

Kingborough



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

1 June 2026

Kingborough Councillors 2022 - 2026



**Acting Mayor
Councillor Christian Street**



Councillor Aldo Antolli



Councillor David Bain



Councillor Gideon Cordover



Councillor Kaspar Deane



Councillor Flora Fox



Councillor Amanda Midgley



Councillor Mark Richardson

Table of Contents

Item	Page No.	
Open Session		
1	Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians	1
2	Attendees	1
C166/10-2026	3 Apologies	1
C167/10-2026	4 Confirmation of Minutes	2
	5 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	6 Declarations of Interest	2
	7 Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C168/10-2026	8 Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1 Dog Park	2
	8.2 Fire Abatement	3
	8.3 Debt	4
	8.4 TPC	5
	8.5 TPC	5
C169/10-2026	9 Questions on Notice from the Public	6
C170/10-2026	10 Questions without Notice from Councillors	15
	10.1 AI	15
	10.2 Toilet Facilities	15
	11 Questions on Notice from Councillors	16
	12 Officers Reports to Planning Authority	17
C171/10-2026	12.1 Development Application for Extension and Alterations to Dwelling at 208 Channel Highway, Tarooma	17
C172/10-2026	12.2 Development Application for Dog Exercise Area and Associated Carpark and Fencing at 'Transend Networks', 34 Maddocks Road, Kingston	18
	13 Petitions still being Actioned	22
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period	22
	15 Officers Reports to Council	22
C173/10-2026	15.1 Dog Management Policy - proposed amendment	22
C174/10-2026	15.2 Information Disclosure Policy	22
C175/10-2026	15.3 Oval Lease - Kingborough Sports Precinct	22
C176/10-2026	15.4 Petition - Kerbside Collection Service, Leslie Vale	23
C177/10-2026	15.5 Appointment to Council Special Committees	23

Table of Contents

Item			Page No.
C178/10-2026	15.6	Appendices	24
	16	Notices of Motion	24
C179/10-2026	16.1	Sandfly Road / Channel Highway Intersection and Margate Act Transport Improvements	24
C180/10-2026	17	Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	24

Public Copy

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 1 June 2026 at 5.30pm

WELCOME

The Chairperson declared the meeting open and welcomed all in attendance. The Chairperson made a statement in terms of Section 8 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025* and advised that audio recordings of Council meetings are made publicly available on Council's website and are live streamed on YouTube.

1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL CUSTODIANS

The Chairperson acknowledged the traditional custodians of this land, paid respects to elders past and present, and acknowledged today's Tasmanian Aboriginal community.

2 ATTENDEES

Councillors:

Acting Mayor Councillor C Street ✓
Councillor A Antolli ✓
Councillor D Bain ✓
Councillor K Deane ✓
Councillor F Fox ✓
Councillor A Midgley ✓
Councillor M Richardson ✓

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer	Mr Dave Stewart
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Engineering Services	Mr Craig Mackey
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Mrs Deleeze Chetcuti
Coordinator Statutory Planning	Mrs Melissa Stevenson
Project Director – Kingborough Sports Precinct	Mr Daniel Kaimatsoglu
Communications Officer	Mr Stuart Heather
Acting Executive Assistant	Ms Portia Jones

C166/10-2026

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor G Cordover

C167/10-2026

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
 Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 9 held on 18 May 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

CARRIED**5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING**

Date	Topic	Detail	Consultant
25 May 2026	Capital Plan	Consideration of the <i>draft</i> FY26/27 capital plan	Nil

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C168/10-2026

8 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

8.1 DOG PARK

Ms Jennifer Lawrence asked the following questions without notice:

With the dog park being located around the electrical substation, has a risk assessment been undertaken in relation to any potential effects on people with pacemakers?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services responds:

We did the risk assessment. We sort advice from a cardiac specialist and there was considered to be no risk.

Ms Lawrence:

I'm aware that you do a monthly newsletter. It is on the Council website and possibly on your Facebook page. However, in previous meetings in relation to the dog park, there are a lot of people who do not use social media or the internet, especially the elderly. Now, I know we're in a bit of a technological age, but there are still some dinosaurs out there, if you want to call them dinosaurs. Is it possible that Council may consider doing a print version of your e-newsletter and having it available at Council for people who don't use social media or the internet, so they can read up and be advised on how things are going?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services responds:

We can give consideration to that.

Ms Lawrence:

In relation to the dog park, the signs have gone down, but there are a lot of people who weren't aware because it was only on your webpage that it had been extended. We've been telling the people who go in at the times we're there, but people who go in the afternoon weren't aware of it. It would be a good idea if we didn't rely on word of mouth, if that's okay. Finally, my last question is, I know it's not the height of the tourist season, but there's still a lot of tourists around. The other day, or last week, I drove from Summerleas peanut through to Kingston. between the peanut and the turn-off to the Outlet, there were ten dead animals on the highway on my side of the road only. Now, I know shifting them or removing them may upset the balance of the environment with other animals that are scavenging. However, does Council have a road patrol that can perhaps take them from the middle of the road and put them to the side so that they're not visible? Because I know when we have visitors over, we have to explain to people not to really worry about the roadkill; it's because there are so many animals.

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services:

We do indeed pick up roadkill on Council roads. However, we don't have a weekend road patrol doing that. Certainly, during weekday hours, that is a task that is assigned to our staff.

8.2 FIRE ABATEMENT

Mr Charlie Biggins asked the following questions without notice:

We've heard from Council that being a fallen dead stick, leaves and bark on the ground doesn't trigger the Biodiversity Code Overlay. The TFS guidelines for green fuel breaks require sticks, leaves and bark to be maintained at a depth of no greater than 100mm. At what point does the natural build-up of dry combustible material constitute a fire abatement nuisance and an extreme fire risk property for Kingborough Council?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services responds:

The point is guided by the TFS guidelines. Our abatement staff attend accredited training in relation to fire hazard abatement, and they determine whether an abatement exists in accordance with the guidelines set by TFS.

Mr Biggins:

As far as we know, the CEO has not acted to abate the naturally occurring fuel loads at any of the extreme fire risk properties identified by Geoneon in the 2025 Bushfire Exposure Index mapping. Yet Council staff have been in negotiations with RACT to study the risk and offer incentives paid for by the ratepayer. Can you please explain how Council can acknowledge on one hand that an unacceptable fire risk exists for the insurance industry at certain extreme-risk properties and yet, on the other hand, still be unsatisfied that an abatement fire risk exists?

Chief Executive Officer:

We have answered questions that you've put at previous Council meetings, talking about the approach that Council likes to take in terms of working with property owners in the first instance, making a proactive approach, with abatement being at the far end of that process. The program that Council is considering entering into with RACT and the City of Hobart is much more along the lines of proactively working with community members and helping provide education about what good fire management on their property looks like. As we have said, that funding is part of that process.

Abatement is a tool of last resort, I guess, where Council sees a risk that is untenable and needs to be managed.

Mr Biggins:

The Memorandum of Understanding is targeting between 100 and 120 of the most extreme fire risk properties. The Memorandum of Understanding between RACT, the City of Hobart and Kingborough has been described by RACT as, and I quote, a "behavioural science experiment", and for the purposes of the experiment, the details cannot be discussed in public. Will Council be committing to funding of this experiment before or after the details of the Memorandum of Understanding are made public?

Chief Executive Officer:

Council is currently considering participating in the program. At this point in time, we are not committing to it until such time as we have formally passed the budget. However, given this program is now in the public, we are looking to consider, I guess, support of the program in principle. While the details of exactly how the program runs might not be in the public, I believe we can have confidence with the partners we are looking to work with, including the City of Hobart and UTAS, that this will be an evidence-based and informative process for us to go through to better understand what good fire management can look like in our municipal area.

8.3 DEBT

Mr Will Perry asked the following questions without notice:

What is Council's total debt position today? What are the debt servicing costs per annum, and how does that compare to when this group of Councillors took office in October 2022?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

Without our Director of People and Finance in the room, I would be answering that off the top of my head, so I will take that on notice and come back to you to make sure that I give you accurate figures.

Mr Perry:

What is the projected underlying operating result for the current financial year? Does that represent the tenth underlying deficit in eleven years?

Chief Executive Officer:

Again, I don't have the information in front of me, but the forecast result for the year will be an underlying deficit.

Mr Perry:

Excluding the Audit Panel, when was the last time Council had its business structure and financial performance independently reviewed? At what point does Council consider its financial performance to be a problem requiring urgent action, and what would that action look like?

Chief Executive Officer:

There has been an internal audit of Council's financial sustainability undertaken by WLF, the internal audit firm. I can't recall the date off the top of my head, so we'll need to fill in the gaps on notice. That financial sustainability review has been conducted. We don't have a review of our operating structure within the organisation. I see that as a duty of myself and the Executive Team to do that for the organisation.

8.4 TPC

Ms Tamieka Adkins asked the following questions without notice:

I also have some questions around finances. As a ratepayer, I am concerned that my rates are going towards servicing debt instead of actual services. I understand that borrowing is often used to fund infrastructure. However, there is a large amount of debt and interest rates are rising. I'm asking these questions to better understand the long-term financial impacts, and I understand that without the relevant officer here, they may need to be taken on notice, but I'll ask them anyway. So, with rising debt servicing costs, do they have any direct impact on rates, fees or our service levels? For instance, how much of that increase is actually anticipated in the budget?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

The debt that Council carries is through multiple individual loans, each of them on a fixed term and fixed interest rate. Therefore, fluctuations that are currently occurring in the marketplace are not directly impacting Council's debt servicing for this coming financial year.

Ms Adkins:

What plans are in place to reduce debt, or will borrowing continue to increase? At what point would Council change its borrowing strategy?

Chief Executive Officer:

Council approves borrowing on a pretty limited basis. The debt that Council currently carries was incurred largely through the development of Kingston Park, so a specific project that was developed using debt. Council paid down \$3 million of that debt earlier this year, so that is an indication that where there is available cash, Council will consider, on a case-by-case basis, decreasing the overall debt holding of the organisation.

Ms Adkins:

Lastly, can Council please explain clearly what portion of rate revenue is currently going towards debt servicing?

Chief Executive Officer:

I can't give you an exact percentage, but it would be somewhere just over 1%.

8.5 TPC

Mr Joel Hodson asked the following questions without notice:

During my hearing at the TPC, the planning authority discussed the lack of or more work, being needed for strategic planning in regard to rule living. I mentioned the Middleton and Southern Channel region in particular. Can Council elaborate on what strategic planning has gone into, how zoning has been applied under the LPS?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

The draft LPS is the transition from the interim schemes to the new planning schemes, and so there are, as you're aware, we've discussed, you know, communicated quite a few times, is that there are guidelines and statutory rules that we apply when transitioning the zone from current interim schemes to the TPS. Now there may be some strategic work that we've done in historically or in the past that has informed those zoning outcomes. My understanding is we didn't specifically do additional strategic work, and so in terms of place-based analysis, it was a translation of, best we could in accordance with the rules, to the new scheme, which is what all Councils have been through, and Kingborough the last two, so go through that process. In terms of the strategic work, it's normal for

that to sort of happen before and after and be ongoing, and it is different to, transition to the new scheme. It's usually local or place-based planning where there is a lot more sort of deeper analysis into an area for a reason, so a really good example is, Kingston CBD, that we might need to do a structure plan or a master plan for Kingston CBD. It will often involve targeted engagement with the community to inform that, and then post that, it may or may not then be utilized for further work in terms of potential zoning changes. Unfortunately, it's hard for any council in a perfect world to be great to do these things sequentially and in order, unfortunately things like state reviews of planning schemes, happen that we don't dictate the timing for, and it might have to wait till after or somewhat be done before.

Mr Hodson:

Taking into consideration, Councils are in documents such as strategic plan 2025-35, or other documents that are reviewed in between that time. Can you give an outline of how this planning might occur?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I can't give exact timelines as we've described before we have finite resources, particularly in a strategic planning space, and that's been, sort of, everything's been put towards the draft LPS and getting through that process and having it finalised. However, we do recognise a very important need to start that work, and what we will be working on is, I suppose, like a bit of term, a bucket list of all the additional strategic work that we would like all needs to happen and like to do. We would prioritise that on, its urgency and importance and value to the different areas that it might be in, and that will give us an idea of a resource thing of that to and progressing that project plan.

Mr Hodson:

So, when those changes occur, will the LPS be amended or will it be due to, foresee, changing simply changing property zones or do you foresee, applying further local area objectives or SAPs?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I can't say until we do the work. It may result in scheme amendments to, implement the plans. It really depends on the plans, the area and what the objectives of each of those strategic pieces of work are. I know that's a very high level answer, but I know it's sort of drill down any further at this stage.

C169/10-2026

9 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

9.1 RELOCATION OF THE SOUTHERN OBEDIENCE DOG CLUB

Ms Meg Groves submitted the following questions on notice:

1. *What consultation has the council undertaken with the Kingborough community regarding potentially suitable sites/ locations for this facility?*
2. *Has the council undertaken a thorough assessment of all potential sites and can this be made publicly available?*
3. *Could Council explain why a site in a quiet rural hamlet with no existing recreational facilities on the periphery of the municipality was chosen?*
4. *Environmental Impact Assessments: Sedgebrook Reserve and its immediate perimeter serve as a habitat for native fauna, including vulnerable species such as the Eastern Barred Bandicoot, the native hens, spotted quolls and the Tasmanian Devil. Have formal, site-specific*

environmental impact assessments or fauna surveys been conducted to evaluate the impact of high-density canine activity and security fencing on these populations?

5. *Notice and Exhibition Periods: Notification was delivered to residents of Bonnet Hill on May 20, 2026, with SOC representatives announcing the proposal in April on their Facebook page and then benchmarking the site on May 22, 2026, ahead of the June 1, 2026 Council meeting. Does this abbreviated timeline satisfy Council's statutory obligations for community consultation on major land-use changes?*
6. *Assessment of Current Land Use: What objective data, usage surveys, or community assessments did Council rely upon to determine the current utilization rates of the Sedgebrook Road Reserve prior to proposing its conversion to a dedicated dog training facility?*
7. *Transparency of Options: Council documentation states that multiple locations are under consideration. However, communication from Council states that alternatives have been discarded. Will Council clarify whether Sedgebrook Road Reserve is the sole active option, and if so, why the public documentation indicates otherwise?*
8. *Stakeholder Consultation Timeline: Given that local residents are the primary stakeholders impacted by a zoning or usage change at Sedgebrook Road Reserve, what is the administrative justification for negotiating infrastructure requirements with the Southern Obedience Club (SOC) prior to initiating formal consultation with the Bonnet Hill community.*

Officer's Response:

1. Council has been working with the Southern Obedience Club for an extended period to identify potential relocation sites following the loss of the existing Gormley Drive site due to the AFL High Performance Centre project. To date, consultation has primarily involved discussions with the Club regarding operational requirements and site suitability. Once the Bonnet Hill site emerged as a potential option, adjoining property owners were notified as part of an early courtesy engagement process prior to the commencement of any formal statutory consultation. Should the proposal proceed, formal public consultation would occur through both the Dog Control Act 2000 process and the development application process.
2. Council has investigated a number of potential relocation options over approximately two years. Sites considered included Dru Point, Margate and Lower Longley, along with other Council-owned land. Dru Point was not progressed due to unreasonable land acquisition costs, while Lower Longley was not supported by the Club due to distance from members and weather-related operational concerns. The assessment process has involved a combination of operational, financial, planning and practical considerations.
3. No final site has been selected at this stage. The Bonnet Hill site is being explored as a potential option because it is Council-owned land of sufficient size to potentially accommodate the Club's operational requirements while maintaining public access to the reserve. The site also offers separation from dense residential areas and has existing access to the Channel Highway network.
4. At this stage, no formal environmental impact assessment has been completed because no development application has yet been lodged. Preliminary investigations undertaken by Council's Natural Areas and Biodiversity team did not identify any known significant natural values that would prevent further investigation of the site. Should the proposal proceed, independent environmental assessments and natural values investigations would be undertaken as part of the development application process, including assessment of any potential impacts on native fauna and habitat values.
5. At this stage, Council has not commenced any statutory consultation process because no formal proposal has been submitted for approval. The correspondence issued to adjoining property owners on 20 May 2026 was intended as an early courtesy notification only. This occurred shortly after the Southern Obedience Club advised Council on 19 May 2026 that

Bonnet Hill was its preferred site for further investigation. Any future proposal would still be subject to the statutory consultation requirements associated with both the Dog Control Act 2000 and the development application process, including public advertising and opportunities for submissions.

6. Council has not proposed converting the reserve into an exclusive-use facility. The current concept proposes that the reserve would remain publicly accessible outside of limited club training times, currently proposed between approximately 10:30am and 4:00pm on Sundays. At this stage, Council has relied primarily on-site inspections and operational assessments. No formal usage survey has been undertaken.
7. Council has investigated multiple locations over an extended period, with several sites subsequently discounted for operational, financial or practical reasons. At present, the Bonnet Hill site is the primary location being explored. However, no final decision has been made and investigations remain ongoing.
8. Council has been working with the Southern Obedience Club over an extended period to identify potential relocation options following the loss of the Club's existing site at Gormley Drive due to the AFL High Performance Centre project. Preliminary discussions regarding operational and infrastructure requirements were necessary to determine whether potential sites were capable of accommodating the Club's basic functional needs before broader community consultation could meaningfully occur. This included matters such as minimum space requirements, access arrangements, parking, servicing, and training area configurations.

The discussions undertaken to date do not represent a final decision by Council, nor do they constitute approval of any land use change. Once Bonnet Hill emerged as a potential preferred site for further investigation, adjoining property owners were notified as part of an early courtesy engagement process ahead of any formal statutory consultation requirements.

Should the proposal proceed further, the community would have the opportunity to provide feedback through both the Dog Control Act 2000 process and the statutory development application process before any final decision is made by Council.

Daniel Kaimatsoglu, Project Director - Kingborough Sports Precinct

9.2 PROPOSED DOG EXERCISE AND TRAINING FACILITY AT SEDGEBROOK ROAD RESERVE

Ms Julianne O'Reilly-Wapstra submitted the following question on notice:

1. *What alternative sites have been investigated?*
2. *The proposed infrastructure on the conceptual plan is not to scale. The actual size will be significantly greater. Why has an accurate plan of the proposed size of the re-allocation of land to Southern Obedience Club and an accurate scaled plan of the proposed infrastructure not been provided for councillors and the public to consider and discuss? This needs to be provided to make informed decisions.*
3. *This whole area is a public use area, including a parking area for the Alum Cliffs track. How do council reconcile setting aside parking for one group of users (Southern Obedience Club) on Sundays, when this is a popular recreational day for all public users of this area?*
4. *The reserve is used on Sundays by all members of the public for dog walking, bike riders on the popular Channel Hwy biking route, families with kids, track walkers, etc. How do council reconcile making this area available to only one group of users (Southern Obedience Club) on Sundays?*
5. *There is insufficient detail (traffic and parking impacts, environmental impacts, infrastructure*

impacts, after hours antisocial behaviour and miss-use) for this to be adequately discussed in the upcoming 1st June Council meeting. This should not be tabled at Council until sufficient detail has been provided.

Officer's Response:

1. Council has investigated a range of alternative locations over approximately two years, including Dru Point, Margate and Lower Longley, as well as other Council-owned land. A number of sites were discounted due to factors including land acquisition costs, operational limitations, distance from members, weather exposure, site suitability and land availability.
2. Whilst not to exact scale, the plan circulated to nearby residents closely represents the scale of the proposed infrastructure and was clearly identified as a conceptual layout intended to assist with preliminary discussions only. At this stage, no detailed design work has been completed and no final layout has been determined. Should the proposal proceed, detailed scaled plans and supporting technical documentation would form part of any future development application process and would be publicly available.
3. There will be no dedicated parking allocated to any user group, and the parking area will remain available for use by all members of the public. Parking demand and shared use arrangements would be assessed as part of any future traffic assessment process to ensure continued public access and appropriate management of competing uses.
4. The current concept does not propose permanently restricting public access to the reserve. The training area would only be in active use by the Club during designated training periods currently proposed between approximately 10:30am and 4:00pm on Sundays, with the broader reserve remaining publicly accessible outside those times. The concept plan also includes a dedicated unfenced area with tables and benches for use by walkers, cyclists and other reserve users resting in the area.
5. The matter is currently at a preliminary investigation stage only. The purpose of the current discussions is to inform Councillors and the community that investigations are occurring and to identify key issues requiring further assessment. Should the proposal proceed further, detailed technical investigations and statutory assessment processes would still be required before any final decision could be made by Council.

Daniel Kaimatsoglu, Project Director - Kingborough Sports Precinct

9.3 SEDGBROOK RESERVE AND PROPOSED DOG TRAINING FACILITY

Mr John Davis submitted the following question on notice:

The proposed dog training facility is in a very sensitive ecological area with has many endangered wildlife species. My question is whether the council has prepared an environmental impact statement for this area?

Officer's Response:

No formal Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared at this stage as no development application has yet been lodged.

Preliminary internal investigations have been undertaken to identify whether any known significant natural values would prevent further investigation of the site.

Should the proposal proceed further, independent environmental and natural values assessments would be required as part of the development application process.

Daniel Kaimatsoglu, Project Director - Kingborough Sports Precinct

9.4 PROPOSE RELOCATION OF DOG TRAINING AREA TO LOT 1 TARONGA ROAD, BONNET HILL

Mr Craig Ludlow submitted the following question on notice:

1. *Will Council provide the full financial breakdowns for all evaluated sites, specifically contrasting the costs of the Dru Point option against the total projected expenditure for the Bonnet Hill site?*
2. *Has the budget for the Bonnet Hill proposal factored in the secondary costs of necessary road network rectifications to accommodate increased traffic, ongoing facility maintenance, and potential legal or compensatory claims related to residential property devaluation?*
3. *Did the rejection of the alternative Longley site rest entirely on member travel times? If so, what weighted criteria does Council use to balance the commuting convenience of a private club against the infrastructure costs and logistical impacts borne by a residential community?*
4. *Sedgebrook Road Reserve is currently utilised for unstructured recreation, including children's play and sports. How does Council propose to mitigate the safety risks and operational conflicts inherent in introducing a high-density, off-lead dog training area into an active residential recreational space?*
5. *Council's Dog Management Policy Engagement Report (January 2026) identifies clear negative externalities associated with dedicated dog parks, including noise pollution, traffic congestion, and hygiene issues. How have these specific, Council-identified risks been mitigated in the design and site selection for the Sedgebrook Road proposal?*
6. *During recent rezoning meetings, Council planners affirmed that protecting the visual amenity of Bonnet Hill is a priority. How does the installation of perimeter fencing, clubrooms, and public toilet infrastructure align with those explicit planning objectives?*
7. *Given existing enforcement challenges regarding unauthorised camping and vagrancy at nearby facilities (e.g., Kingston Beach), what specific security, monitoring, and enforcement protocols will be funded to prevent similar issues at the proposed Sedgebrook Road parking and toilet infrastructure?*

Officer's Response:

1. Council has been working within a State Government funding allocation of approximately \$100,000 to relocate the Southern Obedience Club following the loss of its existing site due to the AFL High Performance Centre project. The Dru Point option was not progressed primarily because the cost of acquiring privately owned land significantly exceeded the available budget before any infrastructure or development works were considered. Property acquisition discussions and associated pricing information remain commercial in confidence. The Bonnet Hill option is being explored because it is Council-owned land that may be capable of accommodating the Club within the available project budget, subject to further investigation and approvals. As the proposal remains conceptual only, no final cost estimate has been completed for the Bonnet Hill site.
2. The current concept has been developed to remain within the available State Government funding allocation of approximately \$100,000 and therefore involves relatively modest infrastructure. Should traffic assessments identify the need for additional road upgrades beyond the project scope, these would need to be separately considered by Council through future capital works and budgeting processes. It is Council's view that there would be no basis nor merit for such claims being made.
3. No single factor determined the suitability of the Lower Longley option. Council considered a range of factors including operational suitability, accessibility for members, weather exposure, servicing requirements, land availability, cost implications and the Club's ability to sustainably operate from the site within the available funding allocation. In assessing potential locations,

Council must also take into consideration the views and operational needs of the Club's members to help ensure the organisation can continue to operate effectively and provide its important community service. Council's role has been to investigate whether a practical and financially achievable relocation solution exists for a long-established community organisation displaced by the AFL High Performance Centre project.

4. The current concept proposes a managed dog training facility that will also remain available to the public outside of the Club's operating hours for off-lead dogs and other recreational uses that currently occur at the site. Council does not foresee the site becoming a high-density off-lead area due to the number of existing nearby facilities, including Apex Park and Tarooma Beach to the north and Kingston Beach to the south. The reserve would remain publicly accessible outside of designated training periods currently proposed between approximately 10:30am and 4:00pm on Sundays. The concept also includes fencing, controlled access arrangements and separation of training activities from broader public areas to assist in managing safety and operational interactions. Further consideration of operational management, safety measures and traffic arrangements would occur should the proposal proceed further.
5. The proposal includes both structured training activities operated by an established community club during limited operating hours and opportunities for broader community use as an off-lead dog exercise area. Council recognises there are both positive and negative considerations associated with this type of facility; however, it is considered that the overall community benefits, including increased recreational opportunities, responsible dog ownership, social connection and activation of the reserve, outweigh the potential impacts, which can be appropriately managed through design and operational measures. The concept has intentionally been kept relatively modest in scale to align with the available funding allocation and to minimise impacts on the reserve and surrounding area. Potential impacts such as traffic, noise and site management would be further assessed through the statutory assessment process should the proposal proceed further. Current concepts include limited operating hours, managed training activities, formalised parking arrangements, waste management measures and controlled access arrangements to assist in mitigating potential impacts.
6. At this stage, no detailed design has been completed and the proposal remains conceptual only. The current concept involves relatively modest infrastructure including a single shed, limited fencing, a small shade structure and associated amenities designed to fit within the available project budget. Should the proposal proceed further, visual impacts and neighbourhood character considerations would form part of the development application assessment process, including consideration of siting, scale, materials, landscaping and overall visual integration with the surrounding area.
7. At this stage, no detailed operational management plan has been prepared because the proposal remains in the preliminary investigation phase. Council notes that public toilet facilities have recently been installed at a number of locations throughout the municipality without resulting in issues related to unauthorised camping or anti-social behaviour.

Daniel Kaimatsoglu, Project Director - Kingborough Sports Precinct

9.5 SOUTHERN OBEDIENCE CLUB BONNET HILL OPTION

Ms Janet Rapley submitted the following question on notice:

By default the enclosed area of the plan will become an off leash dog park which will be used daily resulting in a considerable increase of traffic. Will Council improve the safety of the Taronga Road/Sedgebrook Road intersection. It is a very narrow section of road and should be widened. A footpath and lighting need to be constructed so that residents can walk safely to the Channel Highway buses. Signage and white lines need to be visible so that traffic know Taronga Road has right of way.

Officer's Response:

Council has presented the Bonnet Hill site for discussion as a potential relocation option, and the Southern Obedience Club has identified it as its preferred location. However, Council has committed to continuing investigations of the site with the Southern Obedience Club, including the undertaking of more detailed assessments of matters such as traffic and access should the proposal progress further. Should the proposal proceed further, a formal traffic impact assessment would be required as part of the development application process. This assessment would consider matters including vehicle movements, parking demand, intersection safety, sight distances and any required road upgrades.

Council notes the concerns raised regarding the Taronga Road / Sedgebrook Road intersection, pedestrian connectivity, lighting, signage, and line marking. These matters would be considered as part of any future assessment process if the proposal progresses.

Daniel Kaimatsoglu, Project Director - Kingborough Sports Precinct

9.6 CHANNEL HIGHWAY BRIDGE OVER THE NORTH WEST BAY RIVER, MARGATE

Ms Roz Thurn submitted the following question on notice:

1. *Has council managed to identify the responsible person at State Growth overseeing the safety concerns relating to the Channel Highway bridge over North West Bay River, Margate?*
2. *Please give an update as to where Council is at in liaising with State Growth about improving safety for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians who use this bridge.*
3. *Are there any further updates on the proposed shared pathway (which includes a North West Bay River crossing) between Margate and Huntingfield?*
4. *Is Council strongly advocating for a safe crossing of the North West Bay River to be stage 1 of the shared pathway development due to the extreme danger pedestrians and cyclists place themselves in whilst attempting to cross the current bridge?*

Officer's Response:

1. Yes. Council officers are liaising with the Department of State Growth, including representatives within their State Roads/bridge asset teams, who are responsible for safety and infrastructure considerations associated with the Channel Highway and the North West Bay River bridge.
2. Council continues to work collaboratively with the Department of State Growth on improving safety for vulnerable road users in the Margate area.

A jointly funded feasibility study has been completed for a shared user pathway between Margate and Huntingfield, which includes consideration of safer crossing options at the North West Bay River. This study was undertaken specifically to address increasing demand for active transport and safety concerns associated with the current bridge crossing.

The Department has advised that the existing Channel Highway bridge was not designed to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, and this is consistent with many bridges on the State road network.

Council continues to advocate for improved active transport infrastructure, including a safer alternative to the existing bridge crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.

3. The feasibility study for the Margate to Huntingfield shared pathway has been completed.

The current concept includes a separate shared user bridge over the North West Bay River, located adjacent to the existing Channel Highway bridge, to provide a safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Department of State Growth has advised that further design and planning work is subject to future funding consideration. Additional planning work is proposed for the 2026–27 financial year (subject to funding approval), which would review the feasibility findings, consider community feedback, and progress planning for sections of the route.

This work would inform any future funding applications for detailed design, approvals and construction, to be undertaken in partnership with Council.

4. Council recognises the safety concerns associated with pedestrians and cyclists using the existing Channel Highway bridge and continues to advocate for improved active transport outcomes in the Margate area.

Council supports the inclusion of a safe, separated crossing of the North West Bay River as part of the proposed shared pathway project.

The staging and prioritisation of works, including whether the bridge crossing is progressed as an early stage, will ultimately be determined through future planning, design and funding processes led by the Department of State Growth, in partnership with Council.

Council will continue to advocate for investment in infrastructure that improves safety and connectivity for the community.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.7 CLIMATE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Ms Carol Rea submitted the following question on notice:

1. *Is Kingborough planning to support the City of Sydney Motion in Canberra 23-25 June at the Australian Local Government Association conference?*
2. *Which Kingborough Councillors will represent us at The National General Assembly of Local Government (NGA) given that the NGA is the largest annual gathering of local government leaders in Australia.*
3. *How much (what proportion) of our budget does climate change currently cost Kingborough Council? That includes mitigating for disasters, emergency response and recovery after an event.*

Officer's Response:

1. Kingborough delivers climate change adaptation in line with the Kingborough Climate Change Policy and recognises the range of roles and responsibilities in this work from all levels of Australian governments. Council has not considered the motion by the City of Sydney at the National General Assembly.
2. Council staff have not been made aware of Councillors intentions to attend the National General Assembly of the Australian Local Government Association in 2026 at the time of this response.
3. Kingborough has an embedded approach to addressing climate change with future works being viewed through a climate preparedness lens. This includes ensuring assets and services are resilient to the impacts of climate change. At present, Council does not have specific records expenditure where climate change has informed other operational work. However, Council's

Climate Change Program had an operational budget of \$67,000 and 1.0FTE in 2025-2026, or 0.3% of the operating budget for that year.

Padraig Pearce, Climate Change Advisor

9.8 ROADS

At the Council meeting on 18 May 2026, **Mr Joel Hodson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

I notice that the graders have been around Middleton lately grading some roads. Is there a particular reason that Majors Road was skipped particularly after all the discussions that I've had here and elsewhere about its lack of maintenance and really poor condition?

Officer's Response:

Council officers will make contact with Mr Hodson to arrange an onsite meeting and to assess the road.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.9 BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

At the Council meeting on 18 May 2026, **Ms Alison Rogers** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

I'm just circling back to a question that I asked on the 19th January in relation to getting some clarity around what property owners can do in relation to bush fire preparedness. I note that we did get a response on 2nd February and Council officers response was "Council can confirm that no approval was required to collect and remove sticks, leaves, leaf litter or bark that have fallen on the ground on your property for the purpose of reducing bush fire risk. This type of routine property maintenance does not interfere with natural values in a way that requires a permit and it is recognised as appropriate and proactive bush fire risk reduction activity." My question for that is, has that policy changed recently, would that be something that's new or has that been in place for many years?

Officer's Response:

The requirements for vegetation removal are set by the Planning Scheme. Under the Scheme, the removal of native vegetation is generally classified as development and may require a permit unless a relevant exemption applies. These include vegetation removal for fire hazard management to protect existing assets and public safety, where carried out in accordance with an endorsed bushfire hazard management plan, as well as the removal of dead wood. In addition, the collection and removal of sticks, leaves, leaf litter and bark that have fallen on the ground is not considered vegetation removal under the Scheme and does not require approval. There has been no change in policy in relation to this advice. While we have not been able to identify the specific examples referred to in recent correspondence, we would be very happy to review any details that can be provided. This helps us make sure the advice given to landowners is clear and consistent.

Council encourages property owners to prepare their property in line with current Tasmanian Fire Service (TFS) advice ([Bushfire Safety Guide](#)), and any bushfire hazard management plan that may apply to their property.

For anyone who is unsure about whether approval may be needed for any type of vegetation clearing, Council offers a service to help landowners for landowners to seek advice on whether a permit under the planning scheme is required (link below). In some situations, we may ask for supporting information to confirm that an exemption applies.

[Clearing and Tree Removal - Kingborough Council](#)

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

C170/10-2026**10 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS**

10.1 AI

Cr Midgley asked the following questions without notice:

I saw that Devonport has announced they're doing a lot of work in the area of AI and developing some strategies around that. I'm just wondering if we're looking at that. Evidently, they're leading that area in the local government sector in Tasmania, and I'm just curious to know: are we interested in that, and are we progressing anything in that area?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

We are very interested in AI. AI is a powerful tool, and it forms part of the Council Digital Strategy that has been created. There are a couple of councils that are doing great work in this space. One of them is Devonport, and Huon Valley, down the road, is also doing some really interesting work in the area. I think over the next little while, firstly, putting a policy in place to make sure that we've got guardrails about how we safely utilise AI, and making sure that we're using AI in a context that keeps Council data safe, is really important. Beyond that, we'll be looking to continually learn and grow how we utilise AI, including learning from our colleagues at other councils as well. So, both our own approach, but also leveraging what others are doing.

Councillor Midgley:

I note there was a question from a resident, Ms Rea, regarding the National Conference of LGA, the City of Sydney motion to establish a national fund for local government adaptation and remediation. I think we all received a further follow-up email from the local resident. Just wondering, has Council ever considered, or do we at all intend, or has anybody from LGAT gone and attended that conference and looked at that City of Sydney motion that's been outlined in the agenda? The resident has asked us if we have ever thought about attending that Australian Local Government Association National General Assembly, where the City of Sydney is putting a motion around national climate adaptation funding and accountability for Australian cities. The local resident has found out about that and would love us to be able to support that. So I guess the question is: how could we, at all, have our voice at the table to show our support for this motion? Have staff thought about that? Is there anything they would like to say?

Acting Mayor:

Representatives from Kingborough have attended the ALGA Conference previously, generally the Mayor. The conference is this month. We're trying to work out those arrangements at the moment.

10.2 TOILET FACILITIES

Cr Deane asked the following questions without notice:

Could you just provide an update around what toilet facilities are currently available to members of the public outside of hours at Kingston Beach specifically, and whether there have been any changes recently?

Acting Mayor responds:

There has been 24-hour access to public toilets at Christopher Johnson Memorial Park at Kingston Beach on an ongoing basis. That has always been the case. The toilets at the middle of the beach have been closed between 9:30pm and 5:30am. Given recent concerns, we've made arrangements for those toilets to open earlier, at 4:30am in the morning. We're investigating some directional signage so that users understand that, outside those hours, the toilets at Christopher Johnson

Memorial Park are always open and available for use. Our long-term aspiration is to see whether we can arrange some sort of technological solution for after-hours access, but that's a bit of an aspirational goal at the moment.

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no Questions on Notice from Councillors.

Public Copy

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 6:01pm

12 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

C171/10-2026

12.1 Development Application for Extension and Alterations to Dwelling at 208 Channel Highway, Tarooma

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That the Planning Authority resolves that the development application for extension and alterations to dwelling at 208 Channel Highway, Tarooma for Eadesign be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Except as otherwise required by this Permit, use and development of the land must be substantially in accordance with Development Application No. DA-2026-45 and Council Plan Reference No. P1 submitted on 12/04/2026 and Council Plan Reference No. P2 submitted on 25/03/2026.

This Permit relates to the use of land or buildings irrespective of the applicant or subsequent occupants, and whoever acts on it must comply with all conditions in this Permit. Any amendment, variation or extension of this Permit requires further planning consent of Council.

2. The stormwater runoff from all new impervious areas must be disposed of by gravity to Council's reticulated stormwater system to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services.
3. Erosion/siltation infiltration control measures must be applied during construction works to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.

ADVICE

- A. In accordance with section 53(5) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* this permit lapses after a period of two years from the date on which it is granted if the use or development in respect of which it is granted is not substantially commenced within that period.
- B. The approval in this permit is under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and does not provide any approvals under other Acts including, but not limited to *Building Act 2016*, *Urban Drainage Act 2013*, *Food Act 2003* or Council by-laws.

If your development involves demolition, new buildings or alterations to buildings (including plumbing works or onsite wastewater treatment) it is likely that you will be required to get approvals under the *Building Act 2016*. Change of use, including visitor accommodation, may also require approval under the *Building Act 2016*. Advice should be sought from Council's Building Department or an independent building surveyor to establish any requirements.

- C. The proposed development has been assessed as low risk plumbing work. The Plumber is to provide the following documentation to Council after the plumbing work is completed:

- (a) A Form 80;
 - (b) A Form 71B; and
 - (c) An 'As Constructed' drainage plan at a scale of 1:200 in accordance with the Director's Specified List Schedule 3.
- D. This permit does not give approval for any retaining wall on the site. Further approval may be required for any retaining wall constructed on the site that does not meet the exemption provided in clause 5.6.5 of the *Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

CARRIED

C172/10-2026

12.2 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR DOG EXERCISE AREA AND ASSOCIATED CARPARK AND FENCING AT 'TRANSEND NETWORKS', 34 MADDOCKS ROAD, KINGSTON

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane
 Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That the Planning Authority resolves that the development application for a dog exercise area and associated carpark and fencing at 'Transend Networks', 34 Maddocks Road, Kingston for Kingborough Council be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Except as otherwise required by this Permit, use and development of the land must be substantially in accordance with Development Application No. DA-2025-454 and Council Plan Reference No. P5 submitted on 4/3/2026.

This Permit relates to the use of land or buildings irrespective of the applicant or subsequent occupants, and whoever acts on it must comply with all conditions in this Permit. Any amendment, variation or extension of this Permit requires further planning consent of Council.

2. The use of the approved dog exercise area is restricted to the following hours:

Standard Time: 6.00 am to 6.00 pm daily

Daylight Saving Time: 6.00 am to 9.00 pm daily

No use of the dog exercise area is permitted outside these hours.

Appropriate signage must be installed at all entry points specifying the permitted hours of use to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.

3. Unless further approval is obtained, commercial vehicle movements associated with the approved use (including garbage removal) must be within the hours of:
 - (a) 7.00 am to 7.00 pm Mondays to Fridays inclusive;
 - (b) 9.00 am to 5.00 pm Saturdays;
 - (c) Nil Sundays and Public Holidays.
4. The sound attenuation mound on the southeast boundary of the site must not be damaged or degraded by the use or development.

Prior to commencement of the use, a fence suitable to prevent access by dogs and people to the sound attenuation mound must be installed.

Evidence of installation and suitability of the fence must be submitted to council prior to commencement of the use.

5. No more than four (4) trees numbered 1, 5, 7 and 8 and as shown in the plans endorsed under Condition 1 and the arborist assessment (Tree inclined, 22 June 2025), are approved for removal for the purposes of this development.

No further felling, lopping, ringbarking or otherwise injuring or destroying of native vegetation or individual trees is to take place without the prior written permission of Council.

6. All remaining native vegetation identified for retention in the plans endorsed under Condition 1 and the arborist assessment (Tree inclined, 22 June 2025) must be appropriately protected during and after construction in accordance with all the recommendations in the Arboriculture Impact Assessment and AS 4970-2025. This includes but is not limited to implementation of the following measures:

A. Prior to Construction:

Prior to the commencement of any on-site works (including but not limited to vegetation removal, excavations, placement of fill, delivery of building/construction materials and/or temporary buildings):

- (a) Any pruning for machinery and/or carpark user clearance and any necessary tree removal should be completed before the commencement of carpark ground works. This includes any pruning works.
- (b) Pruning of any trees must be conducted by arborist with minimum AQF Level 3 qualifications.
- (c) Installing tree protection fencing in accordance with the arborist assessment (Tree Inclined, 22 June 2025) and condition 7.
- (d) Obtaining evidence of satisfactory installation of this fencing prior to the commencement of any on-site works and making this available to Council upon request.

B. During Construction:

- (a) Maintaining ground and tree protection measures required above for the duration of the construction.
- (b) All works for the proposed internal fencing are to be located outside of the High Conservation Value Trees (*Eucalyptus ovata* >40 DBH)

C. Post Construction:

- (a) Adhering to the following tree management measures post construction for all areas within the tree protection zone but outside the footprint of the approved works:
 - (i) the existing soil level must not be altered around the tree protection zone of the trees (including the disposal of fill, placement of materials or the scalping of the soil);
 - (ii) the tree protection zone must be free from the storage of fill, contaminants or other materials;
 - (iii) machinery and vehicles are not permitted to access the tree protection zone; and

- (iv) development and associated works are not permitted unless otherwise approved by Council in writing or otherwise in accordance with the law.

7. Tree protection fencing required under condition 6 must:
- (a) Be located on the edge of the tree protection zone, unless the outer edge of works as shown on the endorsed plan are closer, in which case this tree protection fencing may be reduced to the minimum amount necessary to allow the works to be completed.
 - (b) Exclude the following from the tree protection zones:
 - (i) Machine excavation including trenching.
 - (ii) Machinery movement.
 - (iii) Excavation of silt fencing.
 - (iv) Cultivation.
 - (v) Storage.
 - (vi) Preparation of chemicals, including preparation of cement products.
 - (vii) Parking of vehicles and plant.
 - (viii) Refuelling.
 - (ix) Dumping waste.
 - (x) Placement of fill.
 - (xi) Lighting of fires.
 - (xii) Soil level changes.
 - (xiii) Temporary or permanent installation of utilities and signs.
 - (xiv) Physical damage to the trees.
 - (c) Be constructed in accordance with the following requirements:
 - (i) Utilise barrier mesh and star pickets fencing unless otherwise approved in writing.
 - (ii) Form a visual and physical barrier.
 - (iii) Be a minimum height of 1.5 metres above ground level.
 - (iv) Include signage clearly marked "Tree Protection Zone - No Entry" on all sides.
8. To reduce the spread of weeds or pathogens, all machinery must take appropriate hygiene measures prior to entering and leaving the site as per the Weed and Disease Planning and Hygiene Guidelines 2015 produced by the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment.
- Any imported materials must be from a weed and pathogen free source to prevent introduction of new weeds and pathogens to the area.
9. Erosion/siltation infiltration control measures must be applied during construction works to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.

ADVICE

- A. In accordance with section 53(5) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* this permit lapses after a period of two years from the date on which it is granted if the use or development in respect of which it is granted is not substantially commenced within that period.
- B. The approval in this permit is under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and does not provide any approvals under other Acts including, but not limited to *Building Act 2016*, *Urban Drainage Act 2013*, *Food Act 2003* or Council by-laws.

If your development involves demolition, new buildings or alterations to buildings (including plumbing works or onsite wastewater treatment) it is likely that you will be required to get approvals under the *Building Act 2016*. Change of use, including visitor accommodation, may also require approval under the *Building Act 2016*. Advice should be sought from Council's Building Department or an independent building surveyor to establish any requirements.

- C. The proposed development has been assessed as low risk plumbing work. The Plumber is to provide the following documentation to Council after the plumbing work is completed:
- (a) A Form 80;
 - (b) A Form 71B; and
 - (c) An 'As Constructed' drainage plan at a scale of 1:200 in accordance with the Director's Specified List Schedule 3.
- D. This permit does not include any approval for signage, other than the traffic management signage shown on the plans endorsed under condition 1. Any further signage is subject to assessment under the planning scheme standards and the lodgement of a separate planning application where required.

CARRIED**PLANNING AUTHORITY SESSION ADJOURNS**

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed at 6:10pm

13 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

There are no petitions still being actioned.

14 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

There are no petitions still being actioned.

15 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C173/10-2026

15.1 DOG MANAGEMENT POLICY - PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Kaspar Deane

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

That pursuant to the provisions of the *Dog Control Act 2000*, Council invite public submissions and consult with any appropriate body or organisation, regarding the establishment of a dog training area located at Lot 1 Taronga Road, Bonnet Hill.

Moved: Cr Richardson

Seconded: Cr Fox

That the matter be deferred.

In Favour: Crs Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Flora Fox, Amanda Midgley and Mark Richardson

Against: Crs Christian Street and Kaspar Deane

CARRIED 5/2

C174/10-2026

15.2 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE POLICY

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Council adopt the *Information Disclosure Policy 3.23* as attached to this report.

CARRIED

C175/10-2026

15.3 OVAL LEASE - KINGBOROUGH SPORTS PRECINCT

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr David Bain

Pursuant to section 178 of the Local Government Act 1993, Council by absolute majority resolves to

dispose of public land being the Twin Ovals AFL Ground at 10 Kingston View Drive, Kingston in Certificate of Title Volume 164078 Folio 2 by means of a long-term lease to the Tasmanian Devils Football Club.

CARRIED

C176/10-2026

15.4 PETITION - KERBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICE, LESLIE VALE

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

That Council does not extend the kerbside collection service to the Leslie Vale area surveyed.

Cr Richardson left the room at 6:36pm

Cr Richardson returned to the room at 6:38pm

In Favour: Nil

Against: Crs Christian Street, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox, Amanda Midgley and Mark Richardson

LOST 0/7

Foreshadowed Motion

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council:

1. Extend the kerbside collection service to the Leslie Vale area surveyed.
2. Include kerbside collection for McKenzies Road as outlined in 4.8.3 of this report, subject to a scope of works being completed for the truck turning circle and available budget funding.

CARRIED

C177/10-2026

15.5 APPOINTMENT TO COUNCIL SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council resolve to appoint Councillors to special committees of Council and external organisations as follows:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| (a) TasWater Owner's Representative | – | Acting Mayor, Cr Street
Cr Fox (proxy)
CEO (proxy) |
| (b) Copping Refuse Site Joint Disposal Authority & Copping C Cell | – | Acting Mayor, Cr Street
Cr Cordover (proxy)
CEO (proxy) |
| (c) Disability Inclusion & Access Advisory Committee | – | Cr Fox (Chair)
Cr Midgley (Deputy Position) |

(d) Kingborough Municipal Emergency Planning Committee

- CEO

CARRIED

C178/10-2026

15.6 APPENDICES

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That the Appendices attached to the Agenda be received and noted.

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

C179/10-2026

16.1 SANDFLY ROAD / CHANNEL HIGHWAY INTERSECTION AND MARGATE ACTIVE TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That That Council write to the Tasmanian Government, through the Department of State Growth, requesting that it undertake a strategic review of the Channel Highway corridor between the Margate Train and Crescent Drive, Margate, in partnership with Kingborough Council.

The aim of the review being to identify and review preferred options as listed in the Tasmanian Government's 2020 Channel Highway Corridor Study, and complete detailed designs, with a focus on improving traffic flow, road safety and active transport outcomes, including but not limited to:

1. Converting the Sandfly Road / Channel Highway intersection to either a signalised intersection or roundabout;
2. Delivering a pedestrian and cyclist bridge across the North West Bay River, Channel Highway, south of the Bowls Club;
3. Delivering pedestrian crossing solutions within the Margate Central Business District;
4. Developing a shared pathway connection between the Margate Train and the Margate Central Business District.

CARRIED

C180/10-2026

17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

That in accordance with the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025* Council, by absolute majority, move into closed session to consider the following items:

Confirmation of Minutes

Regulation 40(6) *At the next closed meeting, the minutes of the previous closed meeting, after any necessary correction,*

are to be confirmed as the true record by the council or council committee and signed by the chairperson of the closed meeting.

Applications for Leave of Absence

Regulation 17(2)(i) *applications by councillors for a leave of absence*

Procurement of Services

Regulation 17(2)(e) *contracts, and tenders, for the supply of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.*

CARRIED

In accordance with the *Council Meetings & Councillor Workshops Audio Recording Guidelines Policy*, recording of the open session of the meeting ceased.

Open Session of Council adjourned at 7:25pm

Public Copy

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 7:49pm

C181/10-2026

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

The Closed Session of Council having met and dealt with its business resolves to report that it has determined the following:

Item	Decision
Confirmation of Minutes	Confirmed
Applications for Leave of Absence	Approved
Procurement of Services	Approved

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 7:49pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)