

Central Highlands Council

AGENDA - ORDINARY MEETING - 17 August 2021

Agenda of an Ordinary Meeting of Central Highlands Council scheduled to be held at the Bothwell Council Chambers, Bothwell, on Tuesday 17th August 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 20 July 2021	Regulation 15 (2)(g) – information of a personal and confidential nature or information provided to Council on the condition it is kept confidential

2	Tenders Grader Replacement	Regulation 15 (2)(d) contracts, and tenders, for the supply of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal
3	Tenders CHC 03-21, CHC 04-21, CHC 05-21 and CHC 06-21-Road Stabilisation and Re-Seal Contracts	Regulation 15 (2)(d) contracts, and tenders, for the supply of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal
4	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: Clr Seconded: Clr

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

10.00 – 10.15 Dr Josie Kelman Derwent Catchment Project

10.15 – 10.30 Toni Glowacki & Linda Smith-McKinnell – Great Lake Community Centre

7.1 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

8.0 MAYORAL COMMITMENTS

14 July 2021	Business of Council
15 July 2021	Business of Council
19 July 2021	Business of Council
20 July 2021	Ordinary Council Meeting, Hamilton
20 July 2021	Meeting with Councillor
20 July 2021	Phone calls with Councillors x3
22 July 2021	Phone calls with Councillors x4
22 July 2021	Business of Council
26 July 2021	Councillor calls x2
26 July 2021	Ratepayer calls x2
27 July 2021	Meeting with General Manager
27 July 2021	Meeting with Works & Services Manager
27 July 2021	Meeting with ratepayers x3
27 July 2021	Meeting with Councillors x2
27 July 2021	Meeting with IT Technician
28 July 2021	Phone calls to Councillors x6
28 July 2021	Business of Council
29 July 2021	Business of Council
30 July 2021	Business of Council

2 August 2021 2 August 2021 2 August 2021 2 August 2021 3 August 2021 4 August 2021 4 August 2021 5 August 2021 6 August 2021 10 August 2021 10 August 2021	Opening of tenders with General Manager and Works & Services Manager Meeting with General Manager Ratepayer calls x4 Phone call with Councillor Phone call with Deputy Mayor Zoom meeting Cattle Hill Community Fund Ratepayer meeting Bothwell Bicentennial Workgroup Meeting LGAT Conference, Hobart LGAT Conference, Hobart Planning Committee Meeting, Bothwell Meeting with Business Owner Meeting with Committee Meeting
10 August 2021 11 August 2021	Meeting with ratepayer Business of Council
11 August 2021	Ratepayer calls x3

8.1 COUNCILLOR COMMITMENTS

Deputy Mayor Allwright

20 July 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, Hamilton

3 August 2021 TasWater Meeting

10 August 2021 Planning Committee Meeting, Bothwell

CIr A Campbell

3 August 2021 Zoom meeting for Cattle Hill Community Fund Committee

4 August 2021 Bothwell Bicentennial Working Group meeting 5 & 10 August2021 Phone calls for the Bothwell Bicentennial

CIr R Cassidy

20 July 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, Hamilton 11 August 2021 Planning Committee Meeting, Bothwell

CIr J Honner

20 July 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, Hamilton

4 August 2021 Bothwell Bi-Centenary working group meeting

10th August 2021 Planning Meeting Bothwell

STATUS REPORT COUNCILLORS

tem 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 and Clr Campbell	Mayor and Clr Campbell to attend the first meeting on the 3rd August and will provide Council with updates at the August 2021 Council meeting.	

8.2 GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMITMENTS

20 July 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, Hamilton
20 July 2021 Meeting Insurance broker

4 August 2021 Bicentennial Workgroup Meeting

5 August 2021 LGAT Annual Conference 6 August 2021 LGAT Annual Conference 10 August 2021 Planning Committee Meeting

16 August 2021 STCA Meeting

8.3 DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMITMENTS

20 July 2021 Ordinary Council Meeting, Hamilton
21 July 2021 LGAT Health and Wellbeing Workshop
4 August 2021 Bi-Centennial Workforce Group Meeting

10 August 2021 RA & Central Highlands Suicide Prevention CAP meeting
10 August 2021 Municipal Recovery Coordinators Monthly Meeting

11 August 2021 Magig - Two-day System Admin Training

9.0 NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL WORKSHOPS HELD

Nil

9.1 FUTURE WORKSHOPS

Workshop re Local Provision Schedule – Monday 23 August 2021 or Tuesday 24 August 2021 – to be confirmed

10.0 MAYORAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

11.0 MINUTES

11.1 RECEIVAL DRAFT MINUTES ORDINARY MEETING

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Draft Minutes of the Open Council Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 20th July 2021 be received.

11.2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES ORDINARY MEETING

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Minutes of the Open Council Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 20th July be confirmed.

11.3 RECEIVAL DRAFT MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Draft Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 10 August be received.

12.0 BUSINESS ARISING:

- 15.1 Correspondence sent by Development & Environmental Services Manager.
- 15.2 Correspondence sent by Development & Environmental Services Manager.
- 15.3 Correspondence sent by Development & Environmental Services Manager.
- 17.2 Correspondence sent by General Manager.
- 17.5 Correspondence sent by General Manager.
- 17.6 Correspondence sent by General Manager.
- 17.7 Correspondence sent by General Manager.
- 17.8 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.9 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.10 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.11 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.12 Correspondence sent by General Manager.
- 17.13 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.14 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.15 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.16 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.
- 17.17 Correspondence sent by Deputy General Manager.

13.0 DERWENT CATCHMENT PROJECT REPORT

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Derwent Catchment Project Annual Report be received. See Attachment

14.0 FINANCE REPORT

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Finance Reports be received.

RATES RECONC	ILIATION AS AT 31 JULY 2021	
	2020	<u>2021</u>
Balance 30th June	\$55,732.29	\$83.43
Rates Raised	\$3,751,261.93	\$3,874,935.09
Penalties Raised	\$0.00	\$0.00
Supplementaries/Debit Adjustments	\$2,853.16	\$2,064.80
Total Raised	\$3,809,847.38	\$3,877,083.32
Less:		
Receipts to Date	\$427,718.39	\$706,750.74
Pensioner Rate Remissions	\$98,181.65	\$94,257.75
Remissions/Supplementary Credits	\$1,498.68	\$307.00
Balance	\$3,282,448.66	\$3,075,767.83

Bank Reco	nciliation as at 31 July 202	1
	2020	2021
Balance Brought Forward	\$11,134,002.37	\$10,204,128.40
Receipts for month	\$742,518.93	\$696,425.58
Expenditure for month	\$1,174,358.05	\$842,062.06
Balance	\$10,702,163.25	\$10,058,491.92
Dalarioo	ψ10,702,100.20	Ψ10,000,401.02
Represented By:		
Balance Commonwealth Bank	\$640,402.93	\$1,172,704.26
Balance Westpac Bank	\$337,253.97	\$290,294.54
Investments	\$9,728,731.33	\$8,727,029.46
Petty Cash & Floats		\$550.00
	\$10,706,388.23	\$10,190,578.26
Plus Unbanked Money	\$25,033.22	\$11,706.79
	\$10,731,421.45	\$10,202,285.05
Less Unpresented Cheques	\$3,543.83	\$0.00
Unreceipted amounts on bank statements		\$143,793.13
	\$10,702,163.25	\$10,058,491.92

	BUDGET	ACTUAL TO	ACTUAL TO	% OF BUDGET	BALANCE OF
	2021/2022	31-Jul-20	31-Jul-21	SPENT	BUDGET
CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES					
ADMIN. STAFF COSTS(ASCH)	\$563,015	\$56,483	\$49,395	8.77%	\$513,620
ADMIN BUILDING EXPEND(ABCH)	\$42,865	\$13,424	\$11,114	25.93%	\$31,751
OFFICE EXPENSES(AOEH)	\$127,000	\$31,949	\$15,882	12.51%	\$111,118
MEMBERS EXPENSES(AMEH)	\$182,481	\$10,630	\$11,611	6.36%	\$170,870
OTHER ADMIN. EXPENDITURE(ASEH + RATES)	\$357,500	\$58,280	\$37,402	10.46%	\$320,098
MEDICAL CENTRES(MED)	\$143,500	\$3,614	\$2,239	1.56%	\$141,261
STREET LIGHTING(STLIGHT)	\$39,600	\$2,997	\$2,983	7.53%	\$36,617
ONCOSTS (ACTUAL)(ONCOSTS)	\$559,360	\$178,228	\$181,830	32.51%	\$377,530
ONCOSTS RECOVERED	(\$487,500)	(\$48,836)	(\$50,257)	10.31%	(\$437,243
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEV & RELATIONS(CDR+EDEV)	\$239,850	\$8,428	\$17,269	7.20%	\$222,581
GOVERNMENT LEVIES(GLEVY)	\$256,604	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$256,604
COVID-19		\$2,967	\$525		
TOTAL CORPORATE & FINANCIAL SERVICES	\$2,024,275	\$318,166	\$279,993	13.83%	\$1,744,807
DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES					
ADMIN STAFF COSTS - DES (ASCB)	\$167,465	\$16,750	\$14,083	8.41%	\$153,382
ADMIN BUILDING EXPEND - DES(ABCB)	\$23,060	\$6,494	\$6,936	30.08%	\$16,124
OFFICE EXPENSES - DES (AOEB)	\$46,500	\$966	\$2,938	6.32%	\$43,562
ENVIRON HEALTH SERVICES (EHS)	\$31,095	\$2,304	\$3,069	9.87%	\$28,026
ANIMAL CONTROL(AC)	\$12,000	\$461	\$3,009	0.00%	\$12,000
PLUMBING/BUILDING CONTROL (BPC)	\$130,112	\$11,636	\$9,905	7.61%	\$120,207
SWIMMING POOLS (POOL)	\$39,092	\$1,072	\$1,184	3.03%	\$37,908
·					
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (DEV)	\$102,000	\$5,838	\$1,784	1.75%	\$100,216
DOOR TO DOOR GARBAGE & RECYCLING (DD)	\$134,544	\$11,116	\$11,238	8.35%	\$123,306
ROADSIDE BINS COLLECTION (DRB)	\$114,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$114,000
WASTE TRANSFER STATIONS (WTS)	\$205,150	\$8,627	\$9,604	4.68%	\$195,546
TIP MAINTENANCE (TIPS)	\$60,481	\$0	\$2,921	4.83%	\$57,560
ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (EP)	\$4,500	\$141	\$89	1.97%	\$4,411
RECYCLING (RECY) TOTAL DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	\$35,000 \$1,104,999	\$4,133 \$69,537	\$5,261 \$69,013	15.03% 6.25%	\$29,739 \$1,035,986
TOTAL DEVELOT MENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	71,104, 333	703,337	705,013	0.23/0	71,033,300
WORKS AND SERVICES					
PUBLIC CONVENIENCES (PC)	\$153,500	\$15,025	\$12,730	8.29%	\$140,770
CEMETERY (CEM)	\$17,000	\$1,532	\$1,847	10.86%	\$15,153
HALLS (HALL)	\$59,512	\$15,524	\$14,819	24.90%	\$44,693
PARKS AND GARDENS(PG)	\$71,000	\$8,281	\$5,715	8.05%	\$65,285
REC. & RESERVES(REC+TENNIS)	\$78,316	\$8,064	\$6,552	8.37%	\$71,764
TOWN MOWING/TREES/STREETSCAPES(MOW)	\$120,000	\$7,573	\$3,979	3.32%	\$116,021
HOUSING (HOU)	\$61,788	\$26,896	\$21,996	35.60%	\$39,792
CAMPING GROUNDS (CPARK)	\$13,500	\$61	\$0	0.00%	\$13,500
LIBRARY (LIB)	\$617	\$723	\$743	120.41%	(\$126)
ROAD MAINTENANCE (ROAD)	\$855,911	\$120,031	\$128,421	15.00%	\$727,490
FOOTPATHS/KERBS/GUTTERS (FKG)	\$5,850	\$4,952	\$0	0.00%	\$5,850
BRIDGE MAINTENANCE (BRI)	\$23,153	\$1,584	\$346	1.49%	\$22,807
PRIVATE WORKS (PW)	\$85,000	\$7,085	\$2,959	3.48%	\$82,041
SUPER. & I/D OVERHEADS (SUPER)	\$315,800	\$42,346	\$52,248	16.54%	\$263,552
QUARRY/GRAVEL (QUARRY)	(\$25,000)	(\$28,496)	\$12,347	-49.39%	(\$37,347)
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT(NRM)	\$122,841	\$12,211	\$471	0.38%	\$122,370
SES (SES)	\$2,000	\$403	\$127	6.33%	\$1,873
PLANT M'TCE & OPERATING COSTS (PLANT)	\$501,128	\$82,460	\$60,360	12.04%	\$440,768
PLANTINCOME	(\$710,000)	(\$108,098)	(\$79,090)		(\$630,910)
DRAINAGE (DRAIN)	\$19,000	\$1,113	\$3,544	18.65%	\$15,456
OTHER COMMUNITY AMENITIES (OCA)	\$25,116	\$5,883	\$5,824	23.19%	\$19,292
WASTE COLLECTION & ASSOC SERVICES (WAS)	\$37,000	\$4,702	\$3,432	9.28%	\$33,568
	, : : , : : 0	, .,	, ,,		, 25,230
TOTAL WORKS & SERVICES	\$1,833,032	\$229,852	\$259,370	14.15%	\$1,573,662

DEPARTMENT TOTALS OPERATING EXPENSES					
Corporate Services	\$2,024,275	\$318,166	\$279,993	13.83%	\$1,744,807
Dev. & Environmental Services	\$1,104,999	\$69,537	\$69,013	6.25%	\$1,035,986
Works & Services	\$1,833,032	\$229,852	\$259,370	14.15%	\$1,573,662
Total All Operating	\$4,962,306	\$617,555	\$608,376	12.26%	\$4,354,455
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE					
CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES					
	¢22.000	40	60	0.000/	daa 000
Computer Purchases	\$32,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$32,000
Equipment Miscellaneous (Municipal Reval etc)	\$6,000	\$0 \$0	\$13,333 \$0	0.00%	(\$7,333)
Miscerianeous (Municipal Reval etc)	\$128,500 \$166,500	\$0 \$0	\$13,333 *	8.01%	\$128,500 \$153,167
	\$100,300	ŞU	Ş13,333	6.01/6	\$155,107
DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES					
Swimming Pool	\$5,000	\$0	\$11,164	223.27%	(\$6,164)
Waste Transfer Station	\$12,000	\$0	\$6,510	54.25%	\$5,490
	\$17,000	\$0	\$17,673	103.96%	\$17,000
WORKS & SERVICES					
Plant Purchases	\$780,000	\$36,960	\$0	0.00%	\$780,000
Camping Grounds	\$0	\$0	\$11,772		(\$11,772)
Public Conveniences	\$120,000	\$14,500	\$156,982	130.82%	(\$36,982)
Bridges	\$0	\$13,166	\$162,515		(\$162,515)
Road Construction & Reseals	\$2,269,000	\$122,026	\$2,223,561	98.00%	\$45,439
Drainage	\$50,000	\$0	\$823,785	0.00%	(\$773,785)
Parks & Gardens Capital	\$40,000	\$0	\$92,007	230.02%	(\$52,007)
Infrastructure Capital (Moved to Roads)	\$170,000	\$0	\$0	0.00%	\$170,000
Footpaths, Kerbs & Gutters	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.000/	\$0
Rec Grounds	\$20,000 \$25,000	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$39,595	0.00% 158.38%	\$20,000 (\$14,595)
Halls Buildings	\$777,500	\$0 \$0	\$16,170	2.08%	\$761,330
Bunumgs	\$4,251,500	\$186,653	\$3,526,387	82.94%	\$ 725,113
TOTAL CAPITAL WORKS					
Corporate Services	\$166,500	\$0	\$13,333	8.01%	\$153,167
Dev. & Environmental Services	\$17,000	\$0	\$17,673	103.96%	(\$673)
Works & Services	\$4,251,500	\$186,653	\$3,526,387	82.94%	\$725,113
	\$4,435,000	\$186,653	\$3,557,394	80.21%	\$877,606

BANK AC	COUNT BALANCES AS AT 31 JULY 2021					
					BALAN	ICE
		Investment	Current Interest			
No.	Bank Accounts	Period	Rate %	Due Date	2020	2021
11100	Cash at Bank and on Hand					
11105	Bank 01 - Commonwealth - General Trading Account				643,945.57	1,072,916.65
	Bank 02 - Westpac - Direct Deposit Account				328,936.35	257,995.81
11110	Petty Cash				350.00	350.00
11115	Floats				200.00	200.00
11199	TOTAL CASH AT BANK AND ON HAND				973,431.92	1,331,462.46
11200	Investments					
11206	Bank 04	30 Days	0.25%	30/07/2021	508,335.23	1,000,000.00
11207	Bank 05	120 Days	0.33%	5/10/2021	3,635,448.65	3,648,993.88
11207	Bank 06	30 Days				
11212	Bank 12	30 Days				
11214	Tascorp	180 Days	0.08%	17/09/2021	77,650.16	78,035.58
11215	Bank 15	90 Days				
11216	Bank 16	90 Days	0.34%	14/09/2021	5,507,297.29	4,000,000.00
11299	TOTAL INVESTMENTS				9,728,731.33	8,727,029.46
	TOTAL BANK ACCOUNTS AND CASH ON HAND				10,702,163.25	10,058,491.92

					lands and Bland		Plant &									B		D
No. ▼	Plant	Total Expense 🔻 S	al and Wag	Oncosts 🔻	Internal Plant Hire	Materials	Equipment Maintenance	Insurance 🔻 F	uel 🔻 Ty	res 🔻	Registratio D		Cost of apital	Recovered	▼ Hours	Recovery per Hour	Expenditure p	Recovery/(Loss) per Hour
PM0149	Loadrite Weighing System	\$ 96.58 \$	5 -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.28	- \$	-	\$ - \$			-	-			
	Transmig Welder	\$ 26.96 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2.00 \$	- \$	-	\$ - \$		\$ 4.50	-	-			
PM0238		\$ 123.33 \$	-	-	T	\$ -	- T	\$ 9.30 \$		-	\$ - \$		\$ 19.01	-	-			
PM0254	Test and Tag Equipment Floor Jack 15 Tonne	\$ 24.50 \$ \$ 32.54 \$			T	\$ - \$ -	Т	\$ 1.85 \$ \$ 2.45 \$	Ψ.		\$ - \$ \$ - \$		\$ 3.78 \$ 5.01	-	-			
PM613	Komatsu Loader Hamilton BO8817	\$ 328.12 \$		\$ -	Y	\$ -	Т	\$ 21.75			\$ 17.48 \$	25.07				\$ \$ 40.00	\$ 218.75	(\$178.7
PM620	Herc Superdog - Kelvin (IT2581)	\$ 415.20 \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18.18			\$ 155.58 \$	185.72						\$21.
PM621	Pig Trailer Hamilton OT0770	\$ 240.36 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.53	- \$	-	\$ 147.17 \$	66.67	\$ 20.00	-	-			
PM622	Fuel Tanker Bothwell PT4204	\$ 6.96 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	- \$	-	\$ 6.96	- :	\$ -	-	-			
	Small Mowers	\$ - \$		-	T	\$ -	\$ -	\$		-	\$ -	- :	•	\$ 22.50		\$ 3.00		\$3.
PM628 PM629	Chainsaws	\$ 70.20 \$ \$ 238.53 \$				\$ 39.31		\$ 17.99			\$ - \$ - \$		\$ - \$ 36.76	\$ 42.50 42.50		5 \$ 5.00 5 \$ 5.00		(\$3.2 (\$23.0
PM630	Spray Units Compressors	\$ 236.33 \$		\$ -		\$ -		\$ 1.61 \$	- 		\$ - \$		\$ 30.76	42.50	- 0.3	5 5.00	\$ 28.00	(\$25.0
PM636	Small Trailers	\$ 47.23 \$		\$ -	7	\$ -	- T	ÿ 1.01 ç	- \$	-	\$ 47.23	-		\$ 30.00	0 6.0	\$ 5.00	\$ 7.87	(\$2.8
PM652	Road Broom UT7744	\$ 36.40 \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.63	\$ - \$	-	\$ 11.43 \$	16.67	\$ 6.67	-	-			(, -
PM654	New Holland Tractor Bothwell B08NO	\$ 362.17 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23.38 \$	\$ - \$	-	\$ 28.23 \$	238.89	\$ 71.67	\$ 105.00	0 3.0	\$ 35.00	\$ 120.72	(\$85.7
PM662	King Tandem Trailer Hamilton YT0630	\$ 14.92 \$		\$ -	7	\$ -	\$ -		- \$	-	\$ 14.92	- :	•	-	-			
PM664	Pressure Cleaner 2003	\$ 51.74 \$		\$ -	T	\$ -	Т	\$ 3.90 \$			\$ - \$		•		-			
PM665 PM667	Dog Trailer - Neville (YT5100) Work Station Hamilton 2003	\$ 434.49 \$ \$ 39.92 \$		\$ - \$ -	T	\$ - \$ -	Т	\$ 15.36 \$ \$ 3.01 \$	- \$		\$ 155.58 \$ \$ - \$			\$ - -	-			
PM668	Work Station Bothwell 2003	\$ 39.92 \$			T	\$ - \$ -	Т	\$ 3.01 \$ \$ 3.01 \$	Ψ.		\$ - \$				-			
PM671	Water Tanker	\$ 116.49 \$		\$ -	T	\$ -		\$ 8.16 \$	- \$	_	\$ - \$		\$ 25.00	\$ 230.00		\$ 10.00	\$ 5.06	\$4.
PM676	Kobelco Excavator FA6566	\$ 1,302.14 \$				\$ 21.40	· ·	\$ 67.63	159.23 \$	-	\$ 17.48 \$		•			- ·	· ·	(\$0.1
PM677	Compressor/Post Driver	\$ 52.11 \$				\$ -		\$ 3.93	- \$	-	\$ - \$		\$ 8.03		-			
PM682	Float IT0169	\$ 155.58 \$			7	\$ -	\$ -	Ş		-	\$ 155.58	- :	•	•	-			
PM684	Komatsu Grader FC7003	\$ 2,017.19 \$		\$ 43.33		•	Т	\$ 96.09	255.0. φ	-	\$ 17.48 \$	981.69	, ,,,,,,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- ·		\$11.
PM687	Western Star - H. Chivers FB5754	\$ 1,652.27 \$		\$ 107.41		\$ -	Т	\$ 72.93 \$			\$ 143.59 \$					\$ 50.00	\$ 13.22	\$36.
PM695	Quick Cut Saw	\$ 14.25 \$ \$ 9.589.93 \$				\$ - \$ 220.50	т	\$ 1.07 \$ \$ 164.41 \$		-	\$ - \$			- ¢ 5125.00	0 102.5	: ¢	¢ 02.50	1642 =
PM705 PM709	Mack Truck FP4026 - Andrew Jones CAT 950 Wheel Loader Bothwell (FR3357)	\$ 9,589.93 \$ \$ 1,921.05 \$		\$ 103.99 \$ -		\$ 220.50 \$ -	\$ 4,871.25	\$ 164.41 \$ \$ 124.40 \$	845.44 \$		\$ 841.51 \$ \$ 17.48 \$				0 102.5	\$ 50.00	\$ 93.56	(\$43.5
PM717	2008 Dog Trailer (Harold) Z54AB	\$ 1,921.03 \$		\$ -	T	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19.56	- 5		\$ 155.58 \$	199.86	\$ 79.94			\$ \$ 25.00	\$ 7.65	\$17.
PM720	S/Hand Tri Axle Dog Trailer Z24BO	\$ 703.56 \$		7	7	· -	Т	\$ 25.54 \$			\$ 170.33 \$		\$ 104.36			- ·	· ·	\$14.0
PM723	CAT 943 Traxcavator	\$ 432.63 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32.63	- \$	-	\$ - \$	333.33	\$ 66.67	\$ 90.00	0 3.0	\$ 30.00	\$ 144.21	(\$114.2
PM724	Toyota Corolla Ascent - Doctor A48YD	\$ 448.19 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33.02 \$	- \$	-	\$ 44.17 \$	337.28	\$ 33.73	-	-			
PM726	John Deere Tractor & Slasher B47EG	\$ 2,047.66 \$		\$ 67.63			Т	\$ 110.12 \$	198.96 \$	-	\$ 28.23 \$,	\$ 225.00	1,462.50	0 32.5	\$ 45.00	\$ 63.01	(\$18.0
PM729	King Box Trailer Hamilton Z92HG	\$ 61.13 \$		\$ -	\$ -		- T	\$ 3.49 \$	- \$		\$ 14.92 \$			-	-			
PM731	Pig Trailer Bothwell VT9746 HC	\$ 255.32 \$ \$ 4.978.47 \$		\$ - \$ 272.49	7	\$ - \$ 16.36	\$ -	\$ 8.16 \$	5 - \$ 5 1,644.70 \$	-	\$ 147.17 \$		\$ 16.67	- c 2.070.00	0 134.5	\$ \$ 60.00	\$ 37.01	\$22.
PM733 PM739	2010 Komatsu Grader Hamilton-B73TJ SES Vehicle Ex Huon Valley	\$ 4,978.47 \$ \$ 98.32 \$				\$ 16.36		\$ 143.36 \$ \$ 7.42 \$		<u>-</u>	\$ 17.48 \$ \$ - \$				U 134.5	5 50.00	\$ 37.01	\$22.
PM740	Hino Tipper C95BL Hamilton 11/11	\$ 2,254.46 \$		-	7	\$ -		\$ 127.29	, T	_	\$ 95.93					\$ \$ 25.00	\$ 12.85	\$12.:
PM741	Mack Truck 2010 (C90JY)	\$ 4,813.06 \$		\$ 77.99		· -	Т	\$ 93.79		-	\$ 841.31 \$	958.11						\$23.0
PM743	Mulcher Head	\$ 281.21 \$	-	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21.21 \$	- \$	-	\$ - \$	216.67	\$ 43.33		-			
PM744	Honda Tiller	\$ 136.03 \$	64.16	\$ 38.50	\$ 14.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.46 \$	\$ - \$	-	\$ - \$	14.92	\$ 2.98	\$ -	-			
PM745	Welder	\$ 18.14 \$		Ψ .	7	\$ -	т	\$ 1.37 \$			\$ - \$			-	-			
PM746	John Deere X304 Ride on Mower (Bothwell)	\$ 62.68 \$		\$ -		\$ -		\$ 4.73			\$ - \$			-	-		\$ 62.68	40.4
PM748 PM751	Hino Tipper C43LG (Bothwell) Toro Groundmaster Mower (Bothwell)	\$ 2,008.68 \$ \$ 366.88 \$	5 -	\$ - \$ -	7	\$ - \$ -	Т	\$ 156.30 \$ \$ 26.93 \$		-	\$ 95.93 \$ \$ 9.77 \$,	\$ 159.68 \$ 55.03	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		\$ 25.00 \$ \$ 20.00		\$8.6 (\$28.9
	Bomag Landfill Compactor	\$ 1,293.81 \$		\$ -	T	\$ -		\$ 76.95						180.00		30.00	· ·	(\$185.6
PM756	Kenworth - Bothwell (Whelan)	\$ 1,497.13 \$				\$ -		\$ 82.92		-	\$ 143.59 \$	847.08	•		-	у 50.00	Ç 225.01	(\$200.0
PM757	JBC Backhoe (Hamilton 2013)	\$ 1,407.11 \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 97.31 \$	\$ - \$	-	\$ 17.48 \$				0 49.5	\$ 40.00	\$ 28.43	\$11.
PM762	Toro Out Front Mower Hamilton	\$ 358.11 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24.88 \$	\$ - \$	-	\$ 28.23 \$	254.17	\$ 50.83	-	-			
PM763	Toro Mower GM7200 Hamilton	\$ 269.42 \$				\$ -	· ·	\$ 18.19		-	\$ 28.23 \$	205.00	\$ 37.17	\$ -	-			
PM765	Rover Shredder Vac Hamilton	\$ 36.13 \$		T		\$ -	7	\$ 2.73		-	\$ - \$		\$ 5.57	-				
PM768 PM770	Trailer - TMD Box 10x6 Nissan Tip Tray Ute	\$ 43.93 \$ \$ 805.33 \$		\$ - \$ 32.18		\$ - \$ -	· ·	\$ 3.31 \$ \$ 55.19 \$			\$ - \$ \$ 44.17 \$	55.65					\$ 12.99	(\$5.9
PM771	Polivac Suction Polisher	\$ 45.28 \$				\$ -	7	\$ 33.19 \$			\$ - \$					7.00		(\$38.2
PM772	Hino Tipper - E96VP	\$ 1,467.44 \$		\$ 51.99		\$ -		\$ 32.20 \$			\$ 95.93 \$							\$11.6
PM773	Variable Mesaging Board	\$ 240.83 \$		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17.04 \$			\$ 14.92 \$		\$ 34.81	\$ -	-			•
PM774	140M AWD William Adams CAT Grader Bothwell	\$ 4,711.56 \$				\$ 1,330.56		\$ 184.35 \$	-	-	\$ 17.48 \$,			0 193.0	\$ 60.00	\$ 24.41	\$35.
PM777	Mitsubishi ASX AWD	\$ 717.84 \$		T	T	\$ -	7	\$ 40.88	- 105.01 φ	-	\$ 44.17 \$	417.66	\$ 50.12		-			
PM778	2017 Ranger 2.2l Diesel	\$ 558.72 \$				•		\$ 38.84 \$			\$ 54.50 \$					5 \$ 7.00	\$ 65.73	(\$58.7
PM779 PM781	Ford Ranger XL 4WD Crew Cab Ute C91LO SES	\$ 281.63 \$ \$ 253.02 \$		T		\$ - \$ -	· ·	\$ 17.13 \$ \$ 19.69 \$		-	\$ 54.50 \$ \$ - \$		\$ 35.00					
PM781 PM783	Portable Barrow Lights x 2 Ford Ranger SCab 4WD H78CR - Bwell (Spray ute)	\$ 253.02 \$ \$ 673.80 \$				\$ - \$ -		\$ 19.69 \$	- \$ 5 - \$		\$ - \$ \$ 58.00 \$	-					\$ 39.64	(\$32.6
PM785	Mits Triton GLX Ext Cab 4WD - Ham (Grader ute)	\$ 1,195.02 \$		7	7	т	Т	\$ 47.41			\$ 44.17 \$							(\$22.5
PM786	Mits Triton GLX Ext Cab 4WD - Bwell (Grader ute)	\$ 655.91 \$				\$ -		\$ 49.17			\$ 44.17 \$							(\$11.7
PM787	Nissan Navara Extra Cab 2WD - Hamilton	\$ 678.16 \$			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40.37		-	\$ 44.17 \$		•			· ·		(\$15.9
PM788	Toyota Hilux SCab 2wd H51CM - Hamilton (Sue)	\$ 1,224.48 \$				\$ -	\$ 473.41				\$ 44.17 \$							(\$0.9
PM789	Mitsubishi Outlandser Exceed (Lyn)	\$ 1,249.32 \$				\$ -	φ 250.50	\$ 65.66			\$ 44.17 \$					\$ 7.00	\$ 16.66	(\$9.6
PM790	X-Trail 4WD Auto Diesel TS Series 2 (Adam) H92CU	\$ 665.21 \$			T .	•	т	\$ 50.75 \$			\$ 44.17 \$				-		F6 700.0:	
PM792 PM793	Toyota Tarago - Community Bus Diesel tank for grader ute PM786	\$ 733.84 \$ \$ 24.20 \$		Ŷ		\$ - \$ -	\$ 454.55 \$ -	\$ 18.90 \$ \$ 1.83 \$	-	-	\$ 44.17 \$ \$ - \$		\$ 23.17 \$ 3.73				\$ 733.84	
PM793 PM794	JCB 5CX Backhoe Loader H11JP (Bothwell)	\$ 24.20 \$ \$ 1,477.26 \$				\$ -		\$ 1.83 \$			\$ - \$ \$ 17.48 \$		\$ 3.73 \$ 313.28			\$ \$ 40.00	\$ 75.76	(\$35.7
PM798	Hustler Fastrak SDX - H27UK	\$ 1,477.26 \$				•		\$ 9.51			\$ 28.23 \$,-						\$15.
PM801	John Deere 1570 Mower	\$ 381.20 \$		\$ -		\$ -	· ·	\$ 27.01			\$ 23.08 \$		\$ 55.19			\$ \$ 30.00		(\$14.8
PM803	Hustler Fastrak SDX - Gretna	\$ 126.10 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9.51	- \$	-	\$ - \$	97.16			-			
PM805	Slasher - McConnel Omega 1.2m forestry head swing				т	\$ -	•	\$ 11.04 \$			\$ - \$		•		-			
PM807	Lyco Loader for PM752	\$ 33.47 \$				•		\$ 2.60 \$			\$ - \$							
PM809	Fire Fighter Goldacres 800Lt	\$ 226.03 \$				\$ 145.15		\$ 6.29		-	\$ - \$							
PM810	Komatsu WA270-8 Loader	\$ 1,623.44 \$ \$ 1,758.73 \$	-		T	\$ 25.45	•	\$ 91.08 \$	- 100.05 φ	414.01	\$ 17.48 \$	930.42	\$ 372.17			7.00	ė 0.40	144
PM811 PM812	Nissan X-Trail 4WD Auto Nissan X-Trail 4WD Auto	\$ 1,758.73 \$ \$ 2,275.89 \$				\$ - \$ -		\$ 57.90 \$ \$ 57.90 \$		414.01	\$ 44.17 \$ \$ 44.17 \$		\$ 59.15 \$ 59.15			- ·	· ·	(\$1.4 (\$3.5
PM813	Water Cartage Tank 10 000lt	\$ 2,275.89 \$		T		•		\$ 57.90 \$			\$ 44.17 \$					7.00 ج	10.51 د	(\$3.5
PM815	Mitsubishi Triton 4X4	\$ 684.49 \$		\$ 42.27		•	\$ -	3 12.04 3			\$ 44.17	-				\$ 50.00	\$ 10.22	\$39.
	Hilux 4x2 Workmate 2.4 T-Diesel Manual	\$ 660.64 \$			\$ 100.00		\$ 256.23	\$			\$ 54.50		\$ 70.34					\$4.0
PM816					7	•					\$ 54.50							(\$1.5
PM816 PM817	Hilux 4x2 Workmate 2.4 T-Diesel Manual Double	\$ 964.75 \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 595.00	ļ \$	244.91 \$		\$ 54.50		\$ 70.34	۶ /9:	5 113.5	5 \$ 7.00	\$ 8.50	(51.5

ONATIONS	AND GRANTS 2021-2022										
ate	Details		Australia Day, ANZAC Day, Hamilton Show	Childrens	Grants \	and	Further Education Bursaries and School Support		Church Grants	Tourism	TOTAL
	Community & Economic Development Support	\$5,000									
	Support/Donations	\$4,750									
	Further Education Bursaries	\$1,800									
	Central Highlands School Support	\$4,000									
	Anzac Day	\$6,000									
	Hamilton show	\$5,000									
	Australia Day	\$1,500									
	Church Grants	\$5,000									
	Suicide Prevention Program	\$2,000									
	Anglers Alliance Sponsorship	\$3,000									
	Bothw ell Spin-out	\$4,000									
	Royal Flying Doctor Service	\$1,000									
	Bothw ell Speed Shear	\$2,000									
	Youth Activities	\$5,000									
	Australiasian Golf Museum contribution to power	\$5,000									
	South Central Region Projects	\$5,000									
	Local Govt Shared Services Project	\$2,000									
	200 Years of Bothwell Celebration	\$10,000									
	Health & Wellbeing Plan Implementation	\$5,000									
19/07/2021	First aid training donation - HATCH	\$2,500			2,500.00						
19/07/2021	Meal delivery progran donation - HATCH	\$2,000			2,000.00						
20/07/2021	Support for Common Ground program	\$750			750.00						
										 	
EAR TO DA	TE EXPENDITURE		0.00	0.00	5,250.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,25
UDGET		\$82,300	12,500.00	5,000.00	10,000.00	7,000.00	5,800.00	34,000.00	5,000.00	3,000.00	82,300

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 CENTRAL HIGHLANDS DRAFT LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE – PUBLIC NOTIFICATION PROGRAM

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to determine the public notification program for the Central Highlands Draft Local Provisions Schedule (the draft LPS).

This matter was considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 10 August and the recommendation encapsulates the outcome of that meeting.

Background

The Tasmanian Planning Scheme will consist of the LPSs from individual Councils and the State Planning Provisions (SPPs).

As Councillors are aware, over the last two years Central Highlands has been working to get its draft LPS into a form that the Commission is prepared to endorse as suitable for public exhibition, attempting to negotiate through a number of issues of contention.

The Commission has now moved the process to the next stage by issuing the formal Notice under Section 35B(4) of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993*, directing Council to publicly exhibit the draft LPS (see attached). The public exhibition period is to commence on Monday 23 August and run for 60 days.

At the July planning committee meeting and the following Council meeting, Council considered the Section 35 Directions Notice from the Commission formally directing Council to make certain modifications to its Draft LPS prior to public exhibition. Council also considered subsequent changes to its *Supporting Report*, particularly to elaborate on matters where the Commission directed amendments to be made contrary to Council's views as the local Planning Authority. The Supporting Report will be placed on public exhibition alongside the draft LPS.

As set out in the attached correspondence from the Commission, once the public exhibition period is completed it will be Council's role to consider the matters raised in submissions received and determine a view on them, including whether the LPS should be amended as a result. The submissions and Council's views on them will then be forwarded to the Commission which will hold public hearings and, ultimately, make final determinations. The Minister will then declare the Tasmanian Planning Scheme to be in force in the Central Highlands municipal area.

Note that the Commission's correspondence points out that certain matters are essentially 'off limits' for consideration in this public consultation process. If Council receives submissions, or parts of submissions, that raise these matters, Council is to essentially declare them to be void. These matters can be generally divided into two categories:

- The State Planning Provisions, and
- Provisions declared to be 'transitioning' from the current Central Highlands Interim Planning Scheme 2015, (CHIPS2015).

The State Planning Provisions make up almost all of the written part of the draft LPS, being provisions that are standardised across the whole State. They were subject to their own public exhibition process four years ago, which included public submissions and public hearings before final determination by the Commission. Understandably, they cannot be subject to the possibility of amendment as each local council area goes through the process of developing its LPS.

The provisions 'transitioning' from existing Central Highlands Interim planning Scheme 2015 (CHIPS2015) also cannot be amended. When the government created the legislation to establish the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, it included the concept that many existing planning scheme provisions would be copied exactly into the respective LPSs. Changes to these provision are essentially only possible if necessary to make them fit properly with the State Planning Provisions. The intent of this was, possibly, to speed the process of creating the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

The down side of the 'transitioning provisions' concept is that Councils have not been able to undertake 'scheme renovation': to amend the many minutia within planning schemes that have become unnecessary, irrelevant or, in some cases, detrimental to appropriate development. Such changes are generally too insignificant to justify the expense of full-blown planning scheme amendment processes and Councils have traditionally looked forward to whole-scheme reviews to fix them in an efficient and cost effective manner. Unfortunately, Tasmanian Councils have not been able to undertake scheme renovation for, in some cases, decades, as the previous regional planning reform process similarly did not allow for such updates.

Central Highlands has several matters that have been caught in this dilemma, such as Council's desire to remove a redundant attenuation buffer area from around the decommissioned sewage treatment ponds at the Great Lake Hotel.

The Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan.

The Commission is of the view that the Lake Meadowbank Specific Area Plan (SAP) should be a 'transitioning provision'. Central Highlands, as the local Planning Authority, is of the view that certain modifications ought to be made to it. For example, for the recognition and protection of the important Aboriginal heritage sites around the lake. However, even one modification would tip the SAP from being a 'transitioning provision' to an entirely new provision and therefore subject to the requirement for full justification under the planning legislation, including whether the SAP should exist at all.

The Commission has, so far, not been satisfied with Council's rationale for a modified Lake Meadowbank SAP, and has even started to question whether it should exist at all. As per the attached corresponded, the Commission has determined that the SAP is to be subject to an 'Outstanding Issues Notice'. This means it is no longer formally part of the Draft LPS, but will be publicly exhibited alongside it, and members of the public may make submissions in regard to it.

The issues around the proposed modified Lake Meadowbank Specific Area plan are set out in the Supporting Report.

The Spatial Extent of Heritage Places.

It was Council's intention to include the CHIPS2015 Heritage Places in the Draft LPS but with their spatial extents modified to match the revised spatial extents of the equivalent listings on the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The THR listings have been systematically revised by the Tasmanian Heritage Council over the last 20 years to delete the extensive areas of land that were added to the listings 'overnight' when the THR was created in the 1990s and their spatial definition was, for the first time, defined by the titles that were part of each country estate. This process arbitrarily cobbled together multiple titles containing many hundreds of hectares of land into each listing.

The Tasmanian Heritage Register listings have mostly been corrected within the Central Highlands area and Council's intention was simply to align the equivalent planning scheme listings. It had intended to request the Minister to allow an amended heritage list under Schedule 6, Clause 8D of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993*.

There is over 3,000 ha of land currently encumbered by these unnecessarily large spatial extents. This represents a significant unnecessary and unfair encumbrance on future development of these titles.

The Commission has advised that the current heritage place list in the Central Highlands Interim Planning Scheme 2015 must be directly 'transitioned' into the LPS without any amendments to remove superfluous titles. An amendment to any one place on the list would mean the entire list would need to comply with the new information requirements for listed places. This would involve Council engaging a suitably qualified person to create full data sheets of all listed places, (whether their spatial extent was amended or not), including a detailed description and list of heritage values, etc. for each place. This would take considerable time and financial resources, and Council is not prepared to pursue this course of action. This would have delayed the public exhibition of the draft LPS by around one year and would have essentially just duplicated the professional heritage assessment process already undertaken by the Tasmanian Heritage Council. In other words, Council judged this to be an imprudent use of Council time and money.

Council then adopted the position that, if the listings cannot be amended to remove superfluous titles and thereby align with the Tasmanian Heritage Register, then it would prefer that the listings be removed entirely. It formed this view noting that all listings are also on the THR and therefore their heritage values will remain protected by the State heritage-protection system.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission subsequently directed that the listings be removed from the Draft LPS.

PUBLIC EXHIBITION

Minimum Requirements:

The attached correspondence from the Commission sets out the minimum requirement for the 60-day public exhibition process. These are:

- Advertising twice in the daily newspaper. The form and content of the notice is specified.
- Making the draft LPS available for viewing and downloading on Council's website. (PDF documents of the ordinance and the maps). The Commission will also make these documents available on its website).
- Making a copy available for viewing at the Council offices.
- Notifying all Councils within our region and any neighbouring Councils.
- Notifying specified State agencies.

To comply with the above, Council will need to print at least one hard copy set of the ordinance and maps and have them available at one of its offices.

Council's supporting report will also be similarly available.

Potential Additional Measures:

In addition to the minimum public exhibition requirements, the following measures are proposed:

- Making the hard copy sets available at both the Hamilton and Bothwell offices.
 - The cost of this would be the cost of printing an additional set, which will be several hundred dollars.
- Making the maps available via an online interactive mapping tool, enabling members of the public to search properties, see what the proposed zoning is and turn the overlay layers off and on, to see which codes apply. The TasMap and satellite photography layers will be able to be turn on and off, for locational information.

As Councillors will recall from the LPS workshops, the officially endorsed pdf maps cannot include certain locational information. In large rural areas like Central Highlands, this makes property location very difficult, if not impossible. The online mapping tool would solve this problem, as well as make the mapping accessible to all with access to a computer and internet connection.

Council's mapping consultants, Insight GIS, have quoted the interactive mapping tool at \$3,250.00, excluding GST.

A mail-out to ratepayers. The advertising period specified by the Commission does not coincide with a
rates mail-out in which Council normally includes a newsletter. Therefore, a mail out regarding the
draft LPS would have to be a 'stand-alone' process.

The contractors that put together Council's rates mailouts have quoted \$722.37 to produce a double-sided colour A4 flyer for each ratepayer. This does not include postage. However it is noted that some may be able to be emailed, thereby reducing postage costs.

• Information drop-in sessions. During the various public consultation processes involved in the development of the current Central Highlands Interim Planning Scheme 2015, public information 'drop-in sessions' were held at Council's Hamilton and Bothwell offices and also at the Miena community hall. These ran from around mid-afternoon to early evening, with a view to providing s many members or the community as possible the opportunity to call in. These would be staffed by Council's Special Projects Officer / planning consultant / Planning officer who would be able to guide members of the public in terms of what is proposed for their properties, and other aspects of the draft LPS, and answer questions.

In anticipation of Council giving he go-ahead for this facet of the public exhibition program, the Council meeting rooms and the Miena hall have been booked for the following dates:

Miena: Tuesday September 14th, 3:00pm to 7:30pm.
 Hamilton: Wednesday September 15th, 3:00pm to 7:30pm.
 Bothwell: Thursday September 16th, 3:00pm to 7:30pm.

These dates are in the fourth week of the 60-day exhibition period. This should give Council sufficient time to advertise the whole process and make the general community aware of the process. It should also then leave enough time for people to formulate any submissions they may wish to make.

The cost would be the cost of the time of Council's Special Projects Officer, via the resource-sharing arrangement with Southern Midlands Council.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT it be recommended to Council that:

- The 60-day public exhibition period for the Central Highlands Draft Local Provisions Schedule commence on Monday 23 August 2021, as directed by the Tasmanian Planning Commission.
- In addition to the minimum public advertising mechanisms required by legislation, Council institute the following:
 - A hard copy set of the ordinance, maps and supporting report is to be available for perusal at both the Bothwell and Hamilton offices, (instead of just one).
 - The maps are to be made available online via an interactive mapping tool, enabling members
 of the public with access to the internet to search particular properties and determine which
 zone and what code overlays are proposed to apply.
 - Prior to, or in the first week of the advertising period, a colour, double-sided A4 flyer is to be posted and/or emailed to every ratepayer and also any local community group which might have an interest in land use planning matters.
 - o Local community information drop-in sessions are to be held, as follows:

Miena: Tuesday September 14th, 3:00pm to 7:30pm.

Hamilton: Wednesday September 15th, 3:00pm to 7:30pm.

Bothwell: Thursday September 16th, 3:00pm to 7:30pm.

 A Councillor workshop be scheduled either prior to, or soon after, the start of the public exhibition period (23 August) to consider and refine the key messages to be relayed to the community during the exhibition period. The date and time of the workshop is (to be determined by Council).

15.2 SOUTHERN RECYCLING TENDER AND JOINT AUTHORITY

The General Manager has requested that Council consider the information provided by Mr Dion Lester the Chief Executive Officer from the Local Government Association of Tasmania regarding the southern recycling tender and Joint Authority process:

Report Purpose and Community Benefit

The purpose of this report is to seek approval to proceed with a tender to secure a new contract for the processing of Recyclable Materials.

The report also seeks approval for the establishment of a new Joint Authority (with other Southern Tasmanian councils) to manage the new recycling contract (and other waste related issues) on behalf of the region.

Report Summary

Council's former contractor for the processing of co-mingled recycled materials (SKM Industries, Pty Ltd) (SKM) was placed into administration in late 2019.

Cleanaway Pty Ltd took over the operation of the Derwent Park Materials Recycling Facility in December 2019 with a 'Receipt of Recyclable Agreement' entered into between the Council and Cleanaway on 6 November 2020 to cover the period December 2019 to December 2021.

This agreement is an interim measure to ensure recycling continues to be able to be processed in southern Tasmania.

The 12 Southern Tasmanian councils are working together to enable the procurement of a new contract for the processing of co-mingled recyclable materials to take effect late 2021.

This partnership is being coordinated (on an interim basis) through the Waste Management Memorandum of Understanding, with support from the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT).

It has been identified that there is a need for the establishment of a Joint Authority to be formed by the councils in the southern region of Tasmania to manage the new recycling contract and progress other waste related issues for the region.

Background

- 1.1. There have been numerous changes associated with the processing of recyclables over recent years, these include:
 - 1.1.1. Impacts of a decision by China to restrict the import of material
 - 1.1.2. Decisions by the Australian Government to restrict the export of recyclables
 - 1.1.3. The Council's (then) contractor for the processing of recyclables, SKM Industries Pty Ltd (SKM) being placed into administration.
 - 1.1.4. The subsequent acquisition of SKMs assets by Cleanaway Pty Ltd.
 - 1.1.5. Agreement (in December 2019) that Cleanaway Pty Ltd would accept the Councils recyclables for 2 years.

This arrangement allowed the Council (and region) time to prepare to procure a new contract for the processing of recyclables whilst service continuity was maintained.

- 1.2. The 12 southern councils collectively signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to enter into an arrangement to work co-operatively on waste management and resource recovery issues and projects for the southern Tasmanian region.
 - 1.2.1. Under this MOU, the Southern Tasmanian Waste Management Group (STWMG) (facilitated by the LGAT) committed to a range of activities including supporting councils in securing efficient, sustainable and suitably scaled end-of-collection facilities for processing materials including co-mingled recycling
- 1.3. The LGAT was also successful in obtaining assistance from the State Government (Department of State Growth and EPA) to help fund a Southern Tasmanian Strategic Recycling Analysis.
- 1.4. With the completion of the analysis, the region has direction to enable the development of tender specifications.
- 1.5. The analysis identified the following:
 - 1.5.1. A preferred contract duration of 10-15 years
 - 1.5.2. Recycling service administration and management via a dedicated third party
 - 1.5.3. Benefits of expanded reporting and disclosure settings
 - 1.5.4. Capacity to influence products and end buyers
 - 1.5.5. Gate fees to incorporate price transparency and shared ownership
- 1.6. 20,300 tonnes of recycling is currently collected and delivered for processing by the 12 councils in the southern region.
 - 1.6.1. This equates to a total cost of just over \$2.81m per year, based on the current gate fee of \$139 per tonne.
 - 1.6.2. The volume of recycling in the south exceeds the combined total of both the North (11,000 tpa) and the North West (6,700 tpa) regions, with each of those regions running a single contract administration through its Regional Waste Authority.
- 1.7. It is noted that the collection of recycling is outside the scope of this proposal, with collection arrangements of each council area to remain separately determined/administered by each council, to their own satisfaction and requirements.

Details of the findings follow:

- 1.8. Contract duration of 10-15 years
 - 1.8.1. The study recommends the councils acquire a recycling service operating for between 10-15 years' duration.
 - This proposal enables a timeframe that allows operators to invest in modern, high performance plant and equipment needed to produce high quality sorted materials.
 - 1.8.2. High quality products would help diminish market risk arising from strong competing demand for reprocessing capacity on the mainland while positioning the councils to offer material to more local re-processors over coming years.
 - 1.8.3. Equally important, a longer timeframe could also attract new entrants who would need to invest in a complete facility.
 - 1.8.4. While a longer contract represents some risk that the service may grow out of step with market and policy conditions over time, this is itself a more systemic issue caused by a reliance on capital intensive services as a means to deliver resource recovery during a time of market change.
 - 1.8.5. Other recommendations below seek to alleviate this potential disparity, while the State Government may have a role in trialling less capital intensive recycling models with a subset of councils, in parallel to the mainstream use of sorting infrastructure.
- 1.9. Recycling service administration and oversight via a dedicated third party
 - 1.9.1. The report determined that the preferred model to administer the recycling service would involve a single entity overseeing the recycling operator's activities on behalf of the 12 councils, joined through a single contract.
 - 1.9.2. This is anticipated to lower the overall administrative burden across the 12 councils, and help to ensure that those communities whose councils have modest internal resources allocated to waste management are able to access a high standard of recycling services.
 - 1.9.3. It is important that a minimum level of expertise and attention be retained from the council sector to oversee the performance of this third party administrator, both to ensure it acquits its

- duties in line with expectations, and to ensure governance arrangements place councils' priority outcomes at the front and centre of all activities.
- 1.9.4. The analysis found that in ideal circumstances, this single entity model would undertake the procurement process although timing constraints prevent the southern councils from adopting this option in this instance.
- 1.9.5. As such, the councils will need to continue to work together to initiate the procurement process in parallel to establishing the third party arrangement (which will include ACCC authorisations and internal sign-offs across the 12 councils).

1.10. Expanded reporting and disclosure settings

- 1.10.1. The study recognised a number of councils raised the issues of transparency and the need for a suitably encompassing interpretation of accountability with respect to recycling services.
- 1.10.2. Councils (and their communities) need to understand destinations involved with recovery of resources downstream of the sorting facility.
- 1.10.3. Given the situation it was proposed the recycling service involve the following reporting obligations placed on the operator:
 - 1.10.3.1. Volumes received by the operator, reported on a fixed periodic (i.e. monthly) basis.
 - 1.10.3.2. Volumes discarded, processed and consigned, reported on a fixed periodic (i.e. monthly), and covering:
 - Tonnages disposed of to landfill
 - Tonnages consigned to recovery activities, represented according to material types and their end purchasers (company, location and processing activities/outputs), and including volumes of rejected shipments and shipments handed over at 'no charge' to buyers
 - c. Tonnages stockpiled on site at the end of each reporting period (or sites elsewhere, managed by the operator) awaiting shipment to recovery and disposal facilities as relevant, represented according to material types and intended end markets (subject to sales and acceptance of material)
 - 1.10.3.3. Sales reports and disposal costs pertaining to the materials listed above, represented as average unit pricing (i.e. per tonne) over the period and total payments and charges from sale of material and discard to landfill respectively
 - 1.10.3.4. Major contaminants identified in kerbside materials received by the operator from kerbside collections (as observed during normal operations) over the period, where 'major' may refer to larger volume contaminants and/or those that entail greater commercial risk to the operator
 - 1.10.3.5. Market information and intelligence as relevant, where this information may help the operator and the councils better plan for and address commercial and/or reputational risks and unnecessary cost impacts upon the recycling service, shared on a periodic (e.g. quarterly or six-monthly) basis or as needed to manage undue costs and risks
 - 1.10.3.6. Details of incidents that may have impacts on the operator's social and regulatory licences to operate, including incidents that may give rise to or have given rise to:
 - a. Complaints raised by the community
 - b. Investigations, official warnings/notices and enforcement actions associated with environmental regulation, occupational health and safety responsibilities, and other potential breaches of law occurring on premises
 - c. Planned and unplanned changes to operations where this may have an impact on nearby communities and the environment, and/or deleterious impacts on the quality of materials recovered on councils' behalf and/or stockpiling levels
 - d. Other developments and incidents that may impair the social licence of recycling operations conducted by the operator on the councils' behalf.

1.11. Capacity to influence products and end buyers

1.11.1. The study found that expectations on councils have changed, with their exposures to risk and opportunity not as static as in the past.

Further, incidents over recent years reveal that councils cannot be completely insulated from market and policy changes that affect downstream operations.

Rather, there is some need to respond and adapt while staying within the confines of a service agreement with the recycling operator.

- 1.11.2. Councils need some capacity to influence the pathway that their sorted recyclable materials take once they leave the sorting facility.
- 1.11.3. Noting the study proposed that the following terms be applied in the relationship between the councils and the recycling operator:
 - 1.11.3.1. The requirement for the recycling service provider to scan for and engage with councils on alternative products sorted from kerbside materials and alternative end markets.
 - 1.11.3.2. Based on 1 above, the capacity for councils to require that the operator undertake commercial investigations (e.g. potentially including market sounding; feasibility studies and business cases within a confined scale) seeking to explore the merit in adjusting products and end markets, noting that this may potentially involve gate fee impacts and/or the need to introduce upgrades to the service
 - 1.11.3.3. Based on 2 above, the capacity for councils and the operator to agree to a schedule of service amendments to bring online new products and/or sales to new end-markets.
- 1.11.4. It is anticipated that the above terms strike a suitable balance between councils' and commercial operator needs, accounting for the stakes they share in how the recycled material is managed after leaving the recycling facility.

Gate fees to incorporate price transparency and shared ownership

- 1.11.5. The current arrangement to set gate fees involves a fixed rate (per tonne received from the kerbside), with the provision for the operator to seek adjustments to the gate fee in response to market conditions.
- 1.11.6. While this provides some price certainty for councils, it may not be wholly adequate given the volatility in demand and pricing for materials sorted by the recycling operator, and given the shared responsibility that the councils and the operator have for ensuring the quality of recovered material.
- 1.11.7. The study identified a more efficient and risk reduced approach to gate fees could involve two components:
 - 1.11.7.1. A fixed (static) cost component applied to cover the relatively stable cost for the recycler to operate recycling services
 - 1.11.7.2. A variable (dynamic or floating) component that covers the sharing of sales revenue between operator and councils for the sorted material sold onto buyers in various end-markets.
- 1.12. These findings will inform the development of the specifications used as a basis of the new tender.
- 1.13. The STWMG has developed a project plan listing all elements of this complex process (copy attached).

The plan identifies timelines for each of the projects to be undertaken and a potential budget associated with those tasks.

1.14. One key task is the establishment of a Tender Review Committee (TRC).

This five member Committee would be comprised of representatives of the 12 councils and be supported by a Senior Procurement Officer from the City of Hobart and an external Probity Auditor.

- 1.15. The TRC would provide oversight of the following:
 - 1.15.1. Tender specification development
 - 1.15.2. Tender Process and Documentation
 - 1.15.3. Evaluation of tenders received
 - 1.15.4. Development of recommendations in relation to the determination of the tenders received
 - 1.15.5. Oversight the development of the contract documentation.

Joint Authority

1.16. A key finding of the investigations undertaken by the STWMG is the need for the establishment of a single body to manage the recycling contract on behalf of the 12 southern Tasmanian councils.

1.17. Whilst there have been bodies established previously to manage regional waste in Southern Tasmania, the current circumstances present a unique opportunity for the creation of a new body.

Those circumstances include:

1.17.1. The introduction of a new statewide waste levy that could provide funding to resource the body.

The State Government has committed to the provision of funding to regional bodies in the North and North West of the State, to ensure equity, funding should also be available to southern councils.

- 1.17.2. The experiences of the recycling service demonstrate the need for the region to 'work as one'.
- 1.17.3. There are numerous other waste related changes facing the region (and Tasmania) in coming months, the region must be well positioned to take advantage of these changes.
- 1.17.4. A range of joint (or regional) procurement opportunities could be available for organics, green waste, collection services, education and community awareness programs.
- 1.18. The MoU as an interim measure, has allowed the 12 councils to more formally work together while a long term structure was being considered and developed, being this the proposed Joint Authority.
- 1.19. The Joint Authority will
 - 1.19.1. provide a direct link to the State Government for discussion and collaboration and funding opportunities) in the waste sector,
 - 1.19.2. coordinate responses to proposed actions arising from the State's Draft Waste Action Plan (including proposed legislation), providing one source of negotiation on behalf of the 12 councils.
 - 1.19.3. provide a formal structure and administrative body to assist and/or take the place of regional projects and tenders across the region, whereby previously this has been left to a single Council to initiate, coordinate, request involvement of others, and administer (various examples of this being the recycling contract, FOGO processing, compostable bags, recycling units, education programs and collateral, state-wide communications program (Rethink etc).
 - 1.19.4. Improve the ability to secure/access funding, particularly through the levy, but also grant programs.
- 1.20. Objectives and Terms of Reference for such a body should also include specific reference to the management of the recycling contract on behalf of the southern councils, to ensure compliance and to ensure contract provisions are utilised to deliver on priority outcomes for the councils.
 - 1.20.1. With an annual value in excess of \$2.8M, a 10-year contract will have a value of \$28M and is a significant financial undertaking.
 - 1.20.2. More specific reference to the management of the elements of the recycling contract can be included if considered necessary.

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission

- 1.21. The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) granted an authorisation in June 2014 for the Hobart, Glenorchy and Clarence City Councils to jointly tender and subsequently enter into individual contracts comprising common terms for recycling.
- 1.22. The ACCC determined that the proposed arrangements were likely to result in a public benefit that would outweigh the detriment to the public constituted by any lessening of competition arising from the contract.
- 1.23. In preparation for the current tender process, legal advice was sought by the City of Hobart that indicated:
 - (a) Councils may be viewed as competitors where they are seeking to acquire the same goods or services; and
 - (b) By undertaking joint tendering, councils are aggregating their buying power, which may be seen to have a potential anti-competitive effect on the market.
- 1.24. Given the advice received, it is recommended the councils lodge an application for authorisation of the Proposal with the ACCC.
 - The ACCC has recently granted authorisations for a number of similar proposals.

- 2. Proposal and Implementation
- 2.1. This is a complex matter with the following key elements:
 - 2.1.1. Proceeding with the procurement of a new contract for the processing of co-mingled recyclable materials
 - 2.1.2. Agreeing to work with other councils in Southern Tasmania to secure the new service.
 - 2.1.3. Seeking ACCC approval to proceed with a joint tender
 - 2.1.4. Agreeing to establish a new Joint Authority with other councils in Southern Tasmania to progress waste related issues.
- 2.2. This report provides a detailed analysis of issues surrounding the above and proposes the General Manager be delegated authority to undertake all actions necessary to enable:
 - 2.2.1. Tender specification to be developed and advertised
 - 2.2.2. ACCC approval to be pursued
 - 2.2.3. Arrangements for the establishment of a new Joint Authority with other Southern Tasmanian councils to be progressed.
- 3. Strategic Planning and Policy Considerations

TO BE COMPLETED BY INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL

- 4. Financial Implications
- 4.1. Funding Source and Impact on Current Year Operating Result
 - 4.1.1. The processing of co-mingled recycled materials currently costs Council \$8,389 of recycling at \$139 per tonne).
 - 4.1.2. Costs associated with processing recycling are recovered through a waste management service charge on the Council's rates notices.
 - 4.1.3. The costs associated with the establishment of new tender documentation have been estimated at \$70,000 with the Council's share of that cost being \$2,500 (estimate only at this stage).
 - 4.1.4. The costs associated with the establishment of a new Joint Authority will be the subject of a subsequent report.
- 4.2. Impact on Future Years' Financial Result
 - 4.2.1. The costs associated with the processing of the City's co-mingled recycled materials is anticipated to be in the order of \$8,500.
 - 4.2.2. The operational costs of a new joint authority could be in the order of \$200,000 per annum.

It is anticipated that these costs could be covered by the State Government through the allocation of a portion of the new waste levy.

- 5. Legal. Risk and Legislative Considerations
- 5.1. As with all tendering processes there are some risks associated with this matter.
 - 5.1.1. There is always a risk there will be limited interest from service providers meaning the cost could be expensive or the contract provisions unattractive.
 - 5.1.2. Initial conversations with service providers however suggest that this will not be the case and there will be interest from service providers who may be prepared to provide a service at a cost similar to the existing arrangement.
 - 5.1.3. The Council working with 11 other local government partners introduces a level of risk, however there has been significant goodwill expressed between the councils in southern Tasmania.
 - That level of cooperation and goodwill suggests that this risk is also low.
 - 5.1.4. With the 12 councils working together there is a need for ACCC requirements to be satisfied. There is a risk this approval will not be secured.

 Again, this risk is considered low as a similar approval has been secured previously and there
 - is nothing to suggest that the approval will not be again provided.

 5.1.5. As indicated earlier in this report Joint Authorities have been established previously in the southern region.

These Authorities have not been as successful as they could have been. There is a risk any newly establish Joint Authority might not be as effective as it should be. The establishment of the Joint Authority however with the appropriate governance arrangements (including the establishment of an expert Board) and appropriate membership will minimise this risk.

- 5.1.6. On balance it is considered each of the risks identified can be appropriately mitigated to a level within the Council's risk appetite.
- 5.1.7. The *Local Government Act 1993* provides the ability for the establishment of a single or a Joint Authority:
 - 30. Single and joint authorities
 - (1) A council, by a resolution of an absolute majority, may resolve to establish –
 - (a) a single authority; or
 - (b) a joint authority with one or more other councils.
 - (2) A single authority or joint authority may be established –
 - (a) to carry out any scheme, work or undertaking; and
 - (b) to provide facilities or services; and
 - (c) to perform any function or exercise any power of a council under this or any other Act.
- 6. Environmental Considerations
- 6.1. The kerbside recycling service is currently diverting around XXXX tonnes of material from landfill.
- 6.2. Recycling paper, cardboard, plastic, steel, and aluminium recovered through the kerbside recycling system reduces the use of virgin materials and the environmental impacts associated with obtaining those raw materials from the natural environment.
- 7. Community and Stakeholder Engagement
- 7.1. A considerable amount of stakeholder engagement has been undertaken in the Strategic Analysis undertaken by Urban EP.
- 8. Delegation
- 8.1. The matter is for the Council to determine.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT:

- 1. The update on the Council's arrangements for the acceptance and processing of its co-mingled recyclable materials be received and noted.
- 2. Authority be provided to the General Manager to proceed with the procurement of a new contract for the processing of co-mingled recyclable materials.
 - (i) In doing so, the General Manager be authorised to work with other councils in Southern Tasmania to develop specifications, call tenders and award the tender in accordance with the assessment of the submissions received by the Tender Review Committee.
 - (ii) The General Manager be authorised to work with other councils in Southern Tasmania to secure ACCC approval to proceed with a joint tender.
- 3. In accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Act 1993, the Council resolve to establish a Joint Authority with other Southern Tasmanian councils to progress waste related issues.
 - (i) The General Manager be authorised to work with other councils in Southern Tasmania to progress the establishment of a new Joint Authority including the development of rules and governance arrangements for the new Joint Authority.
- 4. A further report be provided to the Council detailing the outcome of the tender process and seeking formal approval of the membership of the Joint Authority, within the next 6-months.

At the July Ordinary Meeting Council were provided with an update on the proposed community notice board at Hamilton.

Elaine Herlihy has now completed a Community Grants Program Application Form for this project seeking \$2,000 to purchase the notice board plus in-kind support for the installation.

The location of the proposed notice board is yet to be determined with it being suggested that it be placed on Council's road reserve to the side of the post box building.





Options

- 1) Council to approve the Community Grants Program Application and place the sign on the Central Highlands Council road reserve to the side of the post box building.
- 2) Council approve the Community Grants Program Application for \$2,000 and the applicant arrange placement of the sign.
- 3) Council refuse the Community Grants Program Application.

FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

15.4 HEATPUMP INSTALLATION - BOTHWELL LIBRARY

Dee Scott, Manager, Bridgewater Library, Libraries Tasmania has contacted Council with the following request:

I write to ask if Council as the landlord of the space we occupy for Bothwell Library would consider installing a more efficient heater in the Library space please? My main concern for our staff member and the comfort levels of our community who visit the Library.

After a recent visit I noted how cold the space was and the current heating is inefficient.

In the main Library room, there are only 3 wall heaters, 2 of which are broken and have not worked for some time. We have purchased plug in oil filled heaters and have more on the way, however a permanent solution would be more cost-effective and create a warmer space for staff and community members.

The Children's room there is an electric heater that works, however a more efficient heater may reduce the need for this to be turned on and reduce costs.

A quotation has been obtained for the installation of a Daikin L Series 7.0kW heat, 6.0kW cool, floor mounted reverse cycle heat pump in the Library space being \$3,790.00 (GST Inclusive).

FOR DISCUSSION

15.5 HEATPUMP INSTALLATION - BOTWELL TOWN HALL

The current heating in the Bothwell Town hall in not adequae and as such a quotation for the installation of heatpumps for the hall and supper room have been obtained as follows:

Item	Quantity	Unit Price	Total
Daikin CORA Series 10.4kW heat, 9.5kW cool, wall	2	\$3,910.00	\$7,820.00
mounted reverse cycle heat pump – Hall Area			
Hoppy Condensate Pump – Hall Area	2	\$260.00	\$520.00
Daikin CORA Series 10.4kW heat, 9.5kW cool, wall	1	\$3,910.00	\$3,910.00
mounted reverse cycle heat pump – Supper Room			

FOR DISCUSSION

15.6 SMOKE DETECTOR / ALARMS

Clr Cassidy would like to discuss the need for Smoke Detector/Alarms in residential properties. As when he visited the Tasfire showroom, they stated that Smoke Detectors have an Expiration Date.

Clr Cassidy thinks it would be valuable to pass this information on to residents and Rate Payers of our municipality.

Perhaps, we could start by inviting TFS to Council to give a bit of education on this and then maybe they could visit our communities or provide literature that we could include with Rates Notices and include in The Highland Digest.

15.7 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
2021 / 00020	Engineering Plus	15 Ruby Road, Miena	Dwelling & Shed
2021 / 00065	Tasbuilt Homes and Cabins	12 Drysdale Road, Miena	Dwelling

PERMITTED

DA NO.	APPLICANT	LOCATION	PROPOSAL
			Transportable Container (Office,
2020 / 00042	J G Bryant	9 Michael Street, Bothwell	Storage & Sleepout)
2021 / 00059	S P A Game, J Barwick	21 High Street, Bothwell	Dwelling and Outbuildings
		43 Bronte Estate Road, Bronte	
2021 / 00055	L W Tatnell	Park	Dwelling

2021 / 00032	A W Bailey	7 Torlesse Street, Hamilton	Expansion of Quarry

DISCRETIONARY

DA NO.	APPLICANT	LOCATION	PROPOSAL
	Central Highlands	Council Office, 6 Tarleton	
2021 / 00041	Council	Street, Hamilton	Re-Roof
		170 Rockmount Road,	
2021 / 00053	P & J Sheds	Ellendale	Outbuilding
		485 Upper Mill Road,	Visitor Accommodation (Partial
2021 / 00054	Ireneinc Planning	Hamilton	Change of Use)
2021 / 00016	J G Herbert, M R Gray	6 Dennistoun Road, Bothwell	Rear Deck

ANIMAL CONTROL

IMPOUNDED DOGS

No dogs have been impounded over the past months.

STATISTICS AS OF 10 August 2021

Registrations

Total Number of Dogs Registered in 2020/2021 Financial Year – 978

2021/2022 renewal have been issued.

- Number of Dogs Currently Registered 744
- Number of Dogs Pending Re-Registration 202

Kennel Licences

Total Number of Kennel Licences Issued for 2020/2021 Financial Year - 29

2021/2022 Renewal have been Issued.

- Number of Licenses Issued –26
- Number of Licences Pending 3

16.0 WORKS & SERVICES

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Works & Services Report be received.

WORKS & SERVICES REPORT 10th July to 9th August

Grading & Sheeting

- Rotherwood Road
- Victoria Valley Road

Repair water leak Hamilton Hall

Buildings:

	Page 2
Plant:	 PM748 Hino tipper service and new taillight PM794 JCB Backhoe serviced and new heater PM818 Hilux ute first service PM705 Mack truck service PM817 Hilux ute serviced PM794 JCB Backhoe Hamilton new battery
Private Works:	 Grading for Kinloch trading Gravel Andrew Dally Gravel delivery to Pitts Gravel John Pilcher Terry Jones gravel delivery Jones River Co side arm slasher hire Kathy Van Dulleman gravel delivery Rodney Bowerman blue metal Kathy Britten gravel delivery Dave Triffett gravel delivery Shannon Harvey water delivery David Eccles water delivery Tony Bowerman concrete premix Paul Green concrete premix Jones family dairy gravel delivery
Casuals	Toilets, rubbish and HobartHamilton general duties

MEADSFIELD ROAD REALIGNMENT - J R FOWLER & SON 16.1

Background

Program for next 4 weeks

Back in 2012 Council received a request from J.R.Fowler & Son from Bendeveron in regards to rerouting of approximately 720m of Meadsfield Road or so that the capacity of Mr Fowler's dam could be increased.

Croakers Alley Footbridge

Award road tenders

Potholing and grading of Municipal roads

Replace bridge decking Green Valley bridge

JR Fowler and Son engaged engineers from GHD to undertake the design of the new road and submitted plans to Council for review and then had a consulting engineer ass the design for Council.

In March 2012 Council gave written permission to JR Fowler and Son for the relocation of the 720m of Meadsfield Road in accordance with the drawings provided to Council by GHD. Council also stated the following conditions in the correspondence given to JR Fowler and Son

- 1, Road being constructed to Council's standards
- 2, you being responsible for surveying and transferring of new road to Council and surveying and transferring old road to your property title
- 3, If the water level of the dam or splash level reaches the proposed road, then Council require you to relocate the road a further 10-15 meters to the west on your property
- 4, You meeting all advertising costs and providing traffic management during the construction of the new road- this includes constructing a by-pass during construction

- 5, A barrier will be required on both sides of the road where it passes the dam and at other locations determined by your engineer and agreed with Councils Works Manager
- 6, Ongoing maintenance of this new section of Meadsfield road will be your responsibility
- 7, Gravel for road surface is to be sourced from Council
- 8, Final engineering plans to be submitted to Council prior to work commencing

JR Fowler & Son then requested that Council re consider condition 5 "the installation of guard rail" as this will make the project very costly and unachievable also condition 6, "In regard to the ongoing maintenance "should be changed to, "you will be responsible of any defects that occur on this section of Meadsfield Road for a period of 12 months after practical completion."

Council then sent the following amendments to JR Fowler and Son

MEADSFIELD ROAD REALIGNMENT - J FOWLER

Thank you for your email of 8 May 2012 regarding the Conditions of Approval for the realignment of Meadsfield Road for flood sections for Mr John Fowler. I wish to make the following comments in regard to Conditions 5 and 6:

Condition 5

Advice has been sought from the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) and they have advised that under the Road Hazard Management Guide anything that has an invert of 1.8m or greater must have guard rail. Anything that has an invert of less than 1.8m does not require a guard rail but requires 1-4 batters from the edge of the road with a 6m clear zone from the edge of the road to the hazard (dam).

Therefore, in accordance with the advice received from DIER, Council are happy for 1-4 batters to be constructed if the invert is no more than 1.8m and that a 6m clear zone is in place from the edge of the road to the dam. Council is adamant that this 6m zone must remain at all times and your client will need to illustrate to Council how this will be achieved given that there will be erosion etc from wave action on the dam.

Council also wish to know if it is an option to reduce the pivot span on the other side of the road so that new road can be redirected further into the paddock away from the dam.

Condition 6

Condition 6 is to be amended as per your recommendation as follows "You will be responsible for any defects that occur on this section of Meadsfield Road for a period of twelve months after Practical Completion of the Works."

All other conditions on Council's Condition of Approval will remain unchanged.

A recent on-site meeting was held with Mr Fowler, Hall Earth Moving, Councils works supervisor and Councils Works Manager to discuss the proposed works and road design as well as discuss the permit conditions from Council.

JR Fowler and Son will also be required to submit a road open permit to Council with the traffic management plan and all appropriate insurances, when Council issue the road open permit this will give hold points that Council will need to inspect during the construction of the re-alignment.

JR Fowler and Son are wanting to start construction as soon as possible due to availability of civil contractors. JR Fowler & Son since the approval from Council has constructed all other sections of their project, pipe lines, pivots, and pump shed.

All previous correspondences are attached for information

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT once a road open permit is received the Works and Services Manager give confirmation to JR Fowler and Son that they can commence construction of 720m of re-alignment of Meadsfield Road in accordance with Councils Permit conditions and the approved drawings from GHD.

16.2 BRONTE PARK SIGNAGE AND SPEED LIMIT CHANGE REQUEST

Mayor Lou Triffitt has recently had concerns from residents and the public requesting a lower speed limit and signage change in Bronte. I believe with the recent construction of the toilets that the amount of people visiting at times, has increased.

The current speed limit in the area is 70km. Marlborough Road is owned and maintained by the Department of State Growth, this means for any requests or changes must be done by DSG and not Council.

The speed limit through our Municipal towns Ouse, Bothwell, Hamilton, and Gretna, on the Lyell Highway and Highlands Lake Road is 60km and with a much higher volume of traffic. I believe that the request for a lower speed limit at Bronte may be challenging as I would imagine that there is certain criteria that need to be met to lower the speed limit for DSG.

If Council are in agreeance for the speed limit change, then the Mayor could write to the Department of State Growth requesting the change in a lower speed limit and for the request of signage.

The Mayor has also had concerns raised by residents about people speeding in the area and if Tasmanian Police can provide a more frequent presence in the area. This is obviously a matter for the State Government

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Mayor write to the Minister of Police, Fire and Emergency Management for a more frequent policing presence in this area.

16.3 2021 KEEP AUSTRALIA BEAUTIFUL SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES – TIDY TOWNS AWARDS

The Mayor has quested that Council consider putting in a nomination for the 2021 Keep Australia Beautiful sustainable communities – Tidy Towns awards.

Awards provide a wonderful opportunity to recognise the great work our council and local community are doing to Keep Tasmania Beautiful.

Entries for the 2021 Awards open on Monday 9th August and close on Friday 17th September.

Entry is free and simple to do online at: www.kabtas.com.au

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the Works and Service Manager be authorised to lodge a nomination for the 2021 Keep Australia Beautiful sustainable communities – Tidy Towns awards for the township of

16.4 REQUEST FROM CWA TO USE BOTHWELL QUEENS PARK AND MARKET PLACE

The CWA have requested approval from Council to use Bothwell Queens Park and Market Place for a Party in the Park Day on Sunday 31st October 2021.

The Branch President Mrs June Pilcher sent the following email to Council:

"Party in the Park Day is planned again this year suggested date Sunday October 31st 2021, similar to last year using the Park and Market Place.

This year a Halloween theme has been suggested with games for children and a fancy dress competition, possibly a chocolate wheel plus last year's features.

The help supplied by Council last year was appreciated so much and allowed a donation of \$3,000 to be made to the Cancer Council.

Council also helped with a Community Grant last year and if this could be arranged again to help with purchase of prizes C.W.A would be most grateful."

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT correspondence be sent to the Country Women's Association asking them to complete a community grant application for consideration by Council at the September Council Meeting.

17.0 ADMINISTRATION

17.1 LEASE PUB WITH NO BEER REST AREA

At the April 2021 Council meeting it was moved that Council negotiate a suitable lease arrangement with the Bignell Family of the pub with no beer rest area.

Council's solicitor has prepared the lease agreement and Mr Bignell is in agreeance with the document.

The lease if for a 12 month period commencing on 1 July 2021 and expiring on 30 June 2022. Rental is \$1.00 per annum.

The lease is a basic lease with the following additional special conditions:

- 1 The landlord (Mr Bignell) is to have access for the movement of sheep and other stock
- 2 Council is permitted to install on the premises the following:
 - · Picnic tables and seating
 - Memorial bench seating
 - An information board
 - Rubbish bins
 - Surveillance cameras
- 3 Council must not allow camping on the premises

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the General Manager be authorised to sign and seal the lease for the Pub with no Beer Rest Area.

The Community Fund Assessment Panel has been appointed and its members are:

- Mayor Loueen Triffitt
- Clr Anita Campbell
- Dr David Meacheam
- Tracey Turale
- Robyn Lewis
- Anne Downie
- Simon Williams Powerchina

The CHWF Community Fund aims to share the benefits of Cattle Hill Wind Farm by investing in the communities around the wind farm. The Funds are intended to provide financial support for community-based initiatives, projects and events that produce lasting community benefit and reflect local priorities.

The annual allocation of funding is a voluntary contribution from Cattle Hill Wind Farm and will comprise of \$120,000 per annum for the life of the project.

Round One - 2021

Cattle Hill wind farm is pleased to announce that the inaugural round of the Community Fund will open on the **23rd August 2021.**

Online Q&A Sessions

Cattle Hill wind farm is hosting a number of online Q&A sessions throughout August for community groups to ask questions about the application process. Bookings are essential via Eventbrite. To book a session please visit:

https://www.eventbrite.com.au/e/cattle-hill-wind-farm-community-fund-q-a-sessions-tickets-162376120347

Key Dates

Online Q&A Sessions

11th August 5pm-7pm 12th August 9.30am to 11.30am 17th August 6pm - 8pm 19th August 12pm - 2pm

Applications Open 23rd August 2021

Applications Close 3pm on the 23rd September 2021

Applications Assessed October/November 2021

Notifications
December 2021

The Community Fund Assessment Panel has met via zoom. Mayor Triffitt indicated to the Panel that she wished to withdraw from the Panel, and the Panel is agreeable to a Councillor being nominated to replace her.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT Clr.....be nominated by Council to replace Mayor Triffitt on the Cattle Hill Wind Farm Community Fund Assessment Panel.

17.3 TASMANIAN TARTAN SIGN

The General Manager has requested that Council consider erecting a 'Tasmanian Tartan' sign subject to planning approval being obtained from Southern Midlands Council; approval from Mr McShane to place the sign on his land and funding for the sign.

Mrs Beth Poore from the Central Highlands Visitor Centre sent the following email to the General Manager:

"Ratho Farms sign is 1250mm x 1200, and Greg has also mentioned that he had his sign made big enough so that Nant could include their sign. That was never taken up, so if needed, we could put the sign with Gregs.

Otherwise I have found out theta is on Gerard McShanes land and David Dare who is his rep from Elders, is going to lay groundwork for me to speak to him and ask his permission.

If Jason could get prices for this sign, could we please put this on the agenda for the next council meeting, as previously discussed in our meeting.

I for some reason can't attach the signs, but Kathy Bradburn has them on her computer, and she sent copies to The Mayor."

Proposed 'Tasmanian Tartan' signs







Mrs Poore from the Central Highlands Visitor Centre advised the General Manager on the 27 July 2021 that she had spoken to Mr Tim McShane who owns Kelvin Grove where it is proposed to install the sign. Mr McShane is happy for the Central Highlands Visitor Centre to place the sign between the Ratho Farm sign and the Highland Lakes sign further up. Mr McShane asked Mrs Poore to ring him or Mr Kip Gray, the manager of the farm, when the Central Highlands Visitor Centre is ready to install the sign at the location, to ensure the sign will not interfere with the stock routes through that area.

The Planning Officer has provided the following information.

The 'Tasmanian Tartan' sign will be considered an Interpretative Sign, which is defined as follows in the Southern Midlands Interim Planning Scheme:

"means a sign providing information for the public, such as plans, historic information, location of services, features and businesses, and includes artworks that convey meaning. This type of sign can be private (i.e. placed by and for the benefit of a private business) or public (i.e. placed by an agency in the public interest)"

The Planning Officer states that there are no standards in terms of size requirements for these signs.

The proposed location of the sign on Mcshane Property is zoned Significant Agriculture. Interpretive Signs are Discretionary in this zone. The land is also within a Scenic Landscape Corridor Code and Road & Railway Assets Code.

The 'Tasmanian Tartan' sign will require a Discretionary Planning permit, fees will be \$370 being \$80 for the application fee and \$290 for advertising.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT Council agree to erect the sign subject to:

- 1. Planning approval being obtained from Southern Midlands Council;
- 2. Approval from Mr McShane to place the sign on his land
- 3. Cost of sign and planning approval not to exceed a total of \$.....

17.4 REGIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMITTEE ISSUE PAPER

Ms Holly Hansen the Recovery Support Officer (Tasmania) for the National Recovery and Resilience Agency at the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet has written to Council regarding the release of the Regional Telecommunications Independent Review Committee issues paper for the Regional Telecommunications Review.

The Regional Telecommunications Review is an opportunity for people living and working in regional, rural and remote areas of Australia to share their views and experiences using telecommunications services in their area.

Every three years the Regional Telecommunications Independent Review Committee (the Committee) is appointed to conduct the review. Committee reports are important in setting the regional communications policy agenda in the following years.

The 2021 Committee was appointed on 1 June 2021. The Review will be held from June to December 2021. The five members appointed to the Committee are the Hon Luke Hartsuyker (Chair), Ms Sue Middleton, Ms Kristy Sparrow, Professor Hugh Bradlow and Mr Michael Cosgrave.

The Review will examine the adequacy of telecommunications services in regional, rural and remote Australia. It will also consider particular issues identified in the Terms of Reference, including the impact of Government policies and programs, insights from COVID-19, emerging technologies, service reliability, regional development, and improving coordination between tiers of government.

The Regional Telecommunications Independent Review Committee has been asked to deliver its report to the Australian Government by 31 December 2021 or earlier. The Committee may make recommendations to the Government, on which it must respond.

The Regional Telecommunications Independent Review Committee is keen to hear from people living and working in regional Tasmania, about telecommunications issues and opportunities in their area, including:

- the reliability of local mobile and broadband services;
- the role of telecommunications during COVID-19 and natural disasters;
- the effectiveness of Government programs;
- how telecommunications can support regional development;
- the potential of emerging communications technologies;
- ways to help regional consumers get connected and use their connection

Submissions will be accepted until 30 September 2021 via:

- webform: www.communications.gov.au/have-your-say
- email: secretariat@rtirc.gov.au
- post: 2021 Regional Telecommunications Review Secretariat Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications GPO Box 594 CANBERRA ACT 2601

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT comments on the Regional Telecommunications Independent Review Committee issues paper be forwarded to the Deputy General Manager by Monday 27 September 2021.

17.5 REQUEST FOR RATES REMISSION

Council received an email from the owner of Property 10-0400-03595 137 Little Den Road Millers Bluff on the 27th July 2021 asking for a rates remission for the solid waste domestic charge on Property 10-0400-03595 at 137 Little Den Road Millers Bluff.

The owner states in their email that if there was a waste facility close by they would use it, however there is no Council waste management facilities near Millers Bluff on the eastern side of the municipality. Hence the property owner takes their waste back to Deloraine with them. The owner requests that the waste charges be waived for the 2021-2022 financial year which has been remitted the last 5 years.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT Council remit the Solid Waste Garbage Fee on property 10-0400-03595, 137 Little Den Road Millers Bluff.

17.6 REQUEST FOR RATES REMISSION

Email received from Rate Payer 2nd August 2021 asking for a rates remission for property 04-0017-03967.

In 2020 Council resolved to remit the rates on this property for that financial year.

As explained in this email according to the Crown Lands Department this P.I.D. is Last Street Bothwell. The owner only uses a small portion of street, part is still public street, part is used by other residents and the bottom is flooded by Ratho Dam.

Owner pays a lease to the Department of Primary Industries, so they have to pay rates as well the convenience of the part that they use is not worth it – the owner continues to keep their section free of noxious weeds (ie: goss etc.).

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT Council remit the rates on property 04-0017-03967.

17.7 LGAT REPRESENTATIVE TASMANIAN HERITAGE COUNCIL

Local Government Association of Tasmania has written to the General Manager regarding a vacancy for the position of LGAT Representative on the Tasmanian Heritage Council which will soon become available, following the end of term of Councillor Mr Jim Cox on 31 December 2021.

LGAT is seeking three nominations to provide the Minister for Heritage for the LGAT Representative role, due to commence from 1 January 2022.

The General Manager on behalf of the Local Government Association of Tasmania is pleased to communicate this upcoming vacancy to appropriately experienced people at the Central Highlands Council, noting the representative may be an elected member or professional council officer.

Nominees will need to provide a curriculum vitae and a supporting statement outlining their interest, skills and experience.

A fact sheet about the Tasmanian Heritage Council is included in the attachments to inform nominees about the role.

Nominations and supporting information should be emailed to reception@lgat.tas.gov.au by 31 August 2021 and queries may be directed to Mr Dion Lester CEO: dion.lester@lgat.tas.gov.au or 6146 3742.

FOR INFORMATION

17.8 GLENORA DISTRICT SCHOOL PRESENTATION AWARDS

The Principal, Ms Liz Graham from the Glenora District School has written to the General Manager asking if Council will generously contribute towards their school's End of Year Presentation Assembly by donating a \$300 bursary and \$50 Citizenship Award.

The principal states that this kind of community support for and involvement in the educational and extracurricular program at the Glenora District School is highly valued.

The Presentation Day is planned for Tuesday 14 December at 1.15pm. At this stage the principal states that due to COVID restrictions they are unable to confirm how their End of Year Presentation Assembly will be conducted. The principal will advise Council when more information is available. The principal states that if the Education Department's policy is that external guests are unable to attend their Assembly, the principal will recognise Council's contribution to their awards.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT Council approves the community grant to the Glenora District School and provide a donation of \$300 bursary and \$50 Citizenship Award for the 2021 End of Year Presentation Assembly.

17.9 COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN - SUICIDE PREVENTION

Mrs Sarah Ellis the Suicide Prevention Project Officer for Relationships Australia has written to the General Manager asking if Council would like to consider developing a community action plan for suicide prevention for the Central Highlands municipality.

Ms Ellis suggests that a community action plan for suicide prevention is a practical plan that communities develop together to safely build supports to prevent and reduce suicide. The focus of a community action plan for suicide prevention is to increase the amount of support the community receives and gives each other by raising awareness and building community skills and resilience in suicide prevention. Any community can develop a community action plan for suicide prevention, whether they are groups from a town, sports club, regional area, workplace or a group with a shared interest in suicide prevention.

Relationships Australia Tasmania supports the development and review of community action plans for suicide prevention state-wide, working with ready communities and including population groups known to be at higher risk of suicide in line with the Tasmanian Suicide Prevention Strategy and also administers a small grants program to assist communities to implement activities identified in community action plan for suicide prevention.

Ms Ellis states that the intention of a community action plan for suicide prevention for the Central Highlands municipality is to increase suicide prevention support to the community, and the three main areas of focus are training, awareness and sustainability. The State Government in conjunction with Relationships Australia Tasmania are offering \$5000 to kickstart a community action plan for suicide prevention for the Central Highlands municipality, which can be linked to Council's Health and Wellbeing Plan 2020-2025.

The Deputy General Manager and Community Relations Officer met with Suicide Prevention Project Officer for Relationships Australia on Tuesday the 10th August to discuss suicide prevention, define the aims, scope and timeline for a program, consider what is currently happening in the municipality and discuss examples of community action plans for suicide prevention from other municipalities across the state.

A copy of the guidelines to develop a community action plan for suicide prevention is included in the attachments.

RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT the General Manager be authorised to sign an agreement with Relationships Australia to undertake consultation within the municipality to consider if a community action plan for suicide prevention should be developed for the Central Highlands municipality.

17.10 TASMANIAN GOVERNMENT CHARGESMART GRANTS PROGRAM

The Tasmanian Government has recently launched the second ChargeSmart Grants Program. This program will provide individual grants towards the cost of purchasing and installing electric vehicle chargers for public use, focusing on regional areas and key tourism destinations.

ChargeSmart will offer grants of up to \$2,500 for destination charging stations and grants of up to \$50,000 for fast charging stations. This program is open for applications from now until 5pm Friday 10 September 2021.

A fact sheet is included in the attachments. Application forms and all other associated information can be found on the Tasmanian Climate Change Office website.

The Deputy General Manager has spoken with Electric Highway Tasmania P/L and they will be applying for a grant to install an electric vehicle charger at Ouse next to the Ouse Hall.

At the September Council Meeting in 2020, Council agreed to the following regarding the electric vehicle charger at Ouse:

Moved: Clr J Honner Seconded: Clr J Poore

That Council support the installation of an electric vehicle charger at Ouse subject to any development application requirements.

CARRIED

FOR the Motion:

Mayor L Triffitt, Deputy Mayor J Allwright, Clr A W Bailey, Clr S Bowden, Clr A Campbell, Clr R Cassidy, Clr J Honner and Clr J Poore.

Electric Highway Tasmania recently commissioned the electric vehicle fast charger at Derwent Bridge in cooperation with Central Highlands Council as host site. This infrastructure is part of a developing state-wide network of electric vehicle chargers designed to enable electric vehicles to travel freely around the state, a critical requirement to support the transition to renewably powered, zero emission transport in Tasmania.

Mr Attwater from Electric Highway Tasmania states that they are currently in active discussions with The Johns Group to locate an electric vehicle fast charger at their Miena property, which is about to undergo a major redevelopment.

While the route from Hobart to Queenstown is now accessible to longer range electric vehicles there are some older model and shorter range electric vehicles for which the chargers along this route remain too widely spaced to enable easy travel. An additional site is also required for some travellers who come from Hobart via Mount Field before going on to Derwent Bridge and the West Coast, or to the Great Lake area.

For this reason, Electric Highway Tasmania in cooperation with Central Highlands Council as host site will apply for a grant to install a charger at Ouse, locating a charger at the side of the Ouse Community Hall. The site has toilets and food and beverage available nearby. The Ouse Community Hall also has three phase power and Council staff have provided past billing information that shows current demand can be met along with the supply to a 25 kW charger.

Electric Highway Tasmania propose an arrangement essentially the same as the Derwent Bridge site:

- Electric Highway Tasmania would pay the full electricity bill for the site, including current community use (approx. \$1,100 per year);
- Electric Highway Tasmania would install, service and maintain electric vehicle charging equipment at the site at our expense:
- When demand warrants additional capacity in the future, Electric Highway Tasmania would install the additional capacity and lease additional parking bays, subject to Council approval

The main difference is that the initial charger will be of lower capacity, 25 kW DC instead of 50 kW. As Electric Highway Tasmania expect the main users of the site will be shorter range electric vehicles and some longer range electric vehicles looking for a modest top up, the lower power level is considered appropriate.

Electric Highway Tasmania proposes the site agreement from Derwent Bridge as the basis for the agreement at Ouse, with minor amendments as required recognising the differences at this site.

If Electric Highway Tasmania receive the grant, they anticipate the site could be completed during 2022.

FOR INFORMATION

17.11 ENCLOSURE OF THE GYM AND SWIMMING POOL COMPLEX AT THE BOTHWELL SCHOOL

Councillor Archer would like Council to consider applying for funds through the Black Summer Bushfire Recovery Grants Program to enclose the swimming pool and gym complex area at the Bothwell District School.

Councillor Archer will speak to this item and table further information at the meeting

FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

18.0 SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEMS

Moved: Clr Seconded: Clr

THAT Council consider the matters on the Supplementary Agenda.

19.0 CLOSURE