



COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

21 September 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
	2	Attendees
C280/17-2026	3	Apologies
C281/17-2026	4	Confirmation of Minutes
	5	Workshops held since Last Council Meeting
	6	Declarations of Interest
	7	Transfer of Agenda Items
C282/17-2026	8	Questions without Notice from the Public
	8.1	Kingborough Biodiversity Challenge
	8.2	Dog Park, Maddocks Road
	8.3	SnapSendSolve
	8.4	Artificial Intelligence
	8.5	Margate Hall
	8.6	Graffiti
	8.7	Aquatic Facility
	8.8	All Day Parking Fees
C283/17-2026	9	Questions on Notice from the Public
	9.1	Channel Highway Pedestrian And Cycle Pathway
	9.2	Graffiti
	9.3	Planning
	9.4	Kingston Green
C284/17-2026	10	Questions without Notice from Councillors
	10.1	Education Programs
	10.2	Bus Rapid Transport
	10.3	Ferry Service
	10.4	TPC Hearings
	10.5	Bushfire Fuel Reduction Guides
	10.6	Kingston View Drive
	10.7	Kingston Parking Strategy
	10.8	Community Attendance at Council Meetings
	11	Questions on Notice from Councillors

Table of Contents

Item		Page No.
	12 Officers Reports to Planning Authority	13
C285/17-2026	12.1 Development Application for Title Consolidation and Five (5) Multiple Dwellings (One Existing) at 157 Roslyn Avenue, Blackmans Bay	13
	13 Petitions still being Actioned	18
	14 Petitions Received in Last Period	18
	15 Officers Reports to Council	18
C286/17-2026	15.1 Financial Report August 2026 Year to Date	18
C287/17-2026	15.2 Appendices	18
	16 Notices of Motion	18
C288/17-2026	17 Confirmation of Items to be Dealt with In Closed Session	18

Public Copy

MINUTES of an Ordinary Meeting of Council
Kingborough Civic Centre, 15 Channel Highway, Kingston
Monday, 21 September 2026 at 5.30pm

WELCOME

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

1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL CUSTODIANS

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

2 ATTENDEES**Councillors:**

Acting Mayor Councillor C Street ✓
Councillor A Antolli ✓
Councillor D Bain ✓
Councillor G Cordover ✓
Councillor F Fox ✓
Councillor A Midgley ✓

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer
Director People & Finance
Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services
Director Engineering Services
Director Environment, Development & Community Services
Team Leader – Statutory Planning
Senior Project Manager – Capital Works
Communications Officer
Executive Assistant

Mr Dave Stewart
Mr David Spinks
Mr Daniel Smee
Mr Craig Mackey
Mrs Deleeze Chetcuti
Ms Sarah Silva
Mr Craig Reid
Mr Stuart Heather
Mrs Amanda Morton

C280/17-2026

3 APOLOGIES

Councillor K Deane
Councillor M Richardson

C281/17-2026**4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

That the Minutes of the open session of the Council Meeting No. 16 held on 7 September 2026 be confirmed as a true record.

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

Date	Topic	Detail	Consultant
14 September	Taroona Bike Lane & Other Projects	Discussion on the progression of the bike lane project	Nigel Vivian – Sugden and Gee

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS

There were no agenda items transferred.

C282/17-2026**8 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC**

Ms Tamieka Adkins asked the following questions without notice:

8.1 Kingborough Biodiversity Challenge

Citizen science programs play an important role in building the community awareness and improving our understanding of local biodiversity. Activities such as the Kingborough Biodiversity Challenge are designed to encourage public participation, strengthen environmental knowledge and support broad ecological mapping across the municipality. Can Council provide a formal assurance that biodiversity information collected through citizen science initiatives, including this one in particular, will not be used to impose, justify or expand regulatory obligations on private landowners, such as conservation covenants, planning overlays or land use restrictions, and that any future regulatory decisions will rely solely on formal ecological assessment undertaken through established statutory processes?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

I can confirm that in terms of any requirements that might be imposed through biodiversity mapping etc, that needs to be based on evidence-based assessment methodology by a suitably qualified person. While we very much appreciate input and knowledge that we gain through citizen science, and this type of initiative is done across Australia and it's really important and gets people involved, it doesn't have the same rigour needed for incorporating into statutory assessments, etc.

8.2 Dog Park, Maddocks Road

I understand that the pathway as you go into the gated area was not supposed to be the way it is now. It was a temporary measure because of the weather and the mud and everything that goes with that. It's quite unstable if you have any sort of disability or mobility challenges. Also, there's unlevel ground and it can be quite risky. Is that going to be addressed soon?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

The pathway and in fact the whole park is still a work in progress. The pathways are temporary and they will be addressed once the site dries out.

Ms Adkins:

Is there any sort of time frame on that? It's fairly dry up there, but the path is quite dangerous.

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

It may be dry, but not dry enough to get heavy machinery in.

8.3 SnapSendSolve

I appreciate that we have discussed this before, and I also understand that it's not integrated into Council's system, but I do have a question around the fact that in 2026, Kingborough Council, received an award for the top resolver this year. The results were for resolution speed or based on the key metrics of resolution speed, communication quality and overall responsiveness. When I asked about some average timeframes last meeting, you did say that that information wasn't able to be provided because there was no data that we could rely on. If that is the case, how could we then have these key metrics mapped to win that award?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

The award is something that SnapSendSolve promote and tell us we have been awarded. It's not something that we have necessarily any visibility into about how they've determined that and so it's not data that we directly have access to. As to how they've determined that, that would be a question for them. I'm not aware of how they do that.

Mr Nick Booth asked the following questions without notice:

8.4 Artificial Intelligence

Does Council intend to use or trial artificial intelligence for general inquiries and initial assessment of planning applications, and if so, what functions would it perform, how would it actually be checked, and when would an inquiry be referred to a Council officer and what effect would that have on staffing requirements?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

AI is obviously new technology and it's changing day by day in terms of what the capabilities and the potential use of AI is. Currently we don't use AI for any of that purpose. That is something that, and I think I've mentioned in the past, that we would cautiously explore as we move into a new planning scheme and there are opportunities for use of AI in those sort of contexts. As it relates to how we would do that, I think the first principle is, and we do have an internal AI policy that states that, all use of AI should have human oversight. So every output from AI should have someone's eyes on it to ascertain whether or not it's factual and accurate and whether it meets the standards that we expect from Council. That's an important underlying premise. As it relates to the future and how we use it, there's still a number of questions there and I think it would be premature for me to give an answer to that as it relates to workforce capacity across the organisation, but it's fair to say that it is also

responsible for us to be looking at what tools are available to us, whether they be AI or other tools, in order to ascertain how we do work in the future and how we make this organisation as efficient and effective and reliable as possible for our community.

Mr Booth:

Does Council currently use, reduce or intend to use artificial intelligence or other automated systems to analyse aerial, satellite or LIDAR imagery, monitor changes on private property or identify possible planning, building, tree or vegetation removal as breaches and will Council commit that any such will require extensive public consultation and formal Council approval before this is considered or implemented by Council?

Chief Executive Officer:

At this stage, Council doesn't use AI tools for any of that sort of use case that you've described during your question. I think across how we adopt any AI system into Council systems is a risk assessment, is a process by which we go through to ascertain the outcome that we're looking for through adopting a new tool, why are we doing it, what's its purpose etc. Then it's responsible and appropriate governance that we put around how we adopt and utilise AI systems or any systems that Council has available to it. As it relates to the future, I'm not going to make a categorical statement one way or another about whether or not we would use systems of that sort. I think that's something that we need to explore through time and make sure that we're putting the right context around it because it would be premature for me to make a statement like that today.

Mr Booth:

So I take that as a no? You may introduce it.

Chief Executive Officer:

I'm not saying one way or the other. I'm saying we need to responsibly consider all systems at our availability around what it is we might use in the future to make sure that we're doing Council's role responsibly, accurately and in a timely manner.

Ms Kim Phillips asked the following questions without notice:

8.5 Margate Hall

The new access ramp and dedicated parking space at the Margate Hall are welcome improvements for the community, however, following a community meeting just this past weekend, several residents raised safety concerns regarding the lack of dual-sided handrails on the stairs and the ramp entrance. And alongside that a distinct trip hazard which, I understand why it's there, it's to stop wheels rolling off, but considering it's the same colour as the concrete, it's also difficult to see. Given that compliance should act as a bare minimum rather than the final design standard, will Council commit to reviewing these specific safety gaps and addressing them, such as installing appropriate handrails and applying high contrast safety paint along the raised edge to protect less mobile users from falls? I do understand as well, chatting to a few people, that similar concerns were raised by the Disability Inclusion and Access Advisory Committee when this project was looked at.

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

I'm not aware of the concerns. Thank you for raising them. We'll have a look at it.

8.6 Graffiti

At the 15 June meeting, a Councillor raised the issue of graffiti on the Firthside fences, and I have asked questions about this previously. Council's Graffiti Management Guideline encourages deterrents such as green walls or screening vegetation, but as we know, these residents are unable

to plant on the road reserve side of their fences. Given the prominence of this fence line at the entrance to Kingston, will Council work with the residents to develop a practical solution such as protective coating, screening along there, or a community-led mural?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

Yes. So if it's the fence that I'm thinking about, we are doing that work at the moment. It's not easy because there are multiple landowners, including State Government and private owners, but we do know it's an eyesore. We're looking at removal and some stencils, but we will also be looking at plantings as well, but we would need permission from State Government. So it's been slower than we had hoped, but we are working on it.

8.7 Aquatic Facility

The State Government announced its regional community sport infrastructure plan on 10 June this year. Given the Aquatic Facility Steering Committee remains paused, has Council made a submission or provided information to the State Government highlighting Kingborough's lack of a public aquatic facility and if not, will it do so and when?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services responds:

Council is awaiting the final regional sport and rec strategy before it gives further consideration to an aquatic facility, so we haven't made a submission to State Government in relation to that matter.

Ms Phillips:

Sorry, apologies. I guess what I'm asking, I understand we're waiting for that strategy, but did we not have an opportunity to input to that strategy?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Which strategy are you referring to? Are you referring to the Greater Hobart? That strategy has been prepared at a high level by consultants. It's not a strategy that has been put out for broad community consultation as yet.

Ms Phillips:

So Council has no opportunity to input to it.

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Council itself does, yes.

Ms Phillips:

That's the question I'm asking. Have we made any input to that?

Director Governance, Recreation & Property Services:

Council has provided input to the Greater Hobart Regional Strategy, but I thought you were referring to a State Infrastructure Strategy. They are one and the same. Council has provided input into the draft, yes.

Mr Mark Donnellon asked the following question without notice:

8.8 All Day Parking Fees

If I recall correctly, Council once passed a strategy or motion that enables the Council to charge for all day parking in Council's car parks. This would introduce a new revenue stream for Council from a resource that does have costs. Kingston Central and Kingston Beach's car parks, I imagine, are the

most high demand areas that are likely to be used unnecessarily by park and ride users, where there are park and ride facilities that have a much lower demand on their parking. Does Council plan to finally introduce a token fee on parking in high demand car parks to dissuade some of the unnecessary use?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

As you've noted, Council does have a parking strategy and it does allude to the consideration of paid parking in the municipal area. As to if and when Council would choose to adopt paid parking, that would be a decision for Council and so that would need to be something that would be considered in the new Council term. It's not something I can answer today from an operational perspective, as it would need to be a decision of governance.

C283/17-2026

9 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM THE PUBLIC

9.1 Channel Highway Pedestrian And Cycle Pathway

Ms Roz Thurn submitted the following question on notice:

Could we get an update as to where Building Tasmania (State Growth) is in regards to the design of the proposed Channel Highway shared pedestrian and cycle path to cross the Northwest Bay River, Margate? Is there a timeframe of when this design is to be completed? If not, then we need to get one.

Officer's Response:

Council is currently in preliminary discussions with officers from Building Tasmania regarding the proposed shared path between Huntingfield and Margate. These discussions are focused on reviewing the previously developed concept designs, confirming priorities, cost estimate and determining the next steps to progress the work.

Craig Mackey, Director Engineering Services

9.2 Graffiti

At the Council meeting on 7 September 2026, **Ms Kim Phillips** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

Council's Graffiti Management Guideline commits to prioritising removal of offensive graffiti from Council property but sets no time frame for doing so. What is Council's internal target for removal once graffiti is reported?

Officer's Response:

When a service request relating to graffiti is received, it is entered into Council's customer request system and assigned a target review, response or completion timeframe of seven days. This does not necessarily mean the graffiti will be removed within seven days, particularly where it is located on property that is not owned or managed by Council.

For graffiti on Council-owned assets, removal timeframes may vary depending on the scale, location and complexity of the works required. Graffiti that is offensive or contains inappropriate content is assigned a higher priority and is generally actioned on the same day the request is made, or if it can't be removed on the day it is covered until it can be.

While the Graffiti Management Policy and Action Plan has not been the subject of regular reporting, graffiti management has continued to be addressed through a range of initiatives. Given competing

reporting priorities across Council's operations, it has not been identified as a stand-alone reporting focus.

Key actions completed to date include:

- Completion of a graffiti audit within the Kingston area.
- Development of graffiti register which can be shared with Police and other public property managers.
- Removal of graffiti from two underpasses.
- Securing agreement from a property owner and facilitating the removal of prominent graffiti in Kingston.
- Delivery of four murals in prominent locations that were previously prone to graffiti, with additional mural projects planned.
- Partnering with TasNetworks to install 'art wraps' on graffiti-prone transformer boxes.

Allocation of a dedicated works budget for graffiti removal and maintenance activities.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.3 Planning

At the Council meeting on 7 September 2026, **Mr Nick Booth** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

1. *Council reports show that planning costs increased from about \$1.9 million in 2019 to 2020 to almost \$3.2 million in 2024 to 2025. What caused the \$1.3 million increase in planning costs and how much was spent on staff, consultants, legal matters and administration?*
2. *How many full-time planning staff did Council employ in 2019 to 2020 compared with 2024 to 2025, and how many positions were vacant or filled by consultants?*
3. *What improvements in planning performance have resulted from this increase in spending and will Council publish the costs, starting levels, application numbers and assessment times on a public dashboard?*

Officer's Response:

1. Council acknowledges that expenditure associated with the Planning Department increased between 2019/20 and 2024/25. However, expenditure alone does not provide a complete picture of the department's activity, workload or financial position.

It is also important to consider planning income. Planning fees are established under Tasmania's legislative framework and are primarily based on development value, which is commonly used as a proxy for the scale and complexity of applications. Council has also benchmarked its fees against other similar Council's in Tasmania to ensure consistency. Accordingly, planning fee revenue provides an indication not only of the number of applications received, but also the complexity and assessment effort associated with those applications. From FY20 to FY26 the planning function generated a total income of \$5.9M

High-level analysis of staffing costs between FY20 and FY26 shows that the normal annual wage increases in accordance with the Enterprise Agreement contributed to approximately 30% of the increase to total costs and 40% of the net cost increase during this period.

In addition to normal wage growth, expenditure increased as a result of:

- a) implementation of recommendations arising from a review of the planning function undertaken in 2019, which identified the need for additional planning resources;
- b) resourcing requirements associated with major statutory projects, including preparation and implementation of Council's Local Provisions Schedule;
- c) recruitment and retention challenges experienced across the planning profession, requiring temporary consultant engagement during periods of vacancy;

Detailed expenditure by category is available through Council's financial records published in Council agendas. However, in general terms employee costs comprise the majority of Planning Department expenditure and are substantially higher than annual consultancy, legal and administrative costs. Council acknowledges that consultant expenditure was relatively high during 2025/26. This was primarily due to several vacancies within the department and was necessary to maintain statutory planning services while recruitment occurred. A proportion of this consultancy expenditure also related to the review of components of the draft Local Provisions Schedule, which was progressed in response to a Council resolution. Also to note that most of the legal costs each year are associated with appeals, where often the appeal is against the decision to grant a permit for a development, and Council still needs to attend and participate in this

- 2. In FY2020 the planning team comprised 18 approved positions (not FTE). These positions included statutory and strategic planning roles, development engineers, administrative staff with a varied mix of full-time and part-time roles. Currently there are 20 approved positions in the team (not FTE) across these roles.

While Council maintains records of approved positions, a precise comparison of full-time equivalent employees across the period is difficult due to vacancies, temporary acting arrangements, overtime, changes in team and reporting structures, and variations in individual working hours arising from flexible work arrangements.

At the end of 2025 and into 2026 the planning team had 5 vacancies (various roles) as well as key staff that needed to take unplanned leave. Analysis of consultancy hours for statutory planning work during this period estimates that their use equated to approx. 1FTE. Other team members took on additional work to assist during this period.

- 3. It is difficult to comment in detail on the effectiveness of decisions made in 2019 and 2020, as the senior management and executive staff currently responsible for the department were not employed at Council at that time.

However, Council acknowledges that there have been ongoing concerns regarding planning service delivery, assessment efficiency and customer experience. Council has taken these concerns seriously and has been actively working to improve the service. Further information regarding this work will be provided in the coming weeks.

In relation to public reporting, Council supports increased transparency and is exploring opportunities, through its broader digital improvement program, to make additional operational and performance information available to the community. This includes consideration of how information such as application volumes, assessment timeframes and other key service indicators may be reported into the future.

Council considers that planning performance is best assessed through a range of indicators, including application volumes, application complexity, statutory compliance, assessment timeframes, customer experience, staffing levels and the net cost of providing the service, rather than by reference to a single expenditure figure alone.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

9.4 Kingston Green

At the Council meeting on 7 September 2026, **Mr Mark Donnellon** asked the following question without notice to the Chief Executive Officer, with a response that the question would be taken on notice:

There's a largish privately owned bit of land that's long been planned for development, I believe it's known as Kingston Green between what's now a petrol station and I forget what's on the other side, but hopefully that explains where it is. There's a large water body in there that I'm told from natural areas and biodiversity staff that is a natural spring that flows into Coffee Creek and which continues through the Coffee Creek Reserve and Peter Murrell Reserve through to Howden emptying into the Northwest Bay. I had a question from a Landcare volunteer that does a lot of work in the reserves along that creek and they want to know what amount of modifications could the landowner make to this water body and are there any limitations that prevent negative impacts to the downstream environment?

Officer's Response:

The dam being referenced is on private land that is known as 'Kingston Green' in the upper portion of the Coffee Creek catchment. It is a perennial waterbody that is reported to maintain water levels, regardless of rainfall and seasonal variations (from dry to wet periods). Catchment investigations have indicated that the levels are maintained by near-surface groundwater associated with regional faulting and location with respect to the adjacent elevated areas of Maranoa Heights. The dam also appears to receive stormwater from surrounding residential areas.

The Department of Natural resources and Environment (NRE) regulate dam works, including the decommissioning of dams under the *Water Management Act 1999*. A permit from NRE would be required prior to the landowner undertaking any significant works on the dam. The dam is also identified in a Master Plan that is embedded in the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015 as well as under a Part 5 Agreement that is subject of discussions with the landowner about the future development opportunities of the site. The impacts on the immediate environment as well as downstream in Coffee Creek would be considered where applicable.

Deleeze Chetcuti, Director Environment, Development & Community Services

C284/17-2026

10 QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

Cr Cordover asked the following questions without notice:

10.1 Education Programs

A community member has raised with me that there are some local businesses who do a great job in encouraging, for example, the use of reusable containers, reusable keep cups and the like in preference to disposable takeaway cups for example, signs up in local small businesses that say reusables preferred here and things like that to encourage behavioural change. What supports or resources are we providing to the small business community and the large business community to help encourage the use of reusable containers and things like that?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I'm not aware of any specific program we have that reaches into reusable drinks containers or anything of the sort. We currently have no role [staff] in terms of the economic development portfolio so we have no one directly working with business on those types of things on an ongoing basis. It's not to say that through specific projects we don't also reach into the business community around specific opportunities that there might be. There might be grants, programmes or something like that to assist in achieving an outcome. Kingborough Council does invest in Business South and they have support functions that reach into business enterprise around the municipal area and down into the

Huon as well to assist them with various initiatives. That's some work that we do in this space through investment then to our third party.

10.2 Bus Rapid Transport

This question relies on the information in the Greater Hobart Rapid Bus Network proposal, elements of which are available for public consultation regarding the northern corridor at the moment. What are we doing as a Council to encourage the development of the rapid bus network within the southern corridor? Are we taking steps to make sure that we are given some priority in that future infrastructure investment?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

There's been a lot of work done on this broader initiative, mainly led out of the State Government. It has been somewhat at arm's length of Greater Hobart Councils up until this point. As you rightly mentioned, the Northern Corridor is the stage one that's being considered for any rapid bus network across the broader region. That project has been the result of many, many studies into how people are moved into the northern areas of Greater Hobart. I have been talking with the Deputy Secretary in charge of transport at Building Tasmania, and certainly they've indicated to me that Kingborough would be the next area explored as part of that broader initiative. I understand that they had intended at the time of that conversation to reach out later this calendar year to begin the process of talking about what's next there. Obviously, an initiative like this would require a substantive level of investment, both in terms of the infrastructure and in terms of the service. Last I heard, the state was seeking investment from the federal government to enable these next steps to be undertaken in terms of further business casing and next steps.

10.3 Ferry Service

Is there an update to be had and what is Council doing to try and progress a ferry service to Kingborough?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

The tranche one of the Derwent ferry service expansion doesn't include Kingborough within it. There are three new terminals being developed as part of that and they are each going through their independent approval processes for them with their DAs and EPBC and things like that. We're not in that phase. Any subsequent work around a phase two expansion of the network would require further investment. Until such time as that investment is identified and allocated, I don't think there would be much work going into that at this point in time. In saying that as the phase one is coming to a point where it will be delivering an outcome, there'll be work across Greater Hobart to consider how we obtain investment into phase two.

Cr Antolli asked the following questions without notice:

10.4 TPC Hearings

Now that Council won't be attending the majority of the LPS hearings, how and when is Council's written evidence provided to the affected representatives? Is it emailed, does it go onto the TPC website and then they have to actively find it, and how far ahead of those particular hearings do we give that information?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

First, I would like to point out that in the scenario previously where Council officers were attending the hearings, prior information was not provided to representors or to the TPC that was discussed, apart from the Section 35F report and the Irenelnc report that was discussed in the hearing themselves.

We recognise this is a change so we don't anticipate providing substantially new information. However, we are reviewing the hearing schedule, the representations that are being heard and determining if there might be a differing position based on new information we've heard through the process that we would like to provide. That will be done as far in advance as possible, so hopefully 14 days will then be provided directly to the TPC. It will be then up to the TPC what they determine to do with that information. The main way that we will be responding is to directions issued by the TPC. They will be published on the website, as will our response.

Cr Antolli:

Just to clarify, it's the responsibility of Council to provide that information to the TPC, then it's up to the TPC if they want to share it with that representor?... *inaudible* ... Okay, thank you very much.

10.5 Bushfire Fuel Reduction Guides

Earlier this year there were a number of requests for a document to help landowners understand what they can remove from their properties to further bushfire fuel reduction. I understand that there's been a number of requests for that to be provided. I think there might have been an assurance potentially made that something like that was forthcoming. What's the update on that?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services responds:

That was developed and it was available at the KLUB bushfire forum that they held earlier this year. It is now published on the website and we apologise that that has taken longer than we would have liked it to. What we would like to highlight, though, is a couple of things. Vegetation clearing on property is regulated under the scheme. We don't have, as a Council, any rules outside of the scheme rules in terms of what can and can't be done for bushfire or any other reason, safety, etc, what the exemptions are. So that is where the rules sit. What we're also going to do is do a very plain English document to support the information we've already provided, a description or guidance of those exemptions and requirements in the scheme, so it's very easy for our community to access and understand. The other thing we would also like to just highlight is that, as discussed in the forum, one of the key things that landowners can do for their house is clear the immediate vicinity of their buildings as the most effective risk reduction for their homes.

Cr Antolli:

I heard a rumour that it had been provided at that forum. Apparently KLUB have sent a number of emails about it and no one has responded. Is that your understanding?

Director Environment, Development & Community Services:

I have had follow-ups. I wouldn't say nobody has responded. I've spoken directly with KLUB about it on a few occasions.

10.6 Kingston View Drive

Kingston View Drive is going to become a major new destination point and a number of people have registered with me their concerns about the zebra crossings there. We have two crossing points that aren't very visible, they're more like little speed humps with some sort of markings around them. What is the plan to maybe make those two crossing points more obvious? Will there be more crossing points because the concern is that what we have now is inadequate for the current and future use of the road.

Director Engineering Services responds:

What I can confirm is that we've commissioned a traffic consultant to have a look at that and they are looking at pedestrian safety on both Kingston View Drive and in the broader precinct. We expect that work to be completed towards the end of the year and they will outline a range of options which may

include zebra crossings and a range of other measures, so we will consider those when the report is given.

Cr Midgley asked the following questions without notice:

10.7 Kingston Parking Strategy

On 6 May 2024, Council resolved to endorse the Central Kingston Parking Strategy and to reaffirm in principle support for action item 14 of the introduction of paid parking as a demand management tool to address the high demand for long-stay parking in the Kingston CBD. Why haven't we moved forward on that when we have reaffirmed in principle support?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

There's a slight difference between a firm principle and in practice putting it in place. I think as part of any future change of that sort when we're introducing a new fee and charge essentially, there's a fair bit of work that we need to do both in terms of quantifying exactly when and where we're going to charge for a service like parking, how much we charge, what's the nature of that, all that sort of stuff. So there's a fair bit of work that needs to be done on a concept like that as to exactly why we haven't done that. There's probably a few reasons behind it. Not sure any of them are particularly great why that hasn't been moved ahead. Certainly if it's the will of the new Council, we're happy to move that ahead in conversation with them.

10.8 Community Attendance at Council Meetings

We have some new community members to our meeting tonight who are attending for the first time. How does the community know how Council meetings work, how do they know about coming in and asking questions? Have we ever thought about and do other councils have a staff member designated to welcome people to the Council meeting and let them know the procedures? Have we ever done that in the past? Do other councils do it and could it be something maybe we might consider for the future?

Chief Executive Officer responds:

I'm not aware of whether we've done that in the past. We haven't done it in my time here. Certainly it's something that we could consider. I think we also need to be aware of the potential cost that comes alongside that. We pay penalty rates into the evening where we have staff working beyond their paid hours, so we just need to be conscious of what the trade-offs might be associated with that, but certainly something that we can have a chat about internally.

11 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions on notice from Councillors.

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

PLANNING AUTHORITY IN SESSION

Planning Authority commenced at 6.04pm

12 OFFICERS REPORTS TO PLANNING AUTHORITY

C285/17-2026

12.1 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR TITLE CONSOLIDATION AND FIVE (5) MULTIPLE DWELLINGS (ONE EXISTING) AT 157 ROSLYN AVENUE, BLACKMANS BAY

Moved: Cr Gideon Cordover

Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That the Planning Authority resolves that the development application for title consolidation and five (5) multiple dwellings (one existing) at 157 Roslyn Avenue, Blackmans Bay and adjoining road reserve for Oramatis Studio be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Before the approved use and/or development starts, amended plans must be submitted to Council for approval. The plans must be generally in accordance with Council Plan Reference No's P6 submitted on 3 August 2026 but modified to show:
 - (a) the removal of the landscape retaining wall along the eastern side of the proposed driveway and the Hiern Road frontage
 - (b) the removal of the landscape retaining wall between Unit 1 and the Hiern Road frontage and its replacement with a batter slope
 - (c) the dwellings wholly contained within the building envelope listed in Acceptable Solution A3 of Clause 10.4.2 by:
 - i. including a lower roof profile for Unit 4 that reduces its overall height
 - ii. lowering Unit 2 by 0.1m so its height above the natural ground level is reduced; and
 - iii. increasing the boundary setback of Unit 3 by 0.1m; and
 - (d) amended building envelope drawings that reflect the above.

The amended plans must be to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services and once approved will form part of this Permit and then be referred to as the Approved Plans.

Except as otherwise required by this Permit, use and development of the land must be substantially in accordance with the Approved Plans.

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

2. Before occupation of the new dwellings, the titles for CT 23514/21 and CT 23514/22 must be consolidated into a single lot. To consolidate the two titles a Final Plan of Survey must be submitted to Council for sealing, together with a Schedule of Easements, a copy of the survey notes, and a copy of the balance plan (where applicable) prior to building works commencing. Payment of Council's fee for sealing the Final Plan of Survey and Schedule of Easements must be made upon submission of plans.

For Advice: This condition does not prevent the demolition of the existing buildings approved for demolition prior to the consolidation of the titles.

3. The Schedule of Easements submitted for sealing must include a covenant to the effect that the consolidated lot must not be developed for less than a total of two dwellings.
4. Before the start of works, engineering design drawings must be submitted to Council for approval. The engineering plans and specifications must be prepared and certified by a professional Civil Engineer. Plans must be to satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services and comply with:
 - Tasmanian Standard Drawings
 - Austroads Standards and Australian Standards
 - Australian Rainfall and Runoff Guidelines

The plans must include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Provide a subdivision plan indicating the removal and/or capping of all existing services serving both involved lots, together with the location of the proposed new service connection for the proposed single lot.
- (b) Detailed internal vehicle and pedestrian access, car parking and manoeuvring areas including:
 - (i) Longitudinal and cross sections of the driveway/access road
 - (ii) Contours, finish levels and gradients of the driveway/access road
 - (iii) Provision of vehicle access (crossovers) with notation to be constructed in standard grey concrete with a broomed non-slip finish
 - (iv) Signage for visitor spaces and residential spaces as required
 - (v) Line marking for visitor spaces and residential spaces as required
 - (vi) 'No parking/keep clear' signage for turning bay areas
 - (vii) Wheel stops for open parking bays (as appropriate)
 - (viii) Lighting for parking and vehicle circulation roadways and pedestrian paths
 - (ix) Surface treatment and stormwater drainage
- (c) Design (including supporting documentation and hydraulic calculations) of the proposed stormwater infrastructure including:
 - (i) Layout details
 - (ii) A reticulated stormwater system sized to accommodate at least the estimated 10% AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability) flow, incorporating climate change allowances to the year 2100
 - (iii) Any on-site stormwater detention must be detailed including how the on-site detention will be serviced to prevent blockages while maintaining its capacity
 - (iv) A new DN225 connection to Council stormwater mains/manhole

Once endorsed the plans will form part of the permit.

5. The construction works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings. Works must be to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services and must include the following:

- (a) Install 'No Parking' and/or 'Keep Clear' signage within the designated turning bay/area.
 - (b) Install appropriate 'Visitor Parking' signage for all visitor car parking spaces.
 - (c) Install appropriate residential parking signage identifying the allocated parking spaces for each dwelling.
 - (d) Provide line marking to clearly delineate all visitor and residential parking spaces.
 - (e) Provide bollard lighting along parking areas, vehicle circulation roadways and pedestrian paths.
 - (f) Construct the approved on-site stormwater detention system in accordance with the approved stormwater design.
 - (g) Ensure all stormwater runoff from new impervious areas is collected and discharged by gravity to Council's stormwater infrastructure.
 - (h) Construct a new DN225 stormwater connection to the Council stormwater main/manhole in accordance with Council's requirements.
6. Before the start of works, an erosion and sedimentation control plan must be submitted. The plan must be to the satisfaction of Council's Executive Manager – Engineering Services and must be in accordance with the *Hobart Regional Soil and Water Management Code of Practice*. All sediment and erosion control measures must be kept and maintained in place until such time as adequate grass or other vegetation is well established over the whole site.
- Erosion/siltation infiltration control measures must be applied during construction works to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.
7. Any excess fill must be disposed of at a Level 1 facility for disposal of fill or alternatively at a site that has been approved for the disposal or use of Level 1 fill under a development use permit issued by Council.
8. To reduce the spread of weeds or pathogens, all machinery must take appropriate hygiene measures prior to entering and leaving the site as per the Weed and Disease Planning and Hygiene Guidelines 2015 produced by the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment. Any imported materials must be from a weed and pathogen free source to prevent introduction of new weeds and pathogens to the area.
9. The stormwater runoff from all new impervious areas must be disposed of by gravity to Council's reticulated stormwater system to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services.
10. The new double width (5.5m) vehicular access must be constructed in accordance with the Tasmanian Standard Drawings (TSD-RO9, TSD-E01 and TSD-RF01) in standard grey concrete with a broomed non-slip finish from the kerb crossing layback to the lot boundary.
- The existing redundant vehicular access must be removed and the kerb and channel reconstructed in accordance with the Tasmanian Standard Drawings (TSD-R14, TSD-R15, TSD-E01 and TSD-R11 if applicable) to the satisfaction and approval of the Director Engineering Services.
- A Permit to carry out works within a Council Road reservation must be obtained prior to any works commencing within the Council Road reservation.
11. A concrete hardstand area with a minimum width of 1.5 metres, measured from the back of the kerb, must be constructed in accordance with the approved plans and to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.

12. The existing gravel bin storage area and boxed timber steps located within the nature strip on Roslyn Avenue must be removed. The affected nature strip must be reinstated to Council's standard and to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering Services.
13. All waste material generated by the development or from other sources must be contained in appropriate building waste containers for periodic removal to a licensed disposal site. The receptacle must be of a size to adequately contain the amount of waste generated and must be appropriately located on the subject site and must not impede residential traffic or parking at any time.
14. All existing sewer, water, stormwater, TasNetworks, and telecommunication authorities supply infrastructure traversing newly created lots, must be removed and/or replaced as necessary so that they are contained wholly within the boundaries of the specific lot which they service with all associated costs borne by the applicant. The requirements of the relevant service authorities must be strictly complied with by the applicant.
15. At least two (2) visitor parking spaces must be provided for the proposed development. These visitor parking spaces must be appropriately signposted and kept available for visitor parking at all times. Any future application for strata title in respect of the property must ensure that the visitor parking spaces are included within the common property on the strata plan.
16. Before the occupation of the units, the following works must be completed in accordance with the endorsed plans to the satisfaction of the Council:
 - (a) The parking areas (including signage and access);
 - (b) The garden and landscape areas;
 - (c) Drainage works undertaken and completed;
 - (d) Letterboxes installed;
 - (e) Existing gravel bin storage area and boxed timber steps located within the nature strip on Roslyn Avenue removed; and
 - (f) Waste collection platform completed.
17. Before the occupation of the units, landscaping must be provided to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services.

The landscaping areas shown on the endorsed plans must be used for landscaping and no other purpose and any landscaping must be maintained to the satisfaction of the Manager Development Services, including that any dead, diseased or damaged plants are to be replaced.
18. The conditions as determined by TasWater, and set out in the attached Appendix A, form part of this permit.

ADVICE

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

If your development involves demolition, new buildings or alterations to buildings (including plumbing works or onsite wastewater treatment) it is likely that you will be required to get

approvals under the *Building Act 2016*. Change of use, including visitor accommodation, may also require approval under the *Building Act 2016*. Advice should be sought from Council's Building Department or an independent building surveyor to establish any requirements.

- C. An application for Notifiable Plumbing Work must be lodged with Council before commencing any work.
- D. A drainage design plan at a scale of 1:200, designed by a qualified Hydraulic Designer, showing the location of the proposed sewer and stormwater house connection drains; including the pipe sizes, pits and driveway drainage, must be submitted with the application for Plumbing Permit.
- E. The Developer should not allocate any property address numbers for the proposed units.

New property addresses have been allocated as follows:

Lot/Unit No.	Allocated Property Address
1	Unit 1/1 Hiern Road, Blackmans Bay
2	Unit 2/1 Hiern Road, Blackmans Bay
3	Unit 3/1 Hiern Road, Blackmans Bay
4	Unit 4/1 Hiern Road, Blackmans Bay
Existing Dwelling	Unit 5/1 Hiern Road, Blackmans Bay

These numbers must then be referenced on design and As-Constructed drawings as well as any Strata Plans lodged for sealing.

CARRIED

PLANNING AUTHORITY SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open session resumed at 6.40pm

13 PETITIONS STILL BEING ACTIONED

There are no petitions still being actioned.

14 PETITIONS RECEIVED IN LAST PERIOD

A report on the petition headed 'Sealing of Van Morey Road, Margate' will be provided to a future Council meeting.

15 OFFICERS REPORTS TO COUNCIL

C286/17-2026

15.1 FINANCIAL REPORT AUGUST 2026 YEAR TO DATE

Moved: Cr David Bain
Seconded: Cr Amanda Midgley

That Council endorses the attached Financial Reports as at 31 August 2026.

CARRIED

C287/17-2026

15.2 APPENDICES

Moved: Cr David Bain
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

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

CARRIED

16 NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no Notices of Motion.

C288/17-2026

17 CONFIRMATION OF ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN CLOSED SESSION

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
Seconded: Cr Gideon Cordover

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

Confirmation of Minutes

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

Applications for Leave of Absence

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

Tender Assessments - 2026/27 Capital Works Projects - various

Regulation 17(2)(e) *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 6.46pm

OPEN SESSION ADJOURNS

OPEN SESSION RESUMES

Open Session of Council resumed at 6.54pm

C289/17-2026

Moved: Cr Flora Fox
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
Tender Assessments - 2026/27 Capital Works Projects - Various	Tenders awarded to : (a) Statewide Earthworks for \$226,126 excl GST and \$541,895 excl GST; (b) Duggans for \$483,169 excl GST.

CARRIED

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6.55pm

.....
(Confirmed)

.....
(Date)