

Central Highlands Council

AGENDA – ORDINARY MEETING – 19TH JANUARY 2021

Agenda of an Ordinary Meeting of Central Highlands Council scheduled to be held at Hamilton Hall, on Tuesday 19th January 2021, commencing at 9am.

I certify under S65(2) of the Local Government Act 1993 that the matters to be discussed under this agenda have been, where necessary, the subject of advice from a suitably qualified person and that such advice has been taken into account in providing any general advice to the Council.

Lyn Eyles
General Manager

1.0 OPENING

The Mayor advises the meeting and members of the public that Council Meetings, not including Closed Sessions, are audio recorded and published on Council's Website.

2.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

3.0 PRESENT

4.0 APOLOGIES

5.0 PECUNIARY INTEREST DECLARATIONS

In accordance with Regulation 8 (7) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, the Mayor requests Councillors to indicate whether they or a close associate have, or are likely to have a pecuniary interest (any pecuniary or pecuniary detriment) or conflict of interest in any Item of the Agenda.

6.0 CLOSED SESSION OF THE MEETING

Regulation 15 (1) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015* states that at a meeting, a council by absolute majority, or a council committee by simple majority, may close a part of the meeting to the public for a reason specified in sub-regulation (2).

As per *Regulation 15 (1) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, this motion requires an absolute majority

Moved: Clr

Seconded: Clr

THAT pursuant to *Regulation 15 (1) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, Council, by absolute majority, close the meeting to the public to consider the following matters in Closed Session

Item Number	Matter	Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015
1	Confirmation of the Minutes of the Closed Session of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 8 December 2020	Regulation 15 (2)(g) - information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to the council on the condition it is kept confidential

2	Consideration of Matters for Disclosure to the Public	Regulation 15 (8) - While in a closed meeting, the Council, or Council Committee, is to consider whether any discussions, decisions, reports or documents relating to that closed meeting are to be kept confidential or released to the public, taking into account privacy and confidentiality issues
---	---	---

6.1 MOTION OUT OF CLOSED SESSION

Moved:

Seconded:

THAT Council move out of Closed Session and resume the Ordinary Meeting.

OPEN MEETING TO PUBLIC

Due to COVID-19 a limit of 4 members of the public, at any one time will be applied.

7.0 DEPUTATIONS

10.30 – 10.45 Robyn Lewis – Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group

7.1 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

8.0 MAYORAL COMMITMENTS

1 December 2020	Bothwell District High School Awards Presentation
3 December 2020	LGAT Conference Hobart
3 December 2020	Meeting Local Government Division
4 December 2020	Business of Council
5 December 2020	Tele meeting with Councillors x 2
7 December 2020	Business of Council
8 December 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting
8 December 2020	Tele meeting with Councillors x 2
9 December 2020	Business of Council
10 December 2020	Ouse Primary School Awards Presentation
15 December 2020	Westerway Primary School Awards Presentation
17 December 2020	Business of Council
18 December 2020	Business of Council
23 December 2020	Staff Break-up Function
6 January 2021	Business of Council
7 January 2021	Meeting with General Manager and Deputy General Manager
8 January 2021	Business of Council and Tele meeting with rate payer and Councillor

8.1 COUNCILLOR COMMITMENTS

Deputy Mayor J Allwright

17 November 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting- Hamilton
26 November 2020	T.G.A.L.T Workshop Bothwell
30 November 2020	Audit Panel Meeting-Hamilton
8 December 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting- Bothwell
17 December 2020	Gretna Fire Brigade Christmas Barbeque - Gretna
12 January 2021	Planning Committee Meeting - Bothwell

Clr A Campbell

17 November 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting- Hamilton
18 November 2020	Hatch Meeting- Hamilton
26 November 2020	T.G.A.L.T Workshop Bothwell
30 November 2020	Audit Panel Meeting-Hamilton
30 November 2020	Australia Day Meeting-Hamilton
3 December 2020	Drought Workshop- Bothwell
7 December 2020	Phone call- LGAT
8 December 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting- Bothwell
17 December 2020	Phone call from Community member

Clr J Honner

8 December 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting- Bothwell
-----------------	------------------------------------

STATUS REPORT COUNCILLORS

Item No.	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Task	Councillor Responsible	Current Status	Completed Date
3	18-Feb-20	16.5	Cattle Hill Wind Farm Community Fund Committee	Mayor Triffitt, Clr Campbell & Clr Honner	On going to provide Council with updates each Council meeting	

8.2 GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMITMENTS

8 December 2020	Council Meeting
15 December 2020	MAV Insurance Forum
12 January 2021	Planning Committee Meeting

8.3 DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMITMENTS

8 December 2020	Ordinary Council Meeting
15 December 2020	LGAT Health and Wellbeing Advisory Group
15 December 2020	MAV Insurance Forum
15 December 2020	Local Government Work Health and Safety Meeting
21 December 2020	South Regional Emergency Management Recovery Coordinators Meeting - PPE training for Local Government

9.0 NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD

9.1 FUTURE WORKSHOPS

10.0 MAYORAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

11.0 MINUTES

11.1 RECEIVAL DRAFT MINUTES ORDINARY MEETING

Moved:

Seconded:

THAT the Draft Minutes of the Open Council Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 8th December 2020 be received.

11.2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES ORDINARY MEETING

Moved:

Seconded:

THAT the Minutes of the Open Council Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 8th December 2020 be confirmed.

11.3 RECEIVAL DRAFT MINUTES PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Moved:

Seconded:

THAT the Draft Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 12th January 2021 be received.

12.0 BUSINESS ARISING

- 15.2 Correspondence sent by Development & Environmental Services Manager
 - 15.3 Correspondence sent by Development & Environmental Services Manager
 - 15.4 Council policy on council website
 - 17.2 Council policy on council website
 - 17.4 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager
 - 17.7 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager
 - 17.10 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager
 - 18.2 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager
-

13.0 DERWENT CATCHMENT PROJECT REPORT

Moved:

Seconded:

THAT the Derwent Catchment Project report be received.



The Derwent Catchment Project

Increasing Productivity. Restoring Landscapes

Derwent Catchment Project Report for Central Highlands Council

2nd December 2020 – 14th January 2021

General business

Happy New Year!

We hope you all enjoyed the festive season. The team has mostly been on holidays since Christmas Eve. The on-ground work crews have continued to work since early January. We have recently been notified about some successful weed action fund grants and hope to access more funding for key weeds in the next large grants round which will open soon.

Weed Management Program

The team has been working on implementing control works in the eradication zones within the Central Highlands Weed Management Plan. We have also responded to concerns about foxglove proliferation on Belcher's Road close to Maydena but within the Central Highlands Municipality.

It has been a very busy season with the weeds responding to the good season and spreading rapidly. Californian Thistle has also been controlled on 14 Mile Road where it



was becoming dominant along the roadside. Along with intermittent foxglove. Foxglove has been appearing in more and more areas and it is identified as an environmental weed under the Tasmanian Weed Management Act.

The team is currently at Great Lake for a three day stint of Californian Thistle control as part of Hydro funded works in the Highlands.

Cat management

We have recently started to attend the cat management strategy meetings on behalf of Council. There has been a working group focusing on developing and implementing a domestic cat management for Southern Tasmania which also taps into a broader statewide program. A draft Southern Cat Management strategy has recently been completed and the last two meetings have focused on this draft strategy. The Strategy focuses on domestic and stray cats in and near settled areas which are managed under the Cat Management Amendment Act 2019 (the Act). Core discussion topics have been around how to support Council animal control officers to understand changes to the act and implications of the policy. It is likely that training will be provided for all councils, but this is still under development and discussion. Once all comments from the working group have been incorporated the policy will come to all councils for comment.

Agri best Practice

Derwent Pasture Network – funded by NRM South through the Australian Government's National Landcare

Eve and Peter Ball have continued to work on developing material for the Pasture Network website and workshops. This has included site visits in December to Tor Hill exploring options to restore a North facing slope as part of trial work. In January Peter has been working on preparing the next installment of our grazing time course. The full program of material developed to date is available at <https://www.pasturenetwork.org/>. Eve also developed a short YouTube video to explain the pasture network program in December <https://youtu.be/-iX-rmTFOBc>.

As with all land management follow up maintenance works has also been a key part of the program. The onground works crew has been undertaking weed control works at the forage shrub trial sites in Late December and early January.



Nursery and revegetation

Karen has just completed the pricking out stage; we have 15,000 seedlings in pots done so far. Karen is now working on collecting seed for next season and ensuring we have a good stock of locally sourced native seed. There is currently a lack of seed available on the market which is a gap across the state for restoration works and sourcing seed is difficult.

Conservation

Miena cider gum post fire program– funded by DPIPW

Eve and Laurie continued field work to revisit all the burnt stands of Miena cider gum. Sadly, the large majority (90%) of the old trees that have been fire affected are now completely dead. The rainfall from January pre the 2019 fires showed an intense drought event which caused the vegetation to be very stressed at the time. The fire on top of this drought has meant large amounts of eucalypt death, not just in the Miena cider gums. This project will now implement browsing protection in areas where the eucalypt is most likely to persist.

Current grant applications and progress

Biosecurity Program for Orange Hawkweed – Weed Action Fund - this project will undertake extension surveys using a detector dog in the Highlands as identified in the Draft Central Highlands Orange Hawkweed (OHW) Plan to increase understanding of OHW distribution - Project total value \$16,200- applied for \$10,000 – Successful

Ouse River Ragwort – Weed Action Fund– this project will include survey and control of ragwort along the Ouse river to prevent the spread of Ragwort into the lower reaches of the Ouse river. The DCP ground-works team in conjunction with local landholders will undertake physical treatment and removal of ragwort plants to help contain the current outbreak. As part of the ongoing maintenance the DCP ground-work team will conduct follow up treatments to move towards an eradication goal. Project total value \$18,560- applied for \$7,360– Successful

Reducing the spread of African Feather Grass within the Derwent Valley – Weed Action Fund – This project will: 1- develop a long-term plan for eradication 2- Revisit and control to all known sites of infestation – many sites are on unallocated crownland and 3- Undertake a community communication and awareness raising program along the Derwent between Plenty and New Norfolk and along the downstream sections of the Plenty River. The Landholders on the Plenty River are aware of the grass and its risk for agricultural production. The landholders along the main trunk of the Derwent are less aware of the weed and its distribution. - Project total value \$21,568- applied for \$11,000 – Successful

Smart Farms 2020 – Australian Government – A sustainability Roadmap for Tasmanian Farmers - This project will build farmers understanding of how to achieve sustainability goals which meet best practice standards. This

project has been initiated by farmers contacting the Derwent Catchment Project on how to meet sustainable supply chain accreditation requirements. There are several market standards which allow access to premium wool and red meat markets. In Tasmania, many farmers are new to the standards and understanding of sustainability targets is limited. This project will develop a clear guide for farmers to implement, monitor and assess their on-farm sustainability measures – Project total value 192,500 - applied for \$100,000 – pending

Direct drilling innovation in the Derwent –Future Drought Fund– This project will design and manufacture a direct drill that is purpose built for improving the difficult north-facing slopes with drought tolerant pasture species. The project will involve a review of all relevant drills e.g. the Rangelands drill which is successfully used in challenging terrain in America. The review will involve collaboration with established local farming networks to determine the features that are most suitable to the conditions. We will purchase the most appropriate drill and work with a contractor to retrofit to create a purpose-built drill. The drill will be leased out to farmers to cover the costs of maintenance and repair - Project total value \$207,500- applied for \$184,500 – pending

Building natural capital in the Derwent Catchment –Future Drought Fund– This program works with farmers to provide information, knowledge and skills around how to manage and maintain biodiversity and what value this offers on farm. The program has two main focus areas: 1. managing remnant and 2. establishing shelterbelts. The need for maintaining biodiversity and establishing shelter belts is well understood by farmers but there are practical challenges to successful establishment. This program will directly address the barriers - Project total value \$341,000- applied for \$200,000 – pending

Please don't hesitate to call us if you have any queries about our programs.

Yours Sincerely,

Josie Kelman, Facilitator, The Derwent Catchment Project 0427 044 700

Eve Lazarus, Project Officer, The Derwent Catchment Project 0429 170 048

14.0 FINANCE REPORT

Moved: Clr

Seconded: Clr

THAT the Finance Reports be received.

RATES RECONCILIATION AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2020			
		2019	2020
Balance 30th June		\$43,833.95	\$55,732.39
Rates Raised		\$3,756,421.28	\$3,771,640.11
Penalties Raised		\$19,392.79	\$20,047.54
Supplementaries/Debit Adjustments		\$17,492.24	\$19,356.03
Total Raised		\$3,837,140.26	\$3,866,776.07
Less:			
Receipts to Date		\$2,519,585.51	\$2,555,881.42
Pensioner Rate Remissions		\$102,646.62	\$100,416.45
Remissions/Supplementary Credits		\$27,596.86	\$24,118.39
Balance		\$1,187,311.27	\$1,186,359.81

Bank Reconciliation as at 31 December 2020			
		2019	2020
Balance Brought Forward		\$10,257,766.96	\$11,864,433.14
Receipts for month		\$395,922.89	\$347,439.41
Expenditure for month		\$630,710.52	\$1,058,045.18
Balance		\$10,022,979.33	\$11,153,827.37
Represented By:			
Balance Commonwealth Bank		\$355,392.58	\$757,302.48
Balance Westpac Bank		\$175,595.06	\$148,724.86
Investments		\$9,494,505.97	\$10,245,945.10
		\$10,025,493.61	\$11,151,972.44
Plus Unbanked Money & Floats		\$550.00	\$2,034.43
		\$10,026,043.61	\$11,154,006.87
Less Unpresented Cheques		\$3,064.28	\$179.50
Unreceipted amounts on bank statements		\$0.00	\$0.00
		\$10,022,979.33	\$11,153,827.37

	BUDGET 2020/2021	ACTUAL TO 31-Dec-19	ACTUAL TO 31-Dec-20	% OF BUDGET SPENT	BALANCE OF BUDGET
CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES					
ADMIN. STAFF COSTS(ASCH)	\$553,046	\$252,105	\$301,951	54.60%	\$251,095
ADMIN BUILDING EXPEND(ABCH)	\$39,300	\$25,406	\$29,024	73.85%	\$10,276
OFFICE EXPENSES(AOEH)	\$135,100	\$61,384	\$72,670	53.79%	\$62,430
MEMBERS EXPENSES(AMEH)	\$188,829	\$78,545	\$75,705	40.09%	\$113,124
OTHER ADMIN. EXPENDITURE(ASEH + RATES)	\$363,283	\$190,155	\$141,645	38.99%	\$221,637
MEDICAL CENTRES(MED)	\$151,500	\$61,858	\$73,821	48.73%	\$77,679
STREET LIGHTING(STLIGHT)	\$39,600	\$15,427	\$18,302	46.22%	\$21,298
ONCOSTS (ACTUAL)(ONCOSTS)	\$543,364	\$226,310	\$286,498	52.73%	\$256,866
ONCOSTS RECOVERED	(\$480,000)	(\$242,525)	(\$234,240)	48.80%	(\$245,760)
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEV & RELATIONS(CDR+EDEV)	\$204,850	\$130,994	\$55,249	26.97%	\$149,601
GOVERNMENT LEVIES(GLEVY)	\$253,995	\$134,985	\$134,985	53.14%	\$119,010
COVID-19		\$0	\$8,426		
TOTAL CORPORATE & FINANCIAL SERVICES	\$1,992,867	\$934,644	\$964,038	48.37%	\$1,037,255
DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES					
ADMIN STAFF COSTS - DES (ASCB)	\$164,459	\$68,804	\$80,152	48.74%	\$84,307
ADMIN BUILDING EXPEND - DES(ABCB)	\$22,962	\$19,074	\$10,565	46.01%	\$12,397
OFFICE EXPENSES - DES (AOEB)	\$57,000	\$33,815	\$30,717	53.89%	\$26,283
ENVIRON HEALTH SERVICES (EHS)	\$32,637	\$10,495	\$12,373	37.91%	\$20,264
ANIMAL CONTROL(AC)	\$15,122	\$750	\$1,332	8.81%	\$13,789
PLUMBING/BUILDING CONTROL (BPC)	\$125,729	\$45,006	\$52,726	41.94%	\$73,003
SWIMMING POOLS (POOL)	\$42,737	\$11,619	\$13,221	30.94%	\$29,517
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (DEV)	\$112,000	\$87,629	\$34,856	31.12%	\$77,144
DOOR TO DOOR GARBAGE & RECYCLING (DD)	\$146,130	\$54,383	\$55,580	38.03%	\$90,551
ROADSIDE BINS COLLECTION (DRB)	\$113,000	\$50,197	\$40,989	36.27%	\$72,011
WASTE TRANSFER STATIONS (WTS)	\$197,732	\$91,563	\$79,665	40.29%	\$118,067
TIP MAINTENANCE (TIPS)	\$65,906	\$18,158	\$17,779	26.98%	\$48,127
ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (EP)	\$2,730	\$844	\$1,253	45.88%	\$1,478
RECYCLING (RECY)	\$40,600	\$27,315	\$25,613	63.09%	\$14,987
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	\$1,138,744	\$519,652	\$456,822	40.12%	\$681,923
WORKS AND SERVICES					
PUBLIC CONVENIENCES (PC)	\$163,500	\$73,045	\$76,782	46.96%	\$86,718
CEMETERY (CEM)	\$21,510	\$7,914	\$12,915	60.04%	\$8,595
HALLS (HALL)	\$64,683	\$33,283	\$34,051	52.64%	\$30,632
PARKS AND GARDENS(PG)	\$76,384	\$49,764	\$40,572	53.12%	\$35,812
REC. & RESERVES(REC+TENNIS)	\$77,197	\$44,003	\$64,403	83.43%	\$12,794
TOWN MOWING/TREES/STREETSCAPES(MOW)	\$120,000	\$66,922	\$83,571	69.64%	\$36,429
FIRE PROTECTION (FIRE)	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$0
HOUSING (HOU)	\$57,622	\$42,355	\$40,661	70.57%	\$16,961
CAMPING GROUNDS (CPARK)	\$12,000	\$6,440	\$4,815	40.13%	\$7,185
LIBRARY (LIB)	\$580	\$724	\$773	133.34%	(\$193)
ROAD MAINTENANCE (ROAD)	\$795,754	\$560,658	\$620,119	77.93%	\$175,635
FOOTPATHS/KERBS/GUTTERS (FKG)	\$5,744	\$4,661	\$6,304	109.76%	(\$561)
BRIDGE MAINTENANCE (BRI)	\$23,020	\$10,745	\$7,300	31.71%	\$15,721
PRIVATE WORKS (PW)	\$85,000	\$74,031	\$31,137	36.63%	\$53,863
SUPER. & I/D OVERHEADS (SUPER)	\$334,200	\$177,136	\$177,920	53.24%	\$156,280
QUARRY/GRAVEL (QUARRY)	(\$43,000)	(\$40,451)	(\$26,828)	62.39%	(\$16,172)
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT(NRM)	\$130,284	\$42,855	\$72,474	55.63%	\$57,810
SES (SES)	\$2,000	\$1,241	\$999	49.96%	\$1,001
PLANT M'TCE & OPERATING COSTS (PLANT)	\$496,935	\$335,669	\$252,861	50.88%	\$244,074
PLANT INCOME	(\$660,000)	(\$393,811)	(\$424,757)	64.36%	(\$235,243)
DRAINAGE (DRAIN)	\$23,000	\$7,063	\$12,598	54.77%	\$10,402
OTHER COMMUNITY AMENITIES (OCA)	\$25,003	\$15,449	\$19,150	76.59%	\$5,853
WASTE COLLECTION & ASSOC SERVICES (WAS)	\$29,500	\$20,464	\$26,801	90.85%	\$2,699

TOTAL WORKS & SERVICES	\$1,840,916	\$1,140,161	\$1,134,622	61.63%	\$706,294
DEPARTMENT TOTALS OPERATING EXPENSES					
Corporate Services	\$1,992,867	\$934,644	\$964,038	48.37%	\$1,037,255
Dev. & Environmental Services	\$1,138,744	\$519,652	\$456,822	40.12%	\$681,923
Works & Services	\$1,840,916	\$1,140,161	\$1,134,622	61.63%	\$706,294
Total All Operating	\$4,972,527	\$2,594,457	\$2,555,481	51.39%	\$2,425,472
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE					
CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES					
Computer Purchases	\$38,500	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$38,500
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$808	0.00%	(\$808)
Miscellaneous	\$153,500	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$153,500
	\$192,000	\$0	\$808	0.42%	\$191,192
DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES					
Swimming Pool	\$32,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$32,000
Waste Transfer Station	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$20,000
	\$52,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$52,000
WORKS & SERVICES					
Plant Purchases	\$175,000	\$325,262	\$68,690	39.25%	\$106,310
Camping Grounds	\$50,000	\$0	\$7,872	15.74%	\$42,128
Public Conveniences	\$160,000	\$50,659	\$0	0.00%	\$160,000
Bridges	\$175,000	\$95,545	\$51,317	29.32%	\$123,683
Road Construction & Reseals	\$1,555,000	\$779,794	\$897,437	57.71%	\$657,563
Drainage	\$600,000	\$0	\$2,621	0.00%	\$597,379
Parks & Gardens Capital	\$95,000	\$0	\$5,400	5.68%	\$89,600
Infrastructure Capital	\$589,000	\$0	\$128,945	21.89%	\$460,055
Footpaths, Kerbs & Gutters	\$25,000	\$0	\$48,871	195.48%	(\$23,871)
Rec Grounds	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$10,000
Halls	\$155,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$155,000
Buildings	\$221,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$221,000
	\$3,810,000	\$1,251,260	\$1,211,152	31.79%	\$2,598,848
TOTAL CAPITAL WORKS					
Corporate Services	\$192,000	\$0	\$808	0.42%	\$191,192
Dev. & Environmental Services	\$52,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$52,000
Works & Services	\$3,810,000	\$1,251,260	\$1,211,152	31.79%	\$2,598,848
	\$4,054,000	\$1,251,260	\$1,211,960	29.90%	\$2,842,040

Comprehensive Income Statement						
31/12/2020						
Recurrent Income	Budget 2019-2020	Actual to date prior year	Actual to Date	Budget 2020-2021	Variation from YTD Budget %	Comments
Rates Charges	\$3,729,984	\$3,743,136	\$3,761,316	\$3,730,404	1%	
User Fees	\$257,500	\$216,229	\$160,650	\$213,750	25%	
Grants - Operating	\$2,428,040	\$658,974	\$787,065	\$2,428,040	(18)%	
Other Revenue	\$512,034	\$220,650	\$113,704	\$435,200	(24)%	
Total Revenues	\$6,927,558	\$4,838,988	\$4,822,735	\$6,807,394	21%	
Expenditure						
Employee Benefits	\$1,949,709	\$964,006	\$1,018,637	\$2,015,771	1%	
Materials and Services	\$1,418,866	\$772,755	\$716,445	\$1,377,066	2%	
Other Expenses	\$1,551,987	\$862,970	\$879,825	\$1,579,690	6%	
Depreciation and Amortisation	\$2,112,000	\$1,067,596	\$1,033,258	\$2,134,000	(2)%	
Total Expenditure	\$7,032,562	3,667,327	3,648,166	\$7,106,527	1%	
Operating Surplus(Deficit)	(105,004)	1,171,662	1,174,569	(299,133)		
Capital Grants & Other	\$694,000	\$9,182	\$602,040	\$1,321,000		
Surplus(Deficit)	588,996	1,180,844	1,776,609	1,021,867		
Capital Expenditure	\$3,124,000	\$1,251,260	\$1,211,960	\$4,104,000		

BANK ACCOUNT BALANCES AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2020					BALANCE	
No.	Bank Accounts	Investment Period	Current Interest Rate %	Due Date	2019	2020
11100 Cash at Bank and on Hand						
11105	Bank 01 - Commonwealth - General Trading Account				352,328.30	758,607.41
11106	Bank 02 - Westpac - Direct Deposit Account				175,595.06	148,724.86
11110	Petty Cash				350.00	350.00
11115	Floats				200.00	200.00
11199	TOTAL CASH AT BANK AND ON HAND				528,473.36	907,882.27
11200 Investments						
11206	Bank 04	30 Days	0.21%		605,148.54	1,009,881.93
11207	Bank 05	90 Days	0.53%	12/01/2021	1,626,580.20	3,642,135.95
11207	Bank 06	30 Days			702,514.98	
11212	Bank 12	30 Days			1,021,572.88	
11214	Tascorp	91 Days	0.25%	17/03/2021	77,480.17	77,938.96
11215	Bank 15	90 Days			3,382,839.80	
11216	Bank 16	90 Days	0.56%	16/02/2021	2,078,369.40	5,515,988.26
11299	TOTAL INVESTMENTS				9,494,505.97	10,245,945.10
	TOTAL BANK ACCOUNTS AND CASH ON HAND				10,022,979.33	11,153,827.37

No.	Plant	Total Expense	Sal and Wage	Oncosts	Internal Plant Hire	Materials	Plant & Equipment Maintenance	Insurance	Fuel	Tyres	Registration	Depreciation	Cost of capital	Recovered	Hours	Recovery per Hour	Expenditure per Hour	Recovery/(Loss) per Hour
PM0149	Loadrite Weighing System	\$ 575.07	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39.27	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 446.50	\$ 89.30	-	-			
PM0196	Transmig Welder	\$ 160.52	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 122.73	\$ 27.00	-	-			
PM0238	Auger	\$ 734.32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50.14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570.15	\$ 114.03	-	-			
PM0254	Test and Tag Equipment	\$ 145.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9.96	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 113.27	\$ 22.65	-	-			
PM0255	Floor Jack 15 Tonne	\$ 193.74	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13.23	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150.43	\$ 30.09	-	-			
PM613	Komatsu Loader Hamilton BO8817	\$ 7,002.92	\$ 234.82	\$ 140.89	\$ 340.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ -	\$ 117.26	\$ 329.90	\$ -	\$ 106.72	\$ 1,333.33	\$ 400.00	\$ 860.00	21.5	\$ 40.00	\$ 325.72	(\$285.72)
PM620	Herc Superdog - Kelvin (IT2581)	\$ 2,792.00	\$ 69.07	\$ 41.44	\$ 150.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 98.00	\$ -	\$ 50.00	\$ 934.86	\$ 1,114.33	\$ 334.30	\$ 6,375.00	255.0	\$ 25.00	\$ 10.95	\$14.05
PM621	Pig Trailer Hamilton OT0770	\$ 1,600.04	\$ 69.07	\$ 41.44	\$ 50.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35.18	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 884.36	\$ 400.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 2,510.00	125.5	\$ 20.00	\$ 12.75	\$7.25
PM622	Fuel Tanker Bothwell PT4204	\$ 41.77	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41.77	\$ -	\$ -	-	-			
PM629	Spray Units	\$ 1,560.25	\$ 44.93	\$ 11.23	\$ -	\$ 12.83	\$ -	\$ 96.98	\$ 71.04	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,102.70	\$ 220.54	\$ 1,355.00	271.0	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.76	(\$0.76)
PM630	Compressors	\$ 126.86	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8.66	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 98.50	\$ 19.70	-	-			
PM636	Small Trailers	\$ 949.85	\$ 27.63	\$ 16.58	\$ -	\$ 40.00	\$ 580.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285.64	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28.75	5.8	\$ 5.00	\$ 165.19	(\$160.19)
PM652	Road Broom UT7744	\$ 218.28	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 69.49	\$ 100.00	\$ 40.00	-	-			
PM654	New Holland Tractor Bothwell B08NO	\$ 2,206.36	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 126.05	\$ 45.76	\$ -	\$ 171.22	\$ 1,433.33	\$ 430.00	\$ 379.40	10.8	\$ 35.00	\$ 203.54	(\$168.54)
PM662	King Tandem Trailer Hamilton YT0630	\$ 90.86	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90.86	\$ -	\$ -	-	-			
PM664	Pressure Cleaner 2003	\$ 308.08	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21.04	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 239.20	\$ 47.84	\$ -	-			
PM665	Dog Trailer - Neville (YT5100)	\$ 3,066.39	\$ 96.70	\$ 58.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43.64	\$ 82.78	\$ -	\$ 269.09	\$ 934.86	\$ 941.25	\$ 640.05	\$ 7,320.00	292.8	\$ 25.00	\$ 10.47	\$14.53
PM666	Cat. Loader 950F Hamilton ES1483	\$ 6,875.34	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 435.64	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,953.61	\$ 1,486.08	\$ -	-			
PM667	Work Station Hamilton 2003	\$ 237.69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.23	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184.55	\$ 36.91	\$ -	-			
PM668	Work Station Bothwell 2003	\$ 237.69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.23	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184.55	\$ 36.91	\$ -	-			
PM671	Water Tanker	\$ 2,667.00	\$ 179.58	\$ 107.75	\$ -	\$ 1,636.77	\$ -	\$ 43.97	\$ 48.93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 2,206.30	220.6	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.09	(\$2.09)
PM676	Kobelco Excavator FA6566	\$ 11,700.66	\$ 453.99	\$ 272.39	\$ 1,030.00	\$ -	\$ 1,950.87	\$ 364.58	\$ 1,303.74	\$ -	\$ 106.72	\$ 4,145.58	\$ 2,072.79	\$ 13,520.00	208.0	\$ 65.00	\$ 56.25	\$8.75
PM677	Compressor/Post Driver	\$ 310.28	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21.19	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 240.91	\$ 48.18	\$ -	-			
PM682	Float IT0169	\$ 1,662.13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 727.27	\$ 934.86	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,062.50	42.5	\$ 25.00	\$ 39.11	(\$14.11)
PM684	Komatsu Grader FC7003	\$ 13,615.00	\$ 13.81	\$ 8.29	\$ -	\$ 15.80	\$ 3,454.85	\$ 518.01	\$ 662.32	\$ -	\$ 106.72	\$ 5,890.14	\$ 2,945.07	\$ 7,637.50	117.5	\$ 65.00	\$ 115.87	(\$50.87)
PM687	Western Star - H. Chivers FB5754	\$ 25,120.43	\$ 733.22	\$ 439.95	\$ 1,366.75	\$ 5.09	\$ 3,586.16	\$ 393.15	\$ 6,802.01	\$ 4,218.28	\$ 870.19	\$ 4,470.42	\$ 2,235.21	\$ 20,087.50	401.8	\$ 50.00	\$ 62.53	(\$12.53)
PM695	Quick Cut Saw	\$ 84.83	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65.86	\$ 13.17	\$ -	-			
PM705	Mack Truck FP4026 - Andrew Jones	\$ 37,176.40	\$ 1,259.41	\$ 147.28	\$ 388.50	\$ 4,886.26	\$ 3,610.34	\$ 886.27	\$ 8,847.58	\$ -	\$ 5,057.69	\$ 10,077.57	\$ 2,015.51	\$ 33,587.50	671.8	\$ 50.00	\$ 55.34	(\$5.34)
PM709	CAT 950 Wheel Loader Bothwell (FR3357)	\$ 12,676.98	\$ 148.99	\$ 89.38	\$ 186.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 670.58	\$ 800.32	\$ -	\$ 106.72	\$ 7,625.00	\$ 3,050.00	\$ 168.00	3.0	\$ 56.00	\$ 4,225.66	(\$4,169.66)
PM717	2008 Dog Trailer (Harold) Z54AB	\$ 3,068.53	\$ 155.89	\$ 93.54	\$ 100.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 105.46	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 934.86	\$ 1,199.14	\$ 479.65	\$ 6,381.25	255.3	\$ 25.00	\$ 12.02	\$12.98
PM720	S/Hand Tri Axle Dog Trailer Z24BO	\$ 4,396.93	\$ 89.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 137.67	\$ -	\$ 954.54	\$ 1,023.36	\$ 1,565.41	\$ 626.16	\$ 6,043.75	241.8	\$ 25.00	\$ 18.19	\$6.81
PM723	CAT 943 Traxcavator	\$ 2,575.89	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 175.89	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 315.00	10.5	\$ 30.00	\$ 245.32	(\$215.32)
PM724	Toyota Corolla Ascent - Doctor A48YD	\$ 2,952.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 278.27	\$ 177.97	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270.46	\$ 2,023.68	\$ 202.37	\$ -	-			
PM726	John Deere Tractor & Slasher B47EG	\$ 14,309.15	\$ 419.82	\$ 251.89	\$ 301.00	\$ 93.00	\$ 3,686.08	\$ 593.63	\$ 692.52	\$ -	\$ 171.22	\$ 6,750.00	\$ 1,350.00	\$ 12,105.00	269.0	\$ 45.00	\$ 53.19	(\$8.19)
PM729	King Box Trailer Hamilton Z92HG	\$ 366.01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90.86	\$ 213.64	\$ 42.73	\$ -	-			
PM731	Pig Trailer Bothwell VT9746 HC	\$ 1,528.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43.97	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 884.36	\$ 500.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 340.00	17.0	\$ 20.00	\$ 89.90	(\$69.90)
PM733	2010 Komatsu Grader Hamilton-B73TJ	\$ 33,169.09	\$ 1,307.61	\$ 604.41	\$ 1,208.50	\$ 854.16	\$ 5,448.88	\$ 772.81	\$ 9,199.86	\$ 1,363.64	\$ 106.72	\$ 8,787.50	\$ 3,515.00	\$ 32,190.00	536.5	\$ 60.00	\$ 61.82	(\$1.82)
PM739	SES Vehicle Ex Huon Valley	\$ 585.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39.97	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 454.55	\$ 90.91	\$ -	-			
PM740	Hino Tipper C95BL Hamilton 11/11	\$ 14,410.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,326.82	\$ 686.19	\$ 2,524.58	\$ 706.36	\$ 584.19	\$ 7,802.50	\$ 780.25	\$ 14,900.00	596.0	\$ 25.00	\$ 24.18	\$0.82
PM741	Mack Truck 2010 (C90JY)	\$ 32,988.38	\$ 741.50	\$ 414.80	\$ 264.00	\$ 2,806.68	\$ 4,444.61	\$ 505.56	\$ 10,705.40	\$ -	\$ 5,057.69	\$ 5,748.67	\$ 2,299.47	\$ 29,250.00	585.0	\$ 50.00	\$ 56.39	(\$6.39)
PM743	Mulcher Head	\$ 1,674.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 114.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 260.00	\$ -	-			
PM744	Honda Tiller	\$ 231.99	\$ 64.16	\$ 38.50	\$ 14.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 89.55	\$ 17.91	\$ 100.00	10.0	\$ 10.00	\$ 23.20	(\$13.20)
PM745	Welder	\$ 107.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.37	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 83.85	\$ 16.77	\$ -	-			
PM746	John Deere X304 Ride on Mower (Bothwell)	\$ 373.21	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25.48	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 289.77	\$ 57.95	\$ 101.25	2.3	\$ 45.0	\$ 165.87	(\$120.87)
PM748	Hino Tipper C43LG (Bothwell)	\$ 13,614.24	\$ 135.84	\$ 65.78	\$ 48.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 842.57	\$ 1,399.15	\$ -	\$ 584.19	\$ 9,580.65	\$ 958.07	\$ 10,468.75	418.8	\$ 25.00	\$ 32.51	(\$7.51)
PM751	Toro Groundmaster Mower (Bothwell)	\$ 4,296.43	\$ 545.31	\$ 311.19	\$ 40.00	\$ -	\$ 483.63	\$ 145.19	\$ 729.59	\$ -	\$ 60.46	\$ 1,650.89	\$ 330.18	\$ 3,855.00	192.8	\$ 20.00	\$ 22.29	(\$2.29)
PM752	Ford Ranger (Bothwell) C77VJ	\$ 6,417.49	\$ 138.70	\$ 40.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,992.09	\$ 202.50	\$ 240.64	\$ -	\$ 270.46	\$ 2,302.55	\$ 230.26	\$ 1,543.50	220.5	\$ 7.00	\$ 29.10	(\$22.10)
PM753	Bomag Landfill Compactor	\$ 8,125.92	\$ 41.44	\$ 24.86	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,021.82	\$ 414.79	\$ 856.43	\$ -	\$ 106.72	\$ 4,716.55	\$ 943.31	\$ 1,065.00	35.5	\$ 30.00	\$ 228.90	(\$198.90)
PM756	Kenworth - Bothwell (Whelan)	\$ 27,232.26	\$ 625.41	\$ 375.25	\$ 135.00	\$ 214.37	\$ 3,382.48	\$ 446.98	\$ 10,184.30	\$ 3,374.55	\$ 870.19	\$ 5,082.49	\$ 2,541.24	\$ 30,141.50	602.8	\$ 50.00	\$ 45.17	\$4.83
PM757	JBC Backhoe (Hamilton 2013)	\$ 13,860.23	\$ 249.91	\$ 107.72	\$ 250.00	\$ 458.82	\$ 1,571.96	\$ 524.55	\$ 2,736.66	\$ 100.00	\$ 106.72	\$ 5,964.53	\$ 1,789.36	\$ 24,380.00	609.5	\$ 40.00	\$ 22.74	\$17.26
PM762	Toro Out Front Mower Hamilton	\$ 3,226.20	\$ 130.73	\$ 55.99	\$ 100.00	\$ 54.55	\$ -	\$ 134.12	\$ 578.38	\$ -	\$ 342.43	\$ 1,525.00	\$ 305.00	\$ 2,500.00	125.0	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.81	(\$5.81)
PM763	Toro Mower GM7200 Hamilton	\$ 4,275.24	\$ 436.46	\$ 209.78	\$ 100.00	\$ 336.37	\$ 1,505.45	\$ 98.06	\$ 251.12	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,115.00	\$ 223.00	\$ 5,450	272.5	\$ 20.00	\$ 15.69	\$4.31
PM765	Rover Shredder Vac Hamilton	\$ 215.15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14.69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 167.05	\$ 33.41	\$ -	-			
PM768	Trailer - TMD Box 10x6	\$ 261.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17.86	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 203.08	\$ 40.62	\$ -	-			
PM769	Mitsubishi Triton 4x4 E76VG	\$ 5,502.73	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 711.77	\$ 323.07	\$ 156.47	\$ -	\$ 270.46	\$ 3,673.60	\$ 367.36	\$ 273.00	39.0	\$ 7.00	\$ 141.10	(\$134.10)
PM770	Nissan Tip Tray Ute	\$ 6,090.46	\$ 304.45	\$ 161.71	\$ 45.50	\$ -	\$ 603.68	\$ 297.49	\$ 686.26	\$ -	\$ 270.46	\$ 3,382.65	\$ 338.27	\$ 2,049.25	292.8	\$ 7.00	\$ 20.80	(\$13.80)
PM771	Polivac Suction Polisher	\$ 269.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19.95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 226.82	\$ 22.68	\$ 185.50	26.5	\$ 7.00	\$ 10.17	(\$3.17)
PM772	Hino Tipper - E96VP	\$ 8,945.03	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,734.00	\$ 173.60	\$ 2,605.97	\$ 1,083.64	\$ 584.19	\$ 1,974.02	\$ 789.61	\$ 13,587.50	543.5	\$ 25.00	\$ 16.46	\$8.54
PM773	Variable Mesaging Board	\$ 1,435.98	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90.86	\$ 1,044.40	\$ 208.88	\$ 60	6.0	\$ 10.00	\$ 239.33	(\$229.33)
PM774	140M AWD William Adams CAT Grader Bothwell	\$ 27,450.67	\$ 606.55	\$ 337.73	\$ 262.50	\$ -	\$ 2,402.41	\$ 993.77	\$ 6,920.99	\$ -	\$ 106.72	\$ 11,300.00	\$ 4,520.00	\$ 32,100.00	535.0	\$ 60.00	\$ 51.31	\$8.69
PM777	Mitsubishi ASX AWD	\$ 3,899.12	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 220.39	\$ 601.60	\$ -	\$ 270.46	\$ 2,505.96	\$ 300.71	\$ -	-			
PM778	2017 Ranger 2.2L Diesel	\$ 3,657.74	\$ 12.54	\$ 7.52	\$ 3.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 209.37	\$ 758.47	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,380.67	\$ 285.68	\$ 1,743.00	249.0	\$ 7.00	\$ 14.69	(\$7.69)
PM779	Ford Ranger XL 4WD Crew Cab Ute C91LO SES	\$ 1,684.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92.34	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 332.46	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 210.00	\$ -	-			
PM780	Nissan X-Trail 4WD (Graham) F74ZU	\$ 3,910.36	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36.00	\$ 286.82	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,261.40	\$ 326.14	\$ -	-			
PM781	Portable Barrow Lights x 2	\$ 1,506.11	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 106.14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,206.88	\$ 193.10	\$ -	-			
PM782	Ford Ranger XL 4WD Dual Cab (Jason)	\$ 7,600.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,124.64	\$ 276.56	\$ 1,614.50	\$ 709.09	\$ 353.46	\$ 3,144.73						

Date	Details	Budget	Australia Day, ANZAC Day, Hamilton Show	Childrens Services	Community Grants \ Donations	Event Development and Sponsorship	Further Education Bursaries and School Support	General Items	Church Grants	Tourism	TOTAL
	Community & Economic Development Support	\$9,126									
	Support/Donations	\$7,305									
	Further Education Bursaries	\$1,800									
	Central Highlands School Support	\$4,000									
	Anzac Day	\$5,950									
	Hamilton show	\$5,000									
	Australia Day	\$1,500									
	Church Grants	\$5,000									
	Suicide Prevention Program	\$2,000									
	Anglers Alliance Sponsorship	\$273									
	Ellendale Buskers Bash	\$1,000									
	Bothwell Spin-out	\$2,000									
	Royal Flying Doctor Service	\$1,000									
	Bothwell Speed Shear	\$2,000									
	Ouse & Highlands Regional Community Craft Group	\$1,000									
	Youth Activities	\$0									
	Australasian Golf Museum contribution to power	\$5,000									
	South Central Region Projects	\$0									
	Local Govt Shared Services Project	(\$337)									
	Visitors Centre	\$5,000									
	200 Years of Bothwell Celebration	\$10,000									
	Health & Wellbeing Plan	\$10,000									
6/07/2020	Brighton Family Day Care	\$5,000		5,000.00							
22/07/2020	Central Highlands General Practice	\$2,695			2,695.00						
26/08/2020	Anzac Day Donation - Bothwell	\$50	50.00								
11/09/2020	Anglers Alliance 6 cameras-various locations	\$2,727								2,727.27	
14/09/2020	Brighton Council - South Central Sub Region Project	\$5,000						5,000.00			
30/09/2020	Workforce Coordinator - TCF Grant App 25% share	\$5,337						5,336.52			
30/10/2020	Community Grant I Cooper	\$500			500.00						
30/10/2020	Community Grant J Roberts	\$374			374.00						
YEAR TO DATE EXPENDITURE			50.00	5,000.00	3,569.00	0.00	0.00	10,336.52	0.00	2,727.27	21,682.79
BUDGET		\$100,300	12,500.00	5,000.00	10,000.00	7,000.00	5,800.00	52,000.00	5,000.00	3,000.00	100,300.00

15.0 DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

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

Moved: Clr

Seconded: Clr

THAT the Development & Environmental Services Report be received.

15.1 DRAFT CENTRAL HIGHLANDS LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE – FURTHER FEEDBACK FROM THE TASMANIAN PLANNING COMMISSION.

Report By

Planning Consultant (SMC) Damian Mackey

Attachments

- Correspondence - Tasmanian Planning Commission, 23 December 2020, with Attachment 1 and Attachment 2.
- Correspondence – to the Tasmanian Planning Commission, 13 January 2021.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to consider Council's response to the latest feedback from the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) regarding Council's draft Local Provisions Schedule for the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

This report follows discussion of this matter at the Planning Committee meeting held on 12 January 2021.

Background

As Councillors are aware, the Tasmanian Planning Scheme will consist of the State Planning Provisions (SPPs) and the Local Provisions Schedules (LPSs) from individual Councils.

Council's initial draft LPS was submitted to the TPC in late 2019. In early July 2020 a conference was held by the TPC with council planning officers to discuss the issues. In late July the TPC provided Council with its response, detailing a list of issues that it considered needed to be further addressed before it would recommend to the Minister that the draft is suitable for public exhibition.

Council formulated its response to most of these matters at its October 2020 meeting, with the final matter - the Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan - being considered at its December meeting.

Following a second conference in mid-December, the TPC provided further feedback, which is set out in the enclosed correspondence and attachments thereto.

Issue 1 – Zone Mapping:

Agriculture verses Rural Zone Allocation:

The only major change in zoning from the existing Interim Planning Schemes in the southern region to the State Planning Scheme is the way rural areas are zoned.

Currently there is the Significant Agriculture Zone which only applies to the relatively small, well defined areas of high-quality agricultural land, and the Rural Resource Zone which is applies almost everywhere else and includes dry-land cropping, pasture land, summer grazing land, native pasture, grazing land under forest cover, forestry land and mining areas.

Under the new State Planning Scheme there will be the Agriculture Zone covering almost all agricultural land and the Rural Zone covering forestry land, major mining operations, and the like.

The allocation of the Rural and Agriculture Zones is very different to the allocation of the Significant Agriculture and Rural Resource Zones and has been a major task for councils.

To assist in this process the State Government undertook an exercise to map the '*Land Potentially Suitable for the Agriculture Zone*'. This map is known as the LPSAZ.

The makers of the LPSAZ utilised generic decision rules and desktop GIS analysis to generate the layer. The process did not include local on-ground verification. The constraints analysis that was utilised in the LPSAZ mapping was not designed to provide a comprehensive analysis of all the factors that may contribute to the constraint of agricultural land as it was not feasible to develop a model at the state-wide scale that could incorporate all factors of each individual title that need to be considered.

Fundamentally, therefore, the LPSAZ is a broad-brush tool and not necessarily correct at the property level. Its outcomes are merely a starting suggestion and, whilst correct in the majority of cases, the proposed zoning therein needs to be tested against more detailed local-level analysis.

To provide a more refined property-level methodology, the Southern councils (with State Government funding) engaged a firm called AK Consultants to develop the '*Decision Tree & Guidelines for Mapping the Agriculture and Rural Zones*'. This document takes the LPSAZ as a base and adds a standard methodology to enable planners to consider the facts on the ground and to decide whether land should be Rural or Agriculture Zone. It clearly sets out the circumstances in which land in the LPSAZ should in fact be zoned Rural and, conversely, where land not in the LPSAZ should be zoned Agriculture.

The Decision Tree document states that only if, after its guidelines have been applied, it is still uncertain which zone should be used, it would be necessary for an expert consultant to be engaged to make a determination.

The Decision Tree document is given substantive weight by the State's Guideline No.1 as *an agricultural land analysis undertaken at the regional level which incorporates more recent analysis, better aligns with on-ground features and addresses inaccuracies in the LPSAZ, and which is prepared by a suitably qualified person and adopted by all the Southern Councils*, (to paraphrase Guideline AZ1(a)).

Furthermore, AZ6(a) of Guideline No.1 provides for alternative zoning *if local or region strategic analysis has identified or justifies the need*. The application of the Decision Tree rules provides this.

In addition, at the time the Southern councils initially proposed to organise the creation of the Decision Tree, the idea was put to the TPC and the State Government and received endorsement for the idea.

However, since the December conference with the TPC, it has become apparent that the TPC now gives no weight at all to the Decision Tree document. It has adopted the position that land in the LPSAZ should be zoned Agriculture and land not in the LPSAZ should be zoned Rural, and if a council considers it appropriate to deviate from this it must engage an external consultant to verify it.

This has given rise to the situation where the TPC is insisting that areas clearly dominated by forestry be zoned Agriculture, and that areas clearly used for agriculture should be zoned Rural.

Data sources used by Council to allocate zoning include, (in addition to the LPSAZ), the Land Use 2015 LIST layer, the Agricultural Land Capability layer (i.e. Class 1 to 7 under the Protection of Agricultural Land State Policy), aerial photography layers, Private Timber Reserves, Conservation Covenants, Mining Leases, landownership, local knowledge and site inspection, as per the Decision Tree guidelines.

The TPC, in taking the LPSAZ at face value and not apparently utilising these data sets nor the Decision Tree guidelines, has concluded that Council has applied the Rural and Agricultural zones inconsistently.

For example; in regard to Private Timber Reserves, (PTRs), Council's position is that the existence of a PTR should not carry determining weight to zone a piece of land Rural. For example, a PTR making up a small part of a working farm ought to be zoned Agriculture along with the rest of the farm. However, in case of multiple PTRs in an area, along with aerial photographic evidence of forestry land use and predominantly forestry company land ownership indicates an area should be zoned Rural even though it may be mapped in the LPSAZ. The Decision Tree provides the rigour for planners / planning authorities to make this decision. The advice of an external consultant ought not be necessary.

Council has three options to resolve this matter:

1. Zone all land in the unconstrained layer of the LPSAZ as Agriculture and all land not in the unconstrained layer of the LPSAZ as Rural.

Such a blanket adoption of this desk-top broad-brush data set will result in clear instances of the wrong zones being applied.

2. Engage an external consultant to assess all the instances where Council (using the AK Consulting Decision Tree Guidelines) believes it is appropriate to depart from the LPSAZ.

This will require financial resources and delay the progression of the LPS by six or twelve months.

3. Seek clarification from the TPC, and from the State Government if necessary, as to why the AK Consulting Decision Tree Guidelines document appears to have now been dismissed by the TPC, and request that it be given the function and weight it was originally intended to have, and accorded to it by the State's Guidelines No.1 AZ1(a) and AZ6(a).

Until this is clarified, Council cannot formulate responses to the particular questions from the TPC in its 23 December 2020 correspondence.

Zoning of Mining Leases:

Many mining operations in the Central Highlands are small quarries on farms and have been zoning Agriculture along with the rest of the farm and surrounding land. The TPC have requested that Council liaise with Mineral Resources Tasmania (MRT) to seek confirmation that the mines are not of regional significance, and therefore appropriate to be zoned this way.

If a mining operation is considered to be of regional or state significance, it would be appropriate to consider a 'spot zoning' on "Rural Zone" applying to the mining lease area.

MRT has been contacted and provided with the details of the mining leases in Central Highlands, and feedback is expected by the end of January.

Issue 2 – Listings for Heritage Places:

The TPC's position:

The TPC continues to insist that the current heritage place list in the Central Highlands Interim Planning Scheme be transitioned into the LPS without any amendments to remove superfluous titles. (It is assumed it will allow correction of incorrect title references and addresses).

Council's position, adopted at the October meeting, was to seek to amend the heritage list to bring the listings in line with the revised Tasmanian Heritage Register listings, which have mostly been amended by the Tasmanian Heritage Council to remove superfluous titles. If the TPC did not consider this to be possible, Council's position was that it would ask the Minister to allow an amended heritage list under Schedule 6, Clause 8D of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993* - as per advice contained in the TPC's late-July 2020 response.

However, the TPC has now advised that such an amended list would need to comply with the new information requirements for listed places. This would involve Council engaging a suitably qualified person to create data sheets

of all listed places, (amended or not), including a detail description and list of heritage values, etc. for each place. This would take considerable time and financial resources.

How did superfluous titles come to be listed in the planning scheme?

The situation has arisen through a series of 'accidents of history':

- In the 1970s and 1980s planning schemes listed heritage properties simply by name (if there was one) and address. The spatial extent of the listing was not defined. This was not generally a problem for listings in cities and towns - on small urban titles. However, for large rural properties, there was always some doubt as to the spatial extent of the listing.
- In the 1990s the Tasmanian Heritage Register (THR) was established. It was created 'overnight' by collating existing listings in council planning schemes and other lists such as the Register of the National Estate and that of the National Trust.
- The legislation underpinning the Tasmanian Heritage Register stated that the spatial extent of each listing must be defined. The default was the title on which the place was located. The title was almost invariably adopted as there were no resources at the time for expert examination of thousands of listings to define a spatial extent, other than the title(s). Again, this was not generally a problem for listings in cities and towns.
- However, for large rural properties containing many titles, all the titles within a landholding were often adopted. Therefore, whilst the principle title containing, for example, a heritage house, barn and other historic outbuildings was rightfully included, also included were the property's other titles containing hundreds or even thousands of hectares.
- Many planning schemes drafted after the Tasmanian Heritage Register came into being adopted the same spatial definition as the matching THR listing, including that of Central Highlands Council.
- Thus, properties made up of multiple titles, such as Norton Mandeville in the Central Highlands, now find themselves with hundreds of hectares unintentionally encumbered by a statutory heritage listing.
- In recent years the Tasmanian Heritage Council has been expending considerable resources to review Tasmania's rural listings and make amendments to the THR to remove superfluous titles. Most THR listings in Central Highlands have thus been corrected.
- Such corrections, however, do not automatically flow through to the local listing in the local planning scheme.

Council's Position:

Central Highlands Council's long-held position is that it's local list in the planning scheme should just mirror that of the THR.

It could well be argued that the removal of superfluous titles should be seen in exactly the same light as the correction of incorrect title references or street addresses and allowed in the LPS heritage list.

This would remove the unnecessary encumbering of 'heritage listing' from thousands of hectares of Central Highlands land where there is, and never has been, a deliberate decision to list the land.

Councils Options:

There appears to be three options available to Council to progress this matter:

1. Transition the current list into the LPS list with no amendments (other than correction of incorrect title references and street addresses), as per the direction of the TPC. This would mean many rural titles will continue to be unnecessarily heritage-listed. This will result in additional expense and time delays in the development application process for future proposed developments on this land.

Clearly, this would run counter to the State Government's declared aims for the whole planning reform process "to ensure planning in Tasmania will be simpler, fairer and more efficient" and provide "greater certainty to investors and the community".

2. Engage a suitably qualified expert to review the entire heritage list and create the necessary data sheets to enable them to be included in the LPS list as 'new listings', and in the process remove the superfluous titles.

This would require financial resources and would delay the progression of the LPS by six or twelve months, or more.

3. Remove the heritage list from the LPS entirely. The TPC has advised that this option is allowable. This option works with Council's long-held position that it only list properties that are also on the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The heritage values of these properties would still be protected by virtue of the THR.

In fact, the State Planning Provisions explicitly state that the Heritage Code does not apply if a listed property is also listed on the THR. In other words, in the case of 'dual listed' properties, a heritage assessment and decision to approve or refuse would only be done by the Tasmanian Heritage Council. There is to be no 'double assessment' (and potentially conflicting decision) by the local council and the Heritage Council.

Because of this, if the current Council listings are translated straight into the LPS heritage list, the ridiculous situation will arise in which the local planning authority (Council) would only deal, in a heritage-assessment sense, with the superfluous titles on its LPS heritage list. This is because the actual principle heritage titles would be also listed on the THR and therefore the Tasmanian Heritage Council would undertake the assessment of development applications on these titles.

Other Tasmania Councils have adopted the policy position that they will not have locally-listed heritage places, as they prefer to simply rely on the THR to protect the heritage values in their municipal areas. Meander Valley Council is one such example.

Issue 3 – The Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan (SAP):

The TPC has sought explanation on how the SAP meets Section 32(4) of the Act and what Council's policies are behind the SAP. Section 32(4) sets out the reasons necessary to justify the existence of the SAP. Council has already provided the TPC with extensive explanation regarding why it believes Section 32(4) of the Act has been met and has detailed its underlying policies supporting the SAP.

As per Council's December 2020 resolution, these are:

1. *Lake Meadowbank is the premier water-skiing facility in Tasmania. Council wants to allow this recreation facility of state-wide strategic importance to expand, both on and off the water. This includes clubrooms and other shore-based facilities, water-edge facilities such as jetties, pontoons, boat ramps and on-water recreational infrastructure. For these reasons the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(a) of the Act.*
2. *These water-edge and on-water facilities, however, also need to be shared and consolidated so that the current unsystematic proliferation trend is halted and potentially reversed. For this reason, the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(b) of the Act.*
3. *As the lake's status as the State's premier water-skiing location grows, more accommodation will need to be allowed around the lake, over a range of modes including camping, caravans and holiday cabins. This needs clear siting criteria to ensure the lake's landscape values are not destroyed by, for example, numerous buildings close to the water's edge. For this reason, the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(b) of the Act.*
4. *Many operational Hydro lakes and have a degree of recreational use. The difference with Lake Meadowbank is the high degree of recreational use arising from its close proximity to greater Hobart, the specific nature of that use (predominantly; the State's premier water-skiing facility) and associated pressures for more accommodation / housing / camping and aquatic structures. A SAP is required to do this. For this reason, the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(a) of the Act.*

5. *This high-level of specific water-based recreational activities and development pressures pose particular management challenges for Hydro Tasmania, over and above that which exist for other lakes where water-based recreation occurs. Development applications for sites close to the foreshore should be referred to Hydro Tasmania for comment. For this reason, the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(b) of the Act.*
6. *The agricultural value of the land is not highly significant, whilst the economic and social values of the lake as the State's premier water-skiing facility are highly significant. The scheme provisions should lean in favour of the recreational use within the SAP area. The SAP is necessary to do this.*
7. *The land around the lake contains highly significant Aboriginal heritage sites. Development applications involving buildings and works should be referred to AHT for comment. The SAP is necessary to do this. For this reason, the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(a) of the Act.*
8. *The Landscape Conservation Zone is not used in the Central Highlands LPS and, in any case, would not suit this special area. The proposed SAP, in part, introduces some aspects of this zone. For this reason, the SAP is necessary pursuant to Section 32(4)(b) of the Act.*

The TPC has not provided any comment on these reasons, either negative or positive, and has simply asked (again) "how the SAP meets 32(4) of the Act?"

Council cannot further progress this matter until the TPC provides its rational for, presumably, rejecting Council's existing justification for the SAP under Section 32(4).

There are several other matters raised by the TPC regarding the Lake Meadowbank SAP. The TPC has requested that Council liaise with interested parties to resolve these issues. The interested parties include:

- Hydro Tasmania.
- TasWater
- The Aboriginal Heritage Council
- Marine and Safety Tasmania
- The Lake Meadowbank Water Ski Club

Initial contact has been made with most of these parties and it is anticipated their feedback will be obtained during January.

Issue 4 – Drafting:

Under this heading the TPC has reiterated its comments regarding the Lake Meadowbank SAP and the local heritage places list, referred to above.

Issue 5 – Supporting Justification Report:

Under this heading the TPC has essentially pointed out that Council's LPS Supporting Report will need to be amended once all of the above issues are resolved.

This, in and of itself, is quite routine. However, it raises the issue of what the Supporting Report should ultimately say in circumstances where parts of the Draft Local Provisions Schedule have been imposed by the TPC and are at odds with Council's views / policies.

The purpose of the Supporting Report is to provide the general public with an explanation of all the elements in the LPS, including the proposed zoning of land, the contents of the local heritage list and the provisions of the Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan. Fundamental democratic principles would insist that the general public is made aware of what their local elected representatives are responsible for in the LPS and what their State elected representative are ultimately responsible for.

Issue 6 – Process for Further Clarifications:

Under this section the TPC has flagged that the proposed removal of the now-redundant Attenuation Area Overlay over the now-removed Great Lake Hotel sewerage treatment ponds, which Council endorsed at its October 2020 meeting, cannot happen.

This means that Council, and the Great Lake Hotel owners, will have to allocate significant financial resources and time in the future to undertake and planning scheme amendment to remove this now useless element of the planning scheme.

Community Consultation

When directed to do so by the TPC the Central Highlands Draft Local Provisions Schedule will be publicly exhibited in accordance with statutory requirements.

This will involve:

- The statutory requirements of Division 4 of the Act. These are, in summary:
 - A 60-day exhibition period.
 - Notification of adjacent Councils and Councils in the region; and
 - Notification of State Service Agencies and Authorities as directed by the TPC;
 - Newspaper notice of the exhibition;
 - The exhibition of the draft LPS for public viewing within the municipal area;
 - The exhibition of the draft LPS by the TPC;
 - The opportunity for members of the public to lodge representations on the draft LPS;
 - Consideration of representations by the Council (acting as a Planning Authority).
- Use of Council resources to exhibit and communicate the draft - Council website, and readily available information at Bothwell and Hamilton Offices;
- Information Sessions at key locations (i.e. dedicated drop-in session);
- Officers available to discuss matters with the public and stakeholders.

Proposed details of the mechanics of the public exhibition process (dates, times, locations, displays, etc.) will be subject of a separate report for Council consideration once it is clear when the TPC/Minister will endorse the LPS as suitable for public consultation.

As indicated above, Council will need to give consideration to the explanations provided in the Supporting Report in regard to elements of the LPS that have been imposed by the TPC.

External Referrals

As indicated above, the draft Lake Meadowbank SAP has been referred to a range of interested parties and the mining lease areas have been referred to Mineral Resources Tasmania for comment. For many other issues relevant to State agencies, input has already taken place at the statewide level.

The draft LPS will nevertheless be referred to all State agencies once the formal exhibition period commences.

Council Strategic Plan (and Local Planning Strategy)

The draft LPS is considered to be consistent with the Central Highlands Strategic Plan and local planning objectives and plans, as detailed in the Supporting Report considered at the August 2019 Council meeting.

Timeframe

A timeframe for the exhibition of the draft LPS is dependent on the resolution of the abovementioned matters with the TPC.

Financial Implications

Continuing with the preparation and exhibition of the draft is a core requirement of Council and duty of the Planning Authority. It carries a low financial liability but overall is a resource intensive exercise for the Planning Department.

That said, there are several instances highlighted in this report where compliance with the TPC's requirements would entail very significant expenditure of Council finances in the engagement of a range of external consultants. As explained above, this is considered not necessary, as the reasonable exercise of planning judgement by planning officers, Council acting as a planning authority and the Tasmanian Planning Commission should suffice for the matters at hand.

Furthermore, additional expenses will be incurred by Council in the future in dealing with planning scheme amendments to renovate the Central Highlands Local Provisions Schedule to implement the many minor changes the TPC are not currently allowing to go into the scheme. As explained at length above, these changes involve the removal of what are essentially errors or redundant provisions, and their continued presence will achieve nothing except unnecessary red tape, time delays and expenditure by council and developers.

Recommendation

Moved: Clr

Seconded: Clr

THAT Council endorse the resolution of the 12 January 2021 Planning Committee meeting, that Council:

A. Respond to the 23 December 2020 correspondence from the Tasmanian Planning Commission pertaining to the Central Highlands Draft Local Provisions Schedule, advising the following:

1. In regard to the allocation of the Rural and Agriculture Zones, Council cannot respond to the Commission's questions until the status of the AK Consulting '*Decision Tree & Guidelines for Mapping the Agriculture and Rural Zones*' is clarified. Whilst Council representatives have been verbally advised that this report does have standing, the Commission's questions indicates it does not.

If it does not have standing in the Commission's eyes, Council seeks an explanation. This report was funded by the State at the express request of the Southern Councils to guide the allocation of the Rural and Agriculture Zones in the formulation of their Local Provisions Schedules. At the time, this approach was endorsed by Government and Commission representatives.

If the AK Consulting Decision Tree cannot be used, Council will be forced to expend considerable financial resources to engage consultants, (which in its view would be unnecessary), and the progression of the draft LPS will be further delayed.

2. In regard to the spatial extent of heritage place listings on rural properties, Council seeks a full explanation as to why the removal of superfluous titles, that have now been removed from the corresponding Tasmanian Heritage Register listings, cannot be allowed in the LPS. These listings unnecessarily encumber thousands of hectares of the Central Highlands. This is land where there is, and never has been, a deliberate decision to list the land.

It could well be argued that the removal of superfluous titles should be seen in exactly the same light as the correction of incorrect title references or street addresses that is being allowed by the Commission in the LPS heritage list.

Noting that Council's policy is that its local heritage list is to only include properties that are on the Tasmanian Heritage Register, Council foreshadows that if its list cannot be corrected as outlined above, it will remove the list entirely from the draft LPS.

3. In regard to the Draft Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan, Council cannot respond to the Commission's request that Council provide justification for its inclusion in the LPS until the Commission provides feedback on the rationale Council has already provided.
- B. Consult with the Southern Region's Technical Reference Group (Planning) to establish how similar issues are being dealt with by the Tasmanian Planning Commission in other municipal areas, with a view to potentially pursuing areas of common interest jointly with other councils.
- C. Seek advice from the Office of the Coordinator General regarding the above.

15.2 AUSTRALIA DAY CELEBRATION AT BOTHWELL SWIMMING POOL

Report By

Graham Rogers (Manager DES)

Background

In the past Council has supported the Swimming Pool Lifeguard in holding an Australia Day fun day at the Bothwell Swimming Pool.

The Pool Lifeguard has again approached Council seeking their support in holding a fun day and is proposing to hold a BBQ and would also like to purchase some inflatables.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr

Seconded: Clr

THAT Council allocate \$300 for the purchase of pool inflatables and for a BBQ at the Bothwell Swimming Pool on Tuesday 26th January 2021.

15.3 DES BRIEFING REPORT

PLANNING PERMITS ISSUED UNDER DELEGATION

The following planning permits have been issued under delegation during the past month.

NO PERMIT REQUIRED

DA NO.	APPLICANT	LOCATION	PROPOSAL
2020 / 00089	Tasbuilt Homes And Cabins	8 Pauciflora Drive, London Lakes	Dwelling & Carport
2020 / 00090	A Bruty	15 Meredith Springs Road, Miena	Dwelling
2020 / 00096	J C Limbourn	111 Jones Road, Miena	Dwelling Addition
2020 / 00097	K W Towns	691 Ellendale Road, Ellendale	Farm Shed
2020 / 00098	G W Barrett	5 Robertson Road, Miena	New Dwelling

PERMITTED

DA NO.	APPLICANT	LOCATION	PROPOSAL
2020 / 00088	B J Kemp	26a Patrick Street, Bothwell	Outbuilding (Shipping Container)
2020 / 00082	S Y Down	Lyell Highway, Ouse	Outbuilding
2020 / 00082	S Y Down	Lyell Highway, Ouse	Outbuilding
2020 / 00083	P E Piuselli	6937 Lyell Highway, Ouse	Boundary Adjustment
2020 / 00092	H Vanderplas	58 Bronte Estate Road, Bronte Park	Dwelling & Re-clad and Re-roof Shed

DISCRETIONARY

DA NO.	APPLICANT	LOCATION	PROPOSAL
2020 / 00068	A R J & K A Ashlin	7791 Highland Lakes Road, Miena	Outbuilding (Shipping Container)
2020 / 00081	W P Dexter	36 High Street, Bothwell	Outbuilding
2020 / 00082	S Y Down	Lyell Highway, Ouse	Outbuilding
2020 / 00079	Core Collective Architects	2120 Hollow Tree Road, Hollow Tree	Demolition, Alterations & Additions, Change of Use Barn to Visitor Accommodation
2020 / 00085	D E McMillan	131 Wayatinah Road, Wayatinah	Additions to Caravan Park (3 x Annexes Retrospective)
2020 / 00087	C Vanderplas	54 Bronte Estate Road, Bronte Park	Dwelling and Outbuilding
2020 / 00094	Design To Live Pty Ltd	53 Dolerite Crescent, Flintstone	Dwelling, Carport & Outbuilding

ANIMAL CONTROL**IMPOUNDED DOGS**

No dogs have been impounded over the past month.

STATISTICS AS OF 12 JANUARY 2021**Registrations**

Number of Dogs Registered –947

Number of Dogs Pending Re-Registration – 4

Kennel Licences

Number of Licences Issued –29

Number of Licences Pending – 0

16.0 WORKS & SERVICES

Moved: Clr

Seconded: Clr

THAT the Works & Services Report be received.

WORKS & SERVICES REPORT 3rd December 2020 – 12th January 2021

Grading & Sheetting

Gown Brea Road after new bridge

Maintenance Grading

Weatheron Road	Humbie Road
Green Valley Road	Shaw Street
Patrick Street	

Potholing / shouldering

Jones Road	Penstock Road
Interlaken Road	Meadsfield Road
Lower Marshers	Wihareja Road

Spraying:

Culverts / Drainage:

Install culvert Little Pine Lagoon
 Drainage Allison's Road
 Repair culvert Todds Corner
 Clean drain Ouse
 Clean culverts Pine Tier and Gowen Brea

Occupational Health and Safety

- Monthly Toolbox Meetings
- Day to day JSA and daily pre start check lists completed
- Monthly work place inspections completed
- Playground inspections
- 1,064hrs Annual Leave taken
- 17hrs Sick Leave taken
- 76hrs Long Service Leave

Bridges:

Black Snake Lane bridge tender advertised

Refuse / recycling sites:

Cover Hamilton Tip twice weekly

Other:

Bulky rubbish
 Dig offal Pitt Bothwell waste transfer station
 Installation of kerb and channel Alexander Street Bothwell
 Hedges trimmed Bothwell cemetery
 Repair pump Bothwell Pool
 2 X drum musters
 Cold mix holes Arthurs Lake Road
 Cold mix holes Willberville Road
 Repair pump Bethune Park

Heat pumps serviced
 Remove drums from drum muster sheds Bothwell and Hamilton
 Remove tree Coopers Road
 Unblock sewage Ouse units
 Repair toilet system Bothwell rec
 Repair Bridge Platypus Walk
 Install pram crossing at footpath Ouse
 Repair kerb and channel Ouse
 Repair water leak NRM building
 Repair holes Hollow Tree Road

Slashing:

Hollow Tree Road
 Weatheron Road
 Marked Tree Road
 Hamilton Plains Road
 Ransleys Road
 Hanlons Road
 Mc Cullums Road
 Halls Road
 Rock Mount Road

Municipal Town Maintenance:

- Collection of town rubbish twice weekly
- Maintenance of parks, cemetery, recreation ground and Caravan Park.
- Cleaning of public toilets, gutters, drains and footpaths.
- Collection of rubbish twice weekly
- Cleaning of toilets and public facilities
- General maintenance
- Mowing of towns and parks
- Town Drainage

Buildings:

Plant:

PM757 Backhoe Hamilton new rear tyres and rim
 PM676 Kobelco excavator repair hydraulic hoses
 PM740 Hino tipper new clutch
 PM763 Toro mower repairs
 PM687 Western Star new steer tyres
 PM774 Cat grader repairs to air conditioner

Private Works:

Bothwell Tourism gravel delivery
 Patricia Peters rubbish removal
 Nathan Lovell dry hire of mower
 Cody Bannon mower hire
 Vietnam Veterans water delivery
 Bowdens Pty Ltd concrete premix
 Ian Rigby water delivery
 Thorpe Farm slasher hire
 Nigel Campbell gravel
 Sandy Shearing mowing
 Ken Thorpe gravel
 Tom Rolands gravel delivery
 Justin Wickham dry hire of truck
 Bernadette Rogers concrete premix
 Edward Sonners dry hire of truck

Casuals

- Toilets, rubbish and Hobart
- Bothwell general duties
- Hamilton general duties
- Mowing and brush cutting

Program for next 4 weeks

Safe Rural Roads program works to commence on Hollow Tree Road
 Sign upgrade and installation on Hollow Tree Road
 Pelham stage 4 road works
 Finish Ouse footpath
 Commencement of Bothwell storm water upgrade stage 1

16.1 SPEED LIMIT IN THE TOWN OF MIENA

Mrs Robyn Lewis the Public Officer for the Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group has written to Council looking for Council's support to apply to the Department of State Growth to reduce the speed limit in Miena from 80 kph to 60 kph. The reasons for their application are covered in the information below and in the letter which the Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group proposes to send to Minister Ferguson very shortly. This has the support not only of our Group, but also from a growing number of Miena residents and ratepayers, who are becoming increasingly concerned about speeding vehicles, public safety, noise (especially at night and in the early hours of the morning) and associated animal roadkill and injuries. The Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group believes the reduced speed limit in the town of Miena will:

- improve public safety;
- reduce accidents and animal roadkill;
- help make Miena a safer and more attractive tourist and fishing destination;
- reduce noise for residents and holidaymakers, and
- raise awareness of the impact of speeding on Tasmania's wildlife.

Mrs Lewis states that if this proposal can have Council's support, this would give the Minister, State Government and Council the opportunity for a "good news story" on Australia Day, approximately 2 years on from the devastating bushfires of 2019. It is Mrs Lewis understanding that if their application has Council's support, then State Growth cannot refuse the application. Mrs Lewis states that it would obviously take some time to implement, but there is a short-term opportunity for action right now.

Mrs Lewis suggests that Council would be aware, relatively recently the Lakes Highway has been sealed along its length. This has resulted in increased traffic volume, especially of trucks, and also appears to have made drivers less cognisant of the fact that Miena is a town/community, and not just a place to speed through. Regularly trucks are seen and heard travelling at what must be 100 kph or more, especially at night and in the very early mornings (when fishing people are out using the roads also, often towing boats), and truck speeds are often not much less during the day. With only one policeman on duty in the Highlands, and most trucks being equipped with radio, it is extremely easy for drivers to avoid detection (and even for cars), so there is little control.

Mrs Lewis states that the 80kph speed limit in Miena is unusual as most Tasmanian towns where there is no footpath have a 60kph speed limit. Mrs Lewis also suggests that in Miena, State Growth together with the Central Highlands Council has been implementing limited access control to provide road safety. Mrs Lewis believes this collaboration between State Growth and the Council has largely prevented the proliferation of private driveways directly onto the Lakes Highway and this collaboration is exemplary in Tasmania. However, the unintended consequence of this strategy is that there are many wild animals killed and injured in Miena and along the Lakes Highway due to speed, particularly at dusk and night-time (which we inadvertently document, having to collect and care for the resulting orphans for up to 2 years per animal). This is disturbing to many community members, to tourists and to those providing tourist accommodation and services etc, and creates a lot of avoidable work for the Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group. Roadkill and wildlife injuries are also a major concern for many members of the wider Tasmanian community.

On Australia Day 26th January 2021 the Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group will be presented with an Appreciation Award by the Central Highlands Council. This award recognises the voluntary work that the Group has done in rescuing, rehabilitating and feeding wildlife since the 2019 bush fires that destroyed 55,000 ha of significant Central Highlands habitat. Many animals and birds etc were saved by this work, which was conducted with WildCare and the approval of National Parks, and which continued for 9 months though to November 2020 until sufficient regrowth occurred for the animals to be able to forage for themselves. This work also saw the Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group become a Finalist in the Community Group of the Year category of the Tasmanian Community Achievement Awards 2020, and is in addition to their continuing programs for treating wombat mange (which has now reached the Highlands), developing and implementing a wildlife carer training program, and other wildlife-related community activities based in Miena.

The Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group proposal for a lowered speed zone in Miena should also be supported by signage to raise driver awareness and promote road safety outcomes.

Council needs to consider if it agrees to support the Central Highlands Tasmania Wildlife Group application to reduce the speed limit in Miena from 80 kph to 60 kph.

For Decision

16.2 PELHAM ROAD UPGRADE STAGE 2

The Works and Service Manager will provide Council with an update on Stage 2 of Pelham Road.

BACKGROUND

Completion of Pelham Road Stage 2 occurred in October 2019.

During the Defects Liability Period a number of inspections took place with the inspection in October 2020 revealing that there was some longitudinal cracking occurring in the sealed road pavement and in the fill zone behind the guard-rail towards the top end of the works.

Further investigation by way of a detailed level survey showed clearly that the fill batter slope had been constructed steeper than specified on the contract drawings and to a lesser extent than required behind the guard rail posts.

CONTRACTOR'S ACTION

The problem was brought to the Contractor's attention on 13 November 2020 (as-constructed drawings were sent to him) and an inspection was held on site on 19 November 2020. Immediately the problem was drawn to the Contractor's attention the Contractor was willing to co-operate and fix the problem.

The Contractor proposed a sequence of works and costs were negotiated. The Contractor is expected to be starting the work in the week beginning 18th January 2021.

COUNCIL LIABLE FOR EXTRA COSTS OF FILL MATERIALS

Under the construction Contract, Council supplied the imported 60mm fill material from Hamilton quarry to the Pelham site. This was a cost saving mechanism and contributed to keeping the construction cost to a minimum. The extra fill required now to achieve the specified fill batter slopes is not extra material or material that council has already provided. If the fill batters had have been constructed to specification originally, the cost of supply of this material would have been incurred 18 months ago. Instead, it will be incurred now.

The extra 150mm rock surfacing was a provisional variation cost in the original Contract and the new rock surfacing will also be treated a variation cost. It contributes to the overall fill quantity so the amount of 60mm Hamilton fill will be less.

The cost of special construction and geofabric underlay where the fill crosses the creek was a variation cost and there will be more of this construction required. The cost will be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Contract Conditions as it was for the original Contract.

ESTIMATED EXTRA COSTS

- Council to supply 60mm fill to site estimated quantity $750\text{m}^3 + 500\text{m}^3$ less surface spall volume $300\text{m}^3 = 950\text{m}^3$ say 1,000m³ or 1,600 tonne
- Council to pay for supply only of rock surfacing estimated quantity $(130\text{m} + 100\text{m}) \times 10\text{m} = 2,300\text{m}^2 \times 0.15 = 345\text{m}^3$ or 550 tonne @ est \$25 = \$13,800. Construction costs are not appropriated to Council.
- Council to pay a lineal meter rate for the treatment at the creek interface. 80m of this was done in the contract at a rate of \$79.68/m + GST. Estimated length required is 150m.
- TOTAL ESTIMATED ABOVE: \$57,800 Plus GST Given the imprecise method of estimating these quantities a contingency factor is recommended - add 20% that would bring the total extra cost to \$70,000 + GST

Re-mobilisation, traffic management, remove and replace guard rail if necessary, excavation and reconstruction of the cracked sections of road pavement, construction equipment and labour will be at Contractor's cost.

Recommendation

THAT Council allocate an additional \$70,000 in the Capital Works budget for Pelham Road Stage 2.

17.0 ADMINISTRATION

17.1 TASMANIAN CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AMENDMENT BILL 2020

Kerrie Crowder the Acting Deputy Secretary – Corrections & Justice has written to Council regarding the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Bill 2020.

On 18 March 2020, the Government announced that a Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (TasCAT) will be established to streamline services and improve access to justice in Tasmania.

As a first step towards the establishment of TasCAT, the following Tribunals and Boards co-located at new tribunal premises at Barrack Street, Hobart in July 2020:

- The Anti-Discrimination Tribunal;
- The Asbestos Compensation Tribunal;
- The Forest Practices Tribunal;
- The Guardianship and Administration Board;
- The Health Practitioners Tribunal;
- The Mental Health Tribunal;
- The Motor Accident Compensation Tribunal;
- The Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal; and
- The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Tribunal.

The Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Bill 2020 passed Parliament on 15 October 2020 and further legislation to expand TasCAT's jurisdiction is being prepared.

The Acting Deputy Secretary – Corrections & Justice has provided Council with a draft version of the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Bill 2020 which is the second of at least two Bills that will be tabled in Parliament as part of the establishment of TasCAT.

This Bill:

- Sets out how the Tribunal is to be constituted in a particular matter;
- Establishes the original jurisdiction of TasCAT and the review jurisdiction of TasCAT;
- Provides for further powers and procedures for TasCAT (e.g. costs, appeals, ADR);
- Provides for referral of matters from TasCAT to the Magistrates Court Civil Division for matters that involve Federal diversity jurisdiction; and
- Sets out the transitional arrangements allowing current Tribunal/Board members to be transferred to TasCAT from the commencement date of TasCat.

In addition to this Bill, there will be a further bill setting out consequential amendments to a range of legislation in order to confer jurisdiction on to TasCAT within both its original and review jurisdictions, which will be consulted on in 2021.

Submissions on the draft Bill must be made by Monday 8 February 2021.

If you have any questions about the Bill, please contact David Sealy, Senior Project Officer (6165 7500 or david.sealy@justice.tas.gov.au).

Recommendation

THAT Councillors provide their comments on the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Bill 2020 to the General Manager by Friday the 29 January 2021 so that a Council can provide comments to the Department of Justice.

17.2 STATE GRANTS COMMISSION HEARINGS AND VISITS 2021

David Hudson the Chairman of the State Grants Commission has written to the General Manager regarding the State Grants Commission - Discussion Papers, Facts Sheets and 2021 Hearings and Visits.

Mr Hudson has provided Council with copies of the Discussion Paper:

- Discussion Paper DP21-01- Non Resident Impacts - Service Industry Employment Cost Adjustor - 2021 Proposal - issued December 2020.

Mr Hudson whilst encouraging written feedback from councils on the latest proposal by 22 January 2021 for the Commission to consider prior to it commencing the 2021 Hearings and Visits, the Commission is very aware of the complexity of this issue and will also receive verbal feedback on the proposal as part of the 2021 Hearings and Visits. The closing date for final written submissions is Wednesday, 10 March 2021.

The Commission has also prepared some Fact Sheets as general purpose educational tools aimed at assisting stakeholders understand, in general terms, concepts associated with the administration or operation of the Australian Government's Local Government Financial Assistance Grant program in Tasmania. The first three Fact Sheets the Commission has prepared are as follows:

- Fact Sheet FS-001 Financial Assistance Grant Funding Pool – Indexation;
- Fact Sheet FS-002 Financial Assistance Grant Funding Pool - Advance Payments; and
- Fact Sheet FS-003 Cost Adjustor Impacts

The Discussion Paper and Fact Sheets will be the focus of the Commission's 2021 Hearings and Visits with councils. These are included in the attachments.

The Commission is also interested in hearing from councils at the 2021 Hearings and Visits regarding how COVID-19 has impacted their respective operations and business.

During the year, the Commission has reviewed and updated its Strategic and Operational Planning Framework. These are included in the attachments:

- IP20-16 - Strategic and Operational Planning Framework - September 2020;
- State Grants Commission 2019-20 Annual Report and 2020-21 Financial Assistance Grant Recommendations; and

- State Grants Commission 2020-21 Financial Assistance Grant Data Tables.

The Commission will shortly be organising its 2021 Hearings and Visits with councils. In 2021, invitations for Commission visits were to be issued to the following councils:

South: Central Highlands Council, Derwent Valley Council, Huon Valley Council, Kingborough Council and Southern Midlands Council

North: Launceston City Council and George Town Council

North West: Central Coast Council, Waratah-Wynyard Council and West Coast Council.

In light of COVID 19 and social distancing protocols, the Commission's 2021 Hearings and Visits will now be organised and conducted as virtual meetings. The Commission's preference is for the Hearings and Visits to be Zoom meetings.

The Hearings and Visits are currently scheduled to be organised between 9 Feb 2021 and 3 March 2021, but may be subject to change.

The Commission encourages all councils to participate in its Hearings and Visits program each year.

Should you have any queries or require any further information regarding this matter, please contact the Executive Officer, Office of the State Grants Commission, (Pam Marriott) on (03) 6166 4274. Otherwise, you can email the Commission using the Commission's email address SGC@treasury.tas.gov.au

The Executive Officer, Office of the State Grants Commission has already been in contact with the General Manager to confirm the specific scheduling of Council's Visit with the Commission.

The Commission is looking forward to having discussions with Council as part of its preparation of its 2021-22 Financial Assistance Grants recommendations.

Recommendation

THAT Councillors provide their comments on the State Grants Commission - Discussion Papers, Facts Sheets and reports to the General Manager by Friday the 29 January 2021 so that a Council can provide comments to the State Grants Commission before the Hearings and Visits begin.

17.3 BUILDING BETTER REGIONS FUND ROUND 5

The General Manager has requested that Council consider if it should lodge a funding application in Round 5 of the Building Better Regions Fund?

The Guidelines for Round 5 of the Building Better Regions Fund (BBRF) are included in the attachments.

Building Better Regions Fund has both an Infrastructure and a Community Investment Stream.

For most projects grant funding will be up to either 50% or 75% of your eligible project costs. Our location will determine the percentage of grant funding you can receive.

Infrastructure Projects

The Infrastructure Projects Stream supports projects that provide economic and social benefits to regional and remote areas. The projects can be either construction of new infrastructure or the upgrade or extension of existing infrastructure. The Infrastructure Projects Stream only supports investment ready projects.

Key points for Round 5 Infrastructure projects:

- Round Five of the program incorporates \$100 million towards tourism-related infrastructure projects;
- when applying, Council will be asked to indicate your intention to seek funding for your project from the tourism-related infrastructure projects funding pool;

- Council will be asked to demonstrate the impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on your region's tourism industry (or the region that will benefit from your proposed project) and how your project will provide benefits to the tourism industry to assist in mitigating the impact from the COVID-19 pandemic;
- Council will be required to provide evidence to support your claims and must meet the eligibility requirements;
- Council do not have to be a tourist organisation to apply for the tourism-related infrastructure funding.

Community Investment Stream

The Community Investments Stream will fund new or expanded local events, strategic regional plans, or leadership and capability strengthening activities that provide economic and social benefits to regional and remote areas.

For small projects with a total grant amount of equal to or less than \$20,000, grant funding will be up to 100% of eligible project costs.

Round 5 of the Building Better Regions Fund will open on the 12 January 2021 and applications will close on the 5 March 2021 at 5.00pm AEDT.

For Decision

17.4 LOCAL ROADS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT (PHASE 2)

The General Manager has requested that Council consider which project it will undertake for (Phase 2) of the Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Program?

The Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for Local Government on 19 November 2020, provided the General Manager with our Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Program (Phase 2) Grant Agreement with the Commonwealth, represented by Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications

The Grant Agreement has been signed by the Department and signifies the award of a grant by the Delegate for the Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Program Extension (Phase 2).

Central Highlands Council is allocated \$448,743 for a Phase 2 project which could be another stage of Pelham Road or stage 2 of the Bothwell Stormwater Upgrade.

Under Local Roads and Community Infrastructure (Phase 2), projects should be nominated using the streamlined Project Nomination Form, which should be submitted either along with your executed Grant Agreement, or any time after the executed Grant Agreement has been provided to the Department.

The Guidelines provide information on the how the two Phases of the program inter-operate. The Department will endeavour to advise you in a timely manner whether nominated projects have been approved.

Program Guidelines and the Work Schedule Project Nomination Template are available on the Department's website at https://investment.infrastructure.gov.au/infrastructure_investment/local-roads-community-infrastructure-program/

All enquiries related to Local Roads and Community Infrastructure Phase 1 and Phase 2 should be addressed to IIP@infrastructure.gov.au

Recommendation

THAT Council approve 'Stage 6' of Pelham Road

17.5 'HEARTLANDS' SIGN ON THE WAY TO BOTHWELL

At the December Council Meeting, Council discussed the replacement of the picture on the new 'Heartlands' sign on the way to Bothwell which is located on Highland Lakes Road.

The General Manager has requested that Council consider what type of picture it would like nominate to State Growth to replace the current picture, Councillor Cassidy has provide two pictures that Council may wish to nominate or consider a location so that photos can be taken.



Cost for Eye Spy to supply & install new 'Highlands' Sign at Bothwell will be \$2975.00 plus cost of photo shoot if required.

For Decision

17.6 DRAFT CHILD SAFE ORGANISATIONS BILL 2020

Mr Dion Lester the Acting Chief Executive Officer for the Local Government Association of Tasmania has written to Council regarding the Draft Child Safe Organisations Bill 2020.

Mr Lester states that in late 2017 the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse released its final report, which made a number of recommendations. This included ten Child Safe Standards that aim to provide a foundation for a consistent approach to child safety in organisations. This was followed by the Council of Australian Governments endorsing the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations as the foundation. The Tasmanian Government has now developed draft legislation, the Child Safe Organisations Bill 2020, to implement Child Safe Standards in Tasmania.

The attached draft Child Safe Organisations Bill 2020 proposes reforms to:

- Establish Principles for the Safety and Wellbeing of Children;
- Establish Child Safe Standards;
- Require all organisations engaged in services involving interaction with children to embed the Principles for the Safety and Wellbeing of Children and the Child Safe Standards in policies, practices and procedures;
- Require Tasmanian Government entities to embed the Principles for the Safety and Wellbeing of Children and the Child Safe Standards in funding agreements with non-government organisations;
- Require Tasmanian Government entities to report annually on implementation of, and compliance with, the Principles for the Safety and Wellbeing of Children and the Child Safe Standards; and
- Require Tasmanian Government entities to require funded non-government organisations to report annually on implementation of, and compliance with, the Principles for the Safety and Wellbeing of Children and the Child Safe Standards through their funding agreements.

Mr Lester suggests that if Councillors have any questions in relation to the Bill please contact Ms Grace Wilson at grace.wilson@justice.tas.gov.au and if Council wish to provide comments for the Local Government Association of Tasmania submission these should be provided to Mr Lynden Leppard at lynden.leppard@lgat.tas.gov.au by COB Wednesday 10th February 2021.

Recommendation

THAT Councillors provide their comments on the Draft Child Safe Organisations Bill 2020 to the General Manager by Friday the 5 February 2021 so that a Council can provide comments to the Local Government Association of Tasmania.

17.7 TASMANIAN CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AMENDMENT BILL 2020

Mr Dion Lester the Acting Chief Executive Officer for the Local Government Association of Tasmania has written to Council regarding the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Bill 2020.

Mr Lester states that the Government announced that a Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (TasCAT) will be established to streamline services and improve access to justice in Tasmania.

As a first step towards the establishment of TasCAT, the following Tribunals and Boards co-located at new tribunal premises at Barrack Street, Hobart in July 2020:

- The Anti-Discrimination Tribunal;
- The Asbestos Compensation Tribunal;
- The Forest Practices Tribunal;
- The Guardianship and Administration Board;
- The Health Practitioners Tribunal;

- The Mental Health Tribunal;
- The Motor Accident Compensation Tribunal;
- The **Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal**; and
- The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Tribunal.

The *Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Bill 2020* passed Parliament on 15 October 2020. A copy of the draft version of the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Bill 2020 is included in the attachments, this is the second of at least two Bills that will be tabled in Parliament as part of the establishment of TasCAT. This Bill:

- Sets out how the Tribunal is to be constituted in a particular matter;
- Establishes the original jurisdiction of TasCAT and the review jurisdiction of TasCAT;
- Provides for further powers and procedures for TasCAT (e.g. costs, appeals, ADR);
- Provides for referral of matters from TasCAT to the Magistrates Court Civil Division for matters that involve Federal diversity jurisdiction; and
- Sets out the transitional arrangements allowing current Tribunal/Board members to be transferred to TasCAT from the commencement date of TasCAT.

Mr Lester suggests that if Councillors have any questions in relation to the Bill please contact Mr David Sealy, Senior Project Officer in the Department of Justice (6165 7500 or david.sealy@justice.tas.gov.au).

If Council wish to provide comments for the Local Government Association of Tasmania submission these should be provided to Mr Michael Edrich Michael.edrich@lgat.tas.gov.au by Friday 29th January.

Recommendation

THAT Councillors provide their comments on the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Bill 2020 to the General Manager by Friday the 25 January 2021 so that a Council can provide comments to the Local Government Association of Tasmania.

17.8 \$50 MILLION NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

The General Manager has requested that Council consider if it should lodge a funding application in \$50 Million National Flood Mitigation Infrastructure Program?

The Australian Government has announced the establishment of a \$50 million National Flood Mitigation Infrastructure Fund to help Australian communities to better prepare for extreme weather events and flooding.

The program has been established under the Emergency Response Fund and aligns with recommendations of the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements, the National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework, and findings of the State of the Climate Report 2020.

Minister for Emergency Management David Littleproud said the funding initiative will support state, territory and local governments to improve or construct essential public infrastructure to better withstand severe flood events.

"This initiative was determined by Emergency Management Australia (EMA) based on their consultations about the types of projects that could support the ERFs objectives.

"The foundations of our national emergency management arrangements remain strong, however, the events of the past 12 months have compelled us to re-examine how we prepare for and manage emergencies," Minister Littleproud said.

"We need to adjust our approach from focusing on our emergency services responding to major flood events, to all sectors of the community, including all levels of government, helping prevent and mitigate disasters.

“The Government is committed to reducing the economic and social harm to Australian communities in flood prone or flood affected areas and this program will be a key part of our longer-term flood mitigation efforts.”

“Beyond the ERF, the government is already investing more than \$2 billion in regions impacted by the 2019-20 Black Summer Bushfires, with a wide range of supports for individuals, communities, local councils and businesses for immediate and long-term relief and recovery,” Minister Littleproud said.

Emergency Management Australia, within the Department of Home Affairs, will lead the delivery of the program, bringing together emergency management and infrastructure experts from across the Australian Government.

Minister Littleproud went on to state “Our communities continue to display extraordinary resilience in the face of consecutive disasters so this initiative will go a long way in making sure we’re a step ahead when the next disaster hits.

The successful projects will showcase the innovation, commitment and enthusiasm of our communities in assuring their safety from emergencies and disasters.”

Mr Hine the Secretary of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management has written to the General Manager inviting Council to submit project proposals to be considered for inclusion in the Tasmanian Funding application under the \$50 Million National Flood Mitigation Infrastructure Program.

Mr Hine states that State and Territory governments are eligible to apply for funding under the program for the improvement of existing, or the construction of new, flood mitigation infrastructure. State and Territory governments may use a third party such as a local government organisation to deliver the project.

There is no funding cap for each application or a limit on the number of projects that can be submitted for funding by a State or Territory. A co-contribution from the State or Territory government, and/or other appropriate funding partner is desirable but not essential.

The State Emergency Service is coordinating the preparation of the Tasmanian application. Project proposals will be assessed and prioritised by an expert review panel. Recommended proposals will be submitted to the State Emergency Management Committee for endorsement and the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management for clearance prior to the submission of the Tasmanian application on the 12 February 2021.

For information on the program can be obtained from the SES Flood Policy Unit on 6173 2700 or ses@ses.tas.gov.au

The Guidelines for \$50 Million National Flood Mitigation Infrastructure Program are included in the attachments.

For Decision

17.9 INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS ‘CITIES APPEAL’

Ms Jemila Rushton from the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Australia has written to Council looking for Council’s support to join the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons ‘Cities Appeal’.

Ms Rushton states in her letter that history was made last month as the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons achieved a momentous tipping point on the pathway to permanent international law.

On October 24, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons received its 50th ratification, triggering its entry into force 90 days later. Nuclear weapons will be banned under international law on January 22, 2021.

The nuclear ban treaty prohibits nations from developing, testing, producing, manufacturing, transferring, possessing, stockpiling, using or threatening to use nuclear weapons, or allowing nuclear weapons to be stationed on their territory.

Australia has not yet joined the Treaty. In just a few months, Australia will be out of step with international law, and an outlier in our Pacific region where most of our neighbours, including New Zealand, have completed the ratification process.

The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons 'Cities Appeal' is the best way local governments across Australia can show their support for nuclear disarmament.

Ms Rushton states that Fremantle Mayor Dr Brad Pettitt, our region's representative in the international Mayors for Peace Network, has called on Australian councils to take action and participate in the nuclear weapons debate of our time. He notes that; *"This is a crucial issue for cities and towns because nuclear weapons, by their very nature, target civilians, our homes and workplaces. As local government bodies, we have a duty to protect our constituents from the escalating threat of nuclear war."*

In August 2020, after receiving submissions from local councils across the nation, the Australian Local Government Association wrote to the Senator the Hon. Marise Payne Minister for Foreign Affairs with a message: Councils urge the Australian Government to sign and ratify the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Thirty-one Australian councils including Sydney, Melbourne, Fremantle, Port Adelaide, Newcastle and Hobart have endorsed the Cities Appeal, and encouraged our federal government to sign and ratify this landmark treaty.

The 'Cities Appeal' has also been supported by Washington DC, Hiroshima, Berlin, Geneva and Los Angeles and hundreds of cities and towns worldwide.

We now invite Central Highlands Council to endorse the ICAN Cities Appeal in celebration of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons' impending entry-into-force.

The treaty's entry-into-force will cement the illegality of nuclear weapons in international law. This change will influence the behaviour of states, even those which don't join the treaty, interrupt the flow of funds to nuclear arms producers, stimulate debate and increase pressure on nuclear weapons states to disarm.

Wherever they are, cities and towns can be champions in addressing the world's most urgent existential challenges. A suggested council motion in support of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons could read as follows:

- The 2017 United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is the first treaty to comprehensively outlaw nuclear weapons and provide a pathway for their elimination. Having received it's 50th ratification in October 2020, the treaty will enter into force on 22 January 2021. All national governments are invited to sign and ratify the treaty.
- Entry into force is an important milestone on the path to a nuclear weapon- free world. It will make concrete the standard that nuclear weapons are illegal and illegitimate for all states. It will mark the moment that the treaty becomes a permanent part of international law.
- To commemorate this achievement of global diplomacy, our council endorses the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons 'Cities Appeal'.
- Our city/town is deeply concerned about the grave threat that nuclear weapons pose to communities throughout the world. We firmly believe that our residents have the right to live in a world free from this threat. Any use of nuclear weapons, whether deliberate or accidental, would have catastrophic, far-reaching and long-lasting consequences for people and the environment.
- Therefore, we warmly welcome the entry into force of the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons on 22 January 2021, and we call on our national government to sign and ratify it without delay.

Ms Rushton states that Council's support for this motion will be a small but meaningful step towards Australia's ratification of the treaty, which in turn will contribute to the stigmatisation, prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Recommendation

THAT the Central Highlands Council endorses the ICAN Cities appeal in celebration of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, hence Council call on the Federal Government to sign and ratify the treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

17.10 DIABETES TASMANIA POLLIEPEDAL'21

The Mayor has asked that Council consider making a donation to the Diabetes Tasmania PolliePedal'21.

Council made a donation of \$100.00 to the Diabetes Tasmania PolliePedal'20 in January 2020.

Diabetes Tasmania is a health charity, their purpose is to work with our community to prevent and reduce the impact of diabetes. Attached for Councillors information is a copy of the Diabetes Tasmania PolliePedal'21 sponsorship proposal.

Recommendation

THAT Council make a donation of \$...... to the Diabetes Tasmania PolliePedal'21

17.11 REMISSIONS UNDER DELEGATION

The following remissions have been granted by the General Manager under delegation:

01-0823-02438 13.87	Penalty change of ownership
01-0808-03110 19.30	Penalty paid to incorrect property
03-0252-00897 20.93	Penalty gmail issue – notice not received
03-0252-00897 20.80	Penalty gmail issue – notice not received

Recommendation

THAT the remissions be noted.

17.12 ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020

Under Section 72 of the Local Government Act 1993 Council must prepare an Annual Report. The Annual Report has been prepared and is submitted to Council for adoption.

Council's Annual General Meeting will be held at Bothwell on Tuesday, 16 February 2021 commencing at 8.45am.

Recommendation

THAT Council adopt the 2019-20 Annual Report as presented.

18.0 SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEMS

Moved:

Seconded:

THAT Council consider the matters on the Supplementary Agenda.

19.0 CLOSURE