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Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the West Tamar Council held at the Council Chambers, West Street, Beaconsfield on Tuesday 15 August 2017 at 1.30pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Christina Holmdahl, Deputy Mayor Joy Allen and Councillors Carol Bracken, Lynden Ferguson, Richard Ireland, Peter Kearney OAM, Geoff Lyons OAM, Rick Shegog and Tim Woinarski.

APOLOGIES: Nil.

IN ATTENDANCE: Rolph Vos (General Manager), David Gregory (Corporate Services Manager), Ian Howard (Infrastructure Services Manager), Michele Gibbins (Community Services Manager), Michael Purves (Municipal Planner/Development Services Manager), Diane Sheppard (Personal Assistant) and Kristie Giblin (Media Communications Officer).

75/17 MINUTES

Moved Cr Ferguson seconded Cr Lyons that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2017 be received and confirmed.

For: Crs Allen, Bracken, Ferguson, Holmdahl, Ireland, Kearney, Lyons, Shegog & Woinarski.
Against: Nil.

CARRIED 9/0

76/17 COUNCIL WORKSHOPS

- 9.00am - Gravelly Beach Update (Ian Howard)
- 9.15am - Riverside Olympic Soccer Club Update (Michele Gibbins)
- 9.45am - Beaconsfield Council Workshop (Rolph Vos)
- 10.15am - Expenditure Review Committee (David Gregory)
- 10.30am - TasWater Update (Rolph Vos)
- 10.45am - Planning (Michael Purves)
- 11.00am - Shared Services Report (Tim Rutherford & David Richardson)

77/17 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Nil.

COMMUNITY INPUT TIME

1. Mr Jeff Garner, Treasurer of Paringa Archers, Trevallyn
Mr Garner is the Treasurer of the Paringa Archers and is happy to answer any questions regarding support of the recommendation on today’s agenda - Plan 1: Extension to existing outdoor Archery Range and new indoor Archery Range at 201 Reatta, Road Trevallyn.
The Mayor advised Council is now acting as a planning authority under the Land Use and Planning Approvals Act 1993.

78/17 PLAN 1 SENIOR STATUTORY PLANNER’S REPORT: EXTENSION TO EXISTING OUTDOOR ARCHERY RANGE AND NEW INDOOR ARCHERY RANGE AT 201 REATTA ROAD, TREVALLYN

1) Introduction

This report assessed a discretionary planning application for the extension of the existing outdoor archery range and the construction of a new indoor archery range at 201 Reatta Road, Trevallyn. Two representations were received to the proposal.

2) Background

Existing use and development
The subject site/Paringa Archery Club is part of the Trevallyn Nature Recreation Area. The reserve offers visitors a broad range of activities, including club run and commercial activities; including archery, mountain bike trails, walking/running trails, dog walking on and off leash areas, horse riding trails, orienteering, rock climbing picnic shelters, bbq facilities, toilets and car parking. Lake Trevallyn is used for water skiing, canoeing, swimming and windsurfing.

The Paringa Archery Club is more than 50 years old and has been operating from this site for decades. The area occupied by the club contains an outdoor archery range and clubroom with parking.

Development application: PA2017110

Development Description
The proposal is to extend the existing outdoor archery range by 10m towards the south and a new indoor archery range to be erected on the northern end of the existing outdoor archery range.

The proposed indoor range will comprise of a proprietary shed measuring 30.0m x 16.0m with an apex height of 4.411m. This proposed shed will be steel framed with colorbond cladding in Woodland Grey.

Applicant
Cyclad buildings.

Planning Instrument
West Tamar Interim Planning Scheme 2013. (the Scheme)

Zone
Environmental Management.

Use
Use class Sports and recreation
Use status Discretionary
Discretions
The use is Discretionary
29.4.2 P1 requires assessment of the natural values of the site.

Attachments
1. Location plan
2. Proposal
3. Scheme assessment report
4. Representations

3) Strategic/Annual Plan/Council Policy

The proposal is consistent with Council’s Strategic and Annual Plans and policies.

4) Statutory Requirements

The application was made pursuant to section 57 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (the Act). Determination of the application is a statutory obligation.

The application must be determined by 15 August 2017 to meet the statutory deadline under the Act.

The application was assessed against the relevant zone and code standards. The proposal complied with the relevant standards.

The detailed assessment report was provided as Attachment 3 to this report.

Assessment supported approval of the application.

5) Notification

The application was notified for the required 14 day period from 8 July 2017 to 24 July 2017. Two representations were received. Council is required to consider representations to discretionary applications under both the Act and the Scheme.

Matters raised in the representations are addressed in the following table. Full copies of the representations were provided as Attachment 4 to this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Planning response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke Hammond</td>
<td>There is nothing in the planning scheme provisions that allows for assessment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful, natural area</td>
<td>the aesthetics of the proposal. The proposed cladding will be in a muted colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the indoor range</td>
<td>to blend with the surrounding native vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be blight on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrah Wigg</td>
<td>The representor’s dwelling is more than 300m from the proposed indoor archery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My first issue is noise.</td>
<td>range and elevated more than 10m above. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned that the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise will filter through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to our property and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound will be amplified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed application is a colour bond shed. Will it be sound proofed?

We have heard noise in the past coming from the club rooms in the evening time (after 9pm). As this will be a bigger venue, will they be having more events in the evenings? Has any sound testing taken place?

Second issue is regarding the appearance of the proposed structure. A colour bond shed will stick out like a sore thumb in our lovely reserve bush area. No elevation or 3D drawings have been provided but I fail to see how a big ugly shed will fit in with the beautiful environment that is the Trevallyn Reserve.

The Trevallyn Recreation Area should be an area for us to get out in nature for outdoor sports and recreation activities, not for a big colour bond she's in the middle of the bush. I am sure there is plenty of other venues in Launceton that would be a better fit for an indoor archery range. (as submitted)

The proposed indoor range is in a natural depression. The representor lives adjacent to a nature reserve that is there to be used by anybody at any time. The noise could have been from the existing club room that is not part of this proposal.

The hours of operation that were requested as part of this proposal are 8am to 9pm weekdays and 8am to 6pm Saturday and Sunday.

The site contains an existing archery range where practice and competitions have been held outdoors for decades. This proposal will take some of this activity indoors. Archery is not a noisy sport.

The archery club (outdoor sports and recreation) is more than 50 years old and has been located in the current location for decades. This proposal is to expand the options by allowing for an indoor venue to cope with the inclement Tasmanian weather.

It takes up a very small percentage of the Trevallyn Recreation Area leaving ample space for other outdoor pursuits.

The proposed building will be in a muted colour to limit visual impact and to blend in with the surrounding native vegetation. The planning scheme does not provide for any assessment against the aesthetics.

Elevations of the proposed building have been provided as part of the advertising of the proposal.

While the concerns of the representors are noted, they did not raise any matters that alter assessment of the application against the Scheme.

6) Alternative Options

The Planning Authority may approve (with or without conditions) or refuse the application, based on its assessment against the Scheme and any representations that were received.
A recommendation was provided for approval with conditions. Any alternative recommendations must be provided with relevant planning reasons.

7) Financial Impact

Financial impacts are normally limited to the application process and any appeal that may be lodged against the Planning Authority’s decision, provided statutory obligations are met.

8) Officer’s Comments

The proposal is for an indoor extension of a sports club that has been located within the Trevallyn Recreation Area for decades. The existing archery club and the proposed indoor arena occupies a small percentage of the recreation area. The proposed shed will be in a muted colour (Colorbond Woodland Grey) to blend in with the surrounding native vegetation. The planning scheme does not provide for any assessment of the aesthetics.

9) Conclusion

The proposal was assessed against the provisions of the Scheme and complied with all relevant tests. The proposal can therefore be approved subject to the conditions listed below.

Karin van Straten
SENIOR STATUTORY PLANNER

DECISION

Moved Cr Lyons seconded Cr Woinarski that application PA2017110 be determined as follows:

a. the representations do not have planning merit when assessed against the Scheme; and

the application for the extension of the existing outdoor archery range and the construction of a new indoor archery range at 201 Reatta Road, Trevallyn by Cyclad Buildings be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

ENDORSED PLANS

1. The use and/or development must be carried out as shown on the Endorsed plans - site plan by Wilkin Design dated 29/5/2017 Job Number: DA/BA-17PARINGA and shed plans by RANBUILD drawing Number LAUNC3-6142 and described in the endorsed documents to the satisfaction of the Council. Any other proposed development and/or use will require a separate application to and assessment by the Council.
Permit Notes

Notations
A. This permit was issued based on the proposal documents submitted for PA20171110. You should contact Council with any other use or developments, as they may require the separate approval of Council.

B. This permit takes effect after:
   a) the 14 day appeal period expires; or
   b) any appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal is abandoned or determined; or
   c) any agreement that is required by this permit pursuant to Part V of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 is executed; or
   d) any other required approvals under this or any other Act are granted.

C. This permit is valid for two (2) years only from the date of approval and will thereafter lapse if the development is not substantially commenced. A once only extension may be granted if a request is received within 6 months after the expiration date.

Other Approvals
D. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted.

Restrictive Covenants
E. The granting of this permit takes no account of any covenants applicable to the land. The permit holder and any other interested party, should make their own enquires as to whether the proposed development is effected, restricted or prohibited by any such covenant.

If the proposal is non-compliant with any restrictive covenants, those restrictive covenants should be removed from the title prior to construction commencing or the owner will carry the liability of potential legal action in the future.

Access for People with a Disability
F. This permit does not ensure compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act, furthermore the developer may be liable to complaints under the said Act. The developer is directed to Australian Standard 1428 Parts 1 - 4 for technical direction on how to cater for people with disabilities.

Appeal Provisions
G. A planning appeal may be instituted by lodging a notice of appeal with the Registrar of the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal.

A planning appeal may be instituted within 14 days of the date the Corporation serves notice of the decision on the applicant.

For more information see the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal website www.rmpat.tas.gov.au
Permit Commencement

H. If an applicant is the only person with a right of appeal pursuant to section 61 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 and wishes to commence the use or development for which the permit has been granted within that 14 day period, the Council must be so notified in writing. A copy of Council’s Notice to Waive Right of Appeal is attached.

Aboriginal Heritage

I. If any Aboriginal relics are uncovered during works;
   a) All works are to cease within a delineated area sufficient to protect the unearthed and other possible relics from destruction,
   b) The presence of a relic is to be reported to Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania Phone: (03) 6233 6613 or 1300 135 513 (ask for Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania) Fax: (03) 6233 5555 Email: aboriginal@heritage.tas.gov.au; and
   c) the relevant approval processes will apply with state and federal government agencies.

For: Crs Allen, Bracken, Ferguson, Holmdahl, Ireland, Kearney, Lyons, Shegog & Woinarski.
Against: Nil.

CARRIED 9/0
Proposed extension of the existing outdoor archery range and the construction of a new indoor archery range.
Plan 1 - Attachment 2
Proposal Plans
Address 201 Reatta Road, Trevallyn
9.1 DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION
Detailed description of the proposal: The proposal is to extend the existing outdoor archery range by 10m towards the south and a new indoor archery range to be erected on the northern end of the existing outdoor archery range.

The proposed indoor range will comprise of a proprietary shed measuring 30.0m x 16.0m with an apex height of 4.411m. This proposed shed will be steel framed with colorbond cladding in Woodland Grey.

9.2 SITE EVALUATION
Site analysis:-
- Location: Trevallyn Recreation Area - Reatta Road, Trevallyn
- Existing use/development: regional recreation area and the specific area that this proposal applies to - the Paringa Archery Club
- Surrounding use/development: recreation area and residential
- Vegetation: Tasveg 3.0 confirmed Eucalyptus amygdalina forest and woodland on dolerite

SITE CONSTRAINTS/APPLICABLE OVERLAYS
- Contamination: none known
- Landslip: No hazard bands over the subject site
- Flooding: The subject site is not prone to flooding
- Environmental impacts and attenuation: none
- Capacity of infrastructure including access: The existing infrastructure, including access, has sufficient capacity to service the proposal

ANALYSIS
- Surrounding uses and developments that will impact on the proposal: The surrounding uses and developments are compatible and are a mix of recreation and residential uses
- Impact of the proposal on adjoining uses: The proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses
- Effect of hazards on the proposal: There are no known hazards impacting on the proposal

INTERNAL REFERRALS
- Internal referrals raised no issues.

9.3 PLANNING MATTERS
The subject site is within the Environmental Management Zone.

Zone purpose
To provide for the protection, conservation and management of areas with significant ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic value, or with a significant likelihood of risk from a natural hazard.

To only allow for complementary use or development where consistent with any strategies for protection and management.

- Defined use as per planning scheme and classification: Sports and recreation
- Compliance with standards of development
29.3 Use Standards

29.3.1 Reserved Land

Objective: To ensure that development recognises and reflects relevant values of land reserved under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 or Nature Conservation Act 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Solutions</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Use on reserved land is in accordance with a Reserve Activities Assessment approved under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 or Nature Conservation Act 2002.</td>
<td>P1 No performance criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complies with the Acceptable Solution. The proposal included a letter from DPIPWE, Parks and Wildlife Service confirming the following: A Reserve Activity Assessment has been completed and the PWS is satisfied that the proposed works are not inconsistent with the management objectives of the Nature Recreation Area.

29.4 Development Standards

29.4.1 Building Design and Siting

Objective: To ensure that the design and siting of buildings responds appropriately to the natural values of the site and causes minimal disturbance to the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Solutions</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 The curtilage for development must: a) not exceed 20% of the site; or b) be in accordance with a Reserve Activities Assessment approved under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 or Nature Conservation Act 2002.</td>
<td>P1 An area greater than 20% of the site may be used where the development is for a driveway or for the management of natural hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Building height must: a) not exceed 6m; or b) be in accordance with a Reserve Activities Assessment approved under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 or Nature Conservation Act 2002.</td>
<td>P2 Building height must blend with the surrounding landscape and not be individually prominent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Buildings must be set back a) a minimum of 10m to all boundaries; or b) in accordance with a Reserve Activities Assessment approved under the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 or Nature Conservation Act 2002.</td>
<td>P3 No performance criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complies with the Acceptable Solution A1 b); A2 b) and A3 b). The proposal included a letter from DPIPWE, Parks and Wildlife Service confirming the following: A Reserve Activity Assessment has been completed and the PWS is satisfied that the proposed works are not inconsistent with the management objectives of the Nature Recreation Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Solutions</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4 Buildings for a sensitive use must be set back a minimum of 200m to the rural resource zone.</td>
<td>P4 Buildings for sensitive use must be designed and sited to protect uses in the rural resource zone from likely constraint, having regard to the: a) locations of existing buildings; and b) size and proportions of the lot; and c) nature of the rural resources that are, or may potentially be conducted; and d) extent to which the topography or existing vegetation screening may reduce or increase the impact of the proposed variation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acceptable Solution A4 is Not Applicable. The proposed building is not for a sensitive use.
29.4.2 Landscaping

Objective
To ensure that the natural values of the site are retained in a manner that contributes to the broader landscape of the area.

Acceptable Solutions
A1 If for permitted or no permit required uses.

Performance Criteria
P1 Development must be accompanied by a landscape and site management plan that sets out how the entire site will be managed having regard to:

- any retaining walls; and
- retaining any existing native vegetation where it is feasible to do so or required to be retained by another provision of this scheme; and
- the locations of any proposed buildings, driveways, car parking, storage areas, signage and utility services; and
- any fencing; and
- vegetation plantings to be used and where; and
- any pedestrian movement paths; and
- ongoing treatment of the balance of the lot, if any, including maintenance of plantings, weed management and soil and water management.
The subject site is Crown land managed and maintained by Parks and Wildlife. The proposal included a letter from DPIPWE, Parks and Wildlife Service confirming the following: *A Reserve Activity Assessment has been completed and the PWS is satisfied that the proposed works are not inconsistent with the management objectives of the Nature Recreation Area.*

With reference to P1:

a) The proposal does not include any retaining walls;

b) No removal of native vegetation is proposed or required;

c) The only new building is the indoor range to be constructed on what is currently part of the existing outdoor range;

d) No fencing is proposed or required;

e) No planting form parts of this proposal;

f) No pedestrian movement paths are changed from the current situation as part of this proposal;

g) The ongoing maintenance and management of the rest of the Nature Recreation Area is managed by Parks and Wildlife and this proposal will not alter that.

It is considered that the proposal complies with the Performance Criteria.

Codes applicable to the application

**E6.0 Car parking and Sustainable Transport Code** applies to all applications. The proposal meets all the relevant acceptable solutions in this code.

**E8 Biodiversity Code** applies to the proposal – due to the Priority Habitat Special Overlay.

**E8.1 Purpose of the Code**

E8.1.1 The purpose of this provision is to:

a) protect, conserve and enhance the region’s biodiversity in consideration of the extent, condition and connectivity of critical habitats and priority vegetation communities, and the number and status of vulnerable and threatened species; and

b) ensure that development is carried out in a manner that assists the protection of biodiversity by:

i) minimising vegetation and habitat loss or degradation; and

ii) appropriately locating buildings and works; and

iii) offsetting the loss of vegetation through protection of other areas where appropriate.

**E8.2 Application of this Code**

E8.2.1 This code applies to use or development of land:

a) within the area identified as priority habitat on the planning scheme maps; or

b) for the removal of native vegetation.

**E8.6 Development Standards**

**E8.6.1 Habitat and Vegetation Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>To ensure that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) vegetation identified as having conservation value as habitat has priority for protection and is appropriately managed to protect those values; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the representation and connectivity of vegetation communities is given appropriate protection when considering the impacts of use and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Solution</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.1 Clearance or disturbance of priority habitat is in accordance with a certified Forest Practices Plan or:</td>
<td>P1 Clearance or disturbance of native vegetation within priority habitat may be allowed where a flora and fauna report prepared by a suitably qualified person demonstrates that development does not unduly compromise the representation of species or vegetation communities in the bioregion having regard to the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.2 Development does not clear or disturb native vegetation within areas identified as priority habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Clearance or disturbance of native vegetation is in accordance with a certified Forest Practices Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2.1</td>
<td>Clearance or disturbance of native vegetation must be consistent with the purpose of this Code and not unduly compromise the representation of species or vegetation communities of significance in the bioregion having regard to the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>quality and extent of the vegetation or habitat affected by the proposal, including the maintenance of species diversity and its value as a wildlife corridor; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>means of removal; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>value of riparian vegetation in protecting habitat values; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>impacts of siting of development (including effluent disposal) and vegetation clearance or excavations, in proximity to habitat or vegetation; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>need for and adequacy of proposed vegetation or habitat management; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>conservation outcomes and long-term security of any offset in accordance with the General Offset Principles for the RMPS, Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complies with the Acceptable Solution A1.2; A2 is Not Applicable to this assessment.

9.4 STATE POLICIES
The proposal is consistent with the intent of all State Policies.

9.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE LAND USE PLANNING AND APPROVALS ACT 1993
The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.

1) CONCLUSION
It is considered that the proposal is reasonable and should be approved subject to conditions.
Plan 1 - Attachment 4
Representations
Address 201 Reatta Road, Trevallyn

Sent: Friday, 23 June 2017 11:12 AM
To: wtc@wtc.tas.gov.au
Subject: 1201764554 - Paringa Archery Club

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning,

I would like to lodge a complaint about the proposed indoor archery range at Paringa Archery club. It is a beautiful, natural area and an indoor range would be a blight on the landscape. It would be very disappointing if the building was to go ahead Location of the issue: Paringa Archery Club, Trevallyn.

Kind regards,

Luke Hammond

Sent: Sunday, 23 July 2017 8:02 PM
To: wtc@wtc.tas.gov.au
Subject: 1201766442 - Planning application for Archery range

To whom it may concern,
I am writing in regards to the proposed new indoor archery range, I have a few concerns.

My first issue is noise. I am concerned that the noise will filter through to our property and the sound will be amplified as the proposed application is a colour bond shed. Will it be sound proofed? We have heard noise in the past coming from the club rooms in the evening time (after 9pm). As this will be a bigger venue, will they be having more events in the evenings? Has any sound testing taken place?

Second issue is regarding the appearance of the proposed structure. A colour bond shed will stick out like a sore thumb in our lovely reserve bush area. No elevation or 3D drawings have been provided but I fail to see how a big shed will fit in with the beautiful environment that is the Trevallyn Reserve.

The Trevallyn Recreation Area should be an area for us to get out in nature for outdoor sports and recreation activities, not for a big colour bond she’s in the middle of the bush. I am sure there is plenty of other venues in Launceston that would be a better fit for an indoor archery range.

Yours sincerely
Farrah Wigg
1) Introduction

This report assessed a discretionary planning application for a single dwelling - vary front and side boundary setbacks and outbuilding exceeding 80m² and wall height exceeding 3.5m at 2 Skyline Avenue, Grindelwald. One representation was received to the proposal.

2) Background

Existing use and development

The subject site is a triangular vacant residential lot measuring 3131m² located approx 90m from the junction of Skyline Avenue and Atkinsons Road. It is one of only 2 vacant lots on Skyline Avenue.

Development application  PA2017120

Development Description

The proposal is to erect a single dwelling comprising of the following:

Entry, study, lounge, dining-kitchen with access via bi-fold doors to an alfresco area, 3 bedrooms, master with ensuite and walk in robes, bathroom, WC, double garage with laundry. The dwelling is proposed 8.0m from the frontage and 8.0m from the eastern side boundary. A new crossover is also proposed to provide access to the garage and visitor parking via a concrete driveway. External cladding will be brick veneer with custom orb roof cladding.

The proposal also includes a proprietary outbuilding comprising of a 12.0m x 11.0m shed and an 8.0m x 3.0m carport. The maximum wall height of the shed is 3.6m and the apex height is 5.0m.

This outbuilding is proposed 6.0m from the western side boundary. A 13 500 litre tank is proposed next to the shed and carport to capture roof water.

Applicant

Design to Live.

Planning Instrument

West Tamar Interim Planning Scheme 2013.
(the Scheme)

Zone

Low Density Residential.

Use

Use class  Residential
Use status No permit required

Discretions

12.4.1.3 :- Frontage setbacks.
12.4.1.4 :- Side setbacks
12.4.1.6 :- Floor area and wall height of outbuilding
Attachments
1. Location plan
2. Proposal
3. Scheme assessment report
4. Representations

3) Strategic/Annual Plan/Council Policy

The proposal is consistent with Council's Strategic and Annual Plans and policies.

4) Statutory Requirements

The application was made pursuant to section 57 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (the Act). Determination of the application is a statutory obligation.

The application must be determined by 24 August 2017 to meet the statutory deadline under the Act.

The application was assessed against the relevant zone and code standards. The proposal complied with the relevant standards, except for the identified discretions.

The following discretions were supported when assessed against the relevant performance criteria:

12.4.1.3 P1 requires assessment of neighbourhood character and efficient use of the site.
12.4.1.4 P1 requires assessment of amenity impacts and separation of dwellings.
12.4.1.6 P1 requires assessment of the dominant built form.

The detailed assessment report was provided as Attachment 3 to this report.

Assessment of the requested discretions against the relevant performance standards supported approval of the application.

5) Notification

The application was notified for the required 14 day period from 19/7/2017 to 2/8/2017. One representation was received. Council is required to consider representations to discretionary applications under both the Act and the Scheme.

Matters raised in the representation are addressed in the following table. A full copy of the representation was provided as Attachment 4 to this report.
**Issue**

David and Sally Koh

After perusing the proposed plans and documents at the Council Chambers at Eden Street, Riverside, on 31st July 2017, we are deeply concerned that the said proposal of erecting a shed exceeding 80m² in floor area and a wall height exceeding 3.5m in height will block out a considerable amount of sunlight into our property. We are therefore lodging an official objection to the current planning application PA No: 210720 pending approval from the West Tamar Council. Our reasons for this objection are based on:

1) From the proposed building plans, we note that the height of the shed is about 5 meters tall.

2) Our living room and kitchen currently faces north to maximise sunlight into our house for the majority of the day. The proposed site to erect this tall shed based on the proposed plan will effectively block out any sunlight to about half of our property.

We appeal to the West Tamar Council to review the height restriction of the proposed shed which is taller in height compared to the house dwelling in the same proposal. We feel that this shed will be prominently visible because of its size and height, and it will negatively impact on the aesthetics of neighbouring dwellings.

We also implore the West Tamar Council to review the intended site chosen to erect this shed. If the proposed shed was located lower down the property towards the gentle sloping inclination of the land, its potential effect of blocking out the sunlight on our property and other adjoining properties may somewhat be minimised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The apex height of the proposed shed is 5.0m. This is in compliance with the Acceptable Solution under 12.4.1.6. The shadow diagrams below show that on the winter solstice when the sun is at its lowest, there will be limited overshadowing of the representor’s back yard until midday and no overshadowing from midday onwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maximum height for dwellings in the Low Density Residential Zone is 8m - well above the maximum height for outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the concerns of the representors are noted, they did not raise any matters that alter assessment of the application against the Scheme.

6) Alternative Options

The Planning Authority may approve (with or without conditions) or refuse the application, based on its assessment against the Scheme and any representations that were received.

A recommendation was provided for approval with conditions. Any alternative recommendations must be provided with relevant planning reasons.

7) Financial Impact

Financial impacts are normally limited to the application process and any appeal that may be lodged against the Planning Authority’s decision, provided statutory obligations are met.

8) Officer’s Comments

The subject site is an odd shaped triangular block. The proposal placed the dwelling in the northeast corner to allow for maximum open space at the rear of the dwelling. The proposed shed, although larger that the 80m² that the Acceptable Solution allows for, is not dissimilar from other larger sheds in the street and vicinity. The shadow that this proposed shed will cast on the winter solstice over the back yards of the neighbouring numbers 78 and 80 Atkinsons Road, is acceptable. There will be no shadows cast over these back yards after midday.
9) Conclusion

The proposal was assessed against the provisions of the Scheme and complied with all relevant tests. The proposal can therefore be approved subject to the conditions listed below.

Karin van Straten
SENIOR STATUTORY PLANNER

DECISION

Moved Cr Ferguson seconded Cr Shegog that application PA2017120 be determined as follows:

a. the requested variations comply with the relevant performance criteria and be supported;
b. the representation does not have planning merit when assessed against the Scheme; and

c. the application for a single dwelling - vary front and side boundary setbacks and outbuilding exceeding 80m² and wall height exceeding 3.5m for land at 2 Skyline Avenue, Grindelwald, Lot No. 17 on Plan No. 142046 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

ENDORSED PLANS

1. The use and/or development must be carried out as shown on the Endorsed plans by Design to Live dated 05/07/2017 (job number SKLN2) and shed plans by Upright Engineering dated 05-Jul-17 Project No: MTAS02_256678:18 and described in the endorsed documents to the satisfaction of the Council. Any other proposed development and/or use will require a separate application to and assessment by the Council.

Permit Notes

Notations

A. This permit was issued based on the proposal documents submitted for PA2017120. You should contact Council with any other use or developments, as they may require the separate approval of Council. Councils planning staff can be contacted on (insert phone number).

B. This permit takes effect after:

a) the 14 day appeal period expires; or
b) any appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal is abandoned or determined; or.
c) any agreement that is required by this permit pursuant to Part V of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 is executed; or

b) any appeal to the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal is abandoned or determined; or.
c) any agreement that is required by this permit pursuant to Part V of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 is executed; or

d) any other required approvals under this or any other Act are granted.

C. This permit is valid for two (2) years only from the date of approval and will thereafter lapse if the development is not substantially commenced. A once only extension may be granted if a request is received within 6 months after the expiration date.
OTHER APPROVALS
D. This permit does not imply that any other approval required under any other by-law or legislation has been granted.

RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS
E. The granting of this permit takes no account of any covenants applicable to the land. The permit holder and any other interested party, should make their own enquiries as to whether the proposed development is effected, restricted or prohibited by any such covenant.

If the proposal is non-compliant with any restrictive covenants, those restrictive covenants should be removed from the title prior to construction commencing or the owner will carry the liability of potential legal action in the future.

ACCESS FOR PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY
F. This permit does not ensure compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act, furthermore the developer may be liable to complaints under the said Act. The developer is directed to Australian Standard 1428 Parts 1 - 4 for technical direction on how to cater for people with disabilities.

APPEAL PROVISIONS
G. A planning appeal may be instituted by lodging a notice of appeal with the Registrar of the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal.

A planning appeal may be instituted within 14 days of the date the Corporation serves notice of the decision on the applicant.

For more information see the Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal website www.rmpat.tas.gov.au

PERMIT COMMENCEMENT
H. If an applicant is the only person with a right of appeal pursuant to section 61 of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 and wishes to commence the use or development for which the permit has been granted within that 14 day period, the Council must be so notified in writing. A copy of Council’s Notice to Waive Right of Appeal is attached.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE
I. If any Aboriginal relics are uncovered during works;
  a) All works are to cease within a delineated area sufficient to protect the unearthed and other possible relics from destruction;
  b) The presence of a relic is to be reported to Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania Phone: (03) 6233 6613 or 1300 135 513 (ask for Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania) Fax: (03) 6233 5555 Email: aboriginal@heritage.tas.gov.au; and
  c) the relevant approval processes will apply with state and federal government agencies.

For: Crs Allen, Bracken, Ferguson, Holmdahl, Ireland, Kearney, Lyons, Shegog & Woinarski.
Against: Nil.

CARRIED 9/0
Location Plan
2 Skyline Avenue, Grindelwald

2 Skyline Avenue - Grindelwald
NORTHERN ELEVATION

SOUTHERN ELEVATION
1 DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION
The proposal is to erect a 286.6m² single dwelling comprising of the following:
Entry, study, lounge, dining-kitchen with access via bi-fold doors to an alfresco area, 3 bedrooms, master with ensuite and walk in robes, bathroom, WC, double garage with laundry. The dwelling is proposed 8.0m from the frontage and 8.0m from the eastern side boundary. A new crossover is also proposed to provide access to the garage and visitor parking via a concrete driveway. External cladding will be brick veneer with custom orb roof cladding.

The proposal also includes a proprietary outbuilding comprising of a 12.0m x 11.0m shed and an 8.0m x 3.0m carport. The maximum wall height of the shed is 3.6m and the apex height is 5.0m.

This outbuilding is proposed 6.0m from the western side boundary. A 13 500 litre tank is proposed next to both the shed and the carport to capture roof water.

2 SITE EVALUATION
Site analysis:
- Location: 2 Skyline Avenue - approx 90m from the junction of Skyline Avenue and Atkinsons Road
- Area: 3131 m²
- Slope: the lot slopes to the rear - approx 3m over a distance of 75m
- Existing use/development: vacant land
- Surrounding use/development: single dwellings with residential outbuildings and gardens
- Vegetation: sparse grass cover

SITE CONSTRAINTS/APPLICABLE OVERLAYS
- Contamination: none known
- Landslip: No landslide hazard bands over subject site
- Flooding: The subject site is not prone to flooding
- Environmental impacts and attenuation
- Capacity of infrastructure including access: The existing infrastructure, including access, has sufficient capacity to service the proposal

ANALYSIS
- Surrounding uses and developments that will impact on the proposal: The surrounding uses and developments are compatible residential uses
- Impact of the proposal on adjoining uses: The proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses
- Effect of hazards on the proposal: There are no known hazards impacting on the proposal

INTERNAL REFERRALS
- Internal referrals raised no issues.

3 PLANNING MATTERS
The subject site is within the Low Density Residential zone.

12.1 Zone Purpose
12.1.1 Zone Purpose Statements
To provide for residential use or development on larger lots in residential areas where there are infrastructure or environmental constraints that limit development.
To provide for non-residential uses that are compatible with residential amenity.
To ensure that development respects the natural and conservation values of the land and is designed to mitigate any visual impacts of development on public views.
Development Standards

The following clauses only apply to development within the Residential Use Class.

12.4.1.1 Site Coverage

Objective

To ensure that the site coverage respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character:

a) To reduce the impact of increased stormwater runoff on the drainage system; and
b) To ensure sufficient area for landscaping and private open space.

c) To ensure that the site coverage respects the existing or preferred neighbourhood character:

Acceptable Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>The site coverage must not exceed 30% of the site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Performance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>The site coverage must have regard to the:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>size and shape of the site; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>existing buildings and any constraints imposed by existing development or the features of the site; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>site coverage of adjacent properties; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>effect of the visual bulk of the building and whether it respects the neighbourhood character; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>capacity of the site to absorb runoff; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>landscape character of the area and the need to remove vegetation to accommodate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Comments: complies with the Acceptable Solution – coverage = 14%

12.4.1.2 Building Height

Objective

To ensure that the height of dwellings respects the existing or desired future character statements.

Acceptable Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>Building height must not exceed 8 metres.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Performance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>Building height must be appropriate to the site and the streetscape having regard to the:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>effect of the slope of the site on the height of the building; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>relationship between the proposed building height and the height of existing adjacent buildings; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>visual impact of the building when viewed from a road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Comments: complies with the Acceptable Solution – apex height = 4m

12.4.1.3 Frontage Setbacks

Objective

To ensure that the setbacks of dwellings from the road respect the existing or preferred neighbourhood character and make efficient use of the site.

Acceptable Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1.1</th>
<th>Primary frontage setbacks must be a minimum:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Table 12.1.4.3 Primary Frontage Setback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lots</th>
<th>Minimum Setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2500 m² or less</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2500 m² and 5000m²</td>
<td>10 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding 5000m²</td>
<td>15 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>Buildings are set back from the primary frontage an appropriate distance having regard to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>the efficient use of the site; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>the safety of road users; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>the prevailing setbacks of existing buildings on nearby lots; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>the visual impact of the building when viewed from the road; and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Comments:
b) for infill lots, within the range of the frontage setbacks of buildings on adjoining lots, indicated by the hatched section in Figure 12.4.1.3 below; and

![Figure 12.4.1.3 – Primary Frontage Setback for Infill Lots](image)

**A1.2** Buildings must be set back a minimum of 8 metres from the any other frontage.

**Officer Comments:** the front setback is 8.0m; the proposal must therefore rely on the Performance Criteria for compliance:

a) Placing the building forward on the block provides more space at the rear for privacy and open space;

b) The proposed setback will not have any impact on the safety of the road users; the proposal includes a new crossover that is in a location that provides ample sight distance for safe entry and exit of the subject site;

c) Dwellings along Skyline Avenue are at various setbacks from the frontage; the two dwellings closest to the subject site – 80 and 82 Atkinsons Road (on the junction of Atkinsons Road and Skyline Avenue) are less than 5m from the Skyline Avenue frontage. The proposed 8m setback is therefore at an appropriate distance from the frontage when the setbacks of these nearby lots are taken in to consideration;

d) The visual impact when viewed from the street is diminished due to the fact that the road is approx 0.5m higher than the floor level of the proposed dwelling, the dwelling height is only 4m and the façade is articulated and contains a variety of finishes;

e) The front setback only contains sparse grass cover at the present - this will be retained.

It is considered that the proposal complies with the Performance Criteria as discussed above.

### 12.4.1.4 Rear and Side Setbacks

**Objective** - To ensure that the:

a) height and setback of dwellings from a boundary respects the existing neighbourhood character and limits adverse impact on the amenity and solar access of adjoining dwellings; and

b) separation of buildings is consistent with the preferred low density character and local area objectives, if any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Solutions</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Buildings must be set back 5m from the rear boundary.</td>
<td>P1 Building setback to the rear boundary must be appropriate to the location, having regard to the:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer Comments: complies with the Acceptable Solution.

A2 Buildings must be set back in accordance with Table 12.4.1.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12.4.1.4</th>
<th>Lots 2500 m² or less</th>
<th>Lots exceeding 2500m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 metres</td>
<td>10 metre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P2 Building setback to the side boundary must be appropriate to the location, having regard to the:

a) ability to provide adequate private open space for the dwelling; and
b) character of the area and location of dwellings on lots in the surrounding area; and
c) impact on the amenity and privacy of habitable room windows and private open space of existing and adjoining dwellings; and
d) impact on the solar access of habitable room windows and private open space of adjoining dwellings; and
e) locations of existing buildings and private open space areas; and
f) size and proportions of the lot; and
g) extent to which the slope and retaining walls or fences reduce or increase the impact of the proposed variation.

Officer Comments: the proposed dwelling is setback 8.0m from the eastern side boundary and the proposed outbuilding is setback 6.0m from the western side boundary. The proposal must therefore rely on the Performance Criteria for compliance:

a) The locations closer to the side boundaries leaves ample space for the provision of private open space;
b) Dwellings along Skyline Avenue are at various setbacks from the side boundaries, the proposal is consistent with the character of the surrounds;
c) to f) the side boundaries of both neighbouring properties are lined with trees. The shadow diagram earlier in this report showed that 80 Atkinsons Road will be shadow free from midday and 4 Skyline Avenue will be shadow free up to 3pm on the winter solstice.
g) No retaining walls or fences are proposed; the proposed dwelling is cut into the existing ground to reduce the overall height - thus minimising any impact.

It is considered that the proposal complies with the Performance Criteria.
12.4.1.6 Outbuildings and Ancillary Structures

Objective
To ensure that:

a) outbuildings do not detract from the amenity or established neighbourhood character; and
b) dwellings remain the dominant built form within an area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Solutions</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Outbuildings must not have a:</td>
<td>P1 Outbuildings must be designed and located having regard to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) combined gross floor area of greater than 80 m²; and</td>
<td>a) visual impact on the streetscape; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) maximum wall height of greater than 3.5 metres; and</td>
<td>b) any adverse impacts on native vegetation; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) maximum height greater than 5 metres.</td>
<td>c) overshadow adjoining properties; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) compatibility with the size and location of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outbuildings in the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Comments: the proposal does not comply with Acceptable Solution a) – it being 156m² and b) the wall height being a range between 3.061m and 5.00m. The proposal must therefore rely on the Performance Criteria for compliance:

a) The visual impact from the street will be limited as the location of the proposed shed is at least 10m from the frontage and 500mm below the road level;

b) The subject site contains only a sparse grass cover at present, so there will be no adverse impact on native vegetation as a result of the proposal;

c) The shadow diagrams in this report show that by midday on the winter solstice there will be no shadow outside of the subject site from the proposed outbuilding;

d) There are sheds of various sizes along Skyline Avenue; the shed at number 1 Skyline Avenue measures 450m² and at 3 Skyline Avenue 96m². The proposed shed at 156m² is compatible with the size and location of those in the neighbourhood.

Codes applicable to the application

E6.0 Car parking and Sustainable Transport Code applies to all applications. The proposal meets all the relevant acceptable solutions in this code.

9.4 STATE POLICIES
The proposal is consistent with the intent of all State Policies.

9.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE LAND USE PLANNING AND APPROVALS ACT 1993
The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.

1) CONCLUSION
It is considered that the proposal is reasonable and should be approved subject to conditions.
The General Manager,
P.O. Box 16,
Riverside, TAS 7250.

1st August 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Objection to Planning Application PA No: 201720 – 2 Skyline Avenue, Grindelwald.

We write with reference to your letter dated and reissued on 19th July 2017 (enclosed).

After perusing the proposed plans and documents at the Council Chambers at Eden Street, Riverside, on 31st July 2017, we are deeply concerned that the said proposal of erecting a shed exceeding 80m² in floor area and a wall height exceeding 3.5m in height will block out a considerable amount of sunlight into our property. We are therefore lodging an official objection to the current planning application PA No: 210720 pending approval from the West Tamar Council. Our reasons for this objection are based on:

1) From the proposed building plans, we note that the height of the shed is about 5 meters tall.
2) Our living room and kitchen currently faces north to maximise sunlight into our house for the majority of the day. The proposed site to erect this tall shed based on the proposed plan will effectively block out any sunlight to about half of our property.

We appeal to the West Tamar Council to review the height restriction of the proposed shed which is also taller in height compared to the house dwelling in the same proposal. We feel that this shed will be prominently visible because of its size and height, and it will negatively impact on the aesthetics of neighbouring dwellings.

We also implore the West Tamar Council to review the intended site chosen to erect this shed. If the proposed shed was located lower down the property towards the gentle sloping inclination of the land, its potential effect of blocking out the sunlight on our property and other adjoining properties may somewhat be minimised.

We thank you for your kind consideration in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

David & Sally Koh,
Owners of 80 Atkinsons Road.
1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to consider the Annual Plan for the quarter ending 30 June 2017.

2) Background

The Annual Plan details the action plans which council wishes to achieve for the year. Quarterly targets are outlined in the plan and these link to the enterprise agreement for employees.

The quarterly review update has been forwarded under separate cover to all councillors.

The conformance with the Annual Plan was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of activities</th>
<th>June 17</th>
<th>June 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No. of activities</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No. of activities which confirm</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conformance rate</td>
<td>95.32%</td>
<td>98.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result for the quarter is below (June 16 - 98.32%) the same quarter for last year and below the previous (March 17 - 98.55%) quarter.

The following outcomes are noted:

- The conformance to Customer Service Requests - Actioned was below the goal (95%) at 92.2%.
- 0.01% lost time injuries were sustained for the quarter and is below the goal of 0.50% of hours worked.
- Recycling materials collected averaged 65 tonnes per collection which is above the target of 50 tonnes.
- Building approvals were again issued on average within 2.0 days.
- Special Plumbing permits, for disposal of waste water, were issued with an average of 5.1 days (target 12 days).
- 60 Development applications were processed.
- Sick leave for the quarter was 2.93% of labour hours.
- Section 337 certificates were issued in an average of 4.73 days (target 8 days).

3) Strategic/Annual Plan/Policy

Not applicable.
4) **Statutory Requirements**

Not applicable.

5) **Government Departments**

Not applicable.

6) **Community Consultation**

Not applicable.

7) **Alternative Options**

Not applicable.

8) **Financial Impact**

Not applicable.

9) **Officer's Comments**

While the outcome for the quarter is below the previous quarter it is a realistic reflection of setting higher targets and seeking to raise the bar in providing services to the community.

Rolph Vos  
GENERAL MANAGER

**DECISION**

Moved Cr Allen seconded Cr Shegog that Council receive the Annual Plan report for the quarter ending 30 June 2017.

For: Crs Allen, Bracken, Ferguson, Holmdahl, Ireland, Kearney, Lyons, Shegog & Woinarski.  
Against: Nil.  

CARRIED 9/0
1) Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide information to Council on the Resident Opinion Survey.

2) Background

The annual Residents Opinion Survey was undertaken in April 2017, with surveys forwarded to all households with the Beacon. The survey was also available on Council’s web site.

1,172 surveys were returned. This represents 10.95% of surveys issued. In 2016, 729 surveys were returned which was a return rate of 7.15%.

The average satisfaction rate for the 38 service opinions was 80.36% which is above the 2016 satisfaction rate of 79.57%. The result for Opinion 38 “Council’s performance overall” was 84.85% and satisfaction with the level of rates compared to services received increased in satisfaction to 61.59%. The majority of opinions recorded satisfaction ratings comparable to last year.

The ten most important opinions as rated by the residents, in order of importance, were as follows (2016 importance rating is in brackets)

1. Household garbage collection (1)
2. Safe and well maintained Council roads (sealed) and bridges (6)
3. Level of rates compared to the services you receive (5)
4. Council’s performance overall (9)
5. Safe and well maintained pedestrian area e.g. footpaths and walkways (15)
6. Adequacy of storm water drainage in your area (8)
7. Maintaining a clean and tidy town, including public rubbish bins (12)
8. Maintenance of parks and reserves (18)
9. Maintenance of the storm water drainage system in your area (10)
10. An efficient local road network e.g. road signs and markings aiding traffic flow (17)

A number of the ten most important services have changed from last year. Notably removing questions related to TasWater has meant that there are three new items in the ten most important.

While roads, rates and rubbish remain high in the importance ranking it is interesting to see that the mix of important services which are rated highly, reflect the work Council does in seeking to provide a sense of place and increased amenity for its residents.

The variation from the 2016 survey, in the majority of responses regarding the level of either positive or negative satisfaction, varied by less than 2%. The following changes in satisfaction ratings are worth noting:

- Dog and animal control - up 8.16% (75.26%)
- Councillors service to the community - up 4.1% (73.04%)
- Operation of local tip and waste transfer stations - up 3.82% (91.52%)
• Safe and well maintained council roads (sealed) and bridges - up 3.03% (75.30%)
• Adequacy of storm water drainage in your area - 3.03% (63.77%)
• Maintenance of the storm water drainage system in your area - up 2.94% (61.25%)
• Council immunisation programs – up 2.68% (96.68%)
• Access to council information e.g. by phone, at council offices, via the internet etc. - up 2.53% (92.51%)
• Operation of the Beaconsfield Mine and Heritage Centre - down 4.01% (92.2%)
• Household garbage collection - down 3.52% (78.34%)
• Maintenance of parks and reserves - 3.46% (85.45%)
• Council input to community activities which have a broad community benefit e.g. assisting self-help groups - down 2.93% (88.3%)
• Services and programs provided by council for the community and its young people - down 2.81% (83.84%)

The results outlining satisfaction together with comparisons to previous surveys and importance ratings has been forwarded under separate cover.

3) Strategic/Annual Plan

The survey results are used as part of the assessment of strategic and annual plan directions.

4) Statutory Requirements

Not applicable.

5) Government Departments

Not applicable.

6) Community Consultation

The survey is a key tool in measuring customer satisfaction.

7) Alternative Options

Not applicable.

8) Financial Impact

Not applicable.

9) Officer’s Comments

The results of the survey are pleasing with a slight increase in overall satisfaction and a strong increase in participation. The removal of questions relating to functions which are the responsibility of TasWater, now provide a better picture of priority issues which are the responsibility of Council. The data will now be used by employees in their natural work groups to assess how they can continue to improve customer satisfaction.

Rolph Vos
GENERAL MANAGER
DECISION

Moved Cr Ireland seconded Cr Lyons that Council receive the results of the Residents Opinion Survey 2017.

For: Crs Allen, Bracken, Ferguson, Holmdahl, Ireland, Kearney, Lyons, Shegog & Woinarski.
Against: Nil.

CARRIED 9/0
MEETING CLOSURE

Moved Cr Allen seconded Cr Woinarski that, pursuant to Section 15(1) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015, council close the meeting to the public.

This motion requires an absolute majority.

For: Crs Allen, Bracken, Ferguson, Holmdahl, Ireland, Kearney, Lyons, Shegog & Woinarski.
Against: Nil.

CARRIED 9/0

ITEMS FOR THE CLOSED SECTION OF THE MEETING:

Confidential Minutes - 18 July 2017

Meeting closed at 2.35pm.

Cr Christina Holmdahl
MAYOR