



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

20 July 2026

These Minutes are provided for the assistance and information of members of the public, and are a draft until confirmed as a true record at the next Ordinary Meeting of Council.

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
C217/13-2026	3	Apologies	1
C218/13-2026	4	Confirmation of Minutes	1
	5	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	6	Declarations of Interest	2
	7	Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C219/13-2026	8	Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1	Gallaghers Road	2
	8.2	TPC Hearings	2
C220/13-2026	9	Questions on Notice from the Public	4
	9.1	Huntingfield School Zone Sign	4
	9.2	Schedule for Sirius Drive to Park and Ride Path	5
	9.3	Middleton Foreshore	5
	9.4	Potholes on Moody's and Allens Rivulet Roads	5
	9.5	Complaints Management Policy	6
	9.6	Hutchins Street Lane Closure Traffic Data Collected	6
C221/13-2026	10	Questions without Notice from Councillors	7
	10.1	Feral Deer	7
	10.2	Aquatic Facility	7
	10.3	Feasibility Study	8
C222/13-2026	11	Questions on Notice from Councillors	8
	11.1	Waste Strategy	8
	11.2	Leslie Vale Waste Service Opt-Outs	8
	11.3	Leslie Vale Waste Extension Bin Sizes	9
	12	Petitions still being Actioned	10
	13	Petitions Received In Last Period	10
	14	Officers Reports to Council	10
C223/13-2026	14.1	Audit of Delegations	10
C224/13-2026	14.2	Election Caretaker Period Policy	10
C225/13-2026	14.3	Local Government Association of Tasmania General Management Committee Voting	10
C226/13-2026	14.4	Appendices	11
	15	Notices of Motion	11
C227/13-2026	16	Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	11

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 20 July 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 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 Engineering Services	Mr Craig Mackey
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services	Mr Daniel Smee
Director Environment, Development & Community Services	Mrs Deleeze Chetcuti
Communications Officer	Mr Stuart Heather
Executive Assistant	Mrs Amanda Morton

C217/13-2026

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor A Antolli

C218/13-2026

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr David Bain

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 12 held on 6 July 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

CARRIED

5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

Date	Topic	Detail	Consultant
13 July 2026	SGS Economics Report Strategic Asset Management Planning (SAMP) Workshop	Report into government investment in Southern Tasmania An update on progress on the Strategic Asset Management Plan	Lisa Bennetto – EO Greater Hobart Councils Partnership Ashay Prabhu - Modelve

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C219/13-2026

8 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

Ms Kim Phillips asked the following questions without notice:

8.1 Gallaghers Road

I've had a local resident share an email with me and asked me to follow up for them. The last email they have is from 18 August in 2025, where there's an issue with the top section of Gallaghers Road where the turning circle has collapsed down into the drain, making it difficult for council equipment to get out there to perform any maintenance work. Where are we at with that please because they were told that they would have some update on what was happening and have not since?

Director Engineering Services responds:

Apologies, I'm not familiar with that road or that issue, but I can take that question on notice and come back to you.

Ms Allison Rogers asked the following questions without notice:

8.2 TPC Hearings

In the most recent hearings for the draft LPS with the TPC, the ones that took place in June, the Planning Authority have indicated on a number of occasions that there needs to be further review of zoning in Kingborough and has even indicated that some of the zones allocated in the current iteration, that being the IreneInc report, may change subsequent to that strategic review. Under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, commonly known as LUPA, when a council acting as a planning authority reviews its local provision schedule or prepares amendments, its obligations to landowners and ratepayers primarily centre around public notification, consultation and the right to be heard. I think it's safe to say that in the most recent process around the draft LPS that maybe that fell short of the mark from the public perspective. Obviously the key obligations included public notification and exhibition, advertising in the local paper and an exhibition period that allows those documents to be made for public inspection. The position of the council at that point seem to be that as long as the minimum statutory requirements were fulfilled, that you were doing your role in that. My

question is, given the last couple of years around the draft LPS, why hasn't that strategic review been done during the creation of what we've ended up with as four iterations of the draft LPS?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

You are correct. There is strategic work to be done and that will then inform potentially future changes to the LPS. We don't anticipate that will be done as one overall review. It will relate potentially to different areas, different matters, so for example, we might be looking at a structure plan for Kingston or, like Huon Valley has done, looking at the rural living settlements. We acknowledge that it would have been nice to have done a lot of this work either before or through the process. We haven't had capacity to do that as the LPS has been quite consuming. In addition to that, the timing of various things sometimes isn't up to us either. For example, the timing of the LPS and the new planning scheme, that's all determined by the State and you just sort of have to fit in to where you're at. In saying that, we definitely know it's needed and there will be a focus on determining what it is and what those priorities are and as part of any of that work, there will be consultation. So, of course, there's the minimum consultation under LUPA, as you pointed out, but I think it's really important that in developing what those potential plans are or changes that the consultation is done to inform that, then you would go to consultation under the legislation, that will be our plan. We don't have specific details around what it all looks like. We are just starting to get our head in that space and thinking about mapping that work out.

Ms Rogers:

My second question was going to be exactly that. Have the Council developed a policy yet around that and what that would look like? Given that you haven't, is there a process or a time frame that you will go through to determine how that consultation will occur in the future? My concern is that even as recently as the forum that we had on the disaster resilience policy, that it appears that cost can be a barrier for consulting with stakeholders, whoever they might be. I'm just wondering if there is now a position around that? I think it's safe to say that the cost many years ago in relation to the draft LPS may have been less had that mail out occurred initially and so therefore, what steps are the Council going to take to ensure that cost isn't always a barrier to public consultation?

Acting Mayor:

It's indulgent for me to answer this question, Ms Rogers, because ultimately we're having an election in October, and I think the work with respect to strategic planning outcomes is going to happen after that, realistically, given what Ms Chetcuti has said. But I think you can take it as an absolute even that as somebody who has now been on Council through the LPS process and is now the Acting Mayor as it draws to its conclusion, there is no possible way that consultation in relation to strategic planning decisions in future would be conducted in the same manner as the LPS for as long as I remain on Council and for as long as I remain in this role, but noting that, of course, that's unlikely to happen before October. And for that same reason, I think it's very difficult to give you timeframes around when that work's going to occur and what the consultation package is going to look like. But, like I said, I think you can take it as a given that while there are Councillors in this room that remain around the table when those decisions are made, that consultation is going to look very different.

Ms Rogers:

Given that there is some more strategic reviewing to be done around zoning and land use, will those changes incur a cost to a landowner in terms of if they are going to apply for a change of zone? So if we say theoretically this landowner may be zoned rural, for example, in this current LPS, and they then want to query that and ask for a rural living consideration, given that there's still an outstanding strategic review of things, will that come at a cost to the landowner itself going through that process, or are Council going to take into consideration the fact that this perhaps should have taken place simultaneously with this current draft LPS?

Acting Mayor:

We might want to take it on notice, Ms Rogers, but can I just clarify your question? Is what you're asking is if Council were to undertake some future strategic planning work that dictated that a change

of zoning was warranted for a particular area, would a resident in that area be required to pay if they made a representation to the consultation?

Ms Rogers:

Not knowing how this consultation and review is going to take place moving forward, I'm just reflecting on something that the Planning Authority mentioned during one of the most recent hearings. The question by the Tasmanian Planning Commission was, have you strategically chosen the right zone? And then the answer by the Planning Authority was that there could possibly be more strategic review around that and that some of these zones may well change as a result of that. So getting back to my first question, this current iteration has been going on for nearly a decade. Shouldn't that review have happened simultaneously before delivering that draft LPS and therefore if in the short term something does change, is that going to be at a landowner's expense because they are also querying the end result, or is that something that will be considered in that process?

Chief Executive Officer:

First of all, I'd note that there's still a process that's live and underway at the moment, so there's no final determinations about the zones until the TPC makes it, and there's a great degree of analysis that the TPC will be putting into it. I will note that the Council's information profit is only one part of that equation, and the TPC still will remain to make their determinations. As has been pointed out in the previous questions, the programme that Council will undertake with future strategic work won't necessarily be a cross-municipal piece of work. It'll likely be focused on specific areas where more work needs to be done to consider what the future looks like there. I think that's quite different from the process that we're in at the moment with the migration to the LPS. Where a member of the community decides to undertake a private plan change or scheme change, I think there's likely to be a cost in that. We're certainly not in a position to say, no, that's something that will be funded, that there is a cost associated with that. Where it forms part of a Council programme, I would suggest that that's a cost that will be part of Council's work that's undertaken there so I guess the answer is: it depends.

C220/13-2026

9 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

9.1 Huntingfield School Zone Sign

Mr Mark Donnellon submitted the following question on notice:

Regarding the new road connecting to Huntingfield Avenue at the intersection of Nautilus Grove, where Huntingfield Avenue and Nautilus Grove were already school zones. Should this new road which lead into an existing school zone have had a school zone sign before it was opened to the public? What standards or regulations apply in this circumstance?

Officer's Response:

Yes. Where a new road creates an additional approach into an existing school zone, the need for school zone signage should be assessed as part of the subdivision and road opening process so motorists entering the area are aware of the reduced speed limit during school zone operating times.

In this instance, the need to extend the existing school zone to include the new road approach was not identified before the road was opened to the public and, consequently, an application to extend the school zone was not made prior to the road opening.

Once Council became aware that the new approach was not included within the existing approved school zone, Council assessed the changed traffic and pedestrian movements and applied to the Transport Commissioner to extend the school zone. The application was approved and Council has since installed interim static school zone signs pending installation of permanent flashing school zone signs by Building Tasmania (formerly the Department of State Growth).

Under the *Traffic Act 1925*, only the Transport Commissioner can approve a new or extended school zone. Council's role is to identify the need and apply for approval. School zone speed limit signs cannot be installed until that approval has been granted. The design and installation of school zone signage is undertaken in accordance with *Australian Standard AS 1742 – Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* and the requirements of the State road authority. School zones and associated speed limits are established under the *Traffic Act 1925*.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.2 Schedule for Sirius Drive to Park and Ride Path

Mr Mark Donnellon submitted the following question on notice:

The 26/27 financial year budget has \$350,000 allocated to a path in Huntingfield between Sirius Drive and the Park and Ride. Is construction of this project scheduled and can the council provide an estimate for when construction may start and end?

Officer's Response:

Council is currently expecting construction on Sirius Drive and the Huntingfield Park and Ride to start between January and March of 2027, subject to obtaining the Heritage Tasmania permit.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.3 Middleton Foreshore

Mr Joel Hodson submitted the following question on notice:

What was the outcome of Action 63 of the 2019 Open Space Strategy? This is regarding the Middleton foreshore?

Officer's Response:

Action 63 of the Kingborough Open Space Strategy recommended a review of the play equipment on the Middleton Foreshore. This was undertaken in 2020 as part of an audit of all of Council's play spaces, which found that the condition of the equipment was "acceptable". Given that the playground is located within the coastal hazards zone, the current thinking regarding its future is not to replace equipment at this location once it reaches the end of its asset life and to focus future upgrades on the play space at the Middleton Hall.

Daniel Smee, Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services

9.4 Potholes on Moody's and Allens Rivulet Roads

Ms Kim Phillips submitted the following question on notice:

I've also heard numerous complaints about potholes on Moody's and Allens Rivulet Roads. Apparently there have been numerous emails and/or complaints sent to Council. I'm just wondering if we can have an estimate on when they might be addressed?

Officer's Response:

Council has received an increased number of road maintenance requests following the significant rainfall event in June. All requests are being assessed and prioritised in accordance with road safety,

condition and available resources. Works to address potholes on Moody's Road and Allens Rivulet Road are currently programmed to be completed by the end of July.

In addition, Council is scoping a review of its road grading practices. This review will consider drainage, road formation, material selection, repair standards, resourcing, and the way grader schedules are communicated to the community.

As part of this work, Council is publishing its weekly grading schedule through its social media channels and will do through its website in the future so residents can see when grading is planned for their area. Council intends to provide a longer forward schedule once the current backlog of reactive grading works has been completed.

Jade Jones, Manager Works

9.5 Complaints Management Policy

Ms Emma McNab submitted the following question on notice:

Can Council please answer what their complaints management policy is in response to an initial complaint, the time frame to respond?

Officer's Response:

Kingborough Council's Complaints Management Policy provides that all complaints are recorded and acknowledged within five business days of being received (this is usually an immediate response).

Following an initial assessment, Council will determine the most appropriate way to manage the complaint.

Where a complaint requires investigation, it is referred to the relevant team or manager. The policy states that Council aims to complete complaint investigations within 15 working days. If an investigation is expected to take longer, the complainant will be advised and provided with progress updates every 10 working days until the matter is finalised. A written response outlining the outcome of the investigation and the reasons for the decision will then be provided

Dave Stewart, Chief Executive Officer

9.6 Hutchins Street Lane Closure Traffic Data Collected

Mr Donnellon submitted the following question on notice:

Hutchins Street uphill lane was recently closed for a while. There are a lot of reasons the Council might consider closing this or nearby lanes again, like special events, other construction work, or reconfiguration of the road network. Was any data collected around the effects of closing that lane of traffic? That data would be useful to help inform how to better mitigate negative impacts in changing the road configuration.

Officer's Response:

Potential traffic and travel impacts are considered during the planning stages of all road works and events. The level of assessment undertaken depends on factors such as the location of the works, traffic volumes, and the potential for significant disruption. Where greater impacts are anticipated, more detailed Traffic Impact Assessments may be completed to help inform traffic management arrangements.

During the Hutchins Street works, traffic conditions were regularly observed and monitored. While formal traffic data was not collected, the impacts experienced were generally consistent with what had

been anticipated during planning. One factor that had a slightly greater effect than expected was traffic circulating through the Channel Highway roundabouts, which affected the rate at which vehicles could exit Hutchins Street. As expected, these delays were most noticeable during short periods of higher traffic demand around lunchtime and in the mid-afternoon peak.

Vimbai Mavenga, Manager Program Office

C221/13-2026

10 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

Cr Cordover asked the following questions without notice:

10.1 Feral Deer

In June, the Invasive Species Council and Frontier Economics released their report called A Buck Too Far: An Analysis of the Economic, Social and Environmental Cost of Deer in Tasmania. That report found that in the Midlands and eastern regions alone, feral deer are already costing Tasmania more than \$53 million annually and they're estimating almost \$1.4 billion costs over the next 30 years. Where it relates to Kingborough, alarmingly, those figures don't incorporate the true cost of the year because that analysis was limited to the Midlands and eastern regions where the population data is available. So it also doesn't fully quantify the impacts to biodiversity and Aboriginal cultural heritage disease risk, as feral deer populations can be a reservoir and vector for disease, particularly around foot and mouth. Will our Council undertake an analysis to determine the costs to Kingborough feral deer, including costs to agriculture, damage to public reserves, vehicle damage and staff and resources management, particularly around Bruny Island and the feral deer population there?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

We acknowledge that feral deer are a problem in Kingborough, but statewide as well, and we did endorse the Tasmanian government strategy on the eradication. Where we come into play is supporting that with the officers from NRE through education and monitoring etc. To my knowledge, we've don't have any further plans than that with the DEA. However, it's probably watch this space in terms of potential impacts to Kingborough and primarily it's a State Government role, but we do need to support that. So, potentially, we might do that, but at this point in time, it's not planned.

Cr Cordover:

Does Kingborough Council support an increased State Government funding and reform for feral deer control, particularly around eradication? Do we currently support more funding from the State Government for deer control or we don't yet have policy on that?

Acting Mayor:

No, we don't have a position in relation to that.

10.2 Aquatic Facility

Can we have an update regarding the Kingborough Aquatic Facility Steering Committee for which the meetings are currently paused. My first question on that really relates to have we had any engagement from the Sports Minister, Nick Duigan? Have we sent correspondence to the Sports Minister, letting the Sports Minister know about Kingborough's intentions regarding an aquatic facility?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

No, we haven't sent a correspondence to the Minister. The reason the committee was paused was because we were waiting on the outcome of a grant funding application, but we were subsequently

unsuccessful in that. However, we've continued to pause the meetings because there is a body of work being undertaken at a regional level. There's a regional sport and rec strategy that is being prepared that will consider the issue of an aquatic facility for Kingborough as part of it, and that will be the subject of a future Council workshop.

10.3 Feasibility Study

Is the feasibility study undertaken in February 2021 still current, or will it need to be updated with respect to the initiative that's just been discussed, or is it still considered to be a relevant document, or is it now considered out of date?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

The document has some relevance, but I'd suggest that given the period of time and in particular the cost escalation in relation to the construction costs, which everyone knows have multiplied significantly over the past five years, there would need to be updating of that document in relation to costs and the associated implications for Council.

C222/13-2026

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

11.1 Waste Strategy

Cr Amanda Midgley submitted the following question on notice:

Can we please have an update on the development of the Waste Strategy and its completion date. Will the draft be provided to community for input

Officer's Response:

The final draft of the Waste Strategy Scope of Works is now complete and ready to be released to the market as a Request for Quotation (RFQ).

A detailed project timeline will be confirmed once market responses have been received and evaluated. However, it is anticipated that the Waste Strategy will be completed approximately six months following the award of the contract.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

11.2 Leslie Vale Waste Service Opt-Outs

Cr Kaspar Deane submitted the following question on notice:

We, as Councillors, gave indicative support for an extension of the waste service to a part of Leslie Vale, and we've had correspondence from some residents for it and some residents, obviously, against it. Those against have sought clarification as to why there isn't an opt-out clause for those residents, claiming that other councils have provided that opt-out clause. So, could it please, even if it's on notice, provide a response and the specific piece of policy or legislation that indicates why we couldn't, if we can't, provide opt-out provisions for those residents in Leslie Vale, just so it's clear and on the record?

Officer's Response:

The relevant provisions are Sections 93 and 94 of the *Local Government Act 1993* (Tas). Section 93 permits councils to levy a service rate for waste management, while Section 94 permits councils to

levy a service charge for services that are supplied or made available to land. Specifically, Section 94(1) provides that a council may make a service charge for services that it "supplies or makes available", and Section 94(3) allows a council to vary the charge between different parts of the municipal area where different service areas exist.

The Act provides for councils to determine the areas to which a waste service is provided and to levy the associated charge accordingly. There is no provision within the Act that enables an individual residential property owner located within an established service area to elect to opt out of the service or the associated charge. Rather, the legislation contemplates the application of service charges to the defined service area determined by Council.

Accordingly, where Council extends the kerbside waste and recycling collection service to a defined area such as Leslie Vale, all eligible residential properties located within that service area would be charged in accordance with Council's Rates Resolution. Individual properties cannot be selectively excluded from the service or the associated charge.

To validate Council's interpretation and understand current local government practice, Council officers contacted a number of neighbouring Tasmanian councils. Those councils confirmed that they do not provide an opt-out provision for residential properties located on an established kerbside waste and recycling collection route. In each case, where a property is located within the designated service area, the applicable waste service charge is levied regardless of whether the property owner chooses to use the service.

Therefore, Council's position is based both on the legislative framework established by the Local Government Act 1993 and on the consistent practice adopted by neighbouring Tasmanian councils.

Stuart Baldwin, Manager Kingborough Waste Services

11.3 Leslie Vale Waste Extension Bin Sizes

Cr David Bain submitted the following question on notice:

Can Council advise whether Leslie Vale residents have been offered the following options as part of the extension of the kerbside waste and recycling collection service in the area:

- 1. The smallest and lowest-cost general waste bin (80L), with the option to upgrade to a larger bin if required; and*
- 2. The smallest and lowest-cost recycling bin (140L), with the option to upgrade to a 240L recycling bin if required?*

Officer's Response:

1. Yes, the standard general waste bin proposed to be provided as part of the Leslie Vale service rollout is the smallest and lowest-cost waste bin available.
2. When Council adopted its Waste Management Strategy, one of the recommended actions to improve recycling outcomes was the introduction of a larger 240L recycling bin collected fortnightly. As a result, the standard recycling bin provided for new services and replacement bins was changed from 140L to 240L.

Since then, waste and recycling behaviours have changed significantly due to the introduction of FOGO services, the Container Refund Scheme, increased higher-density housing, and ongoing requests from residents for a smaller and more manageable recycling bin option.

In response, Council staff support reintroducing the 140L recycling bin as an alternative to the 240L bin. This would provide greater flexibility for residents, a lower-cost option for households

with lower recycling volumes, and minimal financial impact on Council as collection costs are based on bin size. The current annual charges are \$108 for a 140L recycling bin and \$164 for a 240L recycling bin. Changes to property bin size can be done on a by request basis via customer services.

Stuart Baldwin, Manager Kingborough Waste Services

12 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

A report on the petition headed 'Opposition to Proposed Dog Exercise and Obedience Training Facility at Sedgebrook Road Reserve (Lot 1 Taronga Road)' will be tabled at a future Council meeting.

13 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

At the time the Minutes was compiled no Petitions had been received.

14 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C223/13-2026

14.1 AUDIT OF DELEGATIONS

Moved: Cr Mark Richardson

Seconded: Cr David Bain

That Council note that the Audit Panel has considered the resolution of the 2025 Annual General Meeting regarding delegated powers and has concluded that no further reviews of the matter are necessary.

CARRIED

C224/13-2026

14.2 ELECTION CARETAKER PERIOD POLICY

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council's updated *Election Period Caretaker Policy* (as attached to this report) be endorsed.

CARRIED

C225/13-2026

14.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA GENERAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE VOTING

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley

Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That the matter be discussed.

CARRIED

Moved: Cr Amanda Midgley
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That Council move out of discussion.

CARRIED

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That in the LGAT General Management Committee election the Mayor is authorised to complete the ballot paper on behalf of Kingborough Council casting votes for the General Management Committee:

- (i) Heather Chong as first preference
- (ii) Tim Marks as second preference

CARRIED

C226/13-2026

14.4 APPENDICES

Moved: Cr Mark Richardson
Seconded: Cr Kaspar Deane

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

CARRIED

15 NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no Notices of Motion received.

C227/13-2026

16 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

Moved: Cr Mark Richardson
Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

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*

Provision of Internal Audit services - Expression of Interest process and recommendation

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

Audit Panel Minutes

Regulation 17(2)(a), and (2)(e) *personnel matters, including complaints against an employee of the council, and contracts, and tenders, for the supply of goods and services and their terms, conditions, approval and renewal.*

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

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 6.16pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 6.31pm

C228/13-2026

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Mark Richardson

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
Provision of Internal Audit services - Expression of Interest process and recommendation	Appointment approved
Audit Panel Minutes	Noted

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6.32pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)