



City of
LAUNCESTON

COUNCIL MINUTES

**COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY 27 JUNE 2016
1.00pm**

City of Launceston

COUNCIL MINUTES

Monday 27 June 2016

The Ordinary Meeting of the City of Launceston Council was held at the Council Chambers:

Date: 27 June 2016

Time: 1.00pm

Section 65 Certificate of Qualified Advice

Background

Section 65 of the *Local Government Act 1993* requires the General Manager to certify that any advice, information or recommendation given to Council is provided by a person with appropriate qualifications or experience.

Declaration

I certify that persons with appropriate qualifications and experience have provided the advice, information and recommendations given to Council in the Minutes Items for this Meeting.



Robert Dobrzynski
General Manager

City of Launceston

COUNCIL MINUTES

Monday 27 June 2016

Present: **Alderman** **A M van Zetten (Mayor)**
R I Soward (Deputy Mayor)
R L McKendrick
R J Sands
D H McKenzie
J G Cox
D C Gibson
J Finlay
S R F Wood
K P Stojansek

In Attendance: **Mr R S Dobrzynski (General Manager)**
Mr S G Eberhardt (Acting Director Infrastructure Services)
Mrs L M Hurst (Director Development Services)
Mr R K Sweetnam (Director Facilities Management)
Mr R Mulvaney (Director Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery)
Mr M J Tidey (Director Corporate Services)
Mr J Davis (Manager Corporate Strategy)
Mrs A Rooney (Committee Clerk)

Apologies: **Alderman** **D W Alexander**
E K Williams

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Item No	Item	Page No
1	OPENING OF MEETING - ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES	1
2	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	1
3	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	2
4	DEPUTATIONS	2
	No Deputations were identified as part of these Minutes	2
5	PETITIONS	2
	No Petitions were identified as part of these Minutes	
6	COMMUNITY REPORTS	3
6.1	Vox Harmony City of Launceston Choir	3
6.2	Duck Reach and Celebration of Duck Reach Anniversary	3
7	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	3
7.1	Public Questions on Notice	3
	No Public Questions on Notice were registered as part of these Minutes	
7.2	Public Questions without Notice	4
7.2.1	Mr Basil Fitch - Rating of Independent Living Units	5
7.2.2	Mr Basil Fitch - Fire Service Rates (Retirement Homes)	6
7.2.3	Mr Basil Fitch - Council Meeting - 27 June 2016	7
7.2.4	Mr Ronald Baines - Rating of Retirement Homes	8
7.2.5	Mr Gus Green - Floods and Eastern Bypass Proposal	9

City of Launceston

COUNCIL MINUTES

Monday 27 June 2016

Item No	Item	Page No
8	PLANNING AUTHORITY	10
	No Development Applications were registered with Council as part of these Minutes	
9	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR	11
9.1	Mayor's Announcements	11
10	ALDERMEN'S REPORTS	13
10.1	Alderman D H McKenzie	13
10.2	Alderman J Finlay	13
10.3	Alderman S R F Wood	13
10.4	Alderman R I Soward	13
10.5	Alderman R L McKendrick	14
11	QUESTIONS BY ALDERMEN	15
11.1	Questions on Notice	15
11.1.1	Aldermen's Question on Notice - Council Meeting - 14 June 2016	16
11.2	Questions without Notice	18
	No Questions without Notice were identified as part of these Minutes	
12	COMMITTEE REPORTS	19
12.1	Tender Review Committee Meeting - 14 June 2016	19
13	COUNCIL WORKSHOPS	20
14	NOTICES OF MOTION	21
14.1	Notice of Motion - Alderman D H McKenzie - Making Our Community Safer	21

City of Launceston

COUNCIL MINUTES

Monday 27 June 2016

Item No	Item	Page No
15	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTORATE ITEMS	22
	No Items were identified as part of these Minutes	
16	FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DIRECTORATE ITEMS	23
16.1	Victoria's Cafe and Albert Hall Licence and Management Agreement	23
17	QUEEN VICTORIA MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY DIRECTORATE ITEMS	24
	No Items were identified as part of these Minutes	
18	INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES DIRECTORATE ITEMS	24
	No Items were identified as part of these Minutes	
19	CORPORATE SERVICES DIRECTORATE ITEMS	25
19.1	Fire Service Rates - Retirement Homes	25
20	GENERAL MANAGER'S DIRECTORATE ITEMS	27
20.1	Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016	27
21	URGENT BUSINESS	48
	No Urgent Items were identified as part of these Minutes	
22	CLOSED COUNCIL	48
	No Closed Items were identified as part of these Minutes	
23	MEETING CLOSURE	48

1 OPENING OF MEETING - ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, opened the Meeting at 1.00pm and noted apologies from Alderman D W Alexander and Alderman E K Williams. The Mayor welcomed Aboriginal Elder Gloria Templar who delivered the Welcome to Country.

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, responded with an Acknowledgement of Country: In the spirit of reconciliation, we the citizens of Launceston, recognise that Launceston is situated on country of which the Tasmanian Aboriginal people have been owners for over 35,000 years and on which they have performed age-old ceremonies of celebration, initiation and renewal. We acknowledge the Aboriginal Community of today, their living culture and unique role in the life of this region and offer our deep appreciation of their ongoing contribution to the community.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Local Government Act 1993 - Section 48

(A councillor must declare any interest that the councillor has in a matter before any discussion on that matter commences.)

No Declarations of Interest were identified as part of these Minutes

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 35(1)(b)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the City of Launceston Council held on 14 June 2016 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

DECISION: 27 June 2016

MOTION

Moved Alderman D H McKenzie, seconded Alderman S R F Wood.

That the Motion, as per the Recommendation to Council, be adopted.

CARRIED 10:0

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

4 DEPUTATIONS

No Deputations were identified as part of these Minutes

5 PETITIONS

Local Government Act 1993 - Sections 57 and 58

No Petitions were identified as part of these Minutes

6 COMMUNITY REPORTS

(Community Reports allow an opportunity for Community Groups to provide Council with a three minute verbal presentation detailing activities of the group. This report is not intended to be used as the time to speak on Minutes Items; that opportunity exists when that Minutes Item is about to be considered. Speakers are not to request funding or ask questions of Council. Printed documentation may be left for Aldermen.)

**6.1 Vox Harmony City of Launceston Choir
Ms Jill Forshaw**

Ms Forshaw provided a report to Council regarding the recent Vox Harmony City of Launceston Choir trip to Melbourne and Ballarat to participate in the Melbourne International Singers Festival.

**6.2 Duck Reach and Celebration of Duck Reach Anniversary
Mr Gus Green**

Mr Green provided information to Council on historical facts relating to Duck Reach and the proposed construction of an access bridge.

7 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 31

7.1 Public Questions on Notice

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 31(1)

(Questions on Notice must be in writing and should be received by the General Manager at least seven days before the relevant Council Meeting. Questions on Notice will be researched by Council Officers and both the Question on Notice (as received) and the response will be provided at the Council Meeting and a reply in writing will also be provided.)

No Public Questions on Notice were registered as part of these Minutes

7.2 Public Questions without Notice

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 31(2)(b)

(Members of the public who ask Questions without Notice at a meeting will have both the question and any answer provided recorded in the Minutes. Council Officers will endeavour to answer the question asked at the meeting, however, that is not always possible and more research may be required. If an answer cannot be provided at the Meeting, the question will be treated as a Question on Notice. A response will be provided at the next Council Meeting.)

7.2.1 Mr Basil Fitch - Rating of Independent Living Units

Mr Fitch, as a result of a Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman D H McKenzie on 23 May 2016 relating to rating of residential properties owned by charities, asked when this report would be made available?

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, responded by saying that the matter would be returned to Aldermen for further discussion prior to being presented at Council.

7.2.2 Mr Basil Fitch - Fire Service Rates (Retirement Homes)

Mr Fitch asked whether all retirement home operators affected by Council's intention to remove fire levy remissions had been contacted and if not why?

Mr Michael Tidey (Director Corporate Services) responded by saying that with matters such as this it is difficult to advise people of possible changes and notification would be provided once a final decision has been made. Information is also provided on rate notices.

7.2.3 Mr Basil Fitch - Council Meeting - 27 June 2016

Mr Fitch provided Aldermen with documentation relating to the Minutes of the 14 June 2016 Council Meeting and asked if errors in the Minutes of the Meeting could be altered accordingly.

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, indicated that Council had confirmed the Minutes.

7.2.4 Mr Ronald Baines - Rating of Retirement Homes

How does giving away land valued at approximately \$5M equate to taking \$600,000 from the aged and infirmed in retirement homes?

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, responded by saying that gifting the land to UTAS is considered as an investment into the future. The Mayor also indicated that the decision regarding retirement homes had not been made by Council as yet and a policy would be forwarded to Council for comment and further discussion.

7.2.5 Mr Gus Green - Floods and Eastern Bypass Proposal

Mr Green asked whether the recent flood situation had revealed any developments regarding roads and the Eastern Bypass and the proposed riverside outlet. Mr Green further asked where the Council was situated with regard to road planning as we move forward as a City?

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, responded by saying that after the recent flooding, discussions had been held with the The Hon Rene Hidding MP and the Treasurer, The Hon Peter Gutwein MP regarding these issues.

Mr R Dobrzynski (General Manager) stated that discussions are currently being held with the State Government regarding a future transport strategy in the City. The General Manager stated that the number of instances where the West Tamar highway is inundated with flood waters and traffic is diverted through Trevallyn is a concern. However, of more concern are the safety issues and structural concerns. Options such as the construction of a bridge joining the two highways are also being discussed. The General Manager also indicated that out of all the major transport projects the Council is considering, this proposal has the best cost benefit and is deemed to have the greatest chance of funding success in the future. The Eastern Bypass would cost considerably more and is not seen by the State Government as a priority. At this stage, the bridge proposal is considered a medium term project. The intersection of Charles and Lindsay Streets and the provision of a major roundabout at the Mowbray connector are the most immediate priorities.

8 PLANNING AUTHORITY

No Development Applications were registered with Council as part of these Minutes

DECISION: 27 June 2016

MOTION

Moved Alderman R L McKendrick, seconded Alderman R I Soward.

That Council move to discuss Agenda Item 19.1 - Fire Services Rates - Retirement Homes and 20.1 - Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016.

CARRIED 10:0

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

Council moved to Agenda Items 19.1 - Fire Services Rates - Retirement Homes and 20.1 - Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016.

9 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR**9.1 Mayor's Announcements****FILE NO:** SF2375

Wednesday 15 June 2016

- Attended the Official Opening of the Junior Hub at Newstead Christian School

Friday 17 June 2016

- Attended the Opening of John Brack's Portrait of Sir Lindsay Clark at the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery Wellington Street

Saturday 18 June 2016

- Attended Emily's Voice Fundraising Dinner at the Tailrace Centre

Sunday 19 June 2016

- Attended and laid a wreath at the Boer War Commemorative Day at the City Park

Tuesday 21 June 2016

- Attended the Tourism Research and Education Network MoU Signing and Research Launch at the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery Inveresk

Wednesday 22 June 2016

- Attended the Economic State of Play in Tasmania session - speaker Saul Eslake at the Hotel Grand Chancellor presented by AustSafe Super

Thursday 23 June 2016

- Attended the Business Events Tasmania Launch of the Tasmanian Ambassador Program at Josef Chromy Wines
 - Attended the Official Opening of the Launceston Big Picture School at 4 Invermay Road, Invermay
-

9.1 Mayor's Announcements ...(Cont'd)

Friday 24 June 2016

- Attended the Rio 2016 Olympic Breakfast with speaker Duncan Armstrong at the Hotel Grand Chancellor
- Attended the Awards Ceremony for the upcoming nextgen Business Team Challenge at UTAS Newnham

Saturday 25 June 2016

- Officiated at the South Esk Swimming Club Sprint Meet at the Launceston Aquatic Centre

Sunday 26 June 2016

- Attended the Hawthorn versus Gold Coast Suns game at Aurora Stadium
-

10 ALDERMEN'S REPORTS

(This item provides an opportunity for Aldermen to briefly report on the activities that have been undertaken in their capacity as a representative of the Council. It is not necessary to list social functions that have been attended.)

10.1 Alderman D H McKenzie

- **Attended Nextgen event at UTAS and noted the diverse range of activities undertaken by Adam Mostogl who is participating in innovative and varied programs within the State and overseas. Alderman McKenzie also commented on the enthusiasm and commitment of those students participating in events such as this.**

10.2 Alderman J Finlay

- **Attended the Public Meeting held on 21 June 2016 at the Albert Hall and publicly acknowledged the contribution of the community at that Meeting and stressed the importance of providing a report back to the community on the matters raised.**

10.3 Alderman S R F Wood

- **Noted the commencement of Festival of Voices this Friday at 6.00pm with a free event entitled Winterlight.**
- **Participated in the CEO's Vinnies Sleepout and noted that the City of Launceston team raised just over \$2,000.00. Alderman Wood thanked organisations such as St Vincent de Paul who contribute greatly to the welfare of the local community.**
- **Attended the CityProm Strategic Review Meeting convened by Garry Conway-Cooper working on a strategic plan for the two-year service agreement for the City as well as other issues such as the consumer behaviour survey, review of the risk register and a review of Winterlicious in the upcoming weeks.**

10.4 Alderman R I Soward

- **Deputised for the Mayor and attended the launch of the Tier Report and noted the positive public comments on both the performance of City of Launceston staff during the recent floods and the success of the flood levee system.**

10.5 Alderman R L McKendrick

- **Attended the Launceston College Meeting and noted the Community Committee's Annual General Meeting highlighting the number of parents prepared to participate.**
- **Advised Council of Franklin House maintenance issues that need addressing in the immediate future. Alderman McKendrick stated that if the maintenance issues were left unresolved there would be an impact on the operations at Franklin House.**
- **Alderman McKendrick passed on positive feedback from the Heritage Committee regarding ongoing cooperative efforts.**
- **Community Advisory Group for the Launceston General Hospital met with the incoming CEO of the hospital.**

Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward withdrew from the Meeting at 2.00pm

Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward re-attended the Meeting at 2.02pm

11 QUESTIONS BY ALDERMEN**11.1 Questions on Notice**

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 30

(A councillor, at least seven days before an ordinary Council Meeting or a Council Committee Meeting, may give written notice to the General Manager of a question in respect of which the councillor seeks an answer at that Meeting. An answer to a Question on Notice will be in writing.)

11.1.1 Aldermen's Question on Notice - Council Meeting - 14 June 2016**FILE NO:** SF2375**AUTHOR:** Anthea Rooney (Committee Clerk)**GENERAL MANAGER:** Shane Eberhardt (Acting Director Infrastructure Services)

QUESTION and RESPONSE:

Alderman D C Gibson asked the following question:

1. *What is the status of the Artist in Residence program at the Gorge Cottage?*

Response:

(Mr Shane Eberhardt - Acting Director Infrastructure Services)

The *Artist in Residence* program gives artists the opportunity to stay at Kings Bridge Cottage and use the Cataract Gorge Reserve as inspiration for a body of work.

The program is open to all types of artists including writers, dancers, painters and musicians. Preference is given to applicants who are willing to engage with the local community through exhibitions, openings or workshops.

A residency at Kings Bridge Cottage is available all year round. The length of stays can vary from one week (minimum) up to 12 weeks (maximum). A summary of bookings for 2015 indicates 14 bookings were made; in 2016 a total of 11 residencies have been booked and forward bookings for 2017 indicate four.

Artists are required to:

- Live and work at the cottage.
 - Create works, ideas, notes, research, etc. relating to the Cottage and / or the Cataract Gorge Reserve.
 - Acknowledge the City of Launceston's *Artist in Residence* program in any media interviews or workshops organised by the artist in residence.
 - Submit a written report to the Council's Parks and Recreation Department during a residency speaking of the experience, how it affected their work, their stay, etc.
 - Acknowledge the program in exhibitions, reports, CDs, books, etc. completed during a residency or down the track.
 - Make their own arrangements for any show/performance/exhibition and workshops with local venues and schools, library, etc.
 - Organise their own media interviews and agree to make themselves available to the City of Launceston's Media Officer should the *Program* be featured during a residency.
-

11.1.1 Aldermen's Question on Notice - Council Meeting - 14 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

The City of Launceston reserves the right to promote the residency and the artist's work prior and during their stay.

Fees include linen and a weekly cleaning service:

- One person - \$249.00 per week
 - Per couple - \$377.00 per week
-

Mr S Eberhardt (Acting Director Infrastructure Services) was in attendance to answer questions of Council in respect of this Agenda Item.

11.2 Questions without Notice

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 29

(Questions without Notice, and any answers to those questions, are not required to be recorded in the Minutes of the Meeting.)

No Questions without Notice were identified as part of these Minutes

12 COMMITTEE REPORTS**12.1 Tender Review Committee Meeting - 14 June 2016****FILE NO:** SF0100**AUTHOR:** Raj Pakiarajah (Projects Manager)**DIRECTOR:** Shane Eberhardt (Acting Director Infrastructure Services)

DECISION STATEMENT:

To receive and consider a report from the Tender Review Committee (a delegated authority Committee).

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receives the report from the Tender Review Committee Meeting held on 14 June 2016.

Mr S Eberhardt (Acting Director Infrastructure Services) was in attendance to answer questions of Council in respect of this Agenda Item.

DECISION: 27 June 2016**MOTION**

Moved Alderman J G Cox, seconded Alderman D H McKenzie.

That the Motion, as per the Recommendation to Council, be adopted.

CARRIED 10:0

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

13 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS

Council Workshops conducted on 20 June 2016 were:

- External Organisations Contributions
- Committee Briefing
- Rate Sample Properties - 2016/2017
- Launceston Aquatic Swim Club Request for Lane Hire Fee Reduction

14 NOTICES OF MOTION

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 16(5)

14.1 Notice of Motion - Alderman D H McKenzie - Making Our Community Safer**FILE NO:** SF5547/SF3724**AUTHOR:** Anthea Rooney (Committee Clerk)**GENERAL MANAGER:** Robert Dobrzynski (General Manager)

DECISION STATEMENT:

To consider holding a Civic Reception for emergency services and Council employees.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council convene a Civic Reception as a gesture of gratitude recognising the significant efforts of our emergency services and Council employees in dealing not only with the recent major flood crisis but also the broad range of other activities they undertake on a year round basis to make our community safer.

Mr R Dobrzynski (General Manager) was in attendance to answer questions of Council in respect of this Agenda Item.

DECISION: 27 June 2016**MOTION****Moved Alderman D H McKenzie, seconded Alderman R I Soward.****That the Motion, as per the Recommendation to Council, be adopted.****CARRIED 10:0**

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

15 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTORATE ITEMS

No Items were identified as part of these Minutes

16 FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DIRECTORATE ITEMS

16.1 Victoria's Cafe and Albert Hall Licence and Management Agreement

FILE NO: SF0369

AUTHOR: Matthew Skirving (Manager Architectural Services)

DIRECTOR: Rod Sweetnam (Director Facilities Management)

DECISION STATEMENT:

To consider a two year extension to the existing Licence and Management Agreement for Victoria's Café and Albert Hall between the City of Launceston and TLA Group Catering.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:

Council - 17 December 2012 - Agenda Item 4.2
SPPC Workshop - 6 June 2016

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council resolves to provide a two year extension to the existing Licence and Management Agreement for Victoria's Café and the Albert Hall between the City of Launceston and TLA Group Catering, in accordance with Section 179 *Local Government Act 1993*.

Mr R Sweetnam (Director Facilities Management) and Mr Matthew Skirving (Manager Architectural Services) were in attendance to answer questions of Council in respect of this Agenda Item.

DECISION: 27 June 2016

MOTION

Moved Alderman D C Gibson, seconded Alderman J Finlay.

That the Motion, as per the Recommendation to Council, be adopted.

CARRIED 10:0

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

17 QUEEN VICTORIA MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY DIRECTORATE ITEMS

No Items were identified as part of these Minutes

18 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES DIRECTORATE ITEMS

No Items were identified as part of these Minutes

19 CORPORATE SERVICES DIRECTORATE ITEMS**19.1 Fire Service Rates - Retirement Homes****FILE NO:** SF0521/SF0523**AUTHOR:** Michael Tidey (Director Corporate Services)

DECISION STATEMENT:

To consider the continued provision of remission for Fire Service Rates from Retirement Homes.

A decision, pursuant to Section 129 of the Local Government Act 1993, to provide a rate remission requires an absolute majority of Council.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:

SPPC Workshop - 6 June 2016

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That, due to the legislative requirement for the Council to collect and pay an amount prescribed by the Tasmanian Fire Service, Council determines that the discretionary remission that has been provided, pursuant to Section 129 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, for Fire Service Rates cease as of 1 July 2016 for the financial year ending 30 June 2017 for Retirement Homes.
 2. That Council notes the adoption of the first recommendation will result in the policy of the City of Launceston being consistent with those of other Councils.
-

Mr M Tidey (Director Corporate Services) was in attendance to answer questions of Council in respect of this Agenda Item.

Mr Basil Fitch spoke against the item

Mr Bill Dabner spoke against the item

19.1 Fire Service Rates - Retirement Homes ...(Cont'd)

MOTION

Moved Alderman J Finlay, seconded Alderman D H McKenzie.

That the Motion, as per the Recommendation to Council, be adopted.

AS A FUTHER MOTION HAD BEEN FORESHADOWED NO VOTE WAS TAKEN

DECISION: 27 June 2016

MOTION

Moved Alderman R L McKendrick, seconded Alderman R I Soward.

That the Item be Deferred.

CARRIED 10:0

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

20 GENERAL MANAGER'S DIRECTORATE ITEMS**20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016****FILE NO:** SF0097**GENERAL MANAGER:** Robert Dobrzynski (General Manager)

DECISION STATEMENT:

To report on the Public Meeting held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 at 7.00pm at the Albert Hall in compliance with section 60A(5) of the *Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)*.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:

Council Meeting - 11 April 2016 - Agenda Item 5.1 - Tabling of Petition Requesting a Public Meeting About the Transfer of Land to the University of Tasmania (UTAS)

Council Meeting - 9 May 2016 - Agenda Item 20.1 - Action on Petition Requesting a Public Meeting About the Transfer of Land to the University of Tasmania (UTAS)

Council Meeting - 14 June 2016 - Agenda Item 20.1 - Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday 7, June 2016

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council:

1. In respect of the Public Meeting held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 at 7.00pm at the Albert Hall, Launceston:
 - (i) Minutes the Summary of Submissions, as detailed below, presented by the General Manager in accordance with section 60A(5)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)*.
 - (ii) Minutes the following decisions made at the Public Meeting:
 - (a) Call on Council to rescind the motion passed by the Full Council Meeting 9th November 2015 to transfer said land (free gift) to UTAS.
 - (b) That the said land be placed for sale on the open market via a public auction with a Reserve Price of \$5 million.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

2. Notes the following Summary of Submissions made available at the Public Meeting held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016:

Public Meeting - Tuesday, 21 June 2016***Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)*
Summary of Submissions to the General Manager**Background

The Council was petitioned to hold a Public Meeting. The Public Meeting was held on Tuesday, 7 June 2016. The subject matter of the meeting was:

- 1. That the Launceston City Council call a Public Meeting for the purpose of discussing the Council's decision to transfer (free gift) land, known as Willis Street Car Park and Old Velodrome.*
- 2. Call on Council to rescind the motion passed by the Full Council Meeting 9th November 2015 to transfer said land (free gift) to UTAS.*
- 3. That the said land be placed for sale on the open market via a public auction with a Reserve Price of \$5 million.*

As required by section 60A(1)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)* (the Act), Council displayed and published notice of the Public Meeting and invited written submissions in relation to the subject matter. Written submissions were required to be lodged by 5.00pm Wednesday, 1 June 2016, which was within 21 days (as required by the Act) after the first publication of the notice on 11 May 2016. Submissions were summarised by the General Manager in a document, copies of which were available to those who attended the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016, in accordance with section 60A(4) of the Act.

At the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016, a decision was made to postpone the Public Meeting to Tuesday, 21 June 2016. Minuted decisions taken at the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016 are available at www.launceston.tas.gov.au, in the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Tuesday, 14 June 2016.

In the notices that Council displayed and published in respect of tonight's Public Meeting it was noted that written submissions in relation to the subject matter have been summarised by the General Manager and will be available to those in attendance, as well as at www.launceston.tas.gov.au. The content of the submissions summary that is included in this document is the same content that was available at the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Submissions summary

The General Manager received 22 written submissions from 14 parties. It should be noted that three (3) parties registered 11 submissions. This summary encapsulates the essence of the issues raised as required by section 60(A)(4) of the Act.

Considered responses to each submission will be provided in due course. Where contact details have been provided, responses to specific submissions will be forwarded.

The summary has been set out under headings of the main themes raised within the submissions received.

Of the 22 submissions received, nine (9) expressed concerns relating to due diligence.

Due diligence
Another question is why no apparent attempt to canvass other means of disposing of the land that offered greater ratepayer benefits (e.g. tenders or similar) was made.
When Council made this "in principle" decision to gift land to UTAS, had Alderman sighted a copy of the "Deed of Gift" for the transfer of the Inveresk site from the Federal to State Government?
Why would Council gift the old velodrome site that is strategically important to users of York Park?
It is inconceivable as to why Council has agreed "in principle" to gift land as in the petition, treat the ratepayers with such disparagement and with the potential costs to taxpayers running into hundreds of millions of dollars with no credible business plan presented by any associated party.
UTAS claim that they are a business and must operate as one. As a business they should buy the land and not expect handouts. If the Newnham Campus is not viable, this suggests that the business is not being run properly or efficiently and I wonder if the situation would change if relocated to Inveresk. If nothing changes and business practices aren't improved, Launceston would be left with another unviable campus.
What consideration was obtained by the Council in exchange for the gifted land given that, culturally, gift-giving is used to build and maintain relationships, to show respect and express appreciation, or to enhance the image or reputation of the giver?
...Thus the questions arising in regard to Council's reportedly unanimous decision to gift valuable public land to UTAS, are
1. What expert advice was sought by, and/or offered by, the General Manager in regard to the decision making?
2. What was the source/s of any advice offered to aldermen?
3. Is the advice documented or recorded anywhere if it was formally/informally offered to the aldermen?
4. By extension, what expertise, experience, evidence and/or modelling backed up any such advice offered?

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

<p>5. Did any aldermen seek and/or gain independent advice and if so, from what source/s?</p> <p>6. By extension, was that advice formally acknowledged and/or documented anywhere and available as a public reference.</p>
<p>...I have not seen any sound reasons or solid information to support the current intention of gifting of the land to the university or to support any move from the current campus.</p>
<p>...I further submit...that Council (and by association, the State and Federal Governments) request a full independent analysis on the merits and promotion of the Mowbray-Newnham campus, effects on Mowbray village and shopping centre and northern suburbs, and that similar promotional material on the existing campus (complete with glossy publications) be produced as part of the discussion on the Council's transference of land gratis to the university.</p>
<p>The cost of the land and the amount of funding being given for relocation is not a realistic allocation of funds for Launceston and Northern Tasmania. There are projects that could be and should be carried out to provide true sustainable value for our city and region.</p>
<p>Genuine consideration has not been given to all the implications of a relocation to the said parcels of land to Inveresk-Tamar St-Lindsay St-Boland St-Esplanade-Lower Charles St or to the volume of traffic over the two bridges across the North Esk River.</p>
<p>...It seems somewhat extraordinary that Council is considering anything to do with UTAS's proposed development, and on this site, until or unless there is a firm/concrete proposition for Council to consider in the regular way...If there were a DA before Council in the regular way there would be a level of openness and transparency that would allow ratepayers, residents, et al to represent their interests and concerns in the same way as they can in respect to any other development before Council. Why hasn't this been considered?</p>
<p>I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because [the scale and intensity of the development] shall -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disadvantage the suburbs of Mowbray and Newnham because of their loss of activities and existing economic benefits; • potentially allow for inappropriate developments to occur at the existing Newnham campus as it will become necessary to put available users into that site in order to maintain and protect the area; • waste valuable carbon storages present in the existing Newnham campus buildings as much of that building infrastructure will be potentially destroyed.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Of the 22 submissions received, seven (7) expressed concerns relating to the financial impact on ratepayers.

Financial impact on ratepayers
Why did the Council offer to gift millions of dollars of public assets, in the form of land, to a wealthy and successful university when so many ratepayers were struggling financially?
I strongly disagree that the Launceston City Council should give the land at Inveresk and Willis Street to UTAS for free. There is no guarantee that student numbers can be increased to the extent that students will contribute significantly to Launceston's economy and eventually outweigh the value of the land. Students are usually notoriously poor, so there is a limit to the amount they can contribute to the economy, especially if student numbers remain low. Launceston ratepayers should not have to bear the cost.
If Council's proposal to gift valuable land to UTAS is realised it will equate to a gift to the university in the order of \$150 per rateable property in the municipality. Moreover, if UTAS's plans to shift its campus from Newnham to Inveresk it can be expected that there will be enormous infrastructure implications – road provision and maintenance, sewerage and stormwater, parking, recreational facilities, etc. – that will be ongoing – and potentially increasing over time. Likewise, this will impact upon, and heavily upon, ratepayers without a contribution from the university or any other reliable source. Where is the equity in Council's 'gift decision'? What is Council planning to mitigate against adverse outcomes for ratepayers?...Where is the independent and relevant economic modelling related to this land gift decision and its planned flow-on consequent developments?
Can ratepayers actually afford such gifts?
I wish to contest the very notion that Launceston Council should be gifting millions of dollars of community assets to anyone without first testing the market and establishing its real value - fiscal, social, cultural.
...I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universities do not pay rates or otherwise compensate the municipality for the provision of other services and infrastructure that is provided at the expense of ratepayers; • Universities do not adequately pay for services either as levys or useage charges, thereby increasing the cost imposts on other consumers and payers for such public services; • Even if argued by proponents and the University that a university stimulates and assists economic improvements for nearby commercial operations, there is no mechanism employed for Council and other statutory authorities to charge such alleged business beneficiaries for the alleged business improvements and hence increased municipal rates and other utility and service charges.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Accordingly these adverse factors are not in the interests of ratepayers and citizens of Launceston.

...I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because -

- this land is presently utilised for income producing purposes for the benefit of effectively defraying the Launceston rate burden. Site 1 is regularly utilised and leased out for Royal Launceston Show, car parking for York Stadium, visiting circuses and other travelling events (car & caravan shows) etc. Site 2 is utilised as a public car park and other events.
- this land has been identified by Council to be offered for private developments. Site 1 has been mooted by YPIPA as being suitable for hotel/retail developments with parking as a support facility for York Park Stadium; as a site for a cinema complex. Site 2 has been promoted by Council as being suitable for a multi-storey retail and apartment complex with parking (Council funded a comprehensive study and development concept plan at ratepayer expense; a large supermarket with car park facilities; in conjunction with the former Launceston Gasworks site significant multi-storey hotel developments have been proposed by private developers; Housing Tasmania has considered the site for public housing development, the adjacent car museum has expressed interest in acquiring part of this land for expansion of the National Automobile Museum.
- This land presently supports major events in City Park (Festivale, TSO Concerts etc.) and Albert Hall Convention and Exhibition Centre (antique and trade fairs, gala ball and concerts, special events) as essential car parking.

By gifting this land for University purposes, not only will all of the above activities be either prevented, restricted or loses valuable car parking facilities etc., the income presently enjoyed by ratepayers will be significantly reduced as well as income to ratepaying operators and businesses adjacent to these sites will be reduced and tourism and tourist accommodation and food and beverage services will be adversely impacted upon.

The loss of revenue has got to be made up from somewhere and who's going to pay for that. The loss of revenue would be about \$800,000 a year.

Of the 22 submissions received, seven (7) expressed concerns relating to the suitability of the site because of e.g. flooding.

Suitability of the site

Recognising the known limitations with any development on Launceston's flood plains, did Alderman request an independent report of both the known political risks together with the potential cost burden to the ratepayers?

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

<p>The sale or gifting of land to UTAS by implication puts a legal responsibility on the council in that the land is "fit for purpose" when in fact the council knows that the area is subject to flooding with raw sewerage and the Tasmanian Health Department has warned of disease that can be contracted when such inundation occurs. Thus the Launceston City Council is knowingly disposing of land which is actually "unfit for purpose" and could be subject to future legal action by a person or persons so affected on the said land.</p>
<p>The Inveresk Campus will be on a flood plain...I am sure that flood prevention will always be an issue in Launceston and money will be needed to keep the levies in good condition or replaced. If the land at Inveresk and Willis Street is given away free to UTAS, there will be less money available to ensure that Inveresk is kept safe from floods.</p>
<p>No consideration has been given to the problems of flooding and sewerage at Inveresk. No genuine consideration has been given to the implications of such an over-development on flooding and sewerage.</p>
<p>It is a well-known flood zone.</p>
<p>I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because [the scale and intensity of the university development] shall -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase the pressure for public funding including ratepayer funding of flood protection measures and liabilities for flood damage to structures and their occupants... • increase the risk to buildings and occupants due to the relativity of the sites to known geological fault lines... • increase the demands on public infrastructure such as water, sewerage and stormwater utilities and treatment headworks and outfalls; roads and bridges including foot and bicycle carriageways and bridges • cause significant increases in traffic and parking congestion and environmental pollution • place increased economic pressures on existing land and building users in the vicinity, by forcing up values and rents and pricing out of the market • create a potential ghetto environment and potential social downgrading of the area due to a higher level of low socio-economic residents in this vicinity.
<p>I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because [the scale and intensity of the development] shall -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • create an over-intensification of development of these two parcels of land and be inconsistent with the level of intensity in the vicinity thereby changing the character of the area and the present level of enjoyment by ratepayers and citizens in the vicinity; • change the standard of amenity and alter what is presently available giving an unknown style or gentrification to the locality resulting in potential conflicts.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Of the 22 submissions received, five (5) expressed concerns relating to parking.

Parking
If the Velodrome car park is gifted or sold to UTAS where will...Launceston and surrounding municipality ratepayers park or enjoy events [e.g. York Park hosted sporting events, entertainment or functions, Launceston Show] on week days?
If the Willis St car park is gifted or sold to UTAS where will Launceston and surrounding municipality ratepayers park on week days to visit essential non duplicated services in the adjacent Boland Street offices of Centrelink and Medicare...a fair proportion of the clients are elderly, sick or financially disadvantaged. Many cannot walk any distance...Only limited parking has been provided for Centrelink clients and now combined with the recently introduced Medicare office client numbers have increased and the Commonwealth parking is totally inadequate.
Launceston mothers and child carers park in the Willis St car park and visit the City park daily...Throughout the year many exhibitions and functions are held in the Albert Hall Monday to Friday and a large percentage park in Willis Street. The Cimitiere Tamar St car park is usually full during the day time with visitors to the area and reserved parking for LCC vehicles. Can the LCC respond to these questions with definite answers as to plans for parking should be Willis Street land be gifted or sold to UTAS?
...extra parking will make it very difficult for my carers to pick me up for appointments and attend to my daily needs...
...parking in that [Inveresk] area would be inundated by the hundreds of new parking vehicles if we did get extra hundreds, let alone thousands, of new students - in the extra buildings that would mostly replace current parking allotments.
Residents lose out now to the football with nearby parking.
Also the parking issues for the elderly that live in the area and have carers along with meals on wheels.
We need it for parking during the week, plus the football.

Of the 22 submissions received, four (4) expressed concerns relating to community consultation.

Community consultation
Public concerns are not about whether UTAS should move to the city; they are about Council gifting public assets without ratepayer involvement.
Let the people have a say and it is interesting to note that the two public meetings held on the transfer has been overwhelmingly negative to the UTAS proposal (refer Examiner Feb. 9, 2016, 11:18pm "Public meeting slams UTAS campus deal").
No input was sought from Northern suburbs businesses or residents and no impact study on Mowbray and Newnham businesses has been carried out.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Launceston's population has essentially stagnated, and arguably is currently stagnant, and any prospect of 'substantial growth' seems to be some way away. Indeed, the city seems to be facing the prospect of unsustainability in a changing economic environment. That might be turned around if government - State and Local - were to take its constituency into its confidence.

Of the 22 submissions received, three (3) expressed concerns relating to the conduct of Council officers.

Conduct of Council officers
Council staff and executives could be advantaged with other government groups by dispensing favours that could disadvantage ratepayers financially. Council needs to demonstrate that advantages to Council staff cannot be achieved in this way.
What protections have been provided to ratepayers that some consideration in terms of favours was not obtained by individuals within Council - <i>for example protection against corrupt practices?</i>
The nature and scope of UTAS's proposal is a matter exclusively for UTAS to determine unless of course the City of Launceston is intending to be (or already is?!) a collaborating partner (shareholder?) in the 'enterprise'.
...the lack of a DA suggests that there may be something that is being hidden. If there is, what is it? If there is, why is it being hidden and from whom?
Have open and transparent practices been used to assure ratepayers that corrupt practices are not in play?

Of the 22 submissions received, three (3) expressed concerns relating to the displacement of existing users of the site.

Displacement of existing users of the site
The Velodrome is the major site for the Launceston Show Society to stage their annual show...No suitable [alternative] show site has been suggested or maybe exists.
This land should be done up with the tramline as was the original plan or kept as is for historical purposes... What about the sportspeople that use the grounds as well as the people accommodating the Esk Markets?...It is not the time to swap now and take away something that is of historical significance and something that is used by thousands of rate payers.
We need it for open spaces for people who use it on the weekend.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Of the 22 submissions received, three (3) expressed concerns relating to traffic.

Traffic
Anecdotal evidence claims that traffic, not just at the Lindsay/Goderich Streets intersection, but also at the Lindsay Street/Invermay Road intersection, has increased since Bunnings, Office Works, JB Hi Fi, etc. opened at Ogilvie Park. Has there been a traffic feasibility study done in that area to see if it can cope with extra traffic generated by a UTAS Campus at Inveresk? If the optimistic vision that eventually there will be 10,000 students at Inveresk is realised, there is going to be a massive traffic problem. Even with the current number of students, there will be traffic problems. How will the Launceston City Council address this? Build another bridge? Build an overpass? Knock down shops, businesses and homes to build a wider road? Turn Launceston into another Melbourne or Sydney and spoil its character and charm which is the very thing that brings visitors to Tasmania?
Traffic congestion would be horrendous.
We don't need the congestion it is going to bring into town.

Of the 22 submissions received, one (1) expressed concerns relating to governance.

Governance
From when this idea was sown, has the General Manager and Finance Manager created an expenditure line in the budget to identify costs, including employees time. If so what are the hourly charge out rates, including that of the General Manager, also advising total costs to date and budgeted costs for ongoing years. If you are unable to provide adequate detail, why it is that Council have failed to commit to good governance and accountability in the interest of ratepayers.
In 1990 the community sowed the seeds for the redevelopment of the Inveresk site for a cultural, recreational and community which attracted some \$18m of Federal Government funds together with community contributions: will these be safe unlike Rotary International's 75 th Anniversary Gift that was destroyed by UTAS without any formal apology from the Launceston City Council.

Of the 22 submissions received, one (1) expressed a view that the transfer of land is a great investment for the City of Launceston.

A positive investment in the City of Launceston
This is the only proposal in recent years which could be viewed as an appropriate use for the land. We have seen first hand during our travels overseas, what huge benefits a university close to the central business district of a city, brings to the area and its residents. Kingston in Canada, thrives on its student population. The city is a similar size to Launceston, and its accommodation and retail industries rely on the two universities situated there. Employment is also boosted by these institutions.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

The city of Prince George in Canada is another good example. Education in the form of its university is a driving force in the economy. What an infusion of life it will bring to our city.

3. Determines that the General Manager prepare a report for the consideration of Council dealing with:
 - (i) the matters raised in the submissions received; and
 - (ii) the decisions made at the Public Meeting held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016.
-

Mr R Dobrzynski (General Manager) was in attendance to answer questions of Council in respect of this Agenda Item.

Mr Basil Fitch spoke against the item

MOTION

Moved Alderman R I Soward, seconded Alderman J Finlay.

That the Motion, as per the Recommendation to Council, be adopted.

Alderman Finlay withdrew her seconding of the motion with the consent of Council.

MOTION LAPSED FOR WANT OF A SECONDER

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

DECISION: 27 June 2016

MOTION

Moved Alderman R L McKendrick, seconded Alderman D H McKenzie:

That the Council:

1. In respect of the Public Meeting held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 at 7.00pm at the Albert Hall, Launceston:
 - (i) Minutes the Summary of Submissions, as detailed below, presented by the General Manager in accordance with section 60A(5)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)*.
 - (ii) Minutes the following decisions made at the Public Meeting:
 - (a) Call on Council to rescind the motion passed by the Full Council Meeting 9th November 2015 to transfer said land (free gift) to UTAS.
 - (b) That the said land be placed for sale on the open market via a public auction with a Reserve Price of \$5 million.
2. Notes the following Summary of Submissions made available at the Public Meeting held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016:

Public Meeting - Tuesday, 21 June 2016

Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)

Summary of Submissions to the General Manager

Background

The Council was petitioned to hold a Public Meeting. The Public Meeting was held on Tuesday, 7 June 2016. The subject matter of the meeting was:

1. *That the Launceston City Council call a Public Meeting for the purpose of discussing the Council's decision to transfer (free gift) land, known as Willis Street Car Park and Old Velodrome.*
 2. *Call on Council to rescind the motion passed by the Full Council Meeting 9th November 2015 to transfer said land (free gift) to UTAS.*
 3. *That the said land be placed for sale on the open market via a public auction with a Reserve Price of \$5 million.*
-

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

As required by section 60A(1)(c) of the *Local Government Act 1993 (Tas)* (the Act), Council displayed and published notice of the Public Meeting and invited written submissions in relation to the subject matter. Written submissions were required to be lodged by 5.00pm Wednesday, 1 June 2016, which was within 21 days (as required by the Act) after the first publication of the notice on 11 May 2016. Submissions were summarised by the General Manager in a document, copies of which were available to those who attended the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016, in accordance with section 60A(4) of the Act.

At the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016, a decision was made to postpone the Public Meeting to Tuesday, 21 June 2016. Minuted decisions taken at the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016 are available at www.launceston.tas.gov.au, in the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Tuesday, 14 June 2016.

In the notices that Council displayed and published in respect of tonight's Public Meeting it was noted that written submissions in relation to the subject matter have been summarised by the General Manager and will be available to those in attendance, as well as at www.launceston.tas.gov.au. The content of the submissions summary that is included in this document is the same content that was available at the Public Meeting on Tuesday, 7 June 2016.

Submissions summary

The General Manager received 22 written submissions from 14 parties. It should be noted that three (3) parties registered 11 submissions. This summary encapsulates the essence of the issues raised as required by section 60(A)(4) of the Act.

Considered responses to each submission will be provided in due course. Where contact details have been provided, responses to specific submissions will be forwarded.

The summary has been set out under headings of the main themes raised within the submissions received.

Of the 22 submissions received, nine (9) expressed concerns relating to due diligence.

Due diligence
Another question is why no apparent attempt to canvass other means of disposing of the land that offered greater ratepayer benefits (e.g. tenders or similar) was made.
When Council made this "in principle" decision to gift land to UTAS, had Alderman sighted a copy of the "Deed of Gift" for the transfer of the Inveresk site from the Federal to State Government?

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

<p>Why would Council gift the old velodrome site that is strategically important to users of York Park?</p>
<p>It is inconceivable as to why Council has agreed "in principle" to gift land as in the petition, treat the ratepayers with such disparagement and with the potential costs to taxpayers running into hundreds of millions of dollars with no credible business plan presented by any associated party.</p>
<p>UTAS claim that they are a business and must operate as one. As a business they should buy the land and not expect handouts. If the Newnham Campus is not viable, this suggests that the business is not being run properly or efficiently and I wonder if the situation would change if relocated to Inveresk. If nothing changes and business practices aren't improved, Launceston would be left with another unviable campus.</p>
<p>What consideration was obtained by the Council in exchange for the gifted land given that, culturally, gift-giving is used to build and maintain relationships, to show respect and express appreciation, or to enhance the image or reputation of the giver?</p>
<p>...Thus the questions arising in regard to Council's reportedly unanimous decision to gift valuable public land to UTAS, are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What expert advice was sought by, and/or offered by, the General Manager in regard to the decision making? 2. What was the source/s of any advice offered to aldermen? 3. Is the advice documented or recorded anywhere if it was formally/informally offered to the aldermen? 4. By extension, what expertise, experience, evidence and/or modelling backed up any such advice offered? 5. Did any aldermen seek and/or gain independent advice and if so, from what source/s? 6. By extension, was that advice formally acknowledged and/or documented anywhere and available as a public reference.
<p>...I have not seen any sound reasons or solid information to support the current intention of gifting of the land to the university or to support any move from the current campus.</p>
<p>...I further submit...that Council (and by association, the State and Federal Governments) request a full independent analysis on the merits and promotion of the Mowbray-Newnham campus, effects on Mowbray village and shopping centre and northern suburbs, and that similar promotional material on the existing campus (complete with glossy publications) be produced as part of the discussion on the Council's transference of land gratis to the university.</p>
<p>The cost of the land and the amount of funding being given for relocation is not a realistic allocation of funds for Launceston and Northern Tasmania. There are projects that could be and should be carried out to provide true sustainable value for our city and region.</p>

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Genuine consideration has not been given to all the implications of a relocation to the said parcels of land to Inveresk-Tamar St-Lindsay St-Boland St-Esplanade-Lower Charles St or to the volume of traffic over the two bridges across the North Esk River.

...It seems somewhat extraordinary that Council is considering anything to do with UTAS's proposed development, and on this site, until or unless there is a firm/concrete proposition for Council to consider in the regular way...If there were a DA before Council in the regular way there would be a level of openness and transparency that would allow ratepayers, residents, et al to represent their interests and concerns in the same way as they can in respect to any other development before Council. Why hasn't this been considered?

I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because [the scale and intensity of the development] shall -

- disadvantage the suburbs of Mowbray and Newnham because of their loss of activities and existing economic benefits;**
- potentially allow for inappropriate developments to occur at the existing Newnham campus as it will become necessary to put available users into that site in order to maintain and protect the area;**
- waste valuable carbon storages present in the existing Newnham campus buildings as much of that building infrastructure will be potentially destroyed.**

Of the 22 submissions received, seven (7) expressed concerns relating to the financial impact on ratepayers.

Financial impact on ratepayers

Why did the Council offer to gift millions of dollars of public assets, in the form of land, to a wealthy and successful university when so many ratepayers were struggling financially?

I strongly disagree that the Launceston City Council should give the land at Inveresk and Willis Street to UTAS for free. There is no guarantee that student numbers can be increased to the extent that students will contribute significantly to Launceston's economy and eventually outweigh the value of the land. Students are usually notoriously poor, so there is a limit to the amount they can contribute to the economy, especially if student numbers remain low. Launceston ratepayers should not have to bear the cost.

If Council's proposal to gift valuable land to UTAS is realised it will equate to a gift to the university in the order of \$150 per rateable property in the municipality. Moreover, if UTAS's plans to shift its campus from Newnham to Inveresk it can be expected that there will be enormous infrastructure implications – road provision and maintenance, sewerage and stormwater, parking, recreational facilities, etc. – that will be ongoing – and potentially increasing over time.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Likewise, this will impact upon, and heavily upon, ratepayers without a contribution from the university or any other reliable source. Where is the equity in Council's 'gift decision'? What is Council planning to mitigate against adverse outcomes for ratepayers?...Where is the independent and relevant economic modelling related to this land gift decision and its planned flow-on consequent developments?

Can ratepayers actually afford such gifts?

I wish to contest the very notion that Launceston Council should be gifting millions of dollars of community assets to anyone without first testing the market and establishing its real value - fiscal, social, cultural.

...I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because -

- Universities do not pay rates or otherwise compensate the municipality for the provision of other services and infrastructure that is provided at the expense of ratepayers;
- Universities do not adequately pay for services either as levys or usage charges, thereby increasing the cost imposts on other consumers and payers for such public services;
- Even if argued by proponents and the University that a university stimulates and assists economic improvements for nearby commercial operations, there is no mechanism employed for Council and other statutory authorities to charge such alleged business beneficiaries for the alleged business improvements and hence increased municipal rates and other utility and service charges.

Accordingly these adverse factors are not in the interests of ratepayers and citizens of Launceston.

...I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because -

- this land is presently utilised for income producing purposes for the benefit of effectively defraying the Launceston rate burden. Site 1 is regularly utilised and leased out for Royal Launceston Show, car parking for York Stadium, visiting circuses and other travelling events (car & caravan shows) etc. Site 2 is utilised as a public car park and other events.
- this land has been identified by Council to be offered for private developments. Site 1 has been mooted by YPIPA as being suitable for hotel/retail developments with parking as a support facility for York Park Stadium; as a site for a cinema complex. Site 2 has been promoted by Council as being suitable for a multi-storey retail and apartment complex with parking (Council funded a comprehensive study and development concept plan at ratepayer expense; a large supermarket with car park facilities; in conjunction with the former Launceston Gasworks site significant multi-storey hotel developments have been proposed by private developers; Housing Tasmania has considered the site for public housing development, the adjacent car museum has expressed interest in acquiring part of this land for expansion of the National Automobile Museum.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

- This land presently supports major events in City Park (Festivale, TSO Concerts etc.) and Albert Hall Convention and Exhibition Centre (antique and trade fairs, gala ball and concerts, special events) as essential car parking.

By gifting this land for University purposes, not only will all of the above activities be either prevented, restricted or loses valuable car parking facilities etc., the income presently enjoyed by ratepayers will be significantly reduced as well as income to ratepaying operators and businesses adjacent to these sites will be reduced and tourism and tourist accommodation and food and beverage services will be adversely impacted upon.

The loss of revenue has got to be made up from somewhere and who's going to pay for that. The loss of revenue would be about \$800,000 a year.

Of the 22 submissions received, seven (7) expressed concerns relating to the suitability of the site because of e.g. flooding.

Suitability of the site
Recognising the known limitations with any development on Launceston's flood plains, did Alderman request an independent report of both the known political risks together with the potential cost burden to the ratepayers?
The sale or gifting of land to UTAS by implication puts a legal responsibility on the council in that the land is "fit for purpose" when in fact the council knows that the area is subject to flooding with raw sewerage and the Tasmanian Health Department has warned of disease that can be contracted when such inundation occurs. Thus the Launceston City Council is knowingly disposing of land which is actually "unfit for purpose" and could be subject to future legal action by a person or persons so affected on the said land.
The Inveresk Campus will be on a flood plain...I am sure that flood prevention will always be an issue in Launceston and money will be needed to keep the levies in good condition or replaced. If the land at Inveresk and Willis Street is given away free to UTAS, there will be less money available to ensure that Inveresk is kept safe from floods.
No consideration has been given to the problems of flooding and sewerage at Inveresk. No genuine consideration has been given to the implications of such an over-development on flooding and sewerage.
It is a well-known flood zone.
I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because [the scale and intensity of the university development] shall - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase the pressure for public funding including ratepayer funding of flood protection measures and liabilities for flood damage to structures and their occupants... • increase the risk to buildings and occupants due to the relativity of the sites to known geological fault lines...

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase the demands on public infrastructure such as water, sewerage and stormwater utilities and treatment headworks and outfalls; roads and bridges including foot and bicycle carriageways and bridges • cause significant increases in traffic and parking congestion and environmental pollution • place increased economic pressures on existing land and building users in the vicinity, by forcing up values and rents and pricing out of the market • create a potential ghetto environment and potential social downgrading of the area due to a higher level of low socio-economic residents in this vicinity.
<p>I oppose [the gifting of the land to UTAS] because [the scale and intensity of the development] shall -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • create an over-intensification of development of these two parcels of land and be inconsistent with the level of intensity in the vicinity thereby changing the character of the area and the present level of enjoyment by ratepayers and citizens in the vicinity; • change the standard of amenity and alter what is presently available giving an unknown style or gentrification to the locality resulting in potential conflicts.

Of the 22 submissions received, five (5) expressed concerns relating to parking.

<p>Parking</p>
<p>If the Velodrome car park is gifted or sold to UTAS where will...Launceston and surrounding municipality ratepayers park or enjoy events [e.g. York Park hosted sporting events, entertainment or functions, Launceston Show] on week days?</p>
<p>If the Willis St car park is gifted or sold to UTAS where will Launceston and surrounding municipality ratepayers park on week days to visit essential non duplicated services in the adjacent Boland Street offices of Centrelink and Medicare...a fair proportion of the clients are elderly, sick or financially disadvantaged. Many cannot walk any distance...Only limited parking has been provided for Centrelink clients and now combined with the recently introduced Medicare office client numbers have increased and the Commonwealth parking is totally inadequate.</p>
<p>Launceston mothers and child carers park in the Willis St car park and visit the City park daily...Throughout the year many exhibitions and functions are held in the Albert Hall Monday to Friday and a large percentage park in Willis Street. The Cimitiere Tamar St car park is usually full during the day time with visitors to the area and reserved parking for LCC vehicles. Can the LCC respond to these questions with definite answers as to plans for parking should be Willis Street land be gifted or sold to UTAS?</p>
<p>...extra parking will make it very difficult for my carers to pick me up for appointments and attend to my daily needs...</p>

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

...parking in that [Inveresk] area would be inundated by the hundreds of new parking vehicles if we did get extra hundreds, let alone thousands, of new students - in the extra buildings that would mostly replace current parking allotments.

Residents lose out now to the football with nearby parking.

Also the parking issues for the elderly that live in the area and have carers along with meals on wheels.

We need it for parking during the week, plus the football.

Of the 22 submissions received, four (4) expressed concerns relating to community consultation.

Community consultation

Public concerns are not about whether UTAS should move to the city; they are about Council gifting public assets without ratepayer involvement.

Let the people have a say and it is interesting to note that the two public meetings held on the transfer has been overwhelmingly negative to the UTAS proposal (refer Examiner Feb. 9, 2016, 11:18pm "Public meeting slams UTAS campus deal").

No input was sought from Northern suburbs businesses or residents and no impact study on Mowbray and Newnham businesses has been carried out.

Launceston's population has essentially stagnated, and arguably is currently stagnant, and any prospect of 'substantial growth' seems to be some way away. Indeed, the city seems to be facing the prospect of unsustainability in a changing economic environment. That might be turned around if government - State and Local - were to take its constituency into its confidence.

Of the 22 submissions received, three (3) expressed concerns relating to the conduct of Council officers.

Conduct of Council officers

Council staff and executives could be advantaged with other government groups by dispensing favours that could disadvantage ratepayers financially. Council needs to demonstrate that advantages to Council staff cannot be achieved in this way.

What protections have been provided to ratepayers that some consideration in terms of favours was not obtained by individuals within Council - *for example protection against corrupt practices?*

The nature and scope of UTAS's proposal is a matter exclusively for UTAS to determine unless of course the City of Launceston is intending to be (or already is?!) a collaborating partner (shareholder?) in the 'enterprise'.

...the lack of a DA suggests that there may be something that is being hidden. If there is, what is it? If there is, why is it being hidden and from whom?

Have open and transparent practices been used to assure ratepayers that corrupt practices are not in play?

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

Of the 22 submissions received, three (3) expressed concerns relating to the displacement of existing users of the site.

Displacement of existing users of the site
The Velodrome is the major site for the Launceston Show Society to stage their annual show...No suitable [alternative] show site has been suggested or maybe exists.
This land should be done up with the tramline as was the original plan or kept as is for historical purposes... What about the sportspeople that use the grounds as well as the people accommodating the Esk Markets?...It is not the time to swap now and take away something that is of historical significance and something that is used by thousands of rate payers.
We need it for open spaces for people who use it on the weekend.

Of the 22 submissions received, three (3) expressed concerns relating to traffic.

Traffic
Anecdotal evidence claims that traffic, not just at the Lindsay/Goderich Streets intersection, but also at the Lindsay Street/Invermay Road intersection, has increased since Bunnings, Office Works, JB Hi Fi, etc. opened at Ogilvie Park. Has there been a traffic feasibility study done in that area to see if it can cope with extra traffic generated by a UTAS Campus at Inveresk? If the optimistic vision that eventually there will be 10,000 students at Inveresk is realised, there is going to be a massive traffic problem. Even with the current number of students, there will be traffic problems. How will the Launceston City Council address this? Build another bridge? Build an overpass? Knock down shops, businesses and homes to build a wider road? Turn Launceston into another Melbourne or Sydney and spoil its character and charm which is the very thing that brings visitors to Tasmania?
Traffic congestion would be horrendous.
We don't need the congestion it is going to bring into town.

Of the 22 submissions received, one (1) expressed concerns relating to governance.

Governance
From when this idea was sown, has the General Manager and Finance Manager created an expenditure line in the budget to identify costs, including employees time. If so what are the hourly charge out rates, including that of the General Manager, also advising total costs to date and budgeted costs for ongoing years. If you are unable to provide adequate detail, why it is that Council have failed to commit to good governance and accountability in the interest of ratepayers.

20.1 Report on Public Meeting Held on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 ...(Cont'd)

In 1990 the community sowed the seeds for the redevelopment of the Inveresk site for a cultural, recreational and community which attracted some \$18m of Federal Government funds together with community contributions: will these be safe unlike Rotary International's 75th Anniversary Gift that was destroyed by UTAS without any formal apology from the Launceston City Council.

Of the 22 submissions received, one (1) expressed a view that the transfer of land is a great investment for the City of Launceston.

A positive investment in the City of Launceston

This is the only proposal in recent years which could be viewed as an appropriate use for the land. We have seen first hand during our travels overseas, what huge benefits a university close to the central business district of a city, brings to the area and its residents. Kingston in Canada, thrives on its student population. The city is a similar size to Launceston, and its accommodation and retail industries rely on the two universities situated there. Employment is also boosted by these institutions. The city of Prince George in Canada is another good example. Education in the form of its university is a driving force in the economy. What an infusion of life it will bring to our city.

- 3. Determines that the General Manager provide a further report to the Council dealing with:**
- (i) the matters raised in the submissions received; and**
 - (ii) the decisions made at the Public Meetings held on Tuesday, 7 June 2016 and Tuesday, 21 June 2016.**

CARRIED 10:0

FOR VOTE: Mayor Alderman A M van Zetten, Deputy Mayor Alderman R I Soward, Alderman R L McKendrick, Alderman R J Sands, Alderman D H McKenzie, Alderman J G Cox, Alderman D C Gibson, Alderman J Finlay, Alderman S R F Wood and Alderman K P Stojansek.

Council resumed the published order of business at Agenda Item 9.1 - Mayor's Announcements.

21 URGENT BUSINESS

Regulation 8(6) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, states that a council, by absolute majority at an ordinary council meeting, may decide to deal with a matter that is not on the Minutes.

No Urgent Items were identified as part of these Minutes

22 CLOSED COUNCIL

Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015 - Regulation 15(2)

No Closed Items were identified as part of these Minutes

23 MEETING CLOSURE

The Mayor, Alderman A M van Zetten, closed the Meeting at 2.21pm.

UNCLASSIFIED MINUTES ITEMS: