual areas in particular, shall be developed in a manner and to an extent which is consistent with the protection of the values of the area.

(b) Use or Development and land management practices shall be directed towards achieving environmental sustainability, biodiversity and ecological balance, and avoiding environmental damage such as soil erosion, coastal dune erosion, loss of important animal and plant species and increases in vermin populations.

(c) Use or Development shall not be located in areas of unacceptable risk (eg. from fire, flood or landslip). In situations where risk may exist, use and development shall be appropriately sited and designed to provide an acceptable level of protection and safety for future users. In particular:

i. Lands subject to flood risk are those subject to a greater than one in a 100 year flood interval (1% probability), and land, the natural surface level of which is below 3 metres Australian Height Datum (AHD); and

ii. Land which comprises soils of known or suspected instability, has a slope greater than 1 in 4, or is filled or reclaimed land, are deemed to constitute an unstable land hazard; and

iii. Use and development in bushfire prone areas will comply with the provisions of Schedule 7 Development in Bushfire Prone Areas or some other provisions acceptable to Council and the Tasmania Fire Service.

**COMMENT:** In relation to (a), the subject site is a visually sensitive area. An assessment of this is made elsewhere in this report. The proposed subdivision and likely future use of the lots will not detrimentally affect the environment. In relation to (b), the Bushfire Report, which will form part of any approval, provided building envelopes that will minimise vegetation clearance. In relation
to (c), i) and ii) are not applicable. In relation to iii), the site is prone to bushfire, so Schedule 7 applies.

6.5 Heritage

COMMENT: Not applicable. The subject site is not heritage listed.

6.6 Access and Parking

(a) All new lots must be provided with satisfactory pedestrian and vehicular access to a public street.

(b) All Use or Development shall provide satisfactory pedestrian and vehicular access which is suited to the volume and needs of future users.

COMMENT: All new lots will be able to be provided with suitable access from an upgraded Edens Road or North East River Road.

6.7 Services

(a) Use or Development shall be provided with adequate and appropriate services which are suited to the lifestyle requirements of people, the nature of the location, and the ability of the community to provide.

(b) Lot size and arrangement shall be adequate and appropriate to ensure an acceptable level of servicing, particularly in relation to waste disposal.

(c) In areas not serviced with water use or development shall provide adequate water supply and effluent disposal systems. Each dwelling shall provide a potable water storage facility (minimum capacity of 40kl) to provide for the anticipated number of occupants, and a wastewater disposal system approved by the Council’s Environmental Health Officer.

(d) Use or Development in the bushfire prone areas will provide fire protection features and water supplies which comply with Schedule 7.

(e) Use or Development shall be appropriately sited, designed and constructed to avoid conflict with service mains (including telephone, power, sewer, water and irrigation channels/pipelines). Buildings shall not be erected over any service main or within any easement providing for same whether utilised or not.
(f) Servicing systems shall use adequate and appropriate design methods and materials to ensure an acceptable life span and allow for adequate maintenance requirements.

(g) Use or Development shall optimise efficiency in the use of energy and resources. In particular, land should be subdivided on a generally sequential basis (i.e. one area is substantially developed before the next is subdivided), common trenching should be used for different services where appropriate, and solar access maximised.

COMMENT: The proposed lots are to be serviced to meet (a) and (c). The lots comply with (b), subject to environmental health approval of their wastewater disposal when development is proposed. Criteria (d) to (f) will be addressed when development is proposed. In relation to (g), the lack of sub 40ha residential lots in the area means the proposal is consistent with the subdivision of land on a sequential basis.

6.8 Social Interest

1. Use or Development should demonstrate how it suits the community interest.

2. Use or Development shall have adequate and appropriate types and levels of access to social facilities and services (e.g. shops, government agencies, telecommunication, health services and educational facilities).

COMMENT: The proposal provides additional housing lots on Flinders Island which is considered to be in the community interest. Palana is a remote part of Flinders Island, approximately 50km north of Whitemark. For this area, this level of access to services is considered appropriate.

6.9 Administration

(a) In considering subdivision and/or rezoning proposals, an appropriate balance shall be maintained between current demand and stock available for use or development, and the number of new lots that would be created.

(b) Use or Development proposals should only be approved where the cost to the public of providing and maintaining services is not exceeded by the economic benefit of the use or development to the community.
(c) In considering any proposal, Council shall obtain the advice and opinion of other relevant group(s), individual(s) or organisation(s) with direct interest in the proposal.

COMMENT: In relation to (a), there is anecdotal evidence of a shortage of affordable housing lots on Flinders Island. As a private subdivision with minimal additional public expenditure required, (b) is met. Criterion (c) is not applicable.

**Part 7 Visually Sensitive Special Area**

The objectives of the Visually Significant Areas are:

(a) To retain the natural appearance of each Area;
(b) To minimise the visual impact of Use or Development;
(c) To retain and restore where possible the natural vegetation cover.

COMMENT: In relation to objective (a), the only part of the site that has a natural appearance is the area of remnant vegetation north of Edens Road and north east of North East River Road. The remainder of the site is an exhausted pine plantation – it has been substantially altered from its natural state. In relation to (b), the subdivision itself will not affect the appearance of the area. The future residential use will result in up to 24 houses on the site, with associated driveways and outbuildings. The lots are sufficiently large to enable flexible siting of dwellings to minimise their visual impact. All future dwellings will require a discretionary planning application and it is at this point that this clause is more applicable. In relation to (c), the subdivision proposal has no effect on natural vegetation cover. However, the subdivision enables the development of houses on eight of the lots that are completely covered in natural vegetation. It will be necessary to remove vegetation on these lots. There is no proposal in the application to restore the vegetation cover.

In considering an application for Use or development within the Visually Sensitive areas and whether to impose conditions Council shall consider the following matters:

(a) The objectives listed in Clause 7.2.2
(b) The sitting, orientation, setbacks, bulk, form, height, scale and external finishes of buildings and structures
(c) The visual impact of buildings, clearing, excavation, access, construction, fences, firebreaks or the deposition of fill;
(d) The adequacy of proposed landscaping and whether any special works or practices are required to protect the scenic values of the site;
(e) Whether development is proposed to be located on skylines or ridgelines.
As the subdivision does not propose any buildings, the above matters are not strictly relevant. Future houses are subject to a discretionary planning application.

**Schedule 7 – Development in Bushfire Prone Areas**

The subdivision is within a bushfire prone area. An assessment against the schedule is made below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S7.1.0 ISSUE: Subdivision design and layout</th>
<th>INTENT - The design, siting and layout of subdivisions in bushfire prone areas should minimise fire risks and the potential for loss of life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.1.1a</strong> Subdivisions are designed so that buildings are separated from the bushfire hazard by Building Protection Zones (BPZ) and Fuel Modified Buffer Zones (FMBZ) and</td>
<td>Subdivisions are designed to have lots of sufficient size and appropriate shapes to provide building envelopes located within sufficient fuel reduced areas so buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.1.1b</strong> A BPZ surrounds a building and is separated from the fire hazard by a FMBZ and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.1.1c</strong> BPZ and FMBZ can be constructed to the width measured along the ground as shown in Table 7.1 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.1.1d</strong> If the required width of the BPZ is exceeded, the width of the FMBZ may be reduced by that additional width, thus maintaining the same total width of fuel reduced areas. (Note the width of the BPZ cannot be reduced).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong> BPZs and FMBZs are not referred to in the Bushfire Hazard Management Report so the performance criteria must be met. All the lots have BAL 19 building areas within the proposed lot boundaries so buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire. This is dependent on Edens Road being upgraded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.1.2a</strong> FMBZ are within the boundaries of the subdivision and BPZ are within the boundaries of each lot or</td>
<td>Subdivisions provide all lots with sufficient fuel reduced areas around building envelopes so buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.1.2b</strong> In reticulated water supply areas, the width of the FMBZ may be reduced if it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
can be shown that other fire protection measures acceptable to the Tasmania Fire Service and Council are to be incorporated into the development or

S7.1.2c Where the subdivision does not provide either sufficient BPZ or FMBZ for individual lots, a multi-lot solution may be proposed which may be acceptable to the Tasmania Fire Service and Council.

**COMMENT:** FMBZs and BPZs are not referred to in the Bushfire Hazard Management Report so the performance criteria must be met. BAL 19 building areas are provided so buildings are not subject to threatening levels of flames and radiation during a bushfire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S7.2.0 ISSUE</th>
<th>INTENT</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access in subdivisions</td>
<td>Subdivisions are designed to provide safe access for emergency and other vehicles to all lots and buildings.</td>
<td>S7.2.1a Subdivisions have two access roads to low bushfire hazard areas or 7.2.1b Dead end roads must not exceed 200 metres in length or service more than 8 lots or S7.2.1c Where only one road is available, the Tasmania Fire Service and Council may approve a local area development plan which provides for the eventual linking of a dead end road to a connective road network or S7.2.1d The Tasmania Fire Service and Council may approve a non through road provided it is linked to a formed fire trail to the requirements of the Tasmania Fire Service and Council.</td>
<td>Subdivisions should have safe alternative routes to low bushfire hazard areas for emergency and other vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENT:** The subdivision has access to two roads, Edens Road (which will require upgrading) and North East River Road.

<p>| S7.2.2a | Access must be of all-weather construction and S7.2.2b Road structures (including bridges) must have a minimum load limit of 20 | Safe access roads shall be provided at all times. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>tonnes and</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.2c</strong></td>
<td>There must be vertical clearance to a height of 4 metres above the trafficable width of the access and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.2d</strong></td>
<td>There must be horizontal clearance from 4 metres of the centre line of any trafficable road for a height of 4 metres above the trafficable width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong></td>
<td>Both Edens Road and North East River Road are existing. Without having technical details it is understood that they do or will meet the acceptable solution (Edens Road will require upgrading).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.3a</strong></td>
<td>A maximum gradient of 1 in 8 (12.5%) is specified. However, where a topographic difficulty occurs, an absolute maximum grade of 1 in 5 (20%) for a distance no greater than 50 metres may be approved by the Tasmania Fire Service and Council. The average maximum grade must therefore not exceed 1 in 7 (14.4%) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.3b</strong></td>
<td>Curves must have a minimum inner radius of 10 metres and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.3c</strong></td>
<td>Dips must have no more than a 1 in 8 (12.5%) entry and exit angle and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.3d</strong></td>
<td>All roads must have a maximum cross fall alignment of 1 in 33 (3%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong></td>
<td>Both Edens Road and North East River Road are existing. Without having technical details it is understood that they do or will meet the acceptable solution (Edens Road will require upgrading).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.4a</strong></td>
<td>At the end of all roads or access ways there must be a court bowl or cul de sac of a minimum trafficable radius of 10 metres (shoulders, seal or other consolidated edges may be acceptable) or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7.2.4b</strong></td>
<td>At the end of all roads or access ways there must be hammerhead &quot;T&quot; or &quot;Y&quot; turnarounds with minimum 4 metres width and total length of 16 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong></td>
<td>Suitable turning areas for fire suppression and other vehicles must be provided at the end of all roads and access ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENT:** Not applicable. The Bushfire Report concludes that the roads are effectively through roads as 'safe areas' are available.
| **S7.2.5a** | The minimum trafficable width for access is 6 metres which may include consolidated, formed, surfaced and drained shoulders or |
| **S7.2.5b** | Where 8 or less lots are being serviced, an access with trafficable width of 4 metres for a maximum of 90 metres length may be provided or |
| **S7.2.5c** | Where the access is less than 6 metres trafficable width, passing bays of a minimum length of 20 metres must be provided every 200 metres along the access. The combined width of the access and the passing bay must be a minimum 6 metres. fire suppression and other vehicles |

**COMMENT:** Access within the lots is not part of this application. The right of way through proposed Lot 21 is sufficiently wide for the acceptable solution to be able to be met.

| **S7.2.6a** | An access road forms the perimeter of the development or |
| **S7.2.6b** | A fire trail connected to an access road forms the perimeter of the development. |

**COMMENT:** There is access to the perimeter of the development via North East River Road. Future driveways within the lots will need to encircle dwellings, but this will be required by any future building permit applications which would require a bushfire report.

| **S7.2.7a** | Fire trails are constructed to 4WD standard and |
| **S7.2.7b** | Fire trails have a formed width of 4 metres and |
| **S7.2.7c** | Fire trails must have vertical clearance to a height of 4 metres above the trafficable and |
| **S7.2.7d** | Fire trails must have horizontal clearance from 3 metres of the centre line for a height of 4 metres above the trafficable width and |
| **S7.2.7e** | Fire trails will have a maximum |

**Access should be of sufficient width to allow simultaneous access and egress for emergency and other vehicles.**
gradient of 1 in 6 (17%).

**COMMENT:** Not applicable. No fire trails are proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>INTENT</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S7.3.0 Water supplies for fire suppression in subdivisions</td>
<td>To ensure adequate water supplies are available in a subdivision for landowners or emergency services to defend properties from bushfire</td>
<td>S7.3.1a Subdivisions have a reticulated water supply with a minimum flow rate as specified by Australian Standard AS 2419 for the intended class of development as required under the Building Code of Australia or 600 litres per minute (whichever is greater) or S7.3.1b Subdivisions have a static water supply to comply with AS 2419 for the intended class of development as required under the Building Code of Australia for fire suppression or S7.3.1c For developments not specified in the Building Code of Australia in S7.3.1 b), subdivisions for lots less than 2500 square metres will have 10 000 litres of stored water for fire suppression and for lots 2500 square metres or larger, 20 000 litres of stored water for fire suppression.</td>
<td>Subdivisions have an adequate size of water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT: Reticulated water supply is not available. A static water supply is not specified. Any approval will require a condition that this is provided in accordance with the standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7.3.2a In areas where the water supply complies with S7.3.1 a), the building envelope must not be more than 130 metres from the nearest fire hydrant. The hydrant must comply with Tasmania Fire Service and Council requirements or S7.3.2b In areas where the water supply does not comply with S7.3.1 a), a static supply complying with S7.3.1 b) or c) will be located within the subdivision to be accessible by emergency vehicles at all times.</td>
<td>The water supply for fire suppression will be available at all times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
times. The supply may be from a single source or a combination of storages for either individual lots or for the entire subdivision. Storages must be accessible from all the lots they are intended to serve.

| S7.3.3a | All water storage tanks are constructed of non-combustible and non-rust materials such as galvanised steel and concrete and |
| S7.3.3b | All above ground pipelines and fittings are either constructed of non-combustible and non-rust materials such as galvanised steel and copper, or protected from the effects of heat and flame by lagging or other means and |
| S7.3.3c | All below-ground water pipelines are installed to a depth as specified in the National Plumbing Code AS 3500 (generally 300 mm). |

COMMENT: Reticulated water supply is not available. Any approval will require a condition that this is provided in accordance with the standard.

| S7.3.4a | If the storage is accessible and above ground, a male 64 mm 5V thread coupling to Tasmania Fire Service specifications must be installed on the storage to supply water or |
| S7.3.4b | If the storage is accessible and below ground, there must be sufficient hard standing beside or adjacent to the storage to allow an emergency vehicle access for draughting from the storage or |
| S7.3.4c | If the storage is not directly accessible, a remote access point may be provided which must deliver water at a minimum flow rate of 270 litres per minute at the delivery point through a male 64 mm 5V thread coupling to Tasmania Fire Service specifications. |

COMMENT: Reticulated water supply is not available. Any approval will require a condition that this is provided in accordance with the standard.
Referrals

The application did not require referrals.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:
The application was advertised for 14 days in accordance with the Act.

POLICY/STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:
The relevant strategic focus areas of the Flinders Council Strategic Plan 2015 are:

Strategic Focus Area 1: Population Growth - Focusing on strategies, projects and policy initiatives that support the community, economic development, innovation and investment attraction.

and:

Strategic Focus Area 2: Infrastructure and Services - An Islands’ specific approach to planning and delivery to ensure community and environmental values are maintained.

COMMENT: The proposal is likely to support investment in line with strategic focus area 1; however, as it is not consistent with the rural character, it does not ensure that community and environmental values are maintained. The proposal is therefore not wholly consistent with the plan.

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Not applicable.

OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:
That the application for a 24 lot subdivision in the rural zone, by Nick Griggs & Co. for land located at North East River Road, Palana (CT:237440/1 & 159958/1) be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is not consistent with the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines for the rural zone.

2. The proposal does not meet the requirements of Clause 5.8.3 (b) of the planning scheme relating to subdivision in the rural zone.

Mayor Carol Cox called a break in the meeting at 1.27pm and resumed the meeting at 1.42pm
DECISION:

333.12.2015 Moved: Cr P Rhodes  Seconded: Cr D Williams
That the application for a 24 lot subdivision in the rural zone, by Nick Griggs & Co. for land located at North East River Road, Palana (CT:237440/1 & 159958/1) be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is not consistent with the zone intent, desired zone character and zone guidelines for the rural zone.

2. The proposal does not meet the requirements of Clause 5.8.3 (b) of the planning scheme relating to subdivision in the rural zone.

CARRIED (6-1)

For:  Mayor Carol Cox, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
Against: Deputy Mayor M Cobham (abstained)

Mayor Carol Cox announced at 1.46pm that the Council will now conclude its meeting as a Planning Authority under Section 25 of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015.
Item A3: Development Application Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROONENT</td>
<td>Council Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER</td>
<td>Development Services Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>DSV/0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED PAPERS</td>
<td>Annexure 14: Development Applications Report – November 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION:
The purpose of this report is to provide Councillors with an update of the applications which have been dealt with by the Planning Department for the month of November as per the Council motion 249.09.2015, passed at the 24th September 2015 Council Meeting.

Council has requested that the planning consultancy service (West Tamar Council) provide this detail to Council on a monthly basis.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:
Some items may have been considered at meetings of Council while the remainder have been approved under delegation by the General Manager.

OFFICER’S REPORT:
Refer to Annexure 16 Planner’s Information Report – November 2015, provided by West Tamar Council.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS:
Simple Majority

OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:
That the report be received.

DECISION:
334.12.2015 Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr P Rhodes

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

Jacci Viney, Development Services Coordinator, left the meeting at 1.47pm.

Mayor Carol Cox passed the chair to Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham at 1.47pm.
B. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Item B1: 2016 Visit by Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPONENT</td>
<td>Mayor Carol Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER</td>
<td>Raoul Harper, General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>PUB/0700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED PAPERS</td>
<td>Annexure 15: Email from Governor’s office 3rd December (For Elected Members only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTICE OF MOTION:
That Council accepts the offer of Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner to visit the Island on the 13\textsuperscript{th} of October 2016 and allocates in the 2016-17 budget appropriate funding to support the visit, including holding a Civic Reception.

COUNCILLOR’S REPORT:
Her Excellency the Governor had accepted an invitation from The Flinders Island Show Society to open the Annual Show in 2016, October the 14\textsuperscript{th}. Earlier in the year when that invitation was being arranged I spoke to Councillors about also extending the invitation and opportunity to introduce Her Excellency to the Furneaux Group.

It is proposed that Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner would be on the Island for points of interest, culminating in a Civic Reception on the evening of the 13\textsuperscript{th} of October.

I ask that Councillors endorse this visit and allocate appropriate funding to support it during the 2016-17 budget considerations.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:
Nil

OFFICER’S REPORT:
The motion is supported.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS:
*Local Government Act 1993*

POLICY/STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:
1. Population Growth - Focusing on strategies, projects and policy initiatives that support the community, economic development, innovation and investment attraction.
   1.4 Foster and support entrepreneurial activity.
**BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**
A nominal allocation will need to be made in the 2016-17 Budget to support the visit.

**RISK/LIABILITY:**
Nil

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS:**
Absolute Majority

**OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:**
That Council accepts the offer of Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner to visit the Island on the 13th of October 2016 and allocates in the 2016-17 budget appropriate funding to support the visit, including holding a Civic Reception.

**DECISION:**
335.12.2015  Moved: Mayor C Cox  Seconded: Cr D Williams
That Council accepts the offer of Her Excellency the Governor and Mr Warner to visit the Island on the 13th of October 2016 and allocates in the 2016-17 budget appropriate funding to support the visit, including holding a Civic Reception.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)

For:  Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

*Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham passed the chair to Mayor Carol Cox at 1.50pm.*
**C. GOVERNANCE**

**Item C1: Asia Engagement Strategy Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSENT</td>
<td>Council Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER</td>
<td>Raoul Harper, General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>COU/0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED PAPERS</td>
<td><em>Nil</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTRODUCTION:**
The purpose of this report is to seek Council's direction on a proposal from Meander Valley Council to partner in the delivery of an Asia Engagement Strategy for Northern Tasmanian councils and businesses within these local government areas.

**PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:**
Nil

**OFFICER’S REPORT:**
There has been much commentary on the opportunities for increased trade and investment with China since the visit to Tasmania by President Xi Jinping in November 2014. Since then, Premier Will Hodgman has led a trade delegation to China in March 2015 with another in September 2015 hosted by the Minister for State Growth Matthew Groom.

The Tasmanian Government has also signed several Memorandums of Understanding with China and the Australian Government signed a significant Free Trade Agreement with China which will see a substantial reduction in a broad range of tariffs.

Whilst in recent times there has been a significant focus on China with regard to export opportunity and the potential to attract inbound capital investment, the existing trade relationships and established markets within other Asian countries must not be ignored.

The 2013-14 Tasmanian International Export Figures provide an Asian Market snapshot below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>A $ Million</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>A $ Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>$610.17</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>$174.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>$262.85</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>$152.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>$259.76</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>$114.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$257.14</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>$109.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
India $204.62 Thailand $93.93

In terms of making the most of opportunities to engage with Asia from an economic benefit perspective, there is a view held that there appears to be a lot of activity being undertaken; however, much of it is uncoordinated and lacking integration.

Local government and individual industry sectors and businesses are regularly being asked to participate in official and unofficial delegations both inbound and outbound, however, there is some confusion about the clear objectives of such visits and tangible outcomes achieved.

To summarise, there appears to be a lack of clarity of focus to identify where real opportunities can be realised for the benefit of industries, businesses and communities which we represent.

This project will deliver an Asia Engagement Strategy for Northern Tasmanian Councils and businesses within these local government areas. The project partners include: Break O'Day, Georgetown, Flinders, Launceston City, Meander Valley, Northern Midlands, and West Tamar councils; Launceston Chamber of Commerce and Northern Tasmania Development (NTD). Considering previous discussions undertaken with representatives from the Department of State Growth about the advantages of a regional Asia Engagement Strategy, the Tasmanian Government could possibly be a potential project partner.

In developing the Northern Tasmania Asia Engagement Strategy there is an expectation that the document will include a clear set of recommended actions and implementation plan.

Whilst the Strategy’s key focus will be on the development of a united regional approach to engaging and doing business with Asia, it should take into consideration the opportunities that individual stakeholders should pursue based on relationships already formed and activities already undertaken.

To inform the development of the Strategy it is expected that the following issues need to be considered:

i) The development of the Strategy must be undertaken with consideration to the existing Tasmanian Government and Local Government regional / state / country relationships.

ii) Through the development of the Strategy the process must assess the ability and potential for the relationships identified in i) above to add value to the Northern Tasmanian Asia Engagement Strategy.
iii) The Strategy must take into account the existing Tasmanian Government strategic position and supporting policy with regard to Asia engagement.

Council may decide to:
- take no action;
- endorse the recommendation and be a participant in the project;
- fund an equal share of the project if the Department of State Growth and all regional councils participate; or
- review its role and participation if external funds are not successfully arranged.

**STATUTORY REQUIREMENT:**
N/A

**POLICY/STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:**
1. Population Growth - Focusing on strategies, projects and policy initiatives that support the community, economic development, innovation and investment attraction.
   1.4 Foster and support entrepreneurial activity.

**BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**
The estimated value of this project is $65,000 to $80,000.

Funding is being sought from the Department of State Growth for the amount of $40,000.

An equal contribution from the seven NTD member councils is proposed based upon 40% of the $40,000 council contribution equally apportioned and the balance 60% being apportioned based upon councils resident population. On this basis the individual contributions would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break O'Day</td>
<td>$3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinders</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town</td>
<td>$3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>$13,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meander Valley</td>
<td>$5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Midlands</td>
<td>$4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tamar</td>
<td>$6300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contributions rounded up

A further report will be presented to Council if the Department of State Growth does not make a financial contribution.

Discussions will be undertaken with the Launceston Chamber of Commerce to invite it to participate in the project and should they make a financial contribution, the individual council contributions will be adjusted accordingly.

Council has funds in general expenses that could be allocated to support involvement in the project.
RISK/LIABILITY:
The identified risks may include:
- No funding is forthcoming from the Department of State Growth.
- The participating councils are required to meet the total cost of the project.
- If all councils do not participate the cost burden will be shifted to a few.
- Capability of the consultants to undertake the brief, within budget and on time.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS:
Absolute Majority

OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:
That Council allocates the necessary funds and participate in the project to deliver an Asian Engagement Strategy for Northern Tasmania.

DECISION:
Moved: Cr D Williams      Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Cobham
That Council allocates the necessary funds and participate in the project to deliver an Asian Engagement Strategy for Northern Tasmania.

Mayor Carol Cox passed the chair to Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham at 1.53pm.

AMENDMENT
336.12.2015 Moved: Mayor C Cox      Seconded: D Williams
That Council allocates a maximum of $2,500 to participate in the project to deliver an Asian Engagement Strategy for Northern Tasmania only on the provision that the project is supported by the Department of State Growth.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)
For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham passed the chair to Mayor Carol Cox at 1.56pm.

SUBSTANTIVE
337.12.2015 Moved: Cr D Williams      Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Cobham
That Council allocates a maximum of $2,500 to participate in the project to deliver an Asian Engagement Strategy for Northern Tasmania only on the provision that the project is supported by the Department of State Growth.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)
For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.
Item C2: Councillor Resolution Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPONENT</td>
<td>Council Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER</td>
<td>Raoul Harper, General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE REFERENCE</td>
<td>COU/0600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED PAPERS</td>
<td>Annexure 16: Councillor Resolution Report December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTRODUCTION:**
This report identifies the actions taken and actual costs associated with implementing resolutions passed by elected members up to December 2015.

**PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:**
The report is presented on a monthly basis.

**OFFICER’S REPORT:**
Please read Annexure 18 – Councillor Resolution Report December 2015.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS:**
Simple Majority

**OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION:**
That the Councillor Resolution Report December 2015 be noted.

**DECISION:**
338.12.2015 Moved: Deputy Mayor M Cobham Seconded: Cr D Williams
That the Councillor Resolution Report December 2015 be noted.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)**

For: Mayor Carol Cox, Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham, Cr Chris Rhodes, Cr Peter Rhodes, Cr Ken Stockton, Cr David Williams and Cr Gerald Willis.

*Note: Deputy Mayor Marc Cobham thanked all the staff for their work over the year, especially the airport and the works staff who work weekends.*

Meeting Closed 1.57pm