

Kingborough



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

15 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	5
	2 Attendees	5
	3 Apologies	5
	4 Confirmation of Minutes	6
	5 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	6
C187/11-2026	6 Declarations of Interest	6
	7 Transfer of Agenda Items	6
C188/11-2026	8 Questions without Notice from the Public	6
	8.1 CCTV	6
	8.2 Maddocks dog exercise area	7
	8.3 Snap Send Solve Application	8
	8.4 LPS Hearings	9
	8.5 Development Applications	12
	8.6 Cost Code	12
	8.7 TPC Hearings	13
	8.8 LZC	14
	9 Questions on Notice from the Public	16
	10 Questions without Notice from Councillors	16
	10.1 Traffic Safety	16
	10.2 Graffiti	16
	10.3 Soccer Games	18
	11 Questions on Notice from Councillors	18
	12 Officers Reports to Planning Authority	20
C190/11-2026	12.1 DA-2025-263 - Development Application For Manager's Residence At 1 Lumeah Road, Adventure Bay	20
	13 Petitions still being Actioned	23
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period	23
	15 Officers Reports to Council	23
C191/11-2026	15.1 APPENDICES	23
C192/11-2026	15.2 AGM Notice Of Motion Response - Supporting Residents To Improve Energy Efficiency	23

C193/11-2026	15.3 Rates and Charges Policy Update	23
C194/11-2026	15.4 Operational and Capital Budgets and Rates Resolution 2026/27	24
C195/11-2026	15.5 NOMINATION OF LICENSED PERSON	28
	16 Notices of Motion	28
	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	28

Public Copy

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 15 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 G Cordover	✓
Councillor K Deane	✓
Councillor F Fox	✓
Councillor A Midgley	✓
Councillor M Richardson	✓

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer	Mr Dave Stewart
Director People & Finance	Mr David Spinks
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Engineering Services	Mr Craig Mackey
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Mrs Deleeze Chetcuti
Acting Manager Development Services	Mr Andy D'Crus
Team Leader Statutory Planner	Ms Sarah Silva
Manager Finance	Mr Anthony Lovell
Climate Change Advisor	Mr Padraig Pearce
Communications Lead	Ms Sam Adams
Acting Executive Assistant	Ms Portia Jones

3 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

C186/11-2026

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr David Bain

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No.10 held on 1 June 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

CARRIED

5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

No workshops were held.

C187/11-2026

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cr Midgley declared an interest in the closed item headed Tender Assessment - AB2604 Kingston Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 2.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C188/11-2026

8 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

8.1 CCTV

Mr Boyden Hingston-Muir asked the following questions without notice:

In light of the recent assaults we have seen in our community, can Council confirm whether its CCTV coverage at the Kingston Bus Interchange is limited to partial coverage of the B Stop area in front of the banks by the cameras mounted on the front of Daves Noodles, and that there is currently no CCTV coverage of the A Stop, which is directly across the road at the corner of Channel Highway and Goshawk Way?

Response from Chief Executive Officer:

We will that on notice.

Mr Boyden Hingston-Muir:

Can Council confirm that all of its current security cameras are fully functional and still monitored in the Kingston police station? And what percentage of time are these cameras being actively monitored if at all?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I cannot comment on what the police do; however, they do have access to Council's CCTV network. I cannot comment on how the police utilise the CCTV content provided, but they do have access through the arrangements Council has in place for CCTV. In terms of the proportion of cameras that are operational and functional, that information would need to be taken on notice. The way it usually works is the police alert us if any of the cameras go down and then we can actively understand what the issue is and get the camera back up and running.

Mr Boyden Hingston-Muir:

Is Council currently considering the re-establishment of a formal Community Safety Committee, or a similar advisory group with expanded membership, including representatives from Tasmania Police, Kingston Neighbourhood House, West Winds Community Centre, Neighbourhood Watch, local schools, and other relevant community organisations, to ensure ongoing collaboration and proactive responses to community safety concerns?

Acting Mayor responds:

The former Community Safety Committee to which you refer included representation from Tasmania Police and a number of community members who were engaged on a rolling basis through an application process. The committee itself considered its own disbandment and ultimately resolved to disband, having determined that direct community input to Council and Councillors on these matters, rather than through an intermediary committee, was the most appropriate way forward. This was a matter considered and progressed by the committee itself, and Council agreed to disband the committee on that basis. Should a proposal for a committee be put forward at some future date, I would be happy to receive and consider it. However, it is important to note the history of how we arrived at the current position.

8.2 MADDOCKS DOG EXERCISE AREA

Ms Jennifer Lawrence asked the following questions without notice:

A couple of meetings ago, we were advised that, once planning approval was done on 1st of June, the contractor was ready to commence work on the 2nd. We were also advised that we would be able to continue using the Kingston View Drive area until the new facility was ready, which was expected to be by 21st June. I have not been down there myself; however, several people who exercise their dogs at the dog park have advised that they have driven past or inspected the site. They have observed that some gravel has been delivered and a few slabs have been lifted, but there appears to be no fencing and no significant work being undertaken in relation to the fencing. I would like to know whether Council is monitoring the contractor's meant to be doing, if the works are not completed by 21st June as anticipated, what will occur on 22nd June when the Kingston View Drive area is scheduled to be closed?

Director of Engineering Services responds:

The contractor has started the works there, so we've got the materials delivered. We've also done some of the tree removal and limb removal that happened earlier this week. The civil contractor we'll be heading there towards the end of this week to progress those works, I'll have to confirm an update in terms of the fencing contractor. But yes, our objective is to try and marry up those two dates as close as possible. And again, we continue to monitor the timing of that contract commencement at Kingston View Drive and again we'll continue to see if we can get those two things to marry up as best we can.

Ms Lawrence:

What is the contingency if it's not ready on the 21st.

Director of Engineering Services:

There will be a short delay of access to a dog park, but as we've noted before, there are many other dog parks available in the Kingston area.

Ms Lawrence:

There's no greyhound area other than that one there. What are people with greyhounds going to do? You have to have a dedicated greyhound area.

Chief Executive Officer responds:

We acknowledge that it's not ideal to not have access to a dedicated greyhound area. I will note that there are other options for exercising greyhounds like on leash and in private spaces as well. It's not a great outcome if there's a period of time, a short period of time without the Greyhound exercise area. I fully acknowledge that.

Ms Lawrence:

When you said that we would have a continuous usage either at Kingston View Drive or at Maddocks Road. That's not going to be the case. And yet you said that in the two meetings ago.

Chief Executive Officer:

I think we said we would do everything we could to ensure continuity of access. I don't think at any stage we guarantee that there will be something we could necessarily deliver. I think we are doing everything in our in our powers to be able to sustain continuity of access and we will continue to do that.

8.3 SNAP SEND SOLVE APPLICATION

Ms Alison Rogers asked the following questions without notice:

My first question is in relation to the Snap Send Solve application. I recently used it for the first time after the recent rains, when there was a tree over a road. During the process of using the app, it indicated that I should contact the after-hours number if the matter was an emergency or urgent task. Given that the tree was obstructing the majority of the road, I considered it to be urgent, so I rang the after-hours number and spoke with somebody. I would like to stress that both my experience with the after-hours service and with Snap Send Solve was positive. However, it became apparent during the process that the Snap Send Solve application and the after-hours service may not communicate with each other in the first instance, because the issue lodged through Snap Send Solve did not address my issue until the following business day. While the matter was resolved promptly through the after-hours service, I am wondering, from an efficiency point of view, why the two systems do not communicate with each other. Should the person rostered on for after-hours responses also receive Snap Send Solve notifications?

Acting Mayor asked Ms Rogers to clarify what her question was:

Can I just clarify, Ms Rogers, is the issue that the matter you lodged through Snap Send Solve was not ticked off as being completed?

Ms Rodgers:

There was no real communication after I lodged the request through the Snap Send Solve application. It did not advise me that the issue had been resolved; I only knew it had been resolved because I drove past the location. The after-hours service and Council acted promptly and very well, so the outcome was successful. However, I assume that the Snap Send Solve application involves some cost to Council, and I am wondering whether there may be a more efficient way for the system to operate?

Chief Executive Officer Responds:

The after hours service is a third party contractor that we utilise to be able to take those after hours calls. So, probably rightly, they don't have access to any internal Council systems as part of that. Around Snap Send Solve, it's a useful tool and it's a really good tool that operates across infrastructure providers right across Australia and New Zealand as well. And it's a way that people can lodge any issues that they want to see resolved. At this stage we are not a licence holder with Snap Send Solve. So what that means is that the platform is a conduit that basically allows you to upload the information and then it essentially emails it through to us. So, it's not our integrated product at this point in time. So, we're not paying a licence fee for it currently and it supplies us with the information, but it then doesn't integrate into any Council systems. As part of our digital strategy we intend to put in place a system that allows for a greater degree of integration, whether that be Snap Send Solve or something that will allow aggressive degree of transparency and visibility of any issues that are raised and allow it to efficiently move through the Council system, but also provided improved customer experience at the back end.

8.4 LPS HEARINGS**Ms Rogers:**

During a hearing conducted by the Tasmanian Planning Commission on Wednesday, 10 June, one of the Commission panel members indicated and this, I might add, has not been the first time it has been raised in recent weeks - that the decision tree created by Ireneinc. In the independent report was, in his words, "definitely flawed", creating a bias towards the Landscape Conservation Zone (LCZ). When discussing locations in Kettering and Woodbridge on that day, the panel referred to a road, namely Whittons Road, that was very similar in characteristics, including topography, vegetation, settlement pattern and protective overlays, to another nearby road, namely Whittons Road. Groombridges Road had been recommended in the Ireneinc report for the Rural Living Zone; however, Whittons Road had, I think, a mixture of Landscape Conservation Zone and Rural Zone. The Tasmanian Planning Commission panel member in question asked the Planning Authority representative who was present on the day whether the zone applied to the Whittons Road was strategically the correct choice and whether the Rural Living Zone may have been a better fit. At that point, the Planning Authority disagreed. My question is: given the covering letter submitted with the response to Direction 69, which indicated that Council had an appetite for high risk and that, where possible, the more restrictive zone should apply, why did the Planning Authority not indicate a different position at that point, even when the Tasmanian Planning Commission appeared to be providing an opportunity for the Planning Authority to change its position?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I will preface this that we don't want to provide detailed comment about the hearings in a Council meeting. It is, in and of itself, a process at the moment and, due to procedural fairness, it's probably not appropriate to be commenting about that outside of that process. Also, I'm not across that exact scenario that you're describing. So, what I think would be a better option is that we will take this on notice and then we can formulate a response and discuss with the member of staff who was

attending what the rationale was at that time. I would also point out that, at the end of the day, it is the Commission's decision-making process. The Commission will be the final decision-maker, and they will be considering all evidence before them. In terms of the risk appetite, we have communicated before, and as per the resolution of Council, the Ireneinc report is the starting point. Then, after listening to the evidence and discussions at the hearings, that risk appetite may be considered when those two appropriate zoning options are available. So, I'm sorry I can't answer tonight, but we'll have to go and review that particular matter on the day.

Ms Rogers:

Is there a particular reason why management and Councillors perhaps aren't participating in that hearing process to hear what's actually being said.

Acting Mayor responded:

I would contest that we're not, but I think the point that Ms Chetcuti is making is that, with the volume of hearing time that is occurring, being able to see all of that for any one Councillor's or any one member of management staff is very difficult. With respect to specific questions about what is going on in the hearing, we're always happy to take those questions on notice, investigate them, and come back with responses. I think you're going to get a much more useful outcome and response if we do that, rather than trying to interrogate the whys and wherefores of what is going on in the hearing during a Council meeting like this. Certainly, it would be my expectation that any questions about the way the hearings are going, or advice that is given in those hearings, would be thoroughly answered.

Tamieka Adkins asked the following questions without notice:

When LCZ hearings resumed on 26 May, Dan Ford opened by asking if, when we have a challenge deciding zones, do we refer to the high-risk statement in the cover letter, to which Mr Stander replied, "No, we'll be going with the ireneinc report." The response appears to directly contradict Section C of the cover letter, which states that adopting a high-risk appetite towards landscape values and applying the least restrictive zoning where multiple appropriate options exist has overriding intent. Given the explicit use of the term "overriding intent", why has the direction effectively been set aside in favour of the ireneinc report? Does it reflect a misunderstanding of the term "override" or an intentional decision to disregard it?

Chief Executive Officer Responds:

The intent of how the motion is worded, and the information that we have within the Ireneinc report, lends itself to an application of the decision tree. Where there are two potential options at the far end of that, that are valid, Council's risk appetite statement takes effect and we will, be in a position where we'll advocate for the less restrictive of the two options. So that's the intent of how it works. It is, in some ways, a secondary process to that of the decision tree, because you have to get to a point where you understand what the meaningful and reasonable options are in the first instance. Secondly, I'll draw your attention to a quote from the lead Commissioner for the hearings that he made during the initial hearings when we came back. He said: "The Commission will first hear all evidence on each locality as part of the hearings and, where the panel forms a view that more than one zone could be contemplated for a locality, the panel will issue directions to the *Planning Authority seeking further submissions on appropriate zoning*." That was in response to Council's wording in the resolution around the risk appetite statement. Essentially, the way I hear that is that if the panel or the Commissioners find that, when they get to the point of needing to make a call or decision one way or another, they believe there is more than one valid zone, they will provide Council with a direction to come back to them. That will allow not just our staff in the room and the consultant there to respond to it, but will also allow time for management review of those responses to make sure that the risk appetite statement is correctly applied.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services added to Chief Executive Officer's response:

The risk appetite statement is in relation to landscape values in terms of potential impacts of the two alternate zones that might be appropriate when that point comes in going through the decision tree and determining what might be appropriate. There could be other reasons that sit outside of landscape values where that would sway, I suppose either the Commission or the officers attending in terms of what is an appropriate zone. The risk appetite relates to landscape values and, as you know, under all the different for example Section 8 criteria 8A criteria, there are many different considerations around determining zones. So that could be at times a reason where it's not entirely clear about the risk appetite being applied.

Ms Adkins:

For clarification on that, to be clear. The risk appetite, I understand. There was several, representers that said that could quite easily represent the rural living zone being the preferred, I know, but also the appropriate zone, laying out the settlement patterns and all of the landscape, everything that needed to happen. But on several occasions, Mr Stander said it would be via the Irenelnc report, so there was no opportunity given, for the TPC to hear the planning authority's high-risk appetite looking at the two zones, because the decision tree, in the words of Dan Ford, were heavily weighted to LCZ. They missed a question at the start, which meant almost everything over here, almost everything, went to that LCZ zone. I'm still confused, and my question is: why is that not then being represented back to the TPC when the landholders have clearly demonstrated that there is a case for two zones? However, Mr Stander has been steadfast and referred constantly back to the Irenelnc report of LCZ. Does that mean that the TPC don't need to hear from Council and they will wait? They will take all this into consideration from the representers themselves.

Chief Executive Officer:

I haven't directly received that feedback from the Commission that they have any concerns around the structure of that report. In saying that, I'll refer back to the quote that I read out from the Chair of the proceedings, that if the Commission deems that they want to test Council's view as it relates to the risk appetite statement, they will issue a direction to that effect.

Ms Adkins:

The Woodbridge hearing again on the 10th of June, Dan Ford actually told representer that it was disingenuous to ask for the least restricted zone generally as it means different things in different places. So if the TPC considers such requests to lack sincerity or a proper understanding of the issue, and Mr Stander is not advancing on least restrictive zoning options within those hearings, does this indicate that the cover letter was merely a symbolic gesture? Or, alternatively, were councillors permitted to pass a motion to avoid a practical effect? Or their explicit intentions just being disregarded because it feels like that it's kind of going around in circles of they said this and they said that and I understand there's no outcome yet, but it kind of feels like one statements playing off the other. And I don't know where that lands?

Chief Executive Officer:

I can't speak to the detail of the question here. What I would come back to is the fact that we are in the midst of a hearings process, there's information being presented by representors. There is information being presented by Council and through the external report that was commissioned as well. The Commission have powers through the process to be able to ask further questions and to issue directions, which is their tool to be able to get Council's formal response to different issues. I think if, if the Commission had any concerns about the way the information was being presented then they certainly have a tool available to them to ask Council for clarification on the position. At this stage I haven't heard that there are any requests from the Commission for any clarification there, but we will continue to monitor and support the process.

8.5 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Mr Mark Donnellon asked the following questions without notice:

Kingborough advertised development applications perpetually public information, and can an individual ask for the details of a DA that has passed its advertising period?

Acting Mayor responded:

Not necessarily is the answer to that question, but is somebody going to help me with more detail than that? There are some significant copyright issues, as I understand Mr Donnellon, but perhaps in order to give you an appropriate response, we might take it on notice.

Mr Mark Donnellon asked the following questions without notice:

What is the process involved in completing a request for information regarding a DA, especially with regard to the labour required by Council Staff? Say you want to request information about a DA that has passed its advertising period, what's the process for doing that and what sort of labour is involved on the Council side.

Acting Mayor responded:

We can take that on notice.

8.6 COST CODE

Mr Joel Hodson asked the following questions without notice:

Do Council cost code their employee's time?

Chief Executive Officer response:

In certain cases, we do. For example, if an employee is working on a capital project, then their employees time will be capitalised into a particular piece of work. Then in that case there's a specific cost code associated with it. More generally, our employees times are costed to department areas and we don't break out that work on a you know a billing by the half hour or whatever basis like lawyers might.

Joel Hodson :

It was stated at a TPC hearing by the planning authority that we need more rural zoning in Kingborough. Where has this new approach come from and why is there such an emphasis on rural zoning when the value of our agricultural production is so low, the fifth lowest of all LG's at only 0.45% of total state value, and where the predominant activity at 96 percent is grazing, which is also "no permit required" in rural living zone.

Acting Mayor Responded:

I suspect our staff knows this but just for my own reference. Who was the statement made by that we need more rural zoning, Mr Hodson?

Mr Hodson:

Planning authority at a recent TPC hearing.

Acting Mayor Responded:

I suspect for the reasons that I've outlined the I want to take that question on notice; I think we'll take it on notice, Mr Hodson.

Mr Hodson:

In recent hearings, the Planning Authority has repeatedly stated that strategic work identifying LCZ and rural settlements (i.e. for the Rural Living Zone or Rural Zone) has not been done. It was discussed that this came up at the last Council meeting, where other councils had also not undertaken this strategic planning. Why, then, has Kingborough's LPS been so different? Alternatively, if strategic planning had been undertaken, why has Council failed to follow suit and conduct this strategic planning prior to the LPS project process.

Chief Executive Officer response:

It's difficult to comment on what other councils have done there. In the context of our environment, the reason we haven't is that we have limited resources, and those resources have been devoted to the LPS process itself. As I'm sure a lot of people are aware, we are the last Council to go through that process, which means there has probably been a longer tail in that timing. That has occupied Council's resources for a longer period. I will note that other councils are doing strategic work now, post the shift to the LPS. Namely, our neighbours, Huon Valley Council, have received a significant grant and are undertaking significant structural planning work down there now, which is imagining what the strategic future of Huonville might look like. It's a really good example of our neighbouring council that has been through the LPS process and now has the runway to be able to look at some of the really meaningful strategic work that they want to do.

8.7 TPC HEARINGS

Ms Kim Phillips asked the following questions without notice:

In relation to that, I just want to seek a bit more clarity regarding Mr Stewart's answer to Tamika's question. When you were talking about the TPC issuing directions, I guess the question for all of us is that we aren't hearing directions being asked for at those hearings. Should we expect that to happen later, or should we actually be pushing during our hearing to say, "Could we have a direction, please, to send this back to Council to look at the high-risk appetite?" If I talk about myself, in my hearing that didn't come up at all, and obviously I would like my property to be looked at.

Chief Executive Officer responds:

Look, it's a difficult question to answer because I'm not going to try and give you advice about how to conduct yourself during hearings. My take on it is that the Commission have clearly and publicly articulated what their approach would be where they consider there to be a decision that relates directly to the application of that risk appetite statement. I think that's for the Commission to determine if and when they issue directions.

Ms Phillips:

Can we ask Council to seek clarification on behalf of community members as to whether we could expect to, because I guess the question at the moment is that we're seeking clarity, and what we're being told is the high-risk appetite comes in at a later date because, at the end of the decision tree, it determines whether or not you've got two zones. At the moment, I think others will agree with me that we're actually a bit confused as to what our expectation should be. So that's the clarity I'm looking for. I'm not looking for an answer, more just trying to understand how this process is working for us because we are feeling left high and dry by this statement when, in the hearings, we're not actually seeing that work. Essentially, it's looking like it's being ignored. If we can just ask for clarification, is that appropriate or not? Or is it more appropriate that we go directly to the TPC?

Director Environment, Development & Community Service:

I think it's important that the community and representatives have as much information as possible to understand the process, particularly as they have very strong concerns. I don't think it's probably appropriate for the Planning Authority to go to the TPC on behalf of the representers, but I would encourage you to contact the TPC, outline this, and seek a response back. Perhaps that might then translate into some different methods of communication and clarification during the hearings.

Ms Phillips:

Can we have an update on the Bruny Island SAP review please?

Director Environment, Development & Community Service:

Unfortunately, it's taking longer than we had hoped or anticipated due to several different reasons, some of which are outside of our control. At this point in time, we're still working through getting a finalised draft and hoping to have that before Council very soon, within one month or, at the most, two. I think perhaps it's worked out quite well for us in terms of timing, in terms that there is now a break in the hearings. That has been fortunate and has given us a little bit more time without having an impact on the hearings themselves. As soon as we have more information, and we acknowledge that it's gone on a lot longer than we'd hoped, we thank everyone for their patience. As soon as we have another update, we'll provide it.

8.8 LZC

Ms Natisha Knight asked the following questions without notice:

Throughout the draft Local Provisions Schedule process, Council's advice to landowners regarding proposed Rural and Landscape Conservation Zone zoning was simply that access to a property was required. This is around the Crown Road issue.

It was not until after the IreneInc report was tabled, and following a number of requests for clarification, that Council formally confirmed via correspondence to CLUG and subsequently in Council Chambers that Crown Road frontage may present a significant issue for properties proposed to be zoned Rural Landscape Conservation, particularly where those properties are vacant and reliant on Crown Road access to obtain a dwelling approval. My first question is: how many properties within the draft LPS Schedule are proposed to be in the General Rural or Landscape Conservation Zone that rely on Crown Road frontage for access and, of those properties, how many are currently vacant lots without an existing dwelling?

Acting Mayor responded:

I'm going to suggest that we will probably need to take that on notice, but before we take it on notice, I just want to check with Ms Chetcuti that that is the sort of information that we would have available, because I'm conscious that, if not, the time associated with working out the answer to that question is likely to be disproportionate to the benefit.

Ms Natisha Knight:

As part of my other question, Mr Stander previously stated at a previous Council meeting that those affected property owners were going to receive a letter, so you must be able to get that information for us.

Director Environment, Development & Community Service:

Thank you. I'm not aware of the statement that Mr Stander made in regard to that. I will say that we have answered this question before from a Question on Notice, but we'll take it on notice again.

Ms Natisha Knight:

Not around the properties that exit vacant properties that have crown land.

Director Environment, Development & Community Service:

I believe so. If we have answered it before, then we will refer back to that as well. I'm not sure if that is information we could easily access or ascertain without a detailed property-by-property assessment. However, if we have answered it before, we will refer back to that as well.

Ms Knight:

Well, this then goes to that question.

Has Council undertaken any assessment of the properties adversely affected by the Crown Road access issue? If such an assessment has been undertaken, will it be publicly available?

If no assessment has been undertaken, how can Council be satisfied that the proposed zoning recommendations will not result in unintended restrictions on affected landowners, particularly where the issue was only formally acknowledged after the representations had already been lodged and hearings were underway?

Acting Mayor responded:

I think, given the answer to the first question, we'd probably better take that question on notice.

Ms Knight:

My next question relates to Mr Stander. At a recent Council meeting, I think it was two Council meetings ago, Mr Stander advised that affected landowners would be contacted regarding the Crown Road access issue and stated that property owners would be sent a letter. Subsequent correspondence from Ms Chetcuti, in response to a question without notice from Mr Hodson, indicated that information would instead be provided through a Council newsletter. My question is: when did Council first become aware that Crown Road frontage may prevent or significantly impede development within the Rural and Landscape Conservation Zone? If Council was aware of this issue and knew which properties may be affected, why were those landowners not individually notified before the hearing process commenced, or at the very least before the hearings concluded, so that they could make fully informed representations to the Tasmanian Planning Commission? Further to that, given that this issue may directly affect property rights, development potential, and land value for individual landowners, how does Council consider publication in a general newsletter to satisfy the principles of transparency, procedural fairness and natural justice, particularly when affected landowners could have been identified and contacted directly?

Acting Mayor responded:

We're going to take that on notice, Ms Knight, and I will note that it was about five questions in one go.

9 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

At the time the Minutes was compiled there were no Questions on Notice from the Public.

C189/11-2026

10 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

10.1 TRAFFIC SAFETY

Cr Midgley asked the following question without notice:

It was matter that was raised with yourself, community member Jo Westwood and myself regarding traffic and safety around St Aloysius school, when traffic is entering that precinct area from the new subdivision in Huntingfield. There is no signage for the 40 km/h zone, which is consistent along that road and across from the school. There is a request, after community member Jo Westwood met with the school on Friday, for urgent action to be taken. That is, if we can look at placing a 40 km/h sign there as soon as possible, or if not, whether we could use those trailers obtained through the Community Road Safety Grant to put up a temporary display showing the 40 km/h limit. I'm just wondering if that could be actioned before we look at a permanent sign.

Acting Mayor:

It was an issue that was raised with me last week also. Pleasingly, we do have some progress. The Transport Commission has approved the extension of the 40 km/h zone to include the new approach to the intersection that you've referenced. The Department of State Growth is going to arrange for the installation of new electronic school zone signs in the area that has been approved. In the interim, they've asked us to erect temporary signage as soon as possible, which we're going to do. Both signs have been ordered and we'll arrange their installation as soon as they have been received. We're looking at other things, including improving sightlines and trimming trees, and those works are to be conducted in the coming weeks. I understand that we've also undertaken several site inspections during the morning and afternoon school peak periods, and we're looking at the way in which students are directed across the road to try and make that safer as well. In addition to all of that, we're going to do the work required to determine whether it is appropriate to obtain a warrant for a school crossing guard at that site in the near future. That's what's going on. If Mr Mackey has anything further to add in relation to that, then he can, but otherwise that's the situation. It has been communicated to the school today, that's what's happening.

10.2 GRAFFITI

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

I have some questions on behalf of residents who live in Firthside. They have back fences that overlook the Southern Outlet, which is now blighted with graffiti. The questions are really seeking advice on jurisdiction, if possible. These residents are upset that their back fences are constantly covered in graffiti, which we've all seen when entering Kingston and looking to the left and right.

You can see that line of fencing. Some of the residents are planning on selling those properties to downsize. They're retired and are frustrated that they've been told it's not Council's responsibility, and it's not the Department of State Growth's responsibility. They've gone to the police, and the police have told them to try Council. They're going around and around. They've asked two questions in relation to this. The first question is that there is allegedly a "magic paint" which they've been told can be applied to the fence and makes the clean-up process much easier. Are they allowed to apply that paint?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services responds:

There is indeed a paint that you can apply that assist in the removal of graffiti. However, I would say that the fence in question, if it's a paling fence that won't have a lot of benefit in terms of graffiti removal.

Cr Antolli:

It's a colourbond fence.

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services responds:

Ok, then it may have some.

Cr Antolli:

Would they would have permission to paint it, would they? do they have to keep it in the same colour as existing? What's the planning jurisdiction on that?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services:

Technically if it's their boundary fence, they own the fence, they share it. I would imagine in this case it's with the Department of State Growth. It depends on who owns the adjoining land, but my guess would be its Department of State Growth. Technically it's their fence and they could apply that. In relation to the colour that would be a planning scheme issue that I'm not able to answer.

Cr Antolli:

Are they permitted to put some sort of screening close to that fence that deters people from reoffending? What is the jurisdiction on that?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services:

That comes down to whoever owns the land. The fence is clearly in joint ownership between the two adjoining neighbours. However, if the adjoining land is not owned by the residents, they would need to seek permission from the landowner to plant trees within it.

Cr Antolli:

If it's their back fence, that would be their ownership. If it's a shared fence, it's joint ownership?

Director Governance, Recreation and Property Services:

It depends which side of the fence we're talking about. If it's within their backyard, yes, they own the land and they can plant trees. If it's on the other side of the fence, which I suspect it is, then it depends who owns that land. My guess is that the State Government owns that land.

10.3 SOCCER GAMES

Cr Deane asked the following questions without notice:

There have obviously been a couple of big soccer games of late and, probably unlike the CEO, who still thinks the All Whites are a chance, Australia's going to make it. I woke up and look forward to that happening. However, there was a bigger game than yesterday's victory over Turkey, and that was the Kingborough Lions winning the Statewide Cup this previous Sunday. I was just wondering whether we, as a Council, might like to offer some kind of support to the club in recognition of their efforts. I note that, in Chambers, we have a few examples of supporting local sporting achievements. Whether we might reach out to the club and congratulate them, but also offer them the opportunity to be recognised for their efforts, noting that it was the first senior piece of silverware for the club in their history. It's the biggest tournament to win in the State. So, I was just wondering if you'd like to chase that up.

Acting Mayor responds:

A huge achievement for the Kingborough Lions. I was up there on the weekend. Obviously, the trophy is enormous, but what goes along with that is that they're into the Round of 32 for the Australia Cup. I'm told that on 22 June we'll find out whether we'll have a game played at Lightwood Park, which could potentially be against one of the A-League teams. That would be an incredible opportunity for Kingborough and for the Lions. I'm happy to write to the Lions and congratulate them on that massive achievement. As I said, I was up there over the weekend sharing in their reflected glory.

Cr Deane:

Just in relation to the Southern Obedience Club, could there be an update? At the last Council meeting, we deferred a report to consult on finding a new location. Could we have an update on where that currently sits?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

We've been able to negotiate with the contractors undertaking work within the precinct an arrangement that will enable the Southern Obedience Club to remain at their current location until 31 October. That's really important because it enables us to buy some time to further investigate options with respect to their new location, and that's what staff are currently doing. We intend to bring a report back to Council, with an assessment of the various options, within the next month.

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

At the time the Minutes was compiled there were no Questions on Notice from Councillors.

Public Copy

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 6:28pm

12 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

C190/11-2026

12.1 DA-2025-263 - DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR MANAGER'S RESIDENCE AT 1 LUMEAH ROAD, ADVENTURE BAY

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That the visitor accommodation (manager's unit) at 1 Lumeah Road, Adventure Bay 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-2025-263 and Council Plan Reference No. P3 submitted on 30 April 2026 (Endorsed Plans).

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. An amendment, variation or extension of this Permit requires further planning consent from Council.

2. No 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 or in accordance with a further permit or otherwise as provided for in the Planning Scheme or otherwise in accordance with law.
3. The building is approved for manager's residence only in accordance with the Endorsed Plans; no other use of the building is approved under this development application. The building must not be used for any other use unless in accordance with the relevant legislation and with Council's approval.
4. All native vegetation identified for retention in the Endorsed Plans and the arborist report (Charlie's Tree Service, February 2026) 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 demolition, excavations, placement of fill, delivery of building/construction materials and/or temporary buildings):

- (a) Appointing a Project Arborist.
- (b) Conducting a site briefing between the Project Arborist and the project manager and site supervisor or equivalent for the development, including provision of the Tree Protection Plan (TPP).
- (c) The works and development within the tree protection zone is to be limited to foot traffic only, with the aid of wheelbarrows to transport goods and material.
- (d) Installing tree protection fencing in accordance with the arborist assessment (Charlie's Tree Services, February 2026) and condition 5.

- (e) 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) Ensuring the Project Arborist conducts a site audit during construction to check compliance against the tree protection plan and permit conditions.

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.

5. Tree protection fencing required under condition 4 must:

- (a) Be located on the outer edge of works as shown on the Endorsed Plans and outside tree protection zones of retained trees to the extent feasible 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.
6. Guests must park within the designated car parking area for the subject site.
7. The on-site wastewater system, including the absorption trenches and associated works, must be located as per the Endorsed Plan.

For Advice: Documentation submitted for plumbing approval must demonstrate compliance with these requirements.

8. Erosion/siltation infiltration control measures must be applied during construction works to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.
9. The stormwater runoff from all concrete, paved, or otherwise sealed areas must be contained within the property or discharged to a Council approved discharge point. All works in relation to the discharge of stormwater must be completed to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services.
10. 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.

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 the 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 developer should obtain a Plumbing Permit for the development prior to commencing construction.
- D. A drainage design plan at a scale of 1:200, designed by a qualified Hydraulic Designer showing the location of the proposed sewer and stormwater house connection drains including the pipe sizes, pits and driveway drainage, must be submitted with the application for Plumbing Permit.
- E. The developer must obtain from Council a Plumbing Permit for an upgrade of the existing onsite wastewater management system, in accordance with the wastewater design by Gec Environmental Solutions (dated March 2026).

CARRIED

PLANNING AUTHORITY SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed at 6:42pm

13 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

There are no petitions still being actioned.

14 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

No petitions had been received.

15 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C191/11-2026

15.1 APPENDICES

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

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

CARRIED

C192/11-2026

15.2 AGM NOTICE OF MOTION RESPONSE - SUPPORTING RESIDENTS TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council notes the intention to provide a community energy efficiency program and that this supports the AGM motion raised on 8 December 2025.

CARRIED

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 7:04pm pm for a short break.

Meeting resumed at 7:12pm.

C193/11-2026

15.3 RATES AND CHARGES POLICY UPDATE

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Council approve the updated Rates and Charges Policy 3.14 as attached this report.

In Favour: Crs Christian Street, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox and Amanda Midgley

Against: Crs Aldo Antolli and Mark Richardson

CARRIED 6/2

C194/11-2026

15.4 OPERATIONAL AND CAPITAL BUDGETS AND RATES RESOLUTION 2026/27

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council:

- 1 In accordance with Section 82 of the *Local Government Act 1993 (as amended)* ('the Act') adopts, by absolute majority, the estimates of revenue and expenditure (excluding estimated capital works) for the 2026/27 financial year as detailed in Attachment 1;
- 2 In accordance with Section 82(6) of the Act, by absolute majority, authorises the Chief Executive Officer to make minor adjustments up to \$50,000 to any individual estimate item as he deems necessary during the 2026/27 financial year provided that the total of the Estimates remains unaltered;
- 3 In accordance with Section 90 of the Act, makes a General Rate component for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027 of 0.223090 cents in the dollar of capital value, in respect of all rateable land within the municipal area;
- 4 Pursuant to Section 107 of the Act, by absolute majority, hereby varies the General Rate component (as previously made) for land within the municipal area which is used or predominantly used for industrial purposes to 0.469115 cents in the dollar of capital value of such rateable land;
- 5 Pursuant to Section 107 of the Act, by absolute majority, hereby varies the General Rate component (as previously made) for land within the municipal area which is used or predominantly used for commercial purposes to 0.513355 cents in the dollar of capital value of such rateable land;
- 6 Pursuant to Section 107 of the Act, by absolute majority, hereby varies the General Rate component (as previously made) for land within the municipal area which is used or predominantly used for residential short stay visitor accommodation purposes to 0.334635 cents in the dollar of capital value of such rateable land;
- 7 Pursuant to Section 90(4) of the Act, in making a General Rate, sets a minimum amount of \$494, in respect of all rateable land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027;
- 8 Pursuant to Section 129(4) of the Act, by absolute majority, determines that for a member of the class of ratepayers' whose liability to pay the minimum rate assessed in accordance with this Resolution Part 6 arises for more than one property in the municipal area a remission of the Minimum Rate requirement shall automatically be granted for such of that members properties which:-
 - a) only have erected upon them a boat shed, jetty, ramp or similar structure for access to littoral or riparian waters; or

- b) do not have the qualities of a minimum lot, as defined by the Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1993 (except where such land could be adhered to other lands in the same ownership so as to comprise a block which has the qualities of a minimum lot); and
 - c) the above remission may be withdrawn where the rates have not been paid in full by the due date;
- 9 Pursuant to Section 94(1) of the Act, makes the following charges for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027:
- a) a Garbage Collection Charge of \$228 for each residential, industrial or commercial unit that is provided with a Council garbage collection service utilising a 80-litre mobile garbage bin, whether that service is used or not;
- 10 Pursuant to Section 94(3A) of the Act, by absolute majority determines to vary the Garbage Collection Charge as follows:
- a) for each residential, industrial or commercial unit that is provided with a Council garbage collection service utilising a 120-litre or 140-litre mobile garbage bin the service charge is varied to \$324;
 - b) for each residential, industrial or commercial unit that is provided with a Council garbage collection service utilising a 240-litre mobile garbage bin the service charge is varied to \$511;
- 11 Pursuant to Section 94(1) of the Act, by absolute majority makes the following service charges for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to June 2027;
- a) to offset the Tasmanian State Government Landfill Levy payable by Council to the State Government under the *Waste and Resource Recovery Act 2022*, as follows
 - i) Waste Levy State Government Charge 80 Litre garbage bin \$22.50
 - ii) Waste Levy State Government Charge 120 Litre garbage bin \$34
 - iii) Waste Levy State Government Charge 240 Litre garbage bin \$68
- 12 Pursuant to Section 94(1) of the Act, makes the following charges for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027:
- a) a Recycling Collection Charge of \$108 for each residential, industrial or commercial unit that is provided with a Council recycling collection service utilising a 140-litre mobile recycling bin, whether that service is used or not;
- 13 Pursuant to Section 94(3A) of the Act, by absolute majority determines to vary the Recycling Collection Charge as follows:
- a) for each residential, industrial or commercial unit that is provided with a Council recycling collection service utilising a 240-litre mobile recycling bin the charge is varied to \$164;
- 14 Pursuant to Section 94(1) of the Act, makes the following service rates for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027:

- a) a Green Waste (FOGO) Collection Charge of \$137 for each residential or commercial unit that is provided with a Council Green Waste (FOGO) collection service ;
- 15 Pursuant to Section 93 of the Act, makes the following service rates for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to June 2027;
- a) a Stormwater Removal Rate of 0.006828 cents in the dollar of capital value of such rateable land within the municipal area.
- 16 Pursuant to Section 93(3) of the Act, in making a Stormwater Removal Rate sets a minimum amount of \$110, in respect of all rateable land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to June 2027;
- 17 Pursuant to Section 129(4) of the Act, by absolute majority, determines that for a member of the class of ratepayers' whose liability to pay the Stormwater Removal Rate assessed in accordance with this Resolution Part 15 arises for more than one property in the municipal area a remission of the Stormwater Removal Rate shall automatically be granted for such of that members properties which:-
- a) only have erected upon them a boat shed, jetty, ramp or similar structure for access to littoral or riparian waters; or
- b) do not have the qualities of a minimum lot, as defined by the Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1993 (except where such land could be adhered to other lands in the same ownership so as to comprise a block which has the qualities of a minimum lot); and
- c) the above remission may be withdrawn where the rates have not been paid in full by the due date;
- 18 Pursuant to Section 93A of the Act and the provisions of the *Fire Service Act 1979 (as amended)*, makes the following rates for land within the municipal area for the period 1 July 2026 to 30 June 2027:
- a) a Permanent Brigade District Fire Rate of 0.041281 cents in the dollar of capital value, subject to a minimum amount of \$52 in respect of all rateable land within the Permanent Brigade Rating District.
- b) a Volunteer Brigade District Fire Rate of 0.012445 cents in the dollar of capital value, subject to a minimum amount of \$52 in respect of all rateable land within Volunteer Brigade Rating District.
- c) a General Land Fire Rate of 0.010551 cents in the dollar of capital value, subject to a minimum amount of \$52 in respect of all rateable land within the municipal area, which is not within the Permanent Brigade Rating District, or the Volunteer Brigade Rating District;
- 19 Pursuant to Section 124 of the Act, resolves the rates for 2026/27 shall be payable in four instalments, the dates by which the rates are due to be paid are:
- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| First Instalment | 17 August 2026 |
| Second Instalment | 30 October 2026 |
| Third Instalment | 29 January 2027 |
| Fourth Instalment | 30 April 2027 |

- 20 Pursuant to Section 128 of the Act, resolves where an amount of rates remains unpaid after the due date, a penalty of 5% of the unpaid amount, together with interest on the unpaid amount at a rate of 10.64% per annum calculated daily in arrears, shall be applied;
- 21 Pursuant with Sections 89A, 92 and 109N of the Act resolves:
- a) if a supplementary valuation is made of any land prior to 30 June 2027, the Chief Executive Officer may at his discretion adjust the amount payable in respect of any or all rates for that land for that financial year in line with the new valuation; and
 - b) If a rates notice is issued by the Chief Executive Officer under sub-clause (a), the amount shown as payable on that notice is due to be paid within 30 days of the date on which that notice is issued.
- 22 Pursuant to Section 82 of the Act:
- a) adopts the Capital Works Program for the 2026/27 financial year as detailed in the Annual Estimates, Attachment 2; and
 - b) in accordance with section 82(6) of the Act, by absolute majority, authorises the Chief Executive Officer to make minor adjustments up to \$150,000 to any individual estimate item as he deems necessary during the 2026/27 financial year provided that the total of the Estimates remains unaltered.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That Council:

Clause 6 ; "Pursuant to Section 107 of the Act, by absolute majority, hereby varies the General Rate component (as previously made) for land within the municipal area which is used or predominantly used for residential short stay visitor accommodation predominately used for commercial purposes to a Commercial rate of 0.513355 cents in the dollar of capital value of such rateable land."

Cr Antolli left the room at 8:28pm
Cr Antolli returned at 8:29pm

Cr Richardson left the room at 8:31pm
Cr Richardson returned at 8:33pm

In Favour: Crs Gideon Cordover, Flora Fox

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

AMENDMENT LOST

MOTION

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Cr Antolli be allowed an additional three minutes to speak.

In Favour: Crs Christian Street, Aldo Antolli, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Amanda Midgley and Mark Richardson

Against: Cr Flora Fox

CARRIED 7/1

The original recommendation was then put.

In Favour: Crs Christian Street, David Bain, Gideon Cordover, Kaspar Deane, Flora Fox, Amanda Midgley and Mark Richardson

Against: Cr Aldo Antolli

CARRIED 7/1

C195/11-2026

15.5 NOMINATION OF LICENSED PERSON

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That upon being issued a building services licence and deemed a licenced person in accordance with the Occupational Licensing Act 2005, Council nominates Nicholas Sale, Jason Groombridge and Abdullah Sakib, pursuant to s.24(2)(b)(i) of the Act, to perform the functions or powers of the Permit Authority within the Kingborough Council municipal area.

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

At the time the Minutes was compiled there were no Notices of Motion received.

17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

C196/11-2026

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

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*

Tender Assessment - AB2604 Kingston Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 2

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

Dennes Point Hall Gallery Lease

Regulation 17(2)(d)(i) *commercial information of a confidential nature, that if disclosed, is likely to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it.*

Contractual Matter

Regulation 17(2)(d)(ii) *commercial information of a confidential nature, that if disclosed, is likely to confer a commercial advantage on a competitor of the council.*

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 9:06pm

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 9:06pm for a short break before the closed session.

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 9:39pm

C197/11-2026

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

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	Approved
Applications for Leave of Absence	Nil
21.1 Tender Assessment - AB2604 Kingston Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 2	Approved
21.2 Dennes Point Hall Gallery Lease	Determined
21.3 Contractual Matter	Approved

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 9:40pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)