



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

6 July 2026

Kingborough Councillors 2022 - 2026



Acting Mayor
Councillor Christian Street



Councillor Aldo Antolli



Councillor David Bain



Councillor Gideon Cordover



Councillor Kaspar Deane



Councillor Flora Fox



Councillor Amanda Midgley



Councillor Mark Richardson

Table of Contents

Item		Page No.
Open Session		
	1 Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians	1
	2 Attendees	1
C203/12-2026	3 Apologies	1
C204/12-2026	4 Confirmation of Minutes	2
	5 Workshops held since Last Council Meeting	2
	6 Declarations of Interest	2
	7 Transfer of Agenda Items	2
C205/12-2026	8 Questions without Notice from the Public	2
	8.1 School Zone Speed Sign	2
	8.2 CCTV Cameras	3
	8.3 Bruny Island SAP	4
	8.4 Salty Dog Noise Complaint	5
	8.5 Crown Road	6
	8.6 LCZ	7
	8.7 Complaint Timeframe	8
	8.8 Thank you for Neighbourhood Watch Signs	9
	8.9 Language used in Council Meetings	10
	8.10 Middleton Foreshore	11
C206/12-2026	9 Questions on Notice from the Public	13
	9.1 Complaint regarding odour from burning incense Lewan Avenue (Council's reference: 32.10):	13
	9.2 LCZ	14
	9.3 TPC Hearing	16
	9.4 CCTV Cameras	16
	9.5 LPS Hearings	17
	9.6 Development Applications	18
C207/12-2026	10 Questions without Notice from Councillors	18
	10.1 Cat Management	18
	10.2 Council Communication and Engagement Survey	19
	10.3 Sports Precinct Update	19
	10.4 Clarification regarding Mr Donnellons Question	20
C208/12-2026	11 Questions on Notice from Councillors	21

	11.1	Council's response to investigating noise complaints at the Salty Dog Hotel:	21
	11.2	Textile Upparel Recycling	22
	11.3	Biochar Programs	22
	12	Petitions still being Actioned	22
	13	Petitions Received in Last Period	23
C209/12-2026	13.1	Opposition To Proposed Dog Exercise And Obedience Training Facility At Sedgebrook Road Reserve (Lot 1 Taronga Road)	23
	14	Officers Reports to Council	23
C210/12-2026	14.1	Appendices	23
C211/12-2026	14.2	Financial Report - May 2026	23
C212/12-2026	14.3	Kingborough Sports Precinct Development Arrangements And Land Disposal	23
	15	Notices of Motion	24
C203/12-2026	16	Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	25
C204/12-2026	21	Confirmation of Release of Closed Session Decisions	Error! Bookmark not defined

Public Copy

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 6 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 A Antolli
Councillor D Bain
Councillor K Deane
Councillor F Fox
Councillor A Midgley
Councillor M Richardson

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer
Director People & Finance
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services
Director Environment, Development & Community Services
Communications Lead
Acting Executive Assistant

Mr Dave Stewart
Mr David Spinks
Mr Daniel Smee
Mrs Deleeze Chetcuti
Ms Sam Adams
Ms Portia Jones

C205/12-2026

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor G Cordover

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

C206/12-2026

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No.11 held on 15 June 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

CARRIED

5 WORKSHOPS HELD SINCE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

Date	Topic	Detail	Consultant
22 June 2026	Social Media Policy & WHS Policies Blackmans Bay Water Quality	Discussion on draft new council policies. Presentation on Blackmans Bay water quality investigation work undertaken to date.	Dr Carryn Manicom - Marine Solutions

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C205/12-2026

8 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

8.1 School Zone Speed Sign

Mr Mark Donnellon asked the following questions without notice:

Four months ago, in a Council meeting, I raised the missing school zone sign in Huntingfield, and a sign was recently installed. What is it that made it take four months to have a school zone sign installed?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I'm talking on behalf of our engineering staff, so I just have that caveat at the beginning, is that members of the public or an organisation can apply to Council to have a road speed limit reviewed. We then have to undertake a certain data collection process, for example, traffic counts, etc. That then gets submitted to the Department of State Growth, even if it is a Council road. I believe it's the

Main Roads Commissioner who then needs to approve that. That is the only authorised entity that can approve changes to speed limits. Council did all of those things as quickly as we could and submitted it to the Department of State Growth. We then received approval a few weeks ago and installed the sign as quickly as we could.

Mr Donnellon:

There is funding allocated to a path between Sirius Drive and the Huntingfield Park and Ride in the recently passed budget, \$350,000 off the top of my head. Can you provide estimates for when construction is scheduled to begin and when the path might open?

Acting Mayor responds:

I think we'll take that question on notice, Mr Donnellon, given Mr Mackey's not with us this evening, and be able to come back with an answer in the next agenda.

Mr Donnellon:

I might also just note, I forgot I already wrote to have that on notice. Final question, 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.

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I'm not aware if we collected any data about that road closure. In general, we look at traffic management, in particular, to keep people safe during the time that construction is occurring, and we're also really aware of minimising impact on our community. That project was done well within the timeframe that it was originally allocated to achieve. A great job by the team that actually delivered that project. But we'll need to take it on notice about any data collection we did during that time. I would suspect we don't have any specific data from it, though.

Cr Richardson arrived at 5:35pm

8.2 CCTV Cameras

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

I'd like to just quickly thank Council for their work in responding to my previous questions. Half the residents around the CCTV coverage at the last meeting. However, that response has raised some further questions and concerns within the community. It appears in gathering information to answer that question, Council's identified some cameras that were not working or operating correctly, perhaps some are not fully integrated with Tasmania Police. Can Council confirm whether it was aware of those issues before that question was raised at the Council meeting on the last Council meeting?

Director Governanace, Recreation & Property Services responds:

Yes, we were.

Mr Hingston-Muir:

The response also confirmed that several CCTV cameras at Kingston Park were not functional. How long were these cameras out of order? Have they since been repaired? And if not, when can the community expect those to be repaired? When did Council realise the cameras were not functional?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

It's not the cameras that aren't functional, the cameras are actually working okay. The issue is the electrical feed to them and that electrical feed is obviously underground and it is shorting out. So the cameras have been working intermittently. It was brought to our attention by the police several weeks ago. However, they're coming on and off. We have a contractor working systematically back through the underground electrics to try and find the cause, but it's not easy. And that's why it's taking time.

Mr Hingston-Muir:

For clarification, on the June 23rd edition of the Kingborough Chronicle, an article titled CCTV Upgrades Plan at Bus Interchange included a quote from the Acting Mayor, and I quote, There is existing CCTV coverage at the Kingston bus interchange, including both new bus stops, which provides a level of oversight. However, some of this infrastructure is older, technology with lower resolution compared to current systems, end quote. However, in the written response to my question, council stated, and I quote, Council has CCTV cameras located in the roundabout at the intersection of Channel Highway, Goshawk Way and Freeman Street, but they do not provide targeted coverage of the bus interchange. I've had a few residents reach out to me, raising perhaps that these two statements appear confusing, perhaps contradictory. Given the budget includes \$200,000 to commence a new CCTV strategy, could Council clarify whether the Kingston bus interchange is currently covered by CCTV, and if not, what specific upgrades are planned, as alluded to in the article, what coverage they'll provide and when those upgrades are expected to be delivered?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

To respond to the first part of that question, the cameras that are in the roundabout, they look down the street, they have a broad lens over the new bus interchange. Unlike the one at the Commonwealth Bank that has a targeted camera, it's fixed to the awning of Dave's Noodles, it focuses specifically on that bus stop. The other one, has a far set back, the coverage is poor, the cameras are older technology, they don't have that ability to pivot. I can understand why there is perhaps some thought of ambiguity, but that was the intent to indicate that whilst the bus stop is covered, the ability to hone in on specific incidents is limited. As noted in the response, Metro do have a specific camera targeted, however that does not feed to the Kingston Police and it's not a Council camera. The second part of the question, we have a budget allocation as you have identified. This is the first instalment of a number of years of budget to implement a CCTV strategy that will look to upgrade the existing cameras in terms of their technology and functionality, integrate better, the existing cameras currently have a number of standalone systems, so all of that integrated and we would be working with TAS Police in relation to the implementation of those cameras so we get the best outcome from a crime solving and surveillance perspective.

8.3 Bruny Island SAP

Ms Teisha Archer asked the following questions without notice:

Is the Bruny Island Specific Area Plan a requirement of the LPS?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

It's a part of the current draft LPS. No SAP is a requirement. The Land Use Planning Approvals Act allows for a SAP to be a mechanism for place based control or land use planning control if it warrants that. There's no specific requirement, but it's a mechanism under the Act that can be utilised. It's utilised so I think nearly all councils have SAPs for various reasons across Tasmania. Some Councils have, between 15 and 20 different SAPs. So they're a commonly used mechanism. So at the moment the Bruny Island SAP forms part of our draft LPS that will, as most people are probably aware, there's a review underway, and pending the outcomes of that, it will then be submitted to the Planning Commission, hearings progressing.

Ms Archer:

In 2024, in response to the exhibition period proposed by Kingborough LPS, Bruny Island Community Association, Bruny Island Environment Network, and Friends of North Bruny co-signed a representation asking for the removal of the draft Bruny Island Specific Area Plan due to the lack of genuine community consultation in its development. Earlier this year, Bruny Island Environment Network and the Bruny Island Community Association attended a meeting with Council representatives and consultants undertaking the review and again rejected the SAP in its entirety due to the lack of justification, the excessive environmental controls and the general poor quality of the document, where even the consultant said that the document was clearly rushed, vague and confusing. This was shortly followed up with a co-signed letter from Bruny Island Community Association, Bruny Island Environment Network and the Kingborough Land Users Body to Council and the TPC calling again for the Bruny Island SAP to be removed from consideration in the current planning process. My question given that you've just confirmed that the Bruny Island SAP is not a requirement of the LPS, that it has clearly been rejected by the Bruny Island community, showing that Council is not aligned with the community it represents or its expectations, is Council willing to withdraw the Bruny Island SAP from current TPS process?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

The Planning Authority resolved for an independent review to be undertaken, and part of that was to do consultation both through the survey that was distributed to landowners in the SAP areas and then also with key community groups. That was undertaken and provided to the consultant who is then doing the review. The review will look at the consultation, it obviously will look at the representations. The consultation can't be used as a formal representations in accordance with considering the merits of the SAP itself. That is one part of the review. The other part of the review is where there is statutory and strategic planning merit to the SAP and then those findings will be presented to the Planning Authority and it will be then for them to determine the way forward. I would also say that we did meet with a number of community groups and there were mixed views regarding the SAP. So I think it's important that that process is allowed to be finalised and followed through before any decision is made.

Ms Archer:

And finally, is that review still on track to be presented by the end of the month to Council?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

At this stage, yes.

8.4 Salty Dog Noise Complaint

Ms Kim Phillips asked the following questions without notice:

What is the current status of action relating to the noise complaint for the Salty Dog Hotel?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

We did answer this in the agenda in response to Councillor Deane's questions.

Ms Phillips:

I didn't see that question.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

What I can say is that we have been working with a consultant to look at the monitoring, and the investigation is proceeding. Because this investigation is being undertaken under the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act* (EMPCA), we do have to be careful of process integrity, and also the privacy and confidentiality of both complainants and the owner of the facility. So we're unable to provide detailed updates in this forum, but we are working closely with both the owner and the complainants, and the investigation is progressing.

Ms Phillips:

So when are we likely to hear more?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I'm not actually sure. We are working as quickly as we can. We understand that the owner, the complainants and the community would like this resolved. So I don't have an answer to that. I hope it, you know, doesn't drag on. I'd like to think within the next few weeks, actually months.

Ms Phillips:

And then I've also heard numerous, like many, 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?

Acting Mayor responds:

Ms Phillips, I think we're probably going to have to take that question on notice because I'm not aware, and without Mr Mackey here, I'm missing my point of truth on that. I'll take that question on notice.

8.5 Crown Road

Ms Tamieka Adkins asked the following question without notice:

My questions are in relation to the responses that were given to some questions that were asked last time in the last meeting that we need some clarification on, please, because the responses weren't clear and I don't believe they addressed or answered the question. The first question was, has Council undertaken any assessment of the properties adversely affected by the Crown Road issue? Now, the response was it's not feasible to identify affected properties without manual property to property assessment. However, that doesn't actually answer the question. So the question is, has any assessment whatsoever been undertaken for affected properties?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

No, not a systematic assessment, as answered in the previous response. We don't hold all the data that we would need to be able to make that assessment.

Ms Adkins:

So it's a no.

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

That's right.

Ms Adkins:

The next question, which we also don't feel was answered with any clarification, when did Council first become aware that Crown Road frontage may prevent significant inped development. The response was the SSP came into effect in 2017. It's not unique to Kingborough Council and that we sought advice from NRE. But that still doesn't actually answer the question. The question was when did Kingborough Council first become aware that this would materially affect landowners in Kingborough?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Not with any great certainty apart from the fact that It's been a known requirement of the SPPs for nearly a decade. In terms of how it would impact specific properties or the scale of that, I can't answer with any certainty as to when. Certainly when the strong concerns were raised by the community, which we acknowledged and heard and acted on. We sought advice from the external agencies and we have passed on those concerns plus that advice to the SPO and to the TPC so that they have it on record in terms of their assessments and any future reviews that they do. As stated in the response, this is a statewide issue and other Councils are, I suppose, having to manage this issue for different properties across Tasmania.

Ms Adkins:

Why weren't affected landowners individually notified. So The Council response to the question about when they first became aware of the Crown Road provisions issue, it was said that officers have only ever advised information would be provided through the newsletter. Now we didn't actually ask how it was being provided, it was why weren't they individually contacted? So the question is, given that the Council now accepts that the issue could materially affect future development opportunities, why did the Council choose a general newsletter rather than directly notifying any impacted landowner?

Acting Mayor responds:

Just so that I'm clear, Ms Atkins, you're talking about notification generally of zoning chambers or notification specifically with respect to the Crown Road issue? I think the logical answer to that question is because it's incredibly difficult for us to have the data in order to be able to notify those landowners in any event, which has been borne out in the answers to your other questions.

8.6 Impact of Proposed Zoning on Future Development

Ms Natisha Knight asked the following questions without notice:

This goes back to Deleeze, your response to my questions from last fortnight, last three weeks ago. Just around the future development. Council's response notes that existing lawful

development approvals are not affected by the current zoning proposals. Can Council confirm whether it accepts that vacant titled replacement dwellings and future development applications may still be adversely affected by the proposed rural and landscape conservation zoning where permanent legal road access cannot be demonstrated and if so, why was that consequence not clearly communicated to affected landowners before zoning recommendations were made?

Director Enviroment, Development & Community Services responds:

I think the response is similar to what the Mayor just stated in that it would have been incredibly difficult to identify those impacted landowners to do that. What we did outline in our response as well is that it's a provision of the SPP and across all the different zones from interim schemes to the TPS, there have been many changes from interim schemes to the TPS that impact future development, not just in LCZ or rural living or rural ect. This is one example of that, and we acknowledge that there's a different, I suppose, spectrum of the types of impacts that those changes may have on landowners. However, in terms of drafting an LPS, that is not something that Councils are, I suppose, A, are required to do, but B, could not do because of the very many changes and the hundreds and hundreds, or thousands of landowners that would be impacted in terms if we had to communicate all the different changes under each zone from interim schemes to TPS. In terms of the comments regarding the newsletter, my understanding of the question last week was that reference was made to a council meeting where it was believed that it was stated that it would be provided in notification to be provided by letter. We've reviewed that and we talked about the newsletter. I believe, Council, have tried very hard to answer the questions and we really don't have any more information available to us to share at this point in time on the matter. In terms of future developments, we will be required to assess against the scheme in force at that time, and we will do what we can, application by application, to make sure our assessment provides the most practical and reasonable way forward for the landowner within the provisions of the scheme.

Ms Knight:

Council has advised that development standards were not assessed by a property by property basis when recommending zoning outcomes. If Council did not assess whether individual properties could realistically satisfy one of the fundamental development standards of the proposed zones, on what basis can Council assure landowners that the recommended rural and landscape conservation zone is actually appropriate for their properties?

Director Enviroment, Development & Community Services responds:

I think I've probably exhausted my responses on this one in that in terms of applying the zoning under a draft LPS, we don't look to every provision of every zone and how it is going to change, and in terms of how zoning is then applied. It has been raised with the TPC and we've also encouraged landowners who are potentially affected to raise this with their representations at the TPC as well. I'm not sure whether they can really consider it in accordance, for example, with Section 8A, ect but there's no harm in raising it and having it, I suppose, on the record for their deliberations.

8.7 Complaint Timeframe

Ms Emma McNab asked the following questions without notice:

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

Acting Mayor responds:

We're going to have to take that question on notice. We'll review the policy and answer the question on notice.

Ms McNab:

I can tell you, having just read it, it's five business days, but that's okay. In regards to Lewan Avenue, the matter 3210, I can see Council's notice, questions on notice response, I'm sure we'll get into that shortly. In regards to this matter, that process has not been followed twice. We've submitted an initial complaint and a subsequent complaint, and both times we have not received a response in that timeframe. This is a fairly basic function of Council, can I ask why that's not being performed?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I'm sorry to hear if the process hasn't been followed exactly as the Acting Mayor just touched on, I would need to go back and have a look at the detail of the complaints policy to familiarise myself with that and test this scenario that you're talking about against it. In the particular case you're talking about, it's a bit of a detailed one, it required an investigation out in the field and looking into an issue. It's not as straightforward as just writing a response. There is practical legwork required. There may have been some exacerbating circumstances in terms of how Council was able to respond to that. I will look into it further.

Ms McNab

What comfort can rates pay as residents in the community have that matters are therefore handled in a timely manner if you can't perform that basic function?

Acting Mayor responds:

I'm not sure I'm going to accept the premise of the last part of your question, but I'll ask Mr Stewart to respond.

Chief Executive Officer responds:

As well I don't quite accept the premise of the question in terms of the, due to the previous answer I provided. Sometimes there are situations that are more complex. This isn't a purely internal looking process issue, we're investigating an external situation and so that takes time. However, Council has a suite of policies that guide how we undertake our work. We do everything we can to achieve the service level that those policies provide for and to deliver a quality outcome for our communities. Sometimes like the various situations we find, they're not particularly clear cut. They often have a degree of judgment and we have to balance those different drivers and different perspectives that are in the community in order to be able to respond to different issues and complaints on a balanced basis.

8.8 Thank you for Neighbourhood Watch Signs

Mr Steve Parsell thanked Council for the following:

Mine's not a question. It's a thank you. On behalf of the organisation that I represent or part of, Kingston Neighbourhood Watch, thank the Council for your quick response and assistance in putting up the new Neighbourhood Watch signs that have gone up within the Kingborough area. We thank you for your help for that.

Acting Mayor Responded:

I'm trying to figure out whether there's any way to take that as a question, but I don't think there is so I am just going to say thank you.

8.9 Language used in Council Meetings

Mr Anthony Polson asked the following questions without notice:

Last meeting was my first full meeting. I've been to a couple of half meetings and I have to be honest, I was a little bit disappointed at the jargon and the acronyms. I was lost. You know, I'm a reasonably intelligent person. well educated, reasonably well read, and I spent a lot of the meeting trying to look up acronyms. Some of them I found very hard to find. SSVAs was a particularly hard one. So I thought that I would really feel for people who had, you know, some sort of impairment disability. So my question is, would the council consider some way of simplifying that, explaining, in my industry, is the health industry, you know, we try not to use acronyms and too much jargon around patients and relatives. So is there a way that the Council can look at maybe making that a bit more accessible?

Acting Mayor Repsonds:

I think it's a fair point. Very well made. I don't even think I remember what SSVA stands for, now that you mentioned it.

Mr Polson:

Well, not just that, the LCZs and the LPSs and we could go on and on.

Acting Mayor Repsonds:

Absolutely.

Mr Polson:

Yeah, I missed a lot of the meeting as a result, so I went back and listened to it.

Acting Mayor Repsonds:

I think it's a timely reminder to all of Councillor's and staff that there's more that we can do to make meetings and the things that we do more accessible. And especially, like you point out, in circumstances where we know that 50 per cent of Tasmanians are functionally illiterate and innumerate, and that is just the unfortunate reality of the circumstances of many Tasmanians. I think it's a fair thing that we look at how we communicate and do a better job. So I think it's a fair point well made, and I'm glad that the CEO is here to listen to that as well as all of my Council colleagues.

Mr Polson:

I think it took about nine days for the audio to get onto the website. So I was frustrated because I think it was, pretty sure, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I had my notes and I had what I thought was in the meeting and then I was getting edgy waiting for this to come on. I think it was Friday after the meeting, you know, like about nine days later, I could be wrong. I kept looking and looking for the minutes, and it came onto the website eventually, and I was wondering why it takes so long on uploading an MP3 to a website?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I will note that the YouTube video is available immediately, so it's live streamed to the council meeting, and then it's immediately available on YouTube. So you can always have a look there. You can probably get a bit more look and feel from the visuals as part of that as well. So I will note that that's available immediately post the meeting. Look, take your point around the minutes and the audio recording. As you will note, when we do have a lot of questions and answers, there's a lot of information to be transcribed into the minutes. then there's a quality control check that we need to have across that. So that all takes time. And the more and more questions we have, the more effort and work that that takes. Not that I'm in any way trying to diminish people asking questions, but it's just a reality that there's a bit of work in that. So we'll do our level best to make sure that those recordings and minutes are available as quick as we can, but it's just a reality of, I guess, the process that goes in behind the scenes.

Mr Polson:

Yes, okay. I just found out that it was on YouTube, as in accessible. I only thought it was on the website, so that's why I was hanging out for it to turn up there. My third question, with the digital strategy, are there plans for the council to have an opt-out option for people if they want to opt out at any point for any part of anything to do with the digital strategy?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

Yeah, so the digital strategy is a suite of tools and approaches that we'll be using in council to help us first and foremost do things more effectively internally. So many of the things that are happening within there, you might not necessarily from the outside see, but there'll be process improvements, efficiencies that we can gain inside the organisation, process engineering, those types of things that will go on behind making this a a smarter and faster organisation to turn things around. In terms of the customer or community facing elements of that, look, it's not an exclusively a digital approach. There will be elements that are digital-first, so making many of our tools available on the website and making it the easiest way for people to engage with us. But none of this diminishes the fact that we will still have a customer service approach. You still have the customer service center that you can come in and talk to people. So none of that face-to-face is removed from the process. So I can't think of a single example where it'll solely be a digital approach that we'll be taking. What it is is that many people will prefer to engage with us that way, so it's providing more fit-for-purpose tools in terms of how people engage with council.

8.10 Middleton Foreshore

Mr Joel Hodson asked the following questions without notice:

Can I say a thank you as well, just to Council?

Acting Mayor responded:

I'm not going to get into a habit of this Mr Hodson, but if you're quick.

Mr Hodson:

Yes, I will be quick. I've listened to and looked at a few other policies that other councils have regarding Question Time and it's nice that we don't have like, we do have limitations in questions that we can ask, but as of yet, there's no limitation in time. that we may take to do that, and it's really great. I'm really grateful for that, personally, and I'm sure many other people are. Thank you.

Mr Hodson:

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

Acting Mayor Responds:

I suspect we will have take that on notice.

Mr Hodson:

I'm asking this parallel to, not for, the South Channel Ratepayers Association. Recently there's been some discussion and both Councillor and our CEO attended a meeting with the association regarding the foreshore area. I'm curious about my understanding there hasn't been any climate change coastal inundation reporting or mapping done for that area, none that I could find it anyway. I'm curious if that's something that Council is going to be or is undertaking, considering the answers to some of the questions that the Ratepayers Association received regarding work on the foreshore.

Chief Executive Officer responds:

So I'm not aware of any specific mapping that we have either done or planned in relation to the length of the Middleton foreshore there. I do remember the answers that I provided to the Ratepayers Association during the meeting that I had with them, and it was specifically about a playground there that they were asking for basically a renewal of, and I indicated that the data that we had and the condition rating of that playground still indicated that it had a fair degree of useful life. I did indicate, though, that there may be a move to relocate it at a later stage before when it was redeveloped, when it came time in its renewal cycle for that, due to concern around coastal inundation and the fact that that the water may come across it. I then post that meeting, went down and had a look at it as well. Without the data and without doing studies, I'm still pretty confident in that response that I provided, which was based on the advice that I've received from the team, that it is a low lying area with high tides, storm events, there's the risk of that having water across it more and more. And I think for long-term benefit, it may be a good idea for council to consider whether or not that is renewed at the same site or whether or not it was really relocated.

Mr Hodson:

With that in mind, with the understanding that there is the potential for inundation there, will council look at undertaking some some studies and management of that area, specifically because it is an area that's used by local traffic. It is a location, a nearest safe place location in the event of, say, a bushfire, for instance?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

Coastal inundation and the impacts of climate change is something that we need to grapple with right across the sort of length and breadth of Kingborough and not just Kingborough that's, you know, applies around Tasmania and around Australia, the world. There's no easy answer to it, let's be honest. There's always going to be a balance of the different options that are available to councils. and to other government agencies in terms of how we respond. Kingborough is part of a project working with the Local Government Association of Tasmania and a couple of other councils principally, but I think 19 councils in total have signed up to it, looking at sort of our coastal environments and what needs to be done there. I don't have the details of that top of mind, but it is something we're looking at a more strategic level about how local government authorities manage the impacts of our vulnerable coastlines.

Cr Antolli left the room at 6:11pm

Cr Antolli returned at 6:13pm

C206/12-2026

9 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

**9.1 COMPLAINT REGARDING ODOUR FROM BURNING INCENSE LEWAN AVENUE
(COUNCIL'S REFERENCE: 32.10):**

Emma McNab on behalf of Sarah and Phillip Freeman, Nicole Page, Elene Jonson and Barry Salter submitted the following question on notice:

1. Can Council explain what criteria or threshold must be satisfied before it will investigate and/or take enforcement action in relation to odour complaints under the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994? Specifically, what factors are considered when determining whether an odour constitutes an environmental nuisance?
2. Can Council detail the investigation undertaken in relation to our incense odour complaint, including:
 - the number and dates of site inspections;
 - the times of day at which inspections occurred;
 - whether any inspections were conducted during the evening, late night or outside normal business hours when the odour was reported to occur most frequently;
 - whether weather conditions and wind direction were considered; and
 - what evidence was relied upon in concluding that the statutory threshold for an environmental nuisance had not been met?
3. During the investigation, Council officers advised complainants that Council's "hands were tied", that incense burning was a grey area, and that Council could not take enforcement action. However, Council's written response states that Council does have enforcement powers but determined that the threshold for action had not been met.

Can Council explain why complainants were repeatedly advised that Council could not act, when Council's formal position in response to our complaint is that it can act where the statutory threshold is met?
4. What rights are available to residents and ratepayers, who are experiencing repeated odour entering their property, affecting their health, wellbeing and ability to reasonably use and enjoy their homes and what does Council advise we do?
5. In circumstances where multiple neighbouring households report the same recurring nuisance, what steps does Council take to ensure complainants can have confidence that investigations are sufficiently thorough, consistent and transparent before a decision is made not to take enforcement action?
6. Does Council continue to stand by the decision that the odour complained of does not constitute an environmental nuisance, and if so, is Council satisfied that the investigation undertaken was sufficiently comprehensive to reach that conclusion?

If Council is not satisfied that the investigation adequately assessed the frequency, timing and impact of the odour, will it commit to undertaking further investigation, including observations at times when the odour is reported to occur most frequently?

Officer's Response:

Council has undertaken a thorough investigation in accordance with the relevant legislation and has adhered to the process outlined in Council's [Complaints Management Policy](#) in relation to this matter. The Complaints Management Policy allows for both internal and external review of complaint outcomes and, in maintaining the integrity of the process, remains the appropriate avenue for raising and addressing any concerns or inquiries relating to this matter.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

9.2 LCZ

At the Council meeting on 15 June 2026, **Natisha Knight** asked the following questions without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

- 1) Has Council undertaken any assessment of the properties adversely affected by the Crown Road access issue?
- 2) If such an assessment has been undertaken, will it be publicly available?
- 3) 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?
- 4) When did Council first become aware that Crown Road frontage may prevent or significantly impede development within the Rural and Landscape Conservation Zone?
- 5) 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?
- 6) 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?

Officer's Response:

The following response provides a consolidated context and response to the questions raised at the Council meeting on 15 June 2026, noting that responses to each question are interrelated and cannot be appropriately addressed in isolation.

Council has previously provided information on Crown Road access and the relevant State Planning Provisions (SPPs) in Council agendas dated 20 October 2025, 3 November 2025, 2 February 2026 and 18 May 2026. Information has also been provided directly to the Kingborough Land Users Body and included in the Kingborough email newsletter.

The requirement for new dwellings in the Rural, Agriculture and Landscape Conservation Zones (LCZ) to have lawful and permanent access to a public road is a requirement of the SPPs of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS), rather than a Council rule introduced through the draft Local

Provisions Schedule (LPS) process. The SPPs were publicly released in 2017 and have been publicly accessible since that time.

The issue is not specific to Kingborough, or to the Landscape Conservation Zone and similar issues have been / are being experienced in other Tasmanian municipalities with rural and regional areas where historical access arrangements have relied on Crown reserved roads.

Council sought advice on this matter from Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, and the advice received, together with landowner concerns, has been provided by Council to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) and the State Planning Office (SPO).

In preparing the draft LPS, Council was required to apply the LPS criteria and zone application guidelines. Under the TPS, there are many requirements across the different zones that have changed from the interim schemes which will result in impacts to future development, including this requirement. Specific development standards contained in the SPPs are not matters that are assessed on a property-by-property basis when determining zoning.

In relation to the identification of individual properties that may be impacted by this requirement, Council has previously advised, in February 2026, that it is not feasible to identify these from existing datasets. Determining this would require a manual, property-by-property assessment of all land proposed to transition to the relevant zones. For each property, officers would need to consider matters such as:

- whether the property is vacant or contains an existing approved dwelling;
- whether it has frontage or practical access to a road maintained by a road authority;
- whether any access relies on a Crown reserved road;
- whether there is an existing registered right of way, easement or other permanent legal access arrangement;
- whether a right of way or easement over Crown land could be granted by the Crown; and
- whether any other site-specific constraints affect access.

Some of this data is not held by Council, and there is no consolidated dataset that could be reliably generated through spatial analysis or automated reporting. It would require individual title, tenure and access investigations for each potentially affected lot.

In relation to whether Council advised that potentially impacted landowners would be contacted directly by letter, Council has reviewed previous Council meetings where the matter has been discussed in response to questions without notice. Officer's have only advised that the information would be provided through the Kingborough LPS newsletter, rather than by direct letter to individual landowners.

Council will continue to assess any future development applications in accordance with the planning scheme in force at the time. Where Crown Road access is relevant to an application, Council will consider all compliant options available to the applicant and will seek to support the most straightforward and least onerous lawful pathway available. Importantly, as previously advised, existing approved development is not required to retrospectively satisfy the new dwelling access standard. Council will also continue to raise these concerns through available mechanisms when they arise, including when the SPPs are reviewed.

Council considers that this response, along with the information previously provided, remains relevant and do not have any further information available that can be shared regarding this matter. Council will provide updates if new advice or information becomes available from the relevant State

agencies or the TPC.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.3 TPC HEARING

At the Council meeting on 15 June 2026, **Joel Hodson** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

It was stated at a TPC hearing by the planning authority that we need more rural zone in Kingborough. Where has this new approach come from and why is there such an emphasis on run? Zone 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 in no permit required in rural living zone.

Officer's Response:

The reference at the hearing related to the Agriculture Zone, not the Rural Zone, and reflects the requirements of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme rather than a new local policy shift.

The Agriculture Zone has been applied in accordance with LPS Guideline (please refer to the [LPS supporting document - page 39](#)), which requires all land suitable for agriculture to be identified using the State Government's 'Land Potentially Suitable for Agriculture Zone' mapping on LISTmap, supported by local-level analysis. This process was refined in Kingborough using the *AK Consultants Decision Tree methodology (2018)*, which filters mapping based on factors such as existing land use, capability, vegetation, and constraints, but still required detailed interpretation due to known inaccuracies and local conditions. To address this, Council further refined the approach through the [RMCG Agricultural Profile](#), to better reflect actual land use patterns, mixed rural enterprises, and site-specific constraints.

While Kingborough contributes a relatively small share of Tasmania's total agricultural value (around 0.45%) and production is dominated by grazing, agriculture is still widely distributed, occurs across multiple land parcels, and is supported by a mix of higher-value intensive activities such as eggs, poultry, cherries, and cut flowers. Much of this production occurs on relatively small land areas, with only a small proportion of the municipal area actively farmed, but with additional land held as part of broader agricultural businesses. The methodology therefore focuses on protecting land with demonstrated or potential agricultural capability, not just current output to avoid fragmentation, support future diversification and expansion, and manage land-use conflict over the long term.

Where the Agriculture Zone is not considered appropriate, the LPS Guidelines also recognise that the Rural Zone can provide protection for valuable agricultural land, while allowing for a broader range of compatible uses to be accommodated within that zone.

The final zoning to be informed by public feedback and the Tasmanian Planning Commission's hearing process.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.4 CCTV CAMERAS

At the Council meeting on 15 June 2026, **Boyden Hingston-Muir** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

1. 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 Dave 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?

2. 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?

Officer's Response:

1. Council has CCTV cameras located in the roundabout at the intersection of the Channel Highway/Goshawk Way and Freeman Street, but these do not provide targeted coverage of the Bus Interchange. Metro Tasmania has a CCTV camera that is specifically focussed on the Bus Interchange.
2. Council's public facing CCTV cameras feed to the Kingston Police station and there is a reliance on Tasmania Police to report outages. Some cameras are currently out of action in Kingston Park due to electrical issues that are currently being investigated.

Daniel Smee, Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services

9.5 LPS HEARINGS

At the Council meeting on 15 June 2026, **Alison Rogers** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

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?

Officer's Response:

The TPC is aware of Council's stated risk appetite as outlined in the covering letter submitted with the Irene Inc report and has indicated at the hearings that this will inform its considerations before a final decision is made. Accordingly, there is no obligation or expectation for Council's delegate to restate that position during the hearing unless specifically requested by the panel. Where further clarification is required, the TPC may issue a formal direction to Council seeking confirmation or reconsideration, as occurred with Direction 139 in relation to zoning in the Kettering West locality, which effectively allows Council now to also consider its risk appetite of that locality in light of the direction and questioning at the hearing.

It should also be noted that the TPC's questions and observations form part of a deliberative process designed to test evidence, interrogate methodologies, and better understand submissions from both representors and the Planning Authority. These exchanges do not indicate a predetermined outcome, nor do the views of individual delegates imply consensus or foreshadow the TPC's final decision. The questions instead serve to assess the robustness of the draft LPS, including the methodology underpinning the Irene Inc report, which is recognised as a guiding rather than prescriptive framework to be applied alongside broader planning considerations. The TPC is not bound to adopt its recommendations and may form its own conclusions based on the totality of evidence before it.

While Council understands the reasoning behind the question, its position is that matters of this nature are most appropriately addressed through the formal LPS hearing process, rather than at a

Council meeting. This ensures that all relevant parties have the opportunity to respond in a transparent and structured manner, and to be properly heard. Accordingly, Council is not in a position to answer such questions during Council meetings and will respond consistently should similar questions be raised in the future.

For the same reasons, the Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) has also advised, in response to enquiries, that it does not comment on discussions held during a hearing outside of that formal process.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.6 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

At the Council meeting on 15 June 2026, **Mark Donnellon** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

1. Are advertised development applications perpetually public information, and can an individual ask for the details of a DA that has passed its advertising period?
2. 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.

Officer's Response:

1. The process and requirements for accessing and requesting documentation relating to a development, building or plumbing permit are outlined in Council's [Release of Documents Policy 3.22](#). The applicable requirements vary depending on the type of document requested, the type of application, the relevant legislation, and, where applicable, the stage of assessment.
2. In general, the process involves Council's Records staff reviewing the specifics of the request against the relevant legislative and policy framework, processing any applicable fees, locating the requested documents within Council's records systems, and, where required, contacting the permit holder to seek consent. Access is then provided either through inspection at the Council offices or by supplying copies where permitted. While the process involves a number of steps to ensure compliance with legislative and privacy obligations, it is not considered unduly onerous.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

C207/12-2026

10 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

10.1 Cat Management

Cr Fox asked the following questions without notice:

I'm concerned about is the Cat Management Officer, whether that position that we used to have will be replaced, and what can we do about the number of feral cats that are being reported in the Tinderbox and Huntingfield areas, and how can we support the State Government in trying to eradicate them?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

We have actually replaced the Cat Management Officer. Our new staff member started a couple of weeks ago in that position. It's not called the Cat Management Officer anymore; it's Biodiversity Officer, but with a focus on wildlife and pest and invasive species. So that, I suppose, cat management work will form part of the work that that role manages. We will continue, I suppose, the work that we do in terms of feral cat management. Broadly, that is education and awareness. We work with Parks and Wildlife, particularly in the Peter Murrell Reserve, around trapping as well as surveillance. We respond to complaints regarding cats and also do some of our own active cat trapping as well. So we have a suite of actions that we continuously progress, and we're always happy to meet and have a discussion about, you know, more details of what that program looks like if it would assist.

Cr Fox:

I'm very pleased to hear that. I've been telling a lot of people who've been contacting me that Council does nothing about cats because it's not our jurisdiction. So I'm very pleased to hear the answer.

10.2 Council Communication and Engagement Survey

Cr Bain asked the following question without notice:

I've got a question just around the Council Communication and Engagement Survey. Council's undertaking this engagement survey to understand how the community prefers to hear from Council and access information. The focus for completing the survey appears to be quite electronically based so far. So my question is, does Council have any plans to do face-to-face engagement to ensure it captures responses from residents who prefer receiving information that way as well?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

Yes, indeed we do. Staff intend to do a series of face-to-face exercises to promote the survey. They include visits to the Kingborough Sports Centre, there'll be a presence at the Night of Lights, meetings within the Kingborough Sports Precinct where there are groups meeting, and looking to do pop-up at shopping centres where there's promotion of the survey. So certainly, yes, there is an intent to promote the survey as broadly as possible so we can maximise the returns we get and make it as meaningful as possible.

10.3 Sports Precinct Update

Cr Midgley asked the following question without notice:

Actually a thank you first to staff for holding the community meeting at the Sports Precinct last Wednesday night. I'm just wanting an update in regard to any feedback from the stakeholders. Are people generally happy with how things are going? Any kind of questions or things we need to know about?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

The meeting went really well and I think was received very positively by all those in attendance. They received an update on the status of the project and, when I say the project, I mean the AFL High Performance Centre development and all the associated community infrastructure that goes with that. There were some questions, which were generally around timeframes. Obviously, there are going to be impacts on all stakeholders within the precinct over the next couple of years as we undertake that development. Part of the intent of setting up this group was to provide a means of

communication where these groups can attend a forum and then collaborate in relation to the impacts that are going to be associated with the various construction projects. So those questions were answered by our Project Team.

10.4 Clarification regarding Mr Donnellon's Question

Cr Deane asked the following questions without notice:

Just a clarification for the Mayor. Mr Donnellon asked a question about a road sign that had been replaced. I just didn't quite understand the response. Was Mr Donnellon referring to a sign that had previously been there, was missing, and then needed to be replaced? Or are we talking about a new sign and a new speed reduction?

Acting Mayor responds:

It was a new sign and a new reduction, Councillor Deane.

Cr Deane:

Yeah, that made total sense to me because I was just wondering why we would go down the route you explained if it was just to plonk another sign back.

Acting Mayor responds:

Somebody didn't get the sign out of the ground and run away with it. It was a new sign and a new reduction.

Cr Deane:

Then my second question was just in relation to our last Council meeting. 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, that we 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?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I'll take the substantive part of that question on notice. We don't have an opt-out situation at the moment within Kingborough. The reason for that is because we have a contract with a provider that will be driving past those properties and, from a cost-efficiency standpoint, that's the approach we've taken. But look, I'll take the question on notice to provide you with a proper answer.

C208/12-2026

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

11.1 COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO INVESTIGATING NOISE COMPLAINTS AT THE SALTY DOG HOTEL:

Cr Deane submitted the following question on notice:

1. Has Council engaged an external consultant to undertake sound testing into live music at the venue?
2. If so, what will testing involve e.g. when it will occur, how often, under what conditions etc.?
3. What cost will there be to Council to undertake this testing?
4. What are the conditions in the Salty Dog's permit and noise management plan relating to live music being played at the venue?
5. Are there currently any conditions that specify decibel limits?
6. Once sound testing is complete, how will Council use these results to investigate/resolve noise complaints moving forward?
7. Will the testing results establish a fixed decibel limit to impose on Salty Dog live music activities (either through their planning permit or noise management plan)?

Officer's Response:

1. Yes, a noise consultant has been engaged.
2. The monitoring will involve taking noise measurements at several locations in the vicinity of the Salty Dog Hotel as well as at the Hotel. Monitoring will occur on one occasion during a set of live music on a Sunday afternoon, provided weather conditions are suitable.
3. The noise monitoring will cost under \$5000.
4. The planning permit for the venue has the following condition:

'Amplified outdoor music, live and non-live, must cease at 7:00pm, except for New Years Eve when it must cease at 12 midnight'.

The Noise Management Plan is not a public document and therefore information within it cannot be disclosed on a Council Agenda.

5. No
6. The noise monitoring will allow Council and the Salty Dog to understand the volume of live music sessions both at the venue and in adjacent residential areas. This information will assist Council to determine if noise emissions are being managed in accordance with relevant legislation.
7. This will be determined once the noise monitoring is complete.

Liz Quinn, Manager Environmental Services

11.2 TEXTILE UPPAREL RECYCLING

Cr Amanda Midgley submitted the following questions on notice:

1. Has Council considered the Australian textile recycling organisation UPPAREL as a potential partner for textile recycling initiatives within Kingborough?
2. Would Council consider introducing a textile recycling solution at the Barretta Waste Management Facility, either through a dedicated textile recycling collection day or by establishing a permanent textile collection point for residents?

Officer's Response:

1. Yes, Council has previously contacted representatives of the UPPAREL program and have a meeting scheduled for Thursday 2 July 2026 to discuss a proposal.
2. Yes, depending on the cost benefits of the program and the proposal from the UPPAREL meeting later this week will determine whether we proceed with the program.

Stuart Baldwin, Manager Kingborough Waste Services

11.3 BIOCHAR PROGRAMS

Cr Amanda Midgley submitted the following question on notice:

Many councils across Australia, including Glenorchy City Council, have trialled or implemented biochar programs with positive outcomes for waste reduction, carbon sequestration and improving soil performance.

Has Council thought about investigating whether a similar biochar program could reduce waste costs while creating a new income stream for Council?

Officer's Response:

Council has conducted preliminary investigations into an industrial-scale biochar facility which has suggested a strong return on investment over its life. This facility would manage organic waste on-site, different to the moveable community kiln used by Glenorchy Council. A more detailed business case and further research is required to better understand the cost benefit of such a venture and the up-front investment that would be required.

Padraig Pearce, Climate Change Advisor

12 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

There are no petitions still being actioned.

13 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

C209/12-2026**13.1 OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED DOG EXERCISE AND OBEDIENCE TRAINING FACILITY AT SEDGEBROOK ROAD RESERVE (LOT 1 TARONGA ROAD)**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

That the petition containing **160** signatures be received and referred to the appropriate Department for a report to Council.

CARRIED

14 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C210/12-2026**14.1 APPENDICES**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

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

CARRIED

C211/12-2026**14.2 FINANCIAL REPORT - MAY 2026**

Moved: Cr David Bain

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council endorses the attached Financial Report as at 31 May 2026.

CARRIED

C212/12-2026**14.3 KINGBOROUGH SPORTS PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND LAND DISPOSAL**

Moved: Cr Aldo Antolli

Seconded: Cr Flora Fox

That Council:

- a) Pursuant to section 178(1) of the Act, Council confirms by absolute majority its decisions to dispose of public land at 10 Kingston View Drive, Kingston, Certificate of Title reference 164078/2, PID 3202222 (being the footprint of land required for the construction of the AFL High Performance Training Centre and the existing AFL Oval) by means of leases to the Tasmanian Devils Football Club and authorises the Chief Executive Officer to execute the final agreements.

- b) Pursuant to section 178(1) of the *Local Government Act 1993*, resolves of its intention to

dispose of public land at 10 Kingston View Drive, Kingston, Certificate of Title reference 164078/2, PID 3202222 by means of a lease to the State Government and directs the Chief Executive Officer to undertake the public notice requirements pursuant to section 178(4) of the Act.

- c) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise and execute agreements with the Tasmanian Devils and the State Government at 10 Kingston View Drive, Kingston, Certificate of Title reference 164078/2, PID 3202222 required for the construction of the AFL High Performance Training Centre and the existing AFL Oval.
- d) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise and execute agreements for funding with the State Government and the Tasmanian Devils Football Club for the provision of community infrastructure in the Kingborough Sports Precinct associated with the development of the Tasmanian Devils Football Club's High Performance Training Centre.
- e) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise and execute a shared use licence agreement with the Tasmanian Devils Football Club in relation to use of ovals and their associated infrastructure within the Kingborough Sports Precinct.
- f) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise and execute agreements with the State Government, the Tasmanian Devils Football Club and contractors for:
 - i) The construction of Oval 3 and associated works; and
 - ii) Related works within the Kingborough Sports Precinct.

CARRIED

15 NOTICES OF MOTION

There were Notices of Motion received.

16 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

C213/12-2026

Moved: Cr Flora Fox

Seconded: Cr Aldo Antolli

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

Confirmation of Minutes

Regulation 40(6) *At the next closed meeting, the minutes of the previous closed meeting, after any necessary correction, are to be confirmed as the true record by the council or council committee and signed by the chairperson of the closed meeting.*

Applications for Leave of Absence

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

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 6:41pm

Cr Richardson left the room at 6:42pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 6:44pm

C214/12-2026

Moved: Cr Mark Richardson

Seconded: Cr David Bain

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	Nil

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6:45pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)