



**Redland**  
SHIRE COUNCIL

# **MINUTES**

## **GENERAL MEETING**

**Wednesday 28 March 2007  
commencing at 4:00pm**

**Council Chambers  
1st floor Administration Building  
Bloomfield Street Cleveland. Qld 4163**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF OPENING .....	1
2	DEVOTIONAL SEGMENT .....	1
3	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	1
4	RECEIPT AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES .....	1
5	MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING MINUTES .....	2
5.1	REPORT FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER .....	2
5.1.1	PETITION (DIVISION 3) INTERFACE BETWEEN INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL LANDS ALONG SOUTH STREET, CLEVELAND.....	2
5.1.2	PETITION (DIVISION 8) ANIMAL MANAGEMENT ISSUE AT SPOONBILL STREET, BIRKDALE .....	2
5.1.3	REVIEW OF REDLANDS PLANNING SCHEME – MINIMUM LAND AREA REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILDCARE FACILITIES.....	3
5.1.4	REVIEW OF REDLANDS PLANNING SCHEME – REQUIREMENTS FOR MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE.....	3
6	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	3
7	PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS .....	4
7.1	PETITION (DIVISION 2) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MASTHEAD DRIVE PARK MASTER PLAN .....	4
7.2	PETITION (DIVISION 9) SPEEDING ON ELMHURST STREET AND CROTONA ROAD, CAPALABA .....	4
7.3	PETITION (DIVISION 2) SPEEDING ALONG MOSELLE DRIVE, THORNLANDS .....	4
8	MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS.....	5
9	DECLARATION OF MATERIAL PERSONAL INTEREST ON ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS .....	5

<b>10</b>	<b>PLANNING &amp; POLICY COMMITTEE 14/03/07 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
10.1	OFFICE OF CEO.....	6
10.1.1	CAPALABA STATE COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION OF SOUND BOOTH & STORAGE SHED - CCBF (DIVISION 9) .....	6
10.2	CUSTOMER SERVICES.....	9
10.2.1	CONTRIBUTION TO SPORTS FIELD RENOVATION - CCBF DIVISION 4.....	9
10.2.2	PROVISION OF PLAY EQUIPMENT ALEXANDRA HILLS - CCBF DIVISION 8.....	12
10.2.3	PROVISION OF PLAY EQUIPMENT, WELLINGTON POINT - CCBF DIVISION 1.....	14
10.3	PLANNING AND POLICY.....	18
10.3.1	AMENDMENT TO PLANNING SCHEME POLICY 3 – NEW CHAPTER 4A CYCLEWAY - MAINLAND.....	18
10.3.2	DISPOSAL OF LAND - PART OF REDLAND BAY CEMETERY FOR FIRE STATION .....	22
10.3.3	SHARPS MANAGEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY .....	26
10.3.4	UNDERGROUNDING POWERLINES FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES.....	31
10.3.5	REDLANDS SUSTAINABLE DEMONSTRATION HOUSE – COUNCIL ENDORSEMENT .....	48
10.3.6	REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACQUISITION POLICY POL-0281 .....	54
10.4	CLOSED SESSION.....	60
10.4.1	TOONDAH HARBOUR RE-DEVELOPMENT.....	60
10.4.2	ENVIRONMENT CHARGE LAND AQUISITION WEST MT COTTON ROAD.....	62
10.4.3	LAND DISPOSAL OPTIONS 141 BUNKER ROAD VICTORIA POINT .....	64
10.4.4	SOUTHERN MORETON BAY ISLANDS OPEN SPACE PLAN 2.....	74

---

10.5	GENERAL BUSINESS.....	76
10.5.1	RESEARCH ON THE INTRODUCTION OF CARBON MARKETS.....	76
11	REDLAND WATER AND WASTE COMMITTEE 21/03/07 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT .....	77
11.1	REDLAND WATER AND WASTE .....	77
11.1.1	REDLAND WATER & WASTE COUNCIL BUSINESS UNIT REPORT - FEBRUARY 2007.....	77
11.1.2	POL-2592 WATER CHARGE REMISSIONS FOR CONCEALED LEAKS.....	80
11.1.3	PROCUREMENT FOR PRESSURE & LEAKAGE MANAGEMENT PROJECT.....	86
11.2	GENERAL BUSINESS.....	90
11.2.1	OVERVIEW OF CURRENT WATER SITUATION .....	90
12	FINANCE AND CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 21/03/07 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT .....	93
12.1	CORPORATE SERVICES.....	93
12.1.1	FEBRUARY 2007 - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS .....	93
12.1.2	LAND TO BE REMOVED FROM THE LAND RECORD - VALUELESS LAND .....	97
12.1.3	REVIEW OF CORPORATE POLICY POL-2556 PENSIONER GENERAL RATE DEFERRAL POLICY.....	101
12.2	CUSTOMER SERVICES.....	104
12.2.1	PDG-45128-REDLANDS YOUTH PLAZA DELEGATED AUTHORITY.....	104
12.3	PLANNING AND POLICY .....	108
12.3.1	MONTHLY BALANCED SCORECARD REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2007.....	108
13	DIRECT TO COUNCIL REPORTS.....	112
13.1	REDLAND WATER & WASTE .....	112
13.1.1	RESPONSE TO QUEENSLAND WATER COMMISSION .....	112

---

13.2	PLANNING AND POLICY.....	114
13.2.1	SUBMISSION ON EASTERN BUSWAY.....	114
14	MAYORAL MINUTE.....	117
14.1	STATE EQUESTRIAN FACILITY .....	117
15	NOTICE OF BUSINESS.....	118
15.1	NOTICES GIVEN BY CR BOWLER (DIVISION 6) .....	118
15.1.1	AMENDMENT TO REDLANDS PLANNING SCHEME TO REZONE WHOLE OF SITE LOT 3 ON RP907141 – 141 BUNKER ROAD, VICTORIA POINT.....	118
15.1.2	REPORT ON AMOUNT OF RATES COLLECTED ON THE SOUTHERN MORETON BAY ISLANDS SINCE 1973 .....	118
16	URGENT BUSINESS WITHOUT NOTICE .....	120
16.1	GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT .....	120
17	MEETING CLOSURE.....	120

## 1 DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Mayor declared the meeting open at 4.01 pm.

## 2 DEVOTIONAL SEGMENT

Pastor Neale Collier from the Redlands Ministers' Fellowship led Council in a brief devotional segment.

## 3 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cr D H Seccombe	Mayor
Cr P J Dowling	Deputy Mayor and Councillor Division 4
Cr A G Barker	Councillor Division 1
Cr C B Ogilvie	Councillor Division 2
Cr D A Henry	Councillor Division 3
Cr J L Burns	Councillor Division 5
Cr T Bowler	Councillor Division 6
Cr M A Elliott	Councillor Division 7
Cr A R Beard	Councillor Division 8
Cr K M Williams	Councillor Division 9
Cr H J Murray	Councillor Division 10

### EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP GROUP:

Mrs S Rankin	Chief Executive Officer
Mr M Goode	General Manager Customer Services
Mr R Turner	General Manager Corporate Services
Mr J Pruss	General Manager Redland Water & Waste
Mr G Underwood	General Manager Planning and Policy

### MINUTES:

Mrs J Thomas	Corporate Meetings & Registers Officer
--------------	--

## 4 RECEIPT AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved by: Cr Beard  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That the minutes of the General Meeting of Council held on 28 February 2007 be confirmed.

CARRIED

## **5 MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING MINUTES**

### **5.1 REPORT FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

#### **5.1.1 PETITION (DIVISION 3) INTERFACE BETWEEN INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL LANDS ALONG SOUTH STREET, CLEVELAND**

At the General Meeting of 20 December 2006, Council resolved that the petition requesting Council undertake a master planned upgrade of the interface between industrial and residential lands along South Street, Cleveland, with a view to resolving matters including noise buffering, visual amenity, vehicular/motorist safety, be received and referred to the appropriate area of Council for a report.

A report addressing this petition will be presented to the Planning and Policy Committee meeting on 13 June 2007.

#### **5.1.2 PETITION (DIVISION 8) ANIMAL MANAGEMENT ISSUE AT SPOONBILL STREET, BIRKDALE**

At the General Meeting of 28 February 2007, Council resolved that the petition regarding a continuing noise nuisance from a dog in Spoonbill Street, Birkdale, due to a "gap in noise pollution regulations between State and local government" be received and referred to the Planning and Policy Department for a report. The following report on this matter is presented to Council for noting.

The matters raised by the petitioners have been reviewed by the Community and Social Planning Group who have advised that there is no "gap in noise pollution regulations between State and local government" relating to how long the animal is kept on the premises. Council takes action on all properly made complaints. If a breach of Council's Local Laws is established, appropriate action is taken as determined by Council officers, and if the breach continues, further action is considered.

When a situation occurs as in the animal coming and going from premises on a regular basis, this may delay Council bringing the matter under control, as the animal may be removed from the premises at the time of the re-inspection. But if the animal returns and Council is advised of its return, investigations and appropriate action will continue.

The matter has been referred to Council's Animal Management Team who has contacted the initial complainant and also one of the petitioners to discuss the petition and Council's processes involving animal complaints. The dog mentioned is no longer at this address.

The petitioners will be advised of the outcome in this matter, through the principal petitioner. As this petition was also addressed to the State Member for Cleveland, a letter has been forwarded to him advising him of the action taken by Council.

### **5.1.3 REVIEW OF REDLANDS PLANNING SCHEME – MINIMUM LAND AREA REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILDCARE FACILITIES**

At the General Meeting of 28 February 2007, Council resolved that a review of the Redlands Planning Scheme for minimum land area requirements for childcare facilities be undertaken.

A report addressing this matter will be presented to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting.

### **5.1.4 REVIEW OF REDLANDS PLANNING SCHEME – REQUIREMENTS FOR MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE**

At the General Meeting of 28 February 2007, Council resolved that a review of the Redlands Planning Scheme for requirements for Material Change of Use for internal changes in major centres be undertaken, in order to achieve a more definitive interpretation.

A report addressing this matter will be presented to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting.

## **6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

### **MOTION TO ADJOURN MEETING**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the meeting adjourn for a public participation segment.

CARRIED

The following speaker addressed Council:

Ms Teresa Murphy, 7 Ocean Street, Cleveland, addressed Council in relation to a development application for a funeral parlour on the corner of Bloomfield and Ocean Streets, Cleveland and tabled a report which was distributed to Councillors at the meeting.

### **MOTION TO RESUME MEETING**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Williams

That the proceedings of the meeting resume.

CARRIED



## **7 PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

### **7.1 PETITION (DIVISION 2) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MASTHEAD DRIVE PARK MASTER PLAN**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

**That Standing Orders be suspended and that Council resolve that the petition which reads as follows, be acknowledged and that Council consider this petition as part of budget deliberations:**

**“We, the undersigned, request that Council bring forward expenditure on implementing the Masthead Drive Park Master Plan from the advised 2014 to the next financial year”.**

**CARRIED**

### **7.2 PETITION (DIVISION 9) SPEEDING ON ELMHURST STREET AND CROTONA ROAD, CAPALABA**

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Barker

**That the petition which reads as follows, be received and referred to the appropriate area of Council for consideration and a report to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting:**

**“We, the undersigned, Electors of Division 9 of Redland Shire, request that Council investigate all measures to eliminate hooning and speeding on Elmhurst Street and the corner of Elmhurst and Crotona Road, Capalaba to prevent further loss of property and potential human injury. We would seek Council identify suitable traffic calming measures as a matter of urgency”.**

**CARRIED**

### **7.3 PETITION (DIVISION 2) SPEEDING ALONG MOSELLE DRIVE, THORNLANDS**

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Williams

**That the petition which reads as follows, be received and referred to the appropriate area of Council for consideration and a report to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting:**

**“As residents of Redland Shire, we would like to petition the Council to do something about the speeding along Moselle Drive.**

**The cars, trucks and motorbikes that are continuously speeding along this road will one day cause a very fatal accident. Sometimes the speeding sounds like it is in excess of 100 klms per hour.**

**It is very unsafe for children to try and cross the road especially the middle section of Moselle Drive as you cannot see the cars coming over the rise one way, and coming around the bend the other way. It is supposed to be a 50 klm zone”.**

**CARRIED**

**8 MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Nil

**9 DECLARATION OF MATERIAL PERSONAL INTEREST ON ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

It is noted that Cr Ogilvie declared a Material Personal Interest in *Item 10.4.1 Toondah Harbour Redevelopment* and left the meeting prior to discussion and decision on this matter.

## **10 PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 14/03/07 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That the Planning and Policy Committee Report of 21 March 2007 be received.

CARRIED

### **10.1 OFFICE OF CEO**

#### **10.1.1 CAPALABA STATE COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION OF SOUND BOOTH & STORAGE SHED - CCBF (DIVISION 9)**

**Datworks Filename:** G&S Community Benefit fund  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Susan Rankin  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Author Name:** Tina Robinson  
Executive Support Officer

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council annually allocates in its budget an amount for discretionary spending by the Divisional Councillors known as the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund (CCBF). All funding requests for projects with an expenditure of \$5,000 or greater require approval from Council.

This funding request is for an amount of \$11,481.00 (GST Exclusive) to be allocated from the Division 9 portion of the CCBF to assist with the Capalaba State College in constructing a sound booth and storage area within the college's performing arts building.

#### **PURPOSE**

This report is to seek Council approval to allocate \$11,481.00 (GST Exclusive) from the Division 9 (Cr Karen Williams) portion of the CCBF. These funds will allow the Capalaba State College to construct a sound booth and storage area.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Councillor for Division 9 has received a request from the Capalaba State College to construct a sound booth and storage area within the Performing Arts Building.

The total project cost is \$13,948.73 (GST Exclusive). Cr Karen Williams will be contributing \$11,481.00 (GST Exclusive) from the Division 9 portion of the CCBF and the remaining \$2,467.73 (GST Exclusive) is to be funded by the Capalaba State College.

---

Construction for this project is due to commence on 1 April, 2007 and expected to be finalised by 30 June, 2007.

## **ISSUES**

The Councillors' Community Benefit Fund Guideline, GL-2034 states that two written quotations must be sought for any allocation of funds between \$2,001 and \$7,500 to meet Council's financial reporting requirements. Three quotations have been received and the application from the club meets all other guideline requirements.

The Office of the CEO has received verbal advice only that the Capalaba State College will be able to meet the short-fall of \$2,467.73 (GST Exclusive).

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As per the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund Guideline GL-2034, 3 quotations have been provided and the Division 9 Councillor has sufficient funds to meet this request.

## **CONSULTATION**

The Divisional Councillor has consulted with the Capalaba State College as to the school's requirements.

The Office of the CEO has consulted with Ms Robin Wood, representative of the Capalaba State College to confirm that the school will meet the short-fall of the project costs.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to approve the allocation of \$11,481.00 (GST Exclusive) from the Division 9 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the Capalaba State College to construct a sound booth and storage area within the Performing Arts Centre.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve not to approve the allocation of \$11,481.00 (GST Exclusive) from the Division 9 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the Capalaba State College to construct a sound booth and storage area within the Performing Arts Centre.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to approve the allocation of \$11,481.00 (GST Exclusive) from the Division 9 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the Capalaba State College to construct a sound booth and storage area within the Performing Arts Centre.**

**CARRIED**

## **10.2 CUSTOMER SERVICES**

### **10.2.1 CONTRIBUTION TO SPORTS FIELD RENOVATION - CCBF DIVISION 4**

**Dataworks Filename:** G&S Community Benefit Fund  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Neil Kesur  
Services Manager Parks & Conservation  
**Author Name:** Bill McDowell  
Senior Advisor Urban Landscape

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council annually allocates in its budget an amount for discretionary spending by Divisional Councillors known as the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund (CCBF). All requests for funding individual projects with a greater expenditure than \$5,000 requires approval from Council.

This request is for an amount of \$9,348.00 (excluding GST) to be allocated for the renovation of the No. 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield, Victoria Point.

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from Council for an allocation from the Division 4 portion of the CCBF for \$9,348.00 (excluding GST) for the provision of the services required to undertake the renovation of the No. 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield, Victoria Point.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Within the current Parks & Conservation capital budget (2006-07) is a project for the Sportsfield Renovation Program. This project is managed by the Turf Services Officer. The renovation program includes those activities that impact on the turf growing of a sports field. The renovation of a sports field includes the activities of de-thatching, aeration, topdressing and fertilising.

The No. 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield is a sports field programmed for renovation as part of the 2006-07 budget.

It was identified during the planning of this project that the actual playing surface required installation of irrigation prior to the renovation of the turf. Consultation with representatives of the Victoria Point Sharks Sporting Club Inc regarding this renovation prompted a change in program to promote the irrigation prior to the renovation upgrade. The existing capital budget was not adequate to accommodate both a renovation of the field plus installation of irrigation.

The Turf Services Officer has sought a quotation from a supplier on the P&C Preferred Supplier List to undertake the necessary treatments of the turf on Oval No. 2. The cost submitted is \$9,348.00 (excluding GST).

Consultation with the Councillor for Division 4 was undertaken to secure financial support for this project.

The proposed program as managed by the Turf Services Officer is now to install irrigation on oval No. 2 followed by the renovation of the turf. The irrigation installation is currently being undertaken.

## **ISSUES**

No issues have been identified that impact on this request for funding approval.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Division 4 Councillor supports this project and has sufficient funds to allocate an amount of \$9,348.00 (excluding GST) from the Division 4 portion of the CCBF.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has been ongoing between the Turf Services Officer, Councillor and representatives of the Victoria Point Sharks Sporting Club Inc to define the issues and benefits of the program of works to renovate and irrigate the No 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to approve an allocation of \$9,348.00 (excluding GST) from the Division 4 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the renovation of the No. 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council does not approve the allocation of \$9,348.00 for the renovation of the No. 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to approve an allocation of \$9,348.00 (excluding GST) from the Division 4 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the renovation of the No. 2 oval at Ern Dowling Sportsfield.**

**CARRIED**



**10.2.2 PROVISION OF PLAY EQUIPMENT ALEXANDRA HILLS - CCBF  
DIVISION 8**

**Dataworks Filename:** G&S Community Benefit Fund  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Neil Kesur  
Services Manager Parks & Conservation  
**Author Name:** Bill McDowell  
Senior Advisor Urban Landscape

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council annually allocates in its budget an amount for discretionary spending by Divisional Councillors known as the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund (CCBF). All requests for funding individual projects with a greater expenditure than \$5,000 requires approval from Council.

This request is for an amount of \$10,250.00 (GST exclusive) to be allocated for the provision of a flying fox (play equipment) in Snowdon Street Park, Alexandra Hills.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from Council for an allocation from the Division 8 portion of the CCBF of \$10,250.00 (GST exclusive) for the provision of a flying fox (play equipment) in Snowdon Street Park, Alexandra Hills.

**BACKGROUND**

The Councillor for Division 8 requested an upgrade of the existing play equipment at Snowdon Street Park, Alexandra Hills. The request was for the addition of a flying fox.

The level of upgrade is monitored by the Open Space Study (May 2004).

A quotation was sought by the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape from suppliers listed in the Register of Pre-Qualified Suppliers for park infrastructure and other accredited suppliers.

A quotation was received from Harry Pearson Playgrounds for the supply and installation of a standard 20 metre flying fox. These costs amount to \$9,250.00 (GST exclusive).

Other costs associated with this installation involve the cost of installation of sand soft fall and landscape repairs to the site. These costs amount to \$1,000.00 (GST exclusive). This work is undertaken by Parks and Conservation.

**ISSUES**

The Open Space Study's Desired Embellishment Standards (May 2004) were reviewed to set the level of play equipment for this local park.

---

No further issues were identified.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Division 8 Councillor supports this project and has sufficient funds to allocate an amount of \$10,250.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 8 portion of the CCBF.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

### **CONSULTATION**

The Senior Advisor Urban Landscape consulted with the Senior Advisor Urban Parkland to advise the intended upgrade for this park.

The Councillor Division 10 has advised the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape to proceed with this project for its approval by Council.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to approve an allocation of \$10,250.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 8 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a flying fox for Snowdon Street Park, Alexandra Hills.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council not approve the allocation of \$10,250.00 (GST exclusive) for this project.

### **OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to approve an allocation of \$10,250.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 8 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a flying fox for Snowdon Street Park, Alexandra Hills.**

### **CARRIED**

---

### **10.2.3 PROVISION OF PLAY EQUIPMENT, WELLINGTON POINT - CCBF DIVISION 1**

**Dataworks Filename:** G & S Community Benefit Fund  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Neil Kesur  
Services Manager Parks & Conservation  
**Author Name:** Bill McDowell  
Senior Advisor Urban Landscape

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council annually allocates in its budget an amount for discretionary spending by Divisional Councillors known as the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund (CCBF). All requests for funding individual projects with a greater expenditure than \$5,000 require approval from Council.

This request is for an amount of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) to be allocated for the provision of a flying fox (play equipment) in Wellington Point Recreation Reserve, Wellington Point.

An alternative site being considered if Wellington Point Recreation Reserve is found not to be suitable is Apex Park, Wellington Point.

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from Council for an allocation from the Division 1 portion of the CCBF of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) for the provision of a flying fox (play equipment) in Wellington Point Recreation Reserve, Wellington Point or alternatively Apex Park, Wellington Point.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Councillor for Division 1 requested an addition to the existing play equipment at Wellington Point Recreation Reserve, Wellington Point. The request was for the addition of a flying fox.

The level of upgrade is monitored by the Open Space Study (May 2004) and the Wellington Point Recreation Reserve Master Plan (2006).

A quotation was sought by the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape from suppliers listed in the Register of Pre-Qualified Suppliers for park infrastructure and other accredited suppliers.

A quotation was received from Harry Pearson Playgrounds for the supply and installation of a standard 20 metre flying fox. These costs amount to \$11,790.00 (GST exclusive).

Other costs associated with this installation involve the cost of installation of sand soft fall and landscape repairs to the site. These costs amount to \$2,000.00 (GST exclusive). This work is undertaken by Parks and Conservation.

## **ISSUES**

It has been identified that the proposal to locate the flying fox at Wellington Point Recreation Reserve could receive negative acceptance from local residents who overlook the reserve. The proposed location is adjacent to the existing play equipment installed on the eastern side of the reserve.

The alternative site of Apex Park is proposed if the final decision to locate the flying fox at Wellington Point Recreation Reserve is not to proceed.

The Open Space Study's Desired Embellishment Standards (May 2004) were reviewed to set the level of play equipment for this local park.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to Build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Division 1 Councillor supports this project and has sufficient funds to allocate an amount of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 1 portion of the CCBF.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

## **CONSULTATION**

The Senior Advisor Urban Landscape consulted with the Senior Advisor Urban Parkland to advise the intended upgrade for this park. Based on the planning intent as per the Wellington Point Recreation Reserve Master Plan, it was identified that the flying fox was not an adopted piece of play equipment for this reserve.

An onsite meeting with the Advisor Landscape Architect for the Open Space Planning Unit was undertaken to choose the preferred position for the flying fox. It was agreed that in all preferred locations, the local residents would be impacted by the addition of the flying fox.

The Advisor Landscape Architect for the Open Space Planning Unit consulted with the Division 1 Councillor on the matter of location and the concerns held.

Consequently following further consultation with the Senior Advisor Urban Parkland, the alternative site of Apex Park, Wellington Point has been proposed if directed by the Councillor.

The Councillor Division 1 has advised the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape to proceed with this project for its approval by Council.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To approve an allocation of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 1 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a flying fox for Wellington Point Recreation Reserve, Wellington Point subject to satisfactory outcome of consultation with local residents; and
2. If a satisfactory outcome is not achieved after consultation with residents that Council approve this allocation of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) for a flying fox to be installed in Apex Park, Wellington Point.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

1. That Council resolve to approve an allocation of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 1 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a flying fox for Apex Park, Wellington Point.

OR

2. That Council not approve the allocation of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) for this project.

## **OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To approve an allocation of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 1 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a flying fox for Wellington Point Recreation Reserve, Wellington Point subject to satisfactory outcome of consultation with local residents; and
2. If a satisfactory outcome is not achieved after consultation with residents that Council approve this allocation of \$13,790.00 (GST exclusive) for a flying fox to be installed in Apex Park, Wellington Point.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Barker  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That the Committee Recommendation not be adopted and that Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To approve an allocation of \$14,990.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 1 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a 30m flying fox for Wellington Point Recreation Reserve, Wellington Point, subject to satisfactory outcome of consultation with local residents; and**
- 2. If a satisfactory outcome is not achieved after consultation with residents, that Council approve this allocation of \$14,990.00 (GST exclusive) for a 30m flying fox to be installed in Apex Park, Wellington Point.**

**CARRIED**

## 10.3 PLANNING AND POLICY

### 10.3.1 AMENDMENT TO PLANNING SCHEME POLICY 3 – NEW CHAPTER 4A CYCLEWAY - MAINLAND

<b>Datworks Filename:</b>	RTT - Transport Infrastructure Charges
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">PSP3 - Chapter 4A Cycleway - Mainland Appendix A - Cycleway Infrastructure Charges Schedule</a> <a href="#">Appendix B - Cycleway Plans for Trunk Infrastructure</a>
<b>Responsible Officer Name:</b>	David Elliott Manager Infrastructure Planning
<b>Author Name:</b>	Michael Kriedemann Infrastructure Charges Adviser

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is proposed that the Cycleway Infrastructure Charges Planning Scheme Policy be adopted under the provisions of Schedule 3 of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997*. This policy includes the following charge:

- Cycleway Infrastructure Charge (Mainland)

This charge will enable Council to fund the provision of necessary trunk infrastructure throughout the mainland of the Shire.

Prior to this Planning Scheme Policy being adopted, the relevant actions for notification and consultation need to be undertaken in accordance with Schedule 3 of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997*.

#### PURPOSE

That Council resolve to propose to make the Infrastructure Charges Planning Scheme Policy for Cycleway Infrastructure on the Mainland, in accordance with Schedule 3 of the *Integrated Planning Act*.

#### BACKGROUND

The intent of this policy is to enable Council to fund the construction of necessary trunk infrastructure providing a standard that the community requires in the future. If the infrastructure charges are not adopted, Council will be required to meet a larger financial burden for upgrading existing infrastructure and constructing new infrastructure for the growing population.

The intent of Infrastructure Charges is for new development to pay their portion of the infrastructure costs associated with the direct impact their development will have on

the existing and future network. Under *Integrated Planning Act* legislation, all Councils in Queensland are required to undertake appropriate infrastructure planning studies and implement a Priority Infrastructure Plan which details trunk infrastructure improvements for a 15 year planning horizon. Redland Shire has adopted a planning horizon of 2006 – 2021.

Council does not currently have a cycleways charge or contributions scheme. Developments are conditioned to build cycleways within their sites and along their frontages in accordance with Council standards. This new policy will enable Council to plan and develop a fully integrated cycleway network that connects neighbourhoods and suburbs.

## **ISSUES**

The charge has been calculated based on the upgrade of existing cycleways and for the construction of new cycleways as required. The charge methodology recovers funds for the fair share of the transport network used by new developments and is in accordance with the State Government guidelines.

Commercial, Industrial and other non residential developments will not be conditioned to contribute to the cycleways infrastructure charge but will be assessed under the existing rules which will generally involve upgrading infrastructure, constructing new infrastructure along the frontage of their site and making suitable connections to the trunk network.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide and maintain water, waste services, roads, drainage and support the provision of transport and waterways infrastructure.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The existing trunk infrastructure on the mainland has been valued at \$17.25 million and the future trunk infrastructure is proposed to cost \$60.64 million (2006 dollars). The total cost of the existing plus future network apportioned over the total future population at 2021 is the method used to determine the infrastructure charge. The cycleway infrastructure charge per detached dwelling is \$1 250 with other forms of residential development being determined using the same traffic generation rates applied in the transport model.

Based on the demographics report there will be approximately 62,291 households on the mainland in 2021, up from 45,196 households in 2006. This represents an increase of 17,095 households. This increase will consist of approximately 12,000 detached dwellings and 5,095 multiple dwellings. The expected revenue from cycleway infrastructure charges is anticipated to be approximately \$18.8 million.

In order to complete the upgrade works listed in this policy, Council is required to continue to contribute towards the upgrade of the trunk cycleway network, initially at the current rate and then marginally higher, through the life of the program of

---



approximately 15 years. However, if the population increase is lower or if the demand for improvements changes, Council can lower this commitment through regular reviews of the Cycleway Plan. Council currently spends approximately \$1.0 million per year on cycleways and footpaths and this will need to continue and be increased in future years which may result in a need for Council to shift its focus from lower order residential street and footpath construction.

The infrastructure charge is proposed to generate approximately \$1.25 million in revenue each year for 15 years. With Council contributions this will enable Council to undertake an expanded trunk cycleway improvement program. This is essential in ensuring the trunk cycleway network functions at the desired standard of service into the future providing safety and amenity throughout the entire network.

The cost of work in the first 5 years of the program totals approximately \$11.98 million. Council is expecting revenue of approximately \$6.25 million, with the remaining \$5.73 million being funded through the roadworks program. This can be accommodated within the existing capital works programs.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will result in amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme, as the Cycleway Infrastructure Charges Planning Scheme Policy will need to be incorporated into Part 11 - Planning Scheme Policies, Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding, Chapter 4 – Movement Network.

## **CONSULTATION**

In preparing this report, consultation was undertaken with:

- Various Council officers to ensure the Plans for Trunk Infrastructure reflect strategic planning requirements.
- Manager Land Use Planning
- Manager Development Assessment

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

1. That Council propose to make the Planning Scheme Policy - Cycleway Infrastructure Charges for the mainland as attached; and
2. That the relevant actions for notification and consultation be undertaken in accordance with Schedule 3 of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* for the adoption of the Planning Scheme Policies.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council does not adopt the infrastructure charge and continues to raise revenue for cycle- path projects through general rates.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. That Council propose to amend Planning Scheme Policy 3 – *Contributions and Security Bonding* to include a new Chapter 4A – Cycleway – Mainland; and**
- 2. That the relevant actions for notification and consultation be undertaken in accordance with Schedule 3 of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997*.**

**CARRIED**

---

### 10.3.2 DISPOSAL OF LAND - PART OF REDLAND BAY CEMETERY FOR FIRE STATION

**Dataworks Filename:** Cemetery - Redland Bay  
**Attachments:** [Locality Map Redland Bay Cemetery for Fire Station](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Roberta Bonnin  
Manager Community and Social Planning  
**Author Name:** Trevor Green  
Senior Advisor Environmental Health

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Emergency Services is looking for land on behalf of the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service in Redland Shire for the construction of new fire stations to enhance their operation efficiency and effectiveness to the community. One site identified for the construction of a new fire station is on a part of the Council owned Redland Bay cemetery site on Gordon Road.

The Gordon Road site forms part of the future expansion of the Redland Bay Cemetery and the portion requested by the Department will have minimal adverse effects on the future use of the cemetery.

There are several issues of conflict from a planning perspective as the Gordon Road site is outside the urban footprint and reconfiguration of the lot to excise a part (3000 square metres) is inconsistent with the Regional Plan. The provision of community infrastructure such as a fire station could claim exemption. These matters should be dealt with under the Ministerial Delegation provisions of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* (IPA) and as such the State Government would be responsible for resolving these issues.

It is proposed that the Chief Executive Officer be delegated Council authority to dispose of a portion of the Gordon Road site.

#### PURPOSE

To propose that:

1. Council dispose of part of Lot 2 SL10528 (Redland Bay Cemetery) to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services, for the establishment of a fire station.
2. The Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to negotiate, make, vary or discharge a contract for disposal of the land to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services.
3. The Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal any associated documentation.

## BACKGROUND

The Department of Emergency Services on behalf of the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services (QFRS) have expressed interest in obtaining part of Lot 2 SL10528 (Redland Bay Cemetery) for the establishment of a fire station. The QFRS have indicated that the fire station would require approximately 3,000 square metres. The station would front Gordon Rd, and be sited adjacent to the existing ambulance station. The land is owned by Council in freehold title.

It is considered that the area in question would have minimal effect on the long term plans for the development of the cemetery and that the immediate need for the establishment of a fire station on this piece of land would outweigh the longer term use of this area for burials.

Current vegetation in this area contains Eucalyptus species, Allocasuarina and Acacia. Ground storey vegetation is heavily disturbed through grazing of horses. Koala usage in the area is prevalent and scats are found within the cemetery.

## ISSUES

### Local Government Act 1993

The *Local Government Act 1993* requires that the decision to dispose of this land for this purpose must be made by resolution of Council.

### Sale of the Land

Council's Property Services have recommended that the best option for Council is to sell the land to the QFRS.

### Agreements and Statutory approvals

While agreement is sought from Council to dispose of the land to the QFRS, the progression to actual disposal of the land would depend on agreement on conditions between Council and the QFRS regarding a number of factors including:

1. Exact size and positioning of the parcel of land on the cemetery site
2. Sale price
3. IPA and Redlands Planning Scheme considerations
4. Vegetation protection and additional planting.

### Future Development of the Cemetery

The revenue from the sale of the land could be used to progress the development of the cemetery.

### Planning Issues

- a) It is a sound land use siting principle that where possible the co-location of emergency services be encouraged.
- b) Queensland Ambulance Service is situated in the south-east corner of the site with frontage and direct access to Cleveland–Redland Bay Road. There is the opportunity to aggregate accesses for traffic management purposes and to utilise an ultimate simple break in any future median for emergency service vehicle purposes only.
- c) The Redlands Planning Scheme zones the property Community Purposes zone Sub-Area CP1 – Cemetery. An emergency services use would be impact assessable (Material Change of Use) in this zone and sub-area. A number of Overlays are triggered on the property. Generally, the overlay issues can be addressed subject to where the use is sited on the property. In relation to the Habitat Protection Overlay, the area immediately surrounding the Ambulance Station is Bushland Habitat. This would trigger assessment under this Overlay Code and require more detailed analysis to ensure that the siting of the fire station does not have adverse impacts on the environmental values of the property.
- d) The Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2006 identifies this property in the Koala Conservation Area. Similar issues to those under the Bushland Habitat Area are to be considered, whilst recognising the development commitment under the CP zone.
- e) Should the State Minister decide to exercise powers under the Land for Community Infrastructure provisions of the IPA (as anticipated and thereby not requiring the making of a development application under the RPS) it remains appropriate that these matters relating to siting of the use still be addressed in consultation with Council as part of the defined process for designation.
- f) The site is outside the Urban Footprint of the South East Queensland Regional Plan (SEQRP) 2005-2026. However it is not subject to the regulatory provision relating to urban activity in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RL&RPA). The definition of urban activity excludes an emergency services facility. This activity can be located in the RL&RPA in consideration of community need.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Sale of the land would be at market value.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will result in possible amendments to the allocated sub-area classification under Redlands Planning Scheme zoning of Community Purposes.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has occurred with Legal Services, Environmental Management, Property Services, Assessment Services, Land Use Planning and the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

1. That Council dispose of part of Lot 2 SL10528 (Redland Bay Cemetery) to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services, for the establishment of a fire station as shown on the attached map;
2. That the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to negotiate, make, vary or discharge a contract for disposal of the land to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services; and
3. That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal any associated documentation.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

1. That Council lease the land to the QFRS.
2. That Council not dispose of the land to the QFRS.

## **OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

### **That Council resolve as follows:**

1. **To dispose of part of Lot 2 SL10528 (Redland Bay Cemetery) to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services, for the establishment of a fire station as shown on the attached map;**
2. **That the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to negotiate, make, vary or discharge a contract for disposal of the land to the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services; and**
3. **That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal any associated documentation.**

## **CARRIED**

### 10.3.3 SHARPS MANAGEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY

**Dataworks Filename:** Sharps Management Policy and Strategy

**Attachments:** Attachment 1 [Sharps Management POL-3062](#)  
Attachment 2 [Sharps Management Strategy](#)  
Attachment 3 [Drug Offence Statistics](#)  
Attachment 4 [Sharps Management Responsibilities](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Roberta Bonnin  
Manager Community and Social Planning

**Author Name:** Lina Galatola  
Community Safety Officer

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The effective management of sharps requires clear guidelines and responsibilities. At present, Redland Shire Council does not have a co-ordinated approach to the disposal, handling and reporting of sharps. The proposed Sharps Management Policy and Strategy provides strategic direction for Council's approach to sharps management and formalises practices, procedures and education for the reporting and handling of sharps within the workplace and community.

The policy and strategy are based on best practice in the management of sharps, and are in line with Queensland Health guidelines.

It is recommended that Council adopt Corporate Policy POL-3062, Sharps Management Policy, and approve the Sharps Management Strategy.

#### PURPOSE

To seek Council's adoption of POL-3062 Sharps Management Policy and approval of the Sharps Management Strategy.

#### BACKGROUND

The management of sharps is both an environmental health and community safety concern. The proposed Sharps Management Policy and Strategy is driven by a need for formal procedures in sharps management, community and staff awareness about sharps disposal, and mechanisms to report, record and evaluate sharps incidents to assist in strategic planning.

The aim of the strategy is to formalise and co-ordinate Council's approach to sharps management in the community and the workplace in order to effectively and efficiently manage the disposal and handling of needles and reduce the risk of needle stick injuries.

What are “Sharps”?

Sharps are needles, syringes and lancets used by members of the community. Illicit drug users are not the only group that use sharps - diabetics, pet owners, acupuncturists, tattooists and those in the health profession are also required to use and dispose of sharps safely.

#### Sharps in Redland Shire

Incidents of drug use are lower in the Redlands compared with Queensland (Refer to Attachment 3 for drug offence data) and the number of needles distributed through Needle and Syringe Programs (NSPs) is also reasonably low. However, the ageing population of the Redlands has increased the number of people legitimately using sharps, increasing the need to raise community awareness of available sharps disposal services, the handling/disposal of sharps and the reporting of inappropriately discarded needles.

#### What is “Harm Minimisation”?

The harm minimisation approach aims to reduce the adverse health, social and economic consequences of drug use by limiting the associated hazards. Sharps management through NSPs is an example of harm minimisation by providing sterile injecting equipment and sharps bins to reduce the spread of blood-borne viruses, and information, resources and services to address the causes of illicit drug use. These services facilitate the safe use of drugs, educate and support drug users and reduce the number of discarded needles and needle stick injuries.

The proposed Sharps Management Policy and Strategy adopts the harm minimisation model by supporting sharps education and services (such as sharps bins) that encourage safe sharps disposal. This approach enhances community and workplace health and safety by reducing the risk of discarded needles and needle stick injuries.

There are a number of potential costs incurred by Council if a staff member sustains a needle stick injury. These include:

- Lost work time due to the need for medical testing
- Lost productivity
- Emotional distress of the staff member (who may or may not return to work)
- Treatment costs (if required)
- Workers compensation payments

Needle stick injuries and inappropriately discarded sharps in the community also incur costs such as:

- Litigation costs
- Damage to the Council and Shire reputation
- Lower levels of actual safety due to fear of using public spaces



The majority of these costs are either indirect or difficult to measure in monetary terms. Council would benefit from a proactive, harm minimisation approach where needle stick injuries and exposure to discarded sharps is prevented.

#### Local Government's Role in Sharps Management

The 'National Drug Strategic Framework' states that "...Local government is in an ideal position to respond to the needs of local communities and...is an active partner in and facilitator of many local co-operative initiatives aimed at reducing drug-related harm" (National Drug Strategic Framework 1998/99 to 2002/03: Building Partnerships: a strategy to reduce the harm caused by drugs in our community).

Sharps management spans a range of local government roles and responsibilities such as the management of community perceptions of safety, waste management, workplace health and safety, and public health.

Specifically, Council is responsible for:

- The timely collection of discarded sharps to minimise needle stick injuries
- The provision of accessible sharps disposal services
- Informing the community about safe handling and disposal of sharps
- Working collaboratively with community partners in managing sharps
- Effectively using resources to minimise risks and improve public health and safety

#### Sharps Management in Redland Shire

Redland Shire Council provides sharps disposal containers at transfer stations throughout the Shire. Selected Council-operated public amenities have been fitted with sharps bins for single disposal and are accessible for the opening hours of the facility.

Relevant Council groups conduct sweeps of high risk areas to promptly locate discarded sharps and prevent needle stick injuries. Other groups within Council may also come into contact with sharps through their daily duties or the nature of their role.

Attachment 4 outlines the roles and responsibilities that various Council and community groups have in sharps management.

### **ISSUES**

#### Purpose of the Policy and Strategy

Community and Social Planning have developed the proposed Sharps Management Policy and Strategy to improve coordination and effectiveness of Council's sharps management role.

Through the adoption of the proposed policy and strategy, risks such as the following will be mitigated:

- Re-use of potentially contaminated injecting equipment
- Potential for infection from needle stick injuries
- A reduction in public perceptions of safety and cleanliness
- Emotional trauma associated with the possibility of disease transmission
- Adverse publicity for Council and the Shire
- Potentially infectious waste stream generated outside medical settings
- Potential for litigation
- Environmental nuisance

### Elements of the Policy and Strategy

The proposed Sharps Management Policy and Strategy provides a coordinated approach to sharps management by addressing the behaviours and attitudes of the community and Council staff. The strategy recommends actions for the planning and provision of infrastructure to ensure best practice is followed and to facilitate the safe handling and disposal of sharps.

A range of initiatives will assist with the delivery of four key strategic objectives:

1. Raising community awareness
2. Reducing community fear
3. Reducing real and perceived risks for staff
4. Planning and provision of infrastructure

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The majority of the strategy's recommendations are able to be implemented within existing resources.

Education and awareness campaigns may require some funding. Corporate Communications will assist with the development and delivery of a communication strategy and funds that may be required will be considered in the standard budget process.

The current cost of maintaining Council's sharps containers in public amenities is approximately \$6,000 each year. By adopting the Sharps Management Strategy Council can ensure that funds are being effectively spent and sharps are being appropriately managed.

### **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has occurred with a number of stakeholders, which include:

Internal

- Workplace Health and Safety
- Environmental Health (including the Immunisation Clinic)
- Parks and Conservation
- Roads and Drainage Services
- Facilities Services Unit
- Community Development (School Aged Care; Respite, Aged Care and Disability Services)
- Customer Service
- Bush Care
- Redland Water and Waste

External

- Selected local businesses
- Community hall caretakers
- Shopping centre managers
- Queensland Health
- Pharmacy Guild of Queensland
- Other local Councils such as Brisbane City Council and Logan City Council

**OPTIONS****PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to adopt Corporate Policy POL-3062, Sharps Management Policy and approve the Sharps Management Strategy as attached.

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve not to adopt the Sharps Management Policy POL-3062 and not to approve the Sharps Management Strategy and request that a new policy and strategy be developed.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns

Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to adopt the Corporate Policy POL-3062, Sharps Management Policy and approve the Sharps Management Strategy as attached.**

**CARRIED**

---

### 10.3.4 UNDERGROUNDING POWERLINES FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES

**Dataworks Filename:** EM Projects – Undergrounding Powerlines

**Attachment** [Appendix 1](#) – Redlands Planning Scheme  
[Appendix 2](#) – Koala Hits  
[Appendix 3](#) – Photos  
[Appendix 4](#) – Desktop Analysis  
[Appendix 5](#) – Response from Valuer General  
[Appendix 6](#) – Aerial Mapping

**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Photinos  
Manager- Environmental Management

**Author Name:** Leo Newlands  
Advisor- Reserves Management  
Candy Daunt  
Support Officer – Natural Environment

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It was requested on the 20 December 2006 by Cr Helen Murray and agreed by Council resolution that a program to facilitate and implement the gradual undergrounding of powerlines for the purposes of conservation of urban koala habitat be provided. It has been suggested that overhead power infrastructure has a considerable effect on habitat loss in these older urban environments due to pruning.

However, perceived and substantiated losses from pruning on ‘average’ streets have been largely unquantified to date. Survey data gathered during a case study investigation of Ormiston indicates that total loss to native trees was 30.3% whilst pruning losses to native koala food trees approximates 26.7% based on a projected ‘complete canopy’.

Undergrounding of powerlines is one suggested option for increasing koala habitat and koala food trees, and will require major adjustments to power and communications infrastructure. The costs of undergrounding are significant and issues of equity, capacity and willingness to pay, remain major constraints to any undergrounding strategy.

Undergrounding of powerlines in suburban street situations will not achieve substantial gains to increasing koala food trees such as gums. However, this exercise does illustrate the need for significant planting of street scapes to meet current Council obligations. This in itself will provide significant benefits for suburban areas in terms of increased koala habitat.

Further, given the rate of decline, stabilisation of the Shire’s koala population requires short term efficient and cost effective strategies. Planting appropriate natives at the required densities will offer benefits in short time frames at much lower cost than undergrounding in suburban street situations.

Undergrounding of powerlines in 'power corridors' not associated with designated active roadways can offer a far more cost effective approach to vegetation enhancement and can fulfil a greater range of ecological and social values and still benefit koalas.

The above, combined with fauna/road separation is most likely to derive the greatest ecological benefits and equitable, cost effective outcomes for the broader Redlands community.

## **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to acknowledge that undergrounding electric powerlines in suburban streets is only viable in new developments and retrospectively undergrounding powerlines in existing suburbs is cost prohibitive and does not provide any enhancement of habitat for urban koalas.

## **BACKGROUND**

- Council has previously considered vegetation management issues under powerlines as part of an agreed MOU with Energex on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2006.
- Cr Helen Murray, supported by a Council resolution on 20 December 2006, has requested that Council initiate discussions with Energex and report to Council within two months on progress on the potential to implement a program of gradual undergrounding of electric powerlines for the purpose of conservation of urban koala habitat on both public and private lands.

## **ISSUES**

### **Issues Presented to General Meeting on 20 December 2006 by Cr Helen Murray**

1. The older suburbs of the Shire contain the majority of urban wildlife habitats. These suburbs still have above-ground powerlines and prevent street or near street habitat from being viable. This then causes fragmentation of urban habitats and leads to the extinction of vulnerable wildlife.
2. Koala populations have been officially declared vulnerable and desperately need established and new habitat in suburbs with remnant eucalypts and koala populations, such as Thorneside, Birkdale, Ormiston, Capalaba, Wellington Point, etc.
3. The undergrounding of powerlines will enable trees on or near front fence-lines of new development or established homes to be retained and enhanced and thus creating or maintaining koala territories, particularly in areas of known koala populations.
4. Undergrounding of powerlines:
  - a. enhances the property values of property owners;

- b. allows reduced management costs to Council and Energex;
  - c. benefits the wildlife in every way.
5. In urban renewal situations, it is suggested the cost of undergrounding should be borne by the developer.
  6. In public land, I suggest Council/State should split the cost with Energex.
  7. With individual streets, the cost should be shared by the residents and Energex, with minimal cost to Council. Groups or streets of residents could agree to approach Energex to enter such an agreement.

### **Officer's Response to the Presented Issues**

#### Definitions used in this report

For the purposes of this report two types of powerline arrangements are distinguished as follows:

1. Powerlines that are associated with designated active roadways e.g. streetscapes and roads, are referred to as '**Streetscape power areas**', and
2. Powerlines that are not necessarily associated with designated roadways and roadways are not active, will be referred to as '**power corridors**'. These may be bounded one or both sides by vegetated areas, may have limited public access but allows access for Energex maintenance.

#### **Streetscape Power Areas**

Many older parts of the Redland's still have overhead powerlines and a percentage of pruned trees under these powerlines. It has been suggested that pruning associated with the overhead powerlines has a considerable effect on habitat loss in urban developments. However, perceived and substantiated losses from pruning on the 'average' street are largely unquantified. Undergrounding the power network is one option that may reduce the volume of koala habitat foliage lost through Energex pruning practices and constraints on infill planting which benefit wildlife in general. This may have a marked advantage for koalas in terms of retaining or increasing koala habitat and koala food trees. Overall there are a range of benefits to undergrounding power lines such as improving conservation values, improved safety and amenity, and avoided loss of supply and reduced costs to Energex and Council.

A study was undertaken to assess the scale of impacts accrued to koala food trees from overhead powerlines. A formative strategy was developed to underground power infrastructure and the relative cost benefits of such a process.

#### **Identification of Council Obligations for Koala Habitat**

The Nature Conservation (koala) Conservation Plan 2006 and Management Program 2006-2016 outlines Council obligations to ..." address the conservation of koalas and

Koala habitat” and indicates that “plants used for landscaping should comprise 70% Australian plants of which 50% are native to the area including Koala habitat trees where practicable”. Further, both the Redland Shire Council Vegetation Enhancement Strategy 2004 and the Redlands Planning Scheme indicate that content of native plants should be between 50 and 80% in road reserves.

### **Existing requirements for undergrounding power in targeted roads**

Under the Redlands Planning Scheme there are a range of streets that are nominated for upgrading (undergrounding) by Energex (Appendix 1). Properties being reconfigured on these streets, must in the power easement, install underground power or install conduit for later conductor installation by Energex when upgrades are being undertaken. These streets are typified as being high traffic zones or roads. Whilst these proposed upgrades offer a chance to potentially increase habitat, it will also induce further interactions with vehicles, especially in high traffic streets with higher speed limits. Indeed, koala road deaths in this Shire also reflect this trend (Appendix 2). Other road treatments such as fauna exclusion fencing may be required in these circumstances to offset risks of koala hits.

### **Existing requirement for undergrounding power in new developments**

There are a number of requirements currently in place for powerline undergrounding for a range of development types under the (RPS) Redlands Planning Scheme as per Appendix 1.

In general, roads internal to a development must be undergrounded. Where overhead electricity reticulation exists along frontage of the development and all the proposed lots are to take access off the existing dedicated road -

1. low voltage (240V) and 11kV are converted to underground and all lots supplied underground from consumers’ service pillars;
2. redundant overhead lines and power poles are removed.

Where the overhead electricity reticulation exists along the frontage of the development, but the proposed lots are to take access and have electricity supply from an internal road system, conduits are installed for either the future undergrounding of the existing 11kV component or for new proposed future 11kV.

If the supply for the development is taken from existing overhead mains, then the supply is installed underground from the nearest existing overhead pole at or outside the development boundary. These costs are borne by the developer.

Under the Redland Planning Scheme and the Development Application process existing and proposed vegetation for streetscapes is also assessed.

## Identification of case study area

The suburb of Ormiston was selected as a case study area and used as a tool for developing a potential program and assessing its costs and benefits. This area was characterised as a suburb comprising of a large proportion of old established properties plus a range of redeveloped blocks. These areas are typified by overhead power infrastructure (Appendix 3 Photo 1).

Ormiston comprises of new development areas which incorporate undergrounded powerlines. This suburb also contains a range of koala habitats and a quantity of koala data to support this exercise. Samples of streets were chosen within Ormiston primarily via information gained through a number of overlays (Appendix 4) and ground-truthing. While costs and vegetation management are the main focus of this report, some assessment of other factors such as amenity and reliability of supply were investigated.

## On ground analysis and data collection

### Energex consultation

Discussions were held between Environmental Management, Infrastructure Planning and a number of staff from Energex to assess costings and viability to remove overhead cables and replace with underground power infrastructure in a range of areas. Costings and advice in this report was based on information supplied by Energex.

### Power infrastructure assessment

Power pole type, voltage rating and conduit locations were recorded along with setbacks, presence of other underground services and portions/frontages already undergrounded. Costs per km for undergrounding for selected streets were estimated based on Energex figures and verified by Energex. Estimated Council infrastructure costs were provided by Infrastructure Planning.

### Targeted streets

Streets that were targeted for this study consisted of a sample that offered the greatest benefits for habitat linkages. Specifically, streets were evaluated via the following criteria:

All vegetation on road easements (not private land) on selected streets were assessed for:

- Species- these were analysed by exotic, native, Koala food trees and total habitat trees.
- Height - less than 4 metres, 4-10 metres and over 10 metres
- The Nature Conservation (koala) Conservation Plan 2006 indicates that trees over 4 metres as koala habitat trees. However, the study performed by QPWS



suggests that trees of greater than 10 metres were the preferred habitat for koalas.

- Native Trees Energex pruned- Trees in the study area were pruned for a range of reasons. The amount of pruning resulting only from powerlines management was recorded. Other types of pruning associated with structural integrity and tree safety were disregarded for the purposes of this report.
- Percent of canopy missing- The percentage of canopy missing from Energex pruned trees was estimated and recorded.

### **General pruning affects for native trees**

All remaining streets in the suburb were assessed for the average percentage of canopy loss for native habitat trees. This part of the study was used to provide estimate of actual losses to native trees and provide an ability to extrapolate results to other equivalent suburbs. The percent of canopy missing for native Energex pruned trees on roadway easements was assessed for the height classifications indicated above.

### **Comparison to other suburbs**

The relative quantities of exotic and native trees and the losses to native trees from powerlines in the case study suburb were ground-truthed against other suburbs for comparison of results.

## **Results**

### Amenity benefits

Undergrounding of powerlines can provide significant visual advantages for residents in areas where large scale undergrounding has occurred e.g. new subdivisions and developments.

Improved land values are also considered to be a major benefit from undergrounding powerlines.

However, a 1998 study was undertaken by the Queensland Valuer General in Brisbane, to identify the benefits that would accrue to property owners from undergrounding powerlines in established suburbs.

This report found that the impact on land values would be minimal (Appendix 5). That is, if one thousand dwellings in an area of average to good quality class of development were upgraded to underground power, it is considered that only about 5% of properties would increase in value. This amounted to \$300 per lot or 0.16% of an average land value of \$185,000 or 0.09% of the average property value of \$350,000. Similar trends have been observed in other states.

### Reliability of supply

The reliability of supply is considered to be an important factor in the case for undergrounding. A Monash University (1996) study estimated annual reduced costs for customers from improved reliability at Net Present Value over 40 years was \$35-\$75 assuming a reliability improvement of 22-45%. However, undergrounding a particular part of an overhead system will not necessarily lead to immediate improvement in the reliability of the supply for customers. Reliability improvement will only occur over a number of years, as larger and larger sections of the distribution system are placed underground.

### Powerline impacts on native koala habitat and food trees

A total of 117 native trees >4m for the whole suburb were impacted by powerline pruning with an average canopy loss of 30%.

Of the 117 impacted native trees in this area 74 (63%) were classified as koala food trees for which the average loss to canopy was 26%. It may be noted that even in cases where percent loss was higher, this does not necessarily equate to a significant loss in foliage biomass. This is due to the often low canopy density for native species (especially larger gums which are typically between 30 - 50% FPC (foliage projective cover). In comparison, the FPC of many exotic species is 70 - 90%.

### **Existing vegetation**

Data from the case study indicates that the 'average' street in the case study area comprised of less than 10% native plants of which a small proportion, less than 5 %, were koala food trees. However, it should be acknowledged that many of the older plantings pre-date the vegetation enhancement strategies. Given the above, planting of native trees that reflect Council obligations could provide substantial benefits.

### **Epicormic regrowth from pruning practices**

Pruning of trees can and has resulted in production of epicormic growth, that is, dense re-shooting of foliage (Appendix 3 Photo 2). This can offer a good supply of fresh food for koalas and in the short term can reduce the overall amount of foliage lost to pruning. It is commonly accepted premise is that once pruning practices are stopped then limbs will simply regrow. However, there are a number of issues with this premise as follows:

- Most of the heavily pruned tree specimens have had limbs removed back to a stub. This reduces the amount of epicormic growth that can occur because buds have been removed. That is, a flush of epicormic growth may not occur at all.
- Epicormic growth will thin out as one or two shoots become dominant.

- Epicormic growth is characteristically structurally weak. As such, if epicormic growth does occur and is able to obtain significant size then it also has a substantial risk of breaking out again.

In essence, epicormic regrowth benefits from undergrounding can not be relied upon to provide significant benefits for providing koala food/ habitat. Epicormic regrowth is likely to increase maintenance costs to Energex and Council due to its instability.

### **Setbacks and services**

Setbacks on road easements often range from 3-10 metres with most being at the lower end of this scale (Appendix 3 Photo 3). Underground services such as water mains and communications services were found to be on one or both sides of the streets. Although trees may be planted over top of underground cables it is generally not considered good practice.

### **Meeting Policy obligations for vegetation enhancement**

The 2002 Vegetation Enhancement Strategy first outlined the percentage of natives that should be present in street plantings. Many areas planted prior to 2002 do not meet the criteria for native planting densities as Council is now obliged to meet. Parks and Conservation are currently addressing this paucity of native species in many of its new and older street plantings.

#### Streets totally or partly devoid of plantings

There are a large number of streets throughout the Shire that have no or few street plantings (Appendix 3 Photo 4). This mainly occurs in new areas of the Shire but is still apparent in some of the older parts. Identification and planting of these streets with appropriate native species is required.

#### Existing plantings with small exotic species

Any exotic planted trees less than 3 metres tall should be replaced with appropriate native species (Appendix 3 Photo 5).

#### Mature exotic street scapes

There are a number of precincts in the Shire that are characterised by substantial rows of mature Poincianas (Appendix 3 Photo 6). Notwithstanding community perception, there is a case for the gradual replacement of these trees through infill planting and selective removal. Where, mature Poincianas are removed for any reason, they should be replaced with a native tree. Planting of Poincianas is now being phased out in favour of koala habitat trees. However, exceptions are made when Councillors request exotic species over natives.

### Costs for tree removal and native tree establishment

Contractor costs for small tree (Poinciana) approximate \$500 including GST or for a large tree (Poinciana) \$1000 Including GST. The cost for establishment of trees is \$50.00.

Street	A	B	C	D
Costs removing exotics plus replacement and infilling	\$15,400	\$12,100	\$10,800	\$10,450

### The Cost of Undergrounding

The cost of undergrounding powerlines depends on the voltages of the cables to be undergrounded, the customer density of the areas to be undergrounded, and the approach taken to undergrounding. The costs in this report are broad estimates.

#### Electricity Infrastructure

It is estimated that the total costs to underground all overhead electricity in Ormiston is likely to lie in the \$37 million range. Within this area four streets were accessed for undergrounding potential and associated costs estimated \$4.3 million.

#### Communication Infrastructure

While these cost estimates include street lighting costs, they do not include the costs of undergrounding other overhead infrastructure such as communications cables. Research suggests that costs related to undergrounding communications infrastructure may be in the order of an additional \$2,000 per household. Some of these costs may be shared with DNSPs (Distribution Network Service Providers), so reducing the overall cost of communications refit. A percentage of these costs may be offset to some extent by benefits to the telecommunications carriers, such as reduced maintenance costs.

#### Estimated costs for undergrounding in case study area

Broad estimates supplied by Energex for undergrounding approximated \$1.4 million/km. Streets that were assessed in the case study area provide revised estimates in the vicinity of \$1.7 million/km. The following table indicates approximated costs for the four streets assessed in the study.

Street	A	B	C	D
Cost per km	\$850,000	\$629,000	\$459,000	\$1,547,000
Power to lots @ \$4000/lot	\$152,000	\$132,000	\$72,000	\$208,000
Telecommunications costs	\$76,000	\$66,000	\$36,000	\$104,000
Total cost undergrounding	\$1,078,000	\$827,000	\$567,000	\$1,859,000

Costs to residents are \$5000 - \$7000 per lot for re-installation of power and \$2000 per lot for telecommunications costs.

#### Estimating cost per tree equivalent- undergrounding vs planting

As indicated previously, the average loss to a canopy of large gum is around 25%. In order to gain back the 25% loss, would require the undergrounding of the overhead electrical span where it is located. To save one tree or part thereof, at the equivalent of one tree per span (approx 40 metres) by undergrounding equates to \$68,000. In contrast, establishment of another tree costs \$50 per unit thus planting new appropriate native at a rate of 1 plant per 10 metres would cost \$200 (4 trees per span). Conversely, for this price of saving portions of one tree, 1360 new trees could be planted.

#### **Funding options for undergrounding**

Two main funding options (the 'Beneficiary Pays' and 'Mixed Funding Approaches') are outlined below. These options were evaluated in a study in New South Wales.

<b>Beneficiary pays</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Recover costs from individual electricity consumers via electricity charges.	Benefits to individual accrue as a result of improved reliability of supply.  Simple to administer.	Estimated value of these benefits is small.  Likely to be inequitable.
Recover costs from all property owners in a local area where undergrounding will occur via Local Government rates.	May come closest to aligning benefits with cost recovery.	Benefits to individuals will vary widely based on proximity to infrastructure.  Likely to be significant differences in individuals' willingness to pay, both within a local government area and between local government areas.
The state as a whole to pay for urban undergrounding by reimbursing the costs of wires and cable burial out of consolidated revenue and gifting the new	Administratively simple.	Some customers such as those in new developments where these systems have been already undergrounded in the construction stage would pay twice.

<b>Beneficiary pays</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
assets to the DNSPs (Distribution Network Service Providers).		None of the options above can ensure all costs are set against the benefits in a way that is equitable and is simple to administer.

<b>Mixed Funding Approach</b>		
A combination of the above options is used.	May come closest to meeting equity requirements.	Not as administratively simple as any single option.
60 per cent of costs are recovered through local rates or levies.  15 per cent funded by the State.  5 per cent funded by electricity customers.  20 per cent by DNSPs.	Would benefits those communities that value unquantifiable aspects such as environment and amenity.	Two local communities with similar undergrounding costs may value the unquantifiable benefits of undergrounding very differently.  Relatively low level of quantifiable benefits for consumers.  Affordability especially for lower income families and pensioners is an issue.
Communities that place a relatively low value on the local benefits of undergrounding should be given the choice of opting out.		It may be impractical and inequitable for individuals to opt out.
Amount funded by local government rates and the State should reflect the full costs of undergrounding the existing networks less the costs associated with replacing the existing overhead network at the end of its economic life.		In some areas the benefits may be closer to the costs, potentially creating problems to determine funding responsibility.

Overall, the research has found that the quantified costs are substantially higher than the quantifiable benefits of general widespread undergrounding. The research also identified that some benefits, such as improved amenity and environmental benefits, are difficult to quantify. The cost of undergrounding can only be justified by cost-benefit analysis if the value of hard to quantify benefits such as improved amenity and environmental management is very high.

### **Power Corridors**

As indicated earlier, power corridors are not necessarily associated with designated roadways and roadways are not active. These may be bounded one or both sides by vegetated areas and may include public and private land.

It has been established that undergrounding powerlines on streetscapes will not achieve significant gains and will come at substantial cost. However, undergrounding powerlines or removing powerlines in power corridors within areas of high quality habitat areas where substantial vegetation can be gained or vegetation can be linked may be viable.

One example is that of Duncan Street at the end of Oak Street (Appendix 6- Aerial Photo 1). In this case a 10metre wide power corridor cuts through vegetated areas of Hilliard Creek separating the northern and southern sides of the corridor.

Undergrounding powerlines in this situation could result in canopy closure through revegetation. In this case undergrounding powerlines could result in an area of 7000 m<sup>2</sup> (700m x 10m) for revegetation (700m from the end of Thorn Street to the end of Duncan Street, comprises of 4 poles carrying only 11kV). If replanted at a rate of 3 trees/shrubs per square meter would provide 21,000 trees/shrubs for a total cost of \$1,190,000 for undergrounding. The equivalent length of undergrounding in a street situation at a rate of 1 tree/shrub per 10 metres would provide gains of 70 trees for the same price (only for undergrounding).

King Street (Appendix 6- Aerial Photo 2) is another example of a power corridor where substantial gains can be achieved. The length of the corridor in Council area is 575 metres. Based as above on a 10 metre easement at a planting rate of 3 per square metre amounts to 17,250 trees/shrubs at a cost of \$977,500 for undergrounding.

Apart from the superior ecological benefits that can be gained from selecting corridors for treatment, consensus for undergrounding can be achieved with greater success due to fewer tenures as compared to normal streetscapes. Further, there are a number of corridors in bushland areas where power infrastructure may be obsolete and would only require costs of removal.

To use the above example of Duncan Street, there are only two tenures for which approval would have to be gained one of which is Council owned. The area of King Street that would be proposed to be undergrounded is entirely Council owned. In contrast, a comparative length of suburban street to Duncan Street may require

consensus of up to 40 households. In the latter case, consensus will naturally be harder to obtain.

The Memorandum of Understanding between RSC and Energex allows for the creation of a priority list of environmental areas that the Council would consider advantageous for power infrastructure amendments. Where it is agreed by RSC and Energex that modification of the existing power structure is required, to reduce impacts on existing vegetation, Energex may contribute up to 50% of cost subject to technical, operational and economic considerations. As such, the above types of treatment area (power corridors) can be shown to provide the most cost effective and efficient means retaining and enhancing a range of ecological values for a greater biodiversity of flora and fauna and improve the likelihood of joint funding.

In regards to visual amenity, project works in power corridors that a target community areas such as parks and conservation areas can provide benefits to the broader community and limit issues of inequity through occupants in a particular street accruing visual benefits.

Therefore a program that targets Power Corridor project areas must meet minimum criteria as follows.

#### **Program for Power corridors**

1. The proposed project area must not be associated with a designated active street or roadway.
2. The proposed project area must have the capacity to be planted with up to 3 plants per metre square and be a minimum of 10m wide.
3. The proposed project area must aim to keep tenures to a minimum with priority given to land owned and managed by RSC.
4. Be able to be undergrounded or total removal of obsolete power lines

The area may also be prioritised on a number of other non essential criteria:

- a) walking paths
- b) other public access/structures
- c) visual amenity/scenic landscape ideals under RPS
- d) cultural heritage
- e) flora management
- f) fauna movement
- g) de-fragmentation of habitats
- h) waterways and riparian corridor management
- i) conservation/biodiversity values
- j) fire management



k) Potential partial funding by Energex

Any potential prioritised project areas should undergo consultation between Environmental Management and Parks and Conservation, Infrastructure Planning, Land Use Planning and Energex. Prioritise areas are to be included on a priority list to be forwarded to Energex no later than March 30 each calendar year as per Memorandum of Understanding.

**Response Summary to Issues Presented by Councillor**

1. Council has initiated discussions with Energex and the above information outlines a strategy for assessing and targeting specific areas for undergrounding powerlines and assessment of the costs and benefits for vegetation enhancement.
  2. Given the rate of koala decline, implementation of programmes that produce significant gains in the short term are more likely to achieve stabilisation in koala numbers. These could include increasing the percentage content of appropriate native plant in street plantings and reducing koala/vehicle/rail interactions through road and rail treatments.
  3. Undergrounding frontages for redeveloped blocks in existing suburban areas is a condition of development under the Redland Planning Scheme. While undergrounding of existing lines on streetscapes does not provide significant benefits in terms of native trees/koala food trees gained. The information brought to attention during this exercise indicates that undergrounding power in streetscapes would be cost prohibitive. This may not equate to substantial goals for vegetation enhancement due to other factors such as setbacks, and service infrastructure clearance. It may not be possible due to issues of equity; resident willingness and ability to pay. Undergrounding in power corridors offers a superior form of investment in regards to cost/benefits as compared to streetscapes.
  4. Underground powerlines:
    - (a) Studies indicate that the impact on property values would be minimal and could not be used as a justification for undergrounding powerlines.
    - (b) Undergrounding powerlines can reduce cost to Energex and Council from maintenance costs although the cost and benefits of undergrounding must be assessed initially.
    - (c) The cost/benefits of planting new trees and replacing exotic species in streetscapes far outweigh the marginal advantages and significant costs of undergrounding. Planting streetscapes at densities that meet Council obligations will have significant benefits for koalas and a range of other wildlife.
    - (d) Undergrounding of power infrastructure for large and small developments is already administered through the Development Assessment process of
-

the Redlands Planning Scheme. These costs are borne by the developer but costs at times have been contended due issues of equity where poles do not line up with property boundaries.

5. Under the Energex/Council MOU, Energex may meet 50% of costs depending on circumstances and funding.
6. Communities that value unquantifiable aspects such as environment and amenity may share costs to underground power in street. However, due to the large costs involved all residents would need to be willing and able to pay.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to "Ensure the enhancement of biodiversity including koala habitat, bushland, greenspace, waterways, catchments, air and coastal ecosystems in recognition of our unique location on Moreton Bay".

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are significant financial implications for Council if undergrounding of powerlines is undertaken. This represents approximately \$1.7 million per km for power infrastructure (baseline costs). Partial funding may also be required in suburban areas for other costs as follows: \$5000 - \$7000 per lot for re-installation of power and \$2000 per lot for telecommunications costs.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not result in possible amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has occurred between Energex, Parks and Conservation, Infrastructure Planning and the Environmental Education Unit and details of the consultation have been provided in the report.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

1. To continue to require the undergrounding powerlines in new residential subdivisions in accordance with the Redlands Planning Scheme (RPS); and
2. Not to undertake undergrounding of existing powerlines in suburban areas as it is cost prohibitive.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

No alternative is suggested.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To continue to require the undergrounding powerlines in new residential subdivisions in accordance with the Redlands Planning Scheme (RPS); and
2. Not to undertake undergrounding of existing powerlines in suburban areas as it is cost prohibitive.

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Moved by: Cr Murray

Seconded by: Cr Henry

1. That the Officer's Recommendation not be accepted;
2. That a policy and strategy be introduced urgently for placement in the Redlands Planning Scheme to provide underground power as a condition of approval of subdivision and other developments in areas with overhead power;
3. That Council introduce a policy and strategy whereby residents in streets can petition for undergrounding of power lines, largely at their cost; and
4. That Council urgently introduce a policy and strategy for the undergrounding of power adjacent to conservation areas and parks, costs to be shared under the MOU.

On being put to the vote the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Murray, Elliott, Bowler and Henry voted in the affirmative.

Crs Williams, Beard, Seccombe, Dowling, Ogilvie, Barker and Burns voted in the negative.

The motion was declared by the Chair as LOST.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To continue to require the undergrounding powerlines in new residential subdivisions in accordance with the Redlands Planning Scheme (RPS); and
2. Not to undertake undergrounding of existing powerlines in suburban areas as it is cost prohibitive.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

1. **That the Committee Recommendation not be accepted; and**
2. **That a policy and strategy be introduced urgently, for placement in the Redlands Planning Scheme, to provide underground power as a condition of approval of subdivision and other developments in areas with overhead power.**

**CARRIED**

A division was called for.

Crs Ogilvie, Henry, Dowling, Bowler, Elliott, Williams and Murray voted in the affirmative.

Crs Barker, Burns, Beard and Seccombe voted in the negative.

The motion was declared by the Mayor as **CARRIED**.

---

### 10.3.5 REDLANDS SUSTAINABLE DEMONSTRATION HOUSE – COUNCIL ENDORSEMENT

**Dataworks Filename:** EM Cities for Climate Protection (including Greenhouse Issues)

**Attachments:** [Plans of the house by Fox and Bell / Begbie Bentham – Attachment 1](#)  
[Letter from Sustainable Homes Program – Attachment 2](#)  
[Marketing and communications plan - Attachment 3](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Photinos  
Manager Environmental Management

**Author Name:** Brian Sundermeijer  
Advisor Environmental Performance

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fox and Bell P/L in partnership with Begbie Bentham P/L propose to construct a Sustainable Demonstration House at 111 Parklink Drive Redland Bay. The house will be accessible to the public as an example of an affordable sustainable home for a period of about 6 months.

Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham have requested the endorsement and support from Council for this project. The design for the house has in principle approval from the State Government's Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee.

The project balances sustainability objectives with producing a house that is affordable to first home buyers. The project meets Council's strategic priority to encourage business uptake of sustainability principles and practices.

#### PURPOSE

To brief Council on a proposal from Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham to establish a sustainable demonstration house at Redland Bay, and to gain Council direction on the extent of endorsement and support to be provided in response to the proposal.

#### BACKGROUND

- In November 2006, Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham representatives met with Council officers to discuss a proposed Sustainable Demonstration House at 111 Parklink Drive Redland Bay.
- Council officers encouraged Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham regarding the proposal and advised that a proposal for endorsement and support could be taken to Council as soon as the proposal gained the endorsement of the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee, which falls under the auspices of the EPA's Sustainable Homes Program.

- On 13th of February the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee granted Fox and Bell in principle approval for the project as a sustainable demonstration home (attachment 1).
- On 23<sup>rd</sup> of February Council officers again met with Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham representatives to discuss the options available for endorsement and support.

## ISSUES

### SUSTAINABLE HOMES PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE ENDORSEMENT

The EPA Sustainable Homes Program promotes sustainable housing design standards. The Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee, which is an industry representative body that advises EPA, has given conditional endorsement to the Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham project for inclusion as a sustainable demonstration home project (see attachment 2).

There are minor design amendments required by the Steering Committee from Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham. While these amendments are minor and should not result in complications, Council should not consider endorsement until such time as the Steering Committee's endorsement is unconditional for the project.

There are now 30 individual projects that make up the Sustainable Homes program. Each of these has their own unique characteristics to suit the climate, social needs and economic needs within the communities where they are built. The list includes:

- 3 Projects opened for display (now closed);
- 4 Projects under construction;
- 10 projects endorsed and due to start construction (most will start early in 2007);
- 2 projects about to be presented to the Steering Committee;
- 11 projects in the design and preparatory endorsement phase.

Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham's sustainable house design balances sustainability objectives with producing a house that is affordable to first home buyers. This means that some expected features (e.g. a grey water system, solar panels) are not included because they increase the cost.

The greater affordability of the design improves the potential for home buyers on lower incomes to buy a sustainable home.

### ENDORSEMENT AND SUPPORT SOUGHT FROM COUNCIL

Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham requested the following endorsement and support from Council:

- In principle support and endorsement for the project;
- Coordination of the public relations for the launch/opening of the home, displays, publicity materials;

- Provision of technical assistance with garden scaping and landscaping;
- Brochures and flyers, other materials on sustainability and staffing of the home for "1/2 day per week or so for 6 to 12 months".

Consultation within Council determined the following scope for support to the project. Costs are detailed.

#### MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Marketing and Communications have developed a preliminary support plan (attachment 3) and can work with Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham on a launch event and ongoing promotion. The focus is that the house is an opportunity to see an example of affordable sustainability. Council does not market Fox and Bell, Begbie Bentham, or the purchase of the display home. The value of Council's in kind contribution here is equivalent to \$18,300, and out of pocket expenses of \$5,000 are required.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Environmental Management proposes to continue to provide project coordination, and supply relevant brochures and flyers (energy saving) to be displayed at the house. The approximate value of materials is \$500 and can be met within existing budget. Environmental Management proposes to organise a person to staff the house during the launch and on Saturdays for three months. An overload position at \$50 per hour is projected to require \$4,800 out of pocket.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION UNIT

Environmental Education Unit proposes to assist with development of a waterwise native garden through 'Your Backyard Garden' staff advice to Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham's appointed landscape architect. Council in kind contribution is approximately \$150 for 3 hours staff time for site visit. Environmental Education Unit proposes to supply relevant brochures and flyers (native gardens) to be displayed at the house. The approximate in kind value of materials is \$500.

#### REDLAND WATER WASTE

Redland Water Waste proposes to supply relevant brochures and flyers (water efficiency) to be displayed at the house. The approximate in kind value of materials is \$500.

#### CONSTRUCTION ISSUES

There may be negative feedback if the construction phase of the house is not carried out in a sustainable manner.

To assure the construction is conducted in a sustainable manner Pollution Prevention Unit officers will conduct regular monitoring of the sediment and erosion control measures required throughout the construction phase. Evidence of good sediment and erosion control may be used as part of the display materials when the completed house is opened.

The Sustainable Homes Program Committee and Council officers have encouraged Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham to be involved in the 'Keep Australia Beautiful Clean Site' program, and engage contractors to recycle and reuse building waste on site.

#### SUMMARY

In summary, the potential responses to Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham's request for endorsement and support include:

1. In principle support and endorsement for the project, including permission to use the Council logo to brand the Sustainable Demonstration House project.
2. Assistance with coordination of the public relations for the launch/opening of the home, displays, publicity materials - \$18,300 in kind and \$5,000 out of pocket
3. Provision of technical advice regarding the garden through the Your Backyard Garden Program - \$150 in kind
4. Provision of brochures and flyers, other materials on sustainability - \$1,500 in kind
5. Staffing of the home for the launch and Saturdays for 3 months - \$4,800 out of pocket

#### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to Encourage business uptake of sustainability principles and practices.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

No budget allocation has been made for this project.

Projected costs are:

- \$19,950 in kind contribution from Council staff assistance and materials
- \$9,800 actual out of pocket expenses. This allocation is subject to approval through third quarter budget review. This is a one off budget allocation. No further funds will be required once the project is complete

#### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

#### **CONSULTATION**

- Meetings with Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham regarding the project.
- Environmental Management Group consulted with Marketing and Communications, the Environmental Education Unit, Redland Water and Waste, in drafting this report.



- Discussion with Stuart Ackerman, the Keep Australia Beautiful Queensland 'Clean Site' Program Manager, regarding options for a demonstration day.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve

1. To endorse the Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham Sustainable Demonstration House project once it has received unconditional approval from the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee, and.
2. Provide in kind support only (valued at \$19,950) with coordination of the public relations for the launch/opening of the home, displays, publicity materials and provision of technical advice.

### **ALTERNATIVE 1**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To endorse the Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham Sustainable Demonstration House project once it has received unconditional approval from the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee, and
2. Provide in kind support (valued at \$19,950) for the coordination of the public relations for the launch/opening of the home, displays, publicity materials and provision of technical advice and
3. Make a financial contribution to meet all out of pocket expenses (\$9,800) subject to a consideration and approval of the funds through the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Budget Review.

### **ALTERNATIVE 2**

That Council resolve to endorse the Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham Sustainable Demonstration House project once it has received unconditional approval from the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee.

## **OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To endorse the Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham Sustainable Demonstration House project once it has received unconditional approval from the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee, and
2. Provide in kind support only (valued at \$19,950) for the coordination of the public relations for the launch/opening of the home, displays, publicity materials and provision of technical advice.

**DISCUSSION**

It was agreed that Alternative 1 be adopted with a minor amendment to Recommendation 3 to delete the word "all" from the 1<sup>st</sup> line and replace with the word "some" and to insert the words "up to" before the word "\$9,800", with Recommendation 3 to now read as follows:

"3. Make a financial contribution to meet some out of pocket expenses up to \$9,800 subject to a consideration and approval of the funds through the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Budget Review".

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Dowling

Seconded by: Cr Williams

**That the Committee Recommendation not be adopted and that Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To endorse the Fox and Bell/Begbie Bentham Sustainable Demonstration House project once it has received unconditional approval from the Sustainable Homes Program Steering Committee, and**
- 2. Provide in kind support (valued at \$19,950) for the coordination of the public relations for the launch/opening of the home, displays, publicity materials and provision of technical advice and**
- 3. Make a financial contribution to meet some out of pocket expenses up to \$9,800 subject to a consideration and approval of the funds through the 3rd Quarter Budget Review.**

**CARRIED**

**10.3.6 REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACQUISITION POLICY POL-0281**

**Datworks Filename:** EM Policy - Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy

**Attachments:** [Att 1 – Existing Policy POL-0281](#)  
[Att 2 – First Version Policy POL-3057](#)  
[Att 3 – Second Version Policy POL-3057](#)  
[Att 4 – Table of Options](#)  
[Att 5 – Guideline for Assessment of Land](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Photinos  
Manager Environmental Management

**Author Name:** Richard Collins  
Advisor - Habitat Protection

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy POL-281 has been reviewed in accordance with Council's process of policy review. The policy describes how money raised under the Environmental Separate Charge is to be spent for conservation purposes.

The review process has highlighted the need to make a small number of minor changes to the document which reflects the adoption of the new Corporate Plan and the formalising of the current ongoing practice of spending a portion of the money on management activities.

**PURPOSE**

To recommend minor changes to the Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy POL-281 in accordance with the policy review process.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 972 of the Local Government Act 1993 enables a local government to make a separate charge to rate payers. Council makes several of these including the Environment Separate Charge. The Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy then details how the money raised by the Environmental Separate Charge is to be spent.

The first Environmental Charge Policy was introduced in 1992. This was redrafted 1997 as the Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy which has been subsequently reviewed in 2000 and 2003. The present version of the policy is now due for review.

**ISSUES**

The review of the Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy POL-281 has highlighted the need to make a small number of minor changes. These proposed changes reflect the adoption of the new Corporate Plan and the formalising of current practices and are detailed below;

---

- The change of the Policy title to 'Environmental Charge Acquisition & Management Policy 2006' from the 'Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy'.
- This change reflects the ongoing use of some of the money raised under the charge to be used in the management of conservation reserves (see below).
- The Head of Power has been updated to reflect the adoption of the new 'Corporate Plan 2006 – 2010'. This now reads: 'Council's Corporate Plan states the Strategic Priority for the Natural Environment – to ensure the enhancement of biodiversity including koala habitat, bushland, greenspace, waterways, catchments, air and coastal ecosystems in recognition of our unique location on Moreton Bay'.
- The inclusion of a second Policy Objective reflects the ongoing practice of using a portion of the money raised under the Environment Separate Charge for the management of Council conservation reserves. This principle was included in the 1997 version of the Environment Charge Acquisition Policy but was subsequently removed with the expectation that a separate policy for the management of reserves would be drafted. This separate policy did not eventuate but the use of part of the money for management purposes continued. The proposed change to the policy formalises this current practice.
- The proposed second Policy Objective reads: 'To manage environmentally significant land for existing and future generations and to protect the environmental significance of the site in both the short term and the long term'.
- The inclusion of an additional Policy Statement that affirms Council's commitment to the use of funds for conservation management. Policy Statement 6 reads: 'The contribution of funds from the Environmental Charge Acquisition and Management Policy towards the management of the conservation estate'.
- The addition of a Note that describes the apportioning of the Environmental Separate Charge following a resolution at Council's Special Budget Meeting for the Budget 2006 / 2007. This reads: 'as of 30 June 2006, Council's apportioning of the \$70 charge will be;
  - a) \$30 towards acquisition
  - b) \$30 towards management
  - c) \$10 spent according to developed plans for conservation areas, especially creeks and waterways.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to ensure the enhancement of biodiversity including koala habitat, bushland, greenspace, waterways, catchments, air and coastal ecosystems in recognition of our unique location on Moreton Bay.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The revised and updated Policy does not change any existing financial implications. All funds raised by the current Environment Separate Charge are being expended as Council has resolved through its budget meetings. The policy only serves to formalise these arrangements.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation on this review has included the Acting Manager Operations and Maintenance, Planning and Policy Department's Finance Officer. The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the attached Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy POL-3057, shown as Attachment 2; and
2. Declare Environment Charge Acquisition Policy POL-0281 obsolete.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to defer the adoption of Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy POL-0281 pending amendments as directed by Council.

## **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the attached Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy, POL-3057, shown as Attachment 2; and
2. Declare Environmental Charge Acquisition Policy POL-0281 obsolete.

## **ADDENDUM – 1 MARCH 2007**

This report was presented to the Planning and Policy Committee meeting on 13 December 2006 and subsequent General Meeting, on 20 December 2006, where consideration of this matter was deferred to the next Planning and Policy Committee meeting.

This report was then presented to the Committee meeting on 23 January 2007 where this matter was discussed at length and a number of issues were raised, followed by Council resolution on 31 January 2007 to defer the report to the March Committee meeting.

Further consultation was undertaken with Councillors, General Managers and the Environmental Education Unit. As a result of this consultation, a revised version of the Environment Charge Acquisition Policy, POL-3057 (Attachment 3), has been prepared, together with new assessment guidelines (Attachment 5). This addendum provides information on the additions included in the revised version of the Policy.

#### CHANGE OF POLICY POSITION: ASSISTING CONSERVATION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

A consistent message from the consultation process was that the Policy should reflect greater flexibility in the use of the Environment Separate Charge money to deal with environmental issues specifically with urban areas.

At present, the capital component of the money is used to purchase properties and designate them as conservation reserves. The operational component of the money is then spent on managing these new reserves and managing established reserves.

The inclusion of an additional Policy Statement in the revised version (Attachment 3) identifying the commitment to contribute funds to the management and conservation of habitat and biodiversity on private land has the potential to broaden the scope of Shire-wide environmental outcomes. This represents a change of the policy position which widens the scope for the protection and enhancement of environmental values on both public and private lands.

Redland Shire Council has four extension programs for achieving environmental outcomes on private property. These programs cater for rural land-owners and urban householders. If these programs are used to spearhead initiatives for improving habitat and biodiversity using Environment Separate Charge money there is an in-built flexibility to accomplish the desired outcome in both the rural and urban parts of the Shire.

#### NEW LAND ASSESSMENT GUIDELINE

A number of Councillors expressed concerns that the process for the assessment and selection of properties that Council wished to purchase was inflexible and limited opportunities for acquiring properties that became available on the market.

While the existing policy has a degree of flexibility, a new land assessment guideline has been developed to confirm and supplement the policy's flexibility in the acquisition of property (Attachment 5).

The guideline is based on the same assessment criteria used for properties for inclusion in the 'Watch List'. In addition, the requirement to spend money raised by the Environment Separate Charge to achieve environmental outcomes is maintained.

The Policy Statement indicates that the prioritisation of acquisitions will include the assessment of the environmental significance of the site and the threat posed to it, the community benefits that would be achieved and the ultimate cost of the land. To emphasise this, the guideline places equal value upon these 'four pillars' or criteria.

If the Policy Statement regarding the spending of funds on private property and the guideline for assessing properties is included in the Policy as a whole, the options or, mix of options, can formulated and are shown in Attachment 4.

## **REVISED OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the revised version of the Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy POL-3057 (Attachment 3); and
2. Declare Environment Charge Acquisition Policy, POL-0281, obsolete.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy, POL-3057 (Attachment 2) ; and
2. Declare Environment Charge Acquisition Policy, POL-0281, obsolete.

## **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy, POL-3057, shown as Attachment 3; and
2. Declare Environment Charge Acquisition Policy, POL-0281, obsolete.

## **PROPOSED MOTION 1**

Moved by: Cr Seccombe

Seconded by: Cr Beard

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That the Officer's Recommendation not be adopted and that Council adopt the Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy, POL-3057, shown as Attachment 2; and
2. Declare Environment Charge Acquisition Policy, POL-0281, obsolete.

On being put to the voted the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Beard, Seccombe, Dowling, Barker and Burns voted in the affirmative.

Crs Murray, Williams, Elliott, Bowler, Henry and Ogilvie voted in the negative.

---

The motion was declared by the Chair as LOST.

**PROPOSED MOTION 2**

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the Environment Charge Acquisition and Management Policy, POL-3057, shown as Attachment 3; and
2. Declare Environment Charge Acquisition Policy, POL-0281, obsolete.

On being put to the voted the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Elliott, Bowler and Ogilvie voted in the affirmative.

Crs Murray, Williams, Beard, Seccombe, Dowling, Henry, Barker and Burns voted in the negative.

The motion was declared by the Chair as LOST.

**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

Moved by Cr Seccombe

That the item lie on the table.

CARRIED

In accordance with part 3, Division 5, Section 29(7) of Subordinate Local Law No 5 (Meetings), a procedural motion is required, *“that the item be taken from the table”* before the matter can be reconsidered and concluded.



## 10.4 CLOSED SESSION

### MOTION TO CLOSE COMMITTEE MEETING

The meeting was closed to the public under Section 463(1) of the *Local Government Act 1993* to discuss the following items:

#### 10.4.1 Toondah Harbour Redevelopment

#### 10.4.2 Environment Charge Land Acquisition West Mt Cotton Road

#### 10.4.3 Land Disposal Options 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point

#### 10.4.4 Southern Moreton Bay Island Open Space Plan 2

### MOTION TO REOPEN COMMITTEE MEETING

The meeting was again opened to the public.

#### 10.4.1 TOONDAH HARBOUR RE-DEVELOPMENT

<b>Datworks Filename:</b>	<b>RTT Redevelopment of Toondah Harbour Precinct</b>
<b>Responsible Officer Name:</b>	<b>David Elliott Manager Infrastructure Planning Group</b>
<b>Author Name:</b>	<b>Michael Pattinson Senior Advisor Investigations</b>

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 29 March 2006, Council resolved to support the promotion of ten Redlands Strategic Investment Projects, including the potential for a mixed use development at Toondah Harbour, Cleveland.

A confidential report from Manager Infrastructure Planning dated 5 March 2007 was presented to Committee to note progress to date in this matter.

Cr Ogilvie declared an interest in this item at the committee meeting.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to note the progress to date outlined in the confidential report on the Toondah Harbour redevelopment project.

---

Cr Ogilvie declared a Material Personal Interest in *Item 10.4.1 Toondah Harbour Re-Development* at the Council meeting and left the meeting prior to discussion and decision on this matter.

### **PROPOSED MOTION**

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

1. That the Committee Recommendation not be accepted; and
2. That Council note the report and that community consultation on the different development layouts be undertaken before any further work is done on advancing the planning.

On being put to the vote, the motion was LOST.

Crs Henry, Bowler, Elliott and Murray voted in the affirmative.

Crs Barker, Dowling, Burns, Beard, Williams and Secombe voted in the negative.

Cr Ogilvie was absent from the meeting when the vote was taken.

The motion was declared by the Mayor as LOST.

### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to note the progress to date outlined in the confidential report dated 5 March 2007 from the Manager Infrastructure Planning on the Toondah Harbour redevelopment project.**

### **CARRIED**

Cr Ogilvie returned to the meeting at 4.42 pm.

**10.4.2 ENVIRONMENT CHARGE LAND AQUISITION WEST MT COTTON ROAD**

**Datworks Filename:** EM Environmental Charge Acquisitions 06/07  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Photinos  
Manager Environmental Management Group  
**Author Name:** Stuart Fitzsimmons  
Adviser Biodiversity Planning

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In 2005 Council resolved to enter into negotiations with the property owners for the acquisition of land at West Mount Cotton Road.

Confidential report from Manager Environmental Management dated 14 March 2007 was presented to Committee and discussed in closed session.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To acquire land in West Mount Cotton Road, Sheldon as identified in Recommendation 1 of the confidential report from Manager Environmental Management dated 14 March 2007, (details to remain confidential until negotiations have concluded) at “fair market value” acknowledging the current development application;**
- 2. If negotiations are unsuccessful within 6 months, to compulsorily acquire the land identified in resolution 1 above for conservation park purposes under the provisions of the *Acquisition of Land Act*;**
- 3. Once the lots are acquired,**
  - a. To identify the land as reserve for the purposes of *Local Law 15 (Parks & Reserves)* and be added to the Conservation Area as identified in the confidential report (details to remain confidential until negotiations have concluded) for management and improved habitat sensitive public access;**
  - b. To permanently close Schoeck Road, Sheldon (details to remain confidential until negotiations have concluded) to all traffic in the interest of public safety, under the provisions of section 915 of the *Local Government Act*;**

- c. Using the Environment Separate Charge, fund the securing of the site including fencing, signage, security patrols, and undertake initial management such as clean up and track works up to \$130,000;
4. That this report and details of this acquisition remain confidential until such time as Council has successfully negotiated the acquisition; and
5. That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal all documentation associated with acquisition of these properties.

**CARRIED**

**10.4.3 LAND DISPOSAL OPTIONS 141 BUNKER ROAD VICTORIA POINT**

**Datworks Filename:** 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point

**Attachments:** [Concept Lot Layout Plan Option A](#)  
[Concept Lot Layout Option B](#)  
[Aerial Mapping and Overlays](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Photinos  
Manager Environmental Management Group

**Author Name:** Stuart Fitzsimmons  
Adviser Biodiversity Planning

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Redlands Planning Scheme zoned part of Lot 3 RP 907141 (141 Bunker Road) in the urban residential zone and the balance of the land in the open space zone over part of Council land located at Lot 3 141 Bunker Road, Victoria Point (Lot 3 on RP907141).

Council has requested an investigation of financial assessment of the disposal and development options, opportunities for further protection of environmental values and long term public access along Erapah Creek, and initiate preliminary negotiations for acquisition of identified properties.

This report provides recommendations for the disposal and development options of 141 Bunker Road (Lot 3 on RP907141) based on investigations, and the future use, tenure and possible sale of the property.

**PURPOSE**

That Council resolve the land disposal options for 141 Bunker Road, Victoria Point. Re-configuration and disposal of part of the property will enable retention of important environmental values and generate funds for purchase of land with greater environmental values. This will enable a better outcome than was achieved with the original land dedication.

**BACKGROUND**

- The land was originally dedicated to Council from subdivision of rural land (December 1996).
- In March 2006 Council resolved to undertake an investigation into land disposal and development options with the Redlands Planning Scheme becoming effective from 30 March 2006.
- Currently the site is in Council ownership for conservation and strategic open space purposes, and part is zoned for Urban Residential purposes.
- Saunders Havill Group prepared a Development Options report in November 2006

- Land disposal options have been identified and submitted to Council for consideration that would maximise protection of the site's environmental value, however, through sale or development of non-key environmental areas provide increased funding for purchase or priority land and reduce or eliminate Council's current maintenance requirements.

## ISSUES

### PROPERTY DETAILS

The site is known as 141 Bunker Road, Victoria Point and is more fully described as Lot 3 on RP907141. The site comprises a combined area of 3.593ha and does not have frontage to a dedicated road, although a lawful easement access strip does exist.

The site is zoned Open Space and Urban Residential, with areas closer to Erapah Creek identified as being important in terms of their conservation and open space connectivity value.

Property Description	Lot 3 on RP907141
Address	141 Bunker Road, Victoria Point
Area	3.59 ha
Ownership	Redland Shire Council
RPS Zoning	Split zoning Urban Residential and Open Space
RPS Primary Codes	Urban Residential Zone & Open Space Zone Codes; Reconfiguration Code
RPS Overlays	Habitat Protection, Acid Sulphate Soils, Waterways and Wetlands

### SITE HISTORY

The subject land was transferred to Council in fee simple as a condition of development approval for a land subdivision that created Lots 1 and 2 on RP907141.

This land transfer was provided to Council as part of a subdivision approval with a relaxation of the planning scheme – subdivision provisions for minimum lot size (20 ha) on the basis of community benefit (protection of the environmental values and providing long term public access along the Erapah Creek corridor).

### LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LAND DISPOSAL OPTIONS

- Any consideration to dispose of land must be undertaken in accordance with section 491 of the *Local Government Act* which requires either an auction or inviting tenders.
- Council also needs to demonstrate under the provisions of the *Integrated Planning Act* that the sale of trust land, is undertaken in the process set out in the Act and any proceeds raised from the sale be used for providing similar facilities elsewhere.

OPTIONS FOR DISPOSAL

Redland Shire Council commissioned the Saunders Havill Group to investigate planning and environmental constraints on Lot 3 on RP907141 with a view of establishing potential development options in accordance with the zoning and overlay mapping included in the Redlands Planning Scheme.

Selling or developing sections of this allotment in accordance with the Redlands Planning Scheme while using the development process to maintain or enhance environmental values is considered an option to:

Remove maintenance requirements over an existing vacant allotment.

1. Achieve revenue to support the environmental levy and better allocate resources for achieving conservation outcomes.
2. Allow for the expansion of the Bunker Road community in accordance with Council's planning documentation.

Development Options indicated:

- The site is currently maintained by the Parks & Conservation Unit and contains limited existing vegetation with large areas predominantly slashed and maintained as rural paddock.
- Environmental constraints revolve around the retention and buffering of Eprapah Creek Corridor. The RPS supports this through an Open Space zoning immediately joining the creek area.

OPTION 1 (PREFERRED) - SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY RETAINING A PORTION AND SELLING THE BALANCE UNDEVELOPED

- Reconfiguration of 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point at proposed boundary and application for material change of use for front portion of property as shown in the Concept Lot Layout Option A provided in Saunders Havill Group Development Options Report November 2006.
- Back portion of property (approx 2.4 ha) that has high environmental values (such as Eprapah Creek riparian buffer, RE 12.3.6) and community benefit (open space) remains under Council ownership and front portion (approx 1.1 ha) for disposal.
- Loss of 90m x 20 m (approx 0.18 ha) of enhancement link between 141 & 151-159 Bunker Road that will be required for road access will be added to the back portion of the property (see RSC Planning Scheme overlay).
- Auction / invited tenders for sale of remaining portion of the property undeveloped and subject to development approval.
- Estimated return of \$1 million / ha equates to approximately \$1.1 million from the sub-division and disposal of front part of the property.

- Funds raised from disposal will be used to acquire property of higher environmental value and greater benefits to the community.

#### OPTION 2 - SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY RETAINING A PORTION, DEVELOP AND SELL THE REMAINING LAND

- Consultants report indicated two development portions – Concept Lot Layout Option A (17 allotments) and Concept Lot Layout Option B (25 allotments) subject to Development Assessment preliminary advice, lodgement and approval, allotment sizing, road requirements, etc.
- Concept Lot Layout Option A (17 allotments) is favoured as it provides for retention of environmental values as per Option 1 above.
- Concept Lot Layout Option B (25 allotments) requires significantly more land for development (approximately 0.5 – 0.7 ha). This is not considered a viable option, due to a loss of environmental values identified above.
- An evaluation by Early Group Valuers (June 2006) of proposed lots is approximated between \$180,000 and \$220,000 (Subject to size, location, layout, etc).
- Potential funds generated from sale of allotments are approximately \$3.2 - \$3.6 million for Concept Lot Layout A and \$4.1 – \$4.5 million for Concept Lot Layout Option B.
- Financial costs will be incurred by Council for development assessment, development contributions/charges, road construction, stormwater, sewerage etc (as highlighted in Saunders Havill Group report) if Concept Lot Layout Option A & B are proposed.

#### ROAD ACCESS FOR OPTIONS 1 & 2

The site is currently constrained by its access to Bunker Road, which is a 6.004 metre wide access easement over Lot 2 on RP907141. This access point is unsuitable for any residential development of the subject site (save a single detached dwelling). Any application incorporating access along the existing access alignment would require consent of adjoining owners on Lot 1 & 2 on RP907141 and would additionally require the demolition of a substantial shed located within Lot 2 on RP907141.

Development of the site for residential purposes outlined in Option 2 would require a minimum 15 metre wide road reserve from Bunker Road to the subject site. As adjoining land along the eastern boundary of the site is currently zoned as Conservation, the most appropriate access point is via the western boundary with Lot 68 on RP85360. Development applications are presently lodged by Ausbuild Pty Ltd for Lots 67 and 68 on RP85360 (151 – 169 Bunker Road), and any road access would be dependent upon successful approval by the applicants.



### STORMWATER / DRAINAGE

The site contains two substantial dams that would be retained in Council ownership if 141 Bunker Road is reconfigured. A mapped drainage line flows into the first dam, which then flows into a second dam closer to Eprapah Creek, and then into the creek. Dams are important form of water storage for detention and/or use. The southernmost dam may be retained as a detention basin and form part of a landscaped environmental area or alternatively may be filled and the revegetated.

Stormwater planning overlay (see attached overlays) indicates a flood prone area in the back portion of the property that would be negated by choosing Concept Lot Layout Option A. A stormwater Management Plan would need to be prepared as part of any development application and would need to respond to the requirements of the Stormwater Management Code.

### POTENTIAL LAND ACQUISITION OPTIONS

Council, by resolution in March 2006, instructed that further investigations and negotiations be undertaken to determine what land acquisition opportunities are available for the protection of the environmental values and providing long term public access along the Eprapah Creek corridor.

Whilst section 5.1.34 of the *Integrated Planning Act* does apply to the sale of trust land, it only sets out the process for that disposal. It requires that any proceeds raised from the sale be used for providing similar facilities elsewhere.

Redland Shire Council Property Services Manager has investigated and commenced confidential preliminary negotiations for the potential acquisition of surrounding lots with high environmental values.

### OPTION 3 - RETAIN LAND FOR CONSERVATION AND RECREATION PURPOSES

The retention of 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point in its current configuration provides existing and potential benefits to the community;

- It adjoins, and should be planned and managed along with, important bush blocks to the east that are planned for retention as habitat under the Redlands Planning Scheme.
- In combination (or even considered separately in its own right) with the Conservation areas to the east, this lot forms a large habitat node (classified as Major Patch in EIS4.1) on Eprapah Creek corridor (which is Priority Corridor in the EIS4.1).
- It includes the riparian land along Eprapah Creek and has cleared areas that may also be habitat – for example swamp wallaby and birds of prey.
- As development takes place in the surrounding area there is potential to manage this lot as part habitat and part recreation open space based on the Eprapah Creek connecting corridor.

### SUMMARY

The Development Options Report by Sanders Havill November 2006 outlines that Council does have the option of re-configuring 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on its Concept Lot Layout Plan Option A, where a significant portion of the land along Eprapah Creek and two existing dams are retained. This option allows for the best environmental outcome to be achieved while still releasing a large portion of land that can be sold or developed as residential allotments.

Should Council accept this proposal, it must first notify the public of its intentions to sell and invite submissions under section 5.1.34 of the *Integrated Planning Act* by placing an advertisement in a newspaper circulation in the local government's area. The notice must describe the land intended to be sold, the purpose for which the land was given on trust, and the reason for proposing to sell the land.

Council must then consider all submissions before subsequently resolving to make a decision to sell the land or develop the land and subsequently sell the land. This authority can be delegated and it is proposed that Council delegate its responsibility to the Chief Executive Officer to allow the expedition of the matter.

The proceeds of the sale must be used for providing similar land, which may be available for acquisition contingent on the outcome of the Property Services Managers' report. Due to possible timing issues associated with selling and acquiring lands for this purpose, funds from the Environment Separate Charge may be made available in the interim to acquire the land.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to ensure the enhancement of biodiversity including koala habitat, bushland, greenspace, waterways, catchments, air and coastal ecosystems in recognition of our unique location on Moreton Bay.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The adoption of the preferred option involving the reconfiguration of one lot into 2, retaining the back portion of the property (approximately 2.4ha) and selling the front land (zoned urban residential) as whole property with no development approval, would generate approximately \$1.1 million from auction or invited tenders (based upon potential market price of \$1 million per hectare). Development assessment, survey, legal and stamp duty costs would need to be deducted from this revenue. Revenue from the sale would be available to acquire land in the future.

Should Council decide to not proceed with any disposal options and retain the site, the normal ongoing maintenance costs would continue to apply.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will result in adjustment of the Open Space zoning

---

over the balance area of the land to be retained by Council in the Redlands Planning Scheme as part of any future review.

## CONSULTATION

Land Use Planning Group was consulted regarding the potential planning scheme implications of reconfiguration and any adjustments to the planning scheme. Environmental Management Group was consulted with respect of the environmental and open space values associated with the development options. The Property Services Manager was consulted regarding the potential acquisition of land using funds generated from the disposal of the property, and has entered into negotiations with potential property owners.

## OPTIONS

### PREFERRED

That Council resolves;

1. To notify the public and invite submission under section 5.1.34 of *Integrated Planning Act 1997* on its intention to sell a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A as described in the Saunders Havill Group Development Options Report November 2006;
2. To delegate its authority under Section 5.1.34 (4) of *Integrated Planning Act 1997* to the Chief Executive Officer to consider all submissions for sale of a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A with the following conditions:
  - a) To not exercise any delegated authority under these provisions which to the delegate's knowledge, adversely affects, or is likely to adversely affect, the Council's relations with the public at large, and
  - b) To not sub delegate this authority to any other officer.
3. To delegate its authority under section 36 (2) (b) of the *Local Government Act* to the Chief Executive Officer to dispose of a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A subject to the following conditions:
  - a) That all submissions called for under Section 5.1.34 (4) of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* have been considered under delegated authority.
  - b) That any disposal of land be undertaken by auction or tender in accordance with section 491 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.
4. To authorise the Chief Executive Officer and the Mayor to sign and seal all documentation.

**ALTERNATIVE 1**

That Council resolves

1. To notify the public and invite submissions under section 5.1.34 of *Integrated Planning Act 1997* on its intentions to develop, construct residential allotments and sell land at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A as described in the Sanders Havill Group Development Options Report November 2006.
2. To delegate its authority under Section 5.1.34 (4) of *Integrated Planning Act 1997* to Chief Executive Officer to consider all submissions for sale of a portion of land with development application situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A with the following conditions:
  - a) To not exercise any delegated authority under these provisions which to the delegate's knowledge, adversely affects, or is likely to adversely affect, the Council's relations with the public at large, and
  - b) To not sub delegate this authority to any other officer.
3. To delegate its authority under section 36 (2) (b) of the *Local Government Act* to the Chief Executive Officer develop, construct residential allotments and to dispose of the land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A subject to the following conditions:
  - a) That all submissions called for under Section 5.1.34 (4) of the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* have been considered under delegated authority.
  - b) That any disposal of land be undertaken by auction or tender in accordance with section 491 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.
4. To authorise the Chief Executive Officer and the Mayor to sign and seal all documentation.

**ALTERNATIVE 2**

That Council resolve to notify the public and invite submission under section 5.1.34 of *Integrated Planning Act 1997* on its intention to sell a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A as described in the Saunders Havill Group Development Options Report November 2006.

**ALTERNATIVE 3**

That Council resolves to notify the public and invite submissions under section 5.1.34 of *Integrated Planning Act 1997* on its intentions to develop, construct residential allotments and sell land at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A as described in the Sanders Havill Group Development Options Report November 2006.

---

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To notify the public and invite submission under section 5.1.34 of Integrated Planning Act 1997 on its intention to sell a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A as described in the Saunders Havill Group Development Options Report November 2006;
2. To delegate its authority under Section 5.1.34 (4) of Integrated Planning Act 1997 to the Chief Executive Officer to consider all submissions for sale of a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A with the following conditions:
  - (a) To not exercise any delegated authority under these provisions which to the delegate's knowledge, adversely affects, or is likely to adversely affect, the Council's relations with the public at large; and
  - (b) To not sub delegate this authority to any other officer;
3. To delegate its authority under section 36 (2) (b) of the Local Government Act to the Chief Executive Officer to dispose of a portion of land situated at 141 Bunker Road Victoria Point on the basis of Concept Lot Layout Option A subject to the following conditions:
  - (a) That all submissions called for under Section 5.1.34 (4) of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 have been considered under delegated authority;
  - (b) That any disposal of land be undertaken by auction or tender in accordance with section 491 of the Local Government Act 1993; and
4. To authorise the Chief Executive Officer and the Mayor to sign and seal all documentation.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the Officer's Recommendation not be adopted and that Council retain this parcel of land in its ownership.

**PROPOSED MOTION 1**

Moved by: Cr Bowler

That the Committee Recommendation be adopted with the inclusion of the following;

- (b) that Council amend the zoning to Conservation CN2 at the next Redlands Planning Scheme review.

The Mayor ruled that the amendment changed the intent of the motion and he could not accept the motion.

**PROPOSED MOTION 2**

Moved by: Cr Bowler

That the Committee Recommendation be adopted with the inclusion of the following;

- (b) that Council direct officers in Conservation to start a revegetation program on this block of land.

The Mayor ruled that the amendment changed the intent of the motion and he could not accept the motion.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns

Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That the Officer's Recommendation not be adopted and that Council retain this parcel of land in its ownership.**

**CARRIED**

**10.4.4 SOUTHERN MORETON BAY ISLANDS OPEN SPACE PLAN 2**

**Datworks Filename:** P&R Planning Division 5 Planning  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Photinos  
Manager Environmental Management Group  
**Author Name:** Angela Wright  
Senior Advisor Open Space Planning

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Southern Moreton Bay Islands Open Space Plan 2006 has been prepared primarily in response to the submissions received on the draft Redlands Planning Scheme in 2005. Its main purpose is to provide details and priorities of all parcels of land that council should retain, acquire or develop as public recreation areas on the islands.

Confidential report from Manager Environmental Management dated 14 March 2007 was presented to Committee and discussed in closed session.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To proceed with negotiating the acquisition of all 71 privately owned lots or part lots recommended in the Confidential Southern Moreton Bay Island Open Space Plan 2006, through a land exchange program using Council owned SMBI Residential zoned lots;**
- 2. To proceed with investigating closing a section of the following roads as recommended in the Confidential Southern Moreton Bay Island Open Space Plan 2006 for sites identified in this report as 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 33 and 44;**
- 3. To proceed with investigating the amalgamation of 13 sites in the Confidential Southern Moreton Bay Island Open Space Plan 2006 where Council owns 100% of the land, into single lot parks;**
- 4. To initiate an amendment of the Redland Planning Scheme to include all lots or parts of lots identified in the Confidential Southern Moreton Bay Open Space Study within the Open Space Zone;**
- 5. To designate all privately owned lots or parts of lots currently zoned open space or proposed to be rezoned to open space as Community Infrastructure under the Integrated Planning Act;**

6. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to exchange vacant Council land of similar size and value suitable for residential purposes with land which may involve considerable expenditure to Council to provide infrastructure, or for land which would be of benefit to Council for Town Planning reasons;
7. That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal all relevant documentation; and
8. That the confidential report from Manager Environmental Management and the Southern Moreton Bay Island Open Space Plan 2 remain confidential.

**CARRIED**



**10.5 GENERAL BUSINESS****10.5.1 RESEARCH ON THE INTRODUCTION OF CARBON MARKETS****COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Williams

**That Council resolve to undertake research and report back to Council on the potential revenue opportunities that have been created by the introduction of carbon markets like the NSW Benchmark Scheme. This research to focus on:**

- 1. the business potential of obtaining carbon credits by the sequestration of carbon dioxide through replanting forests; and**
- 2. the options in Council's planning instruments for purchase, lease or otherwise securing sites for this replanting in the koala coast, and other areas important to Council's bushland and habitat corridor plan.**

**CARRIED**

## 11 REDLAND WATER AND WASTE COMMITTEE 21/03/07 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Moved by: Cr Barker  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That the Redland Water and Waste Committee Report of 21 March 2007 be received.

CARRIED

### 11.1 REDLAND WATER AND WASTE

#### 11.1.1 REDLAND WATER & WASTE COUNCIL BUSINESS UNIT REPORT - FEBRUARY 2007

**Datworks Filename:** WW Redland Water & Waste Committee  
WM Redland Water & Waste Committee  
WS Redland Water & Waste Committee

**Attachments:** [Business Unit Report February 2007](#)  
[Appendix A – Additional Water Quality Indicators](#)  
[Appendix B – Wastewater Treatment Plants](#)  
[Supplementary Performance Information](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Jim Pruss  
General Manager, Redland Water & Waste

**Author Name:** Jim Pruss  
General Manager, Redland Water & Waste

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Redland Water & Waste (RWW) Council business unit report is presented to Council for noting. The report provides the business unit's performance for the month of February 2007 and covers financial and non-financial indicators for water, wastewater and waste.

It is expected that, most of the time the report findings will be "business as usual". Where exceptions occur, these will be highlighted.

The report provides a regular opportunity for Council to consider the performance of RWW and to respond to any exceptional reporting.

Council is provided with the option to accept the report or, accept it and request additional information or a review of performance.

### PURPOSE

To report on the ongoing performance of the business unit against key performance indicators (KPIs).

---

## **BACKGROUND**

RWW's performance plan identifies KPIs for which performance targets have been agreed with Council. Reporting is done each month through the RWW Committee.

## **ISSUES**

The report is provided to Council as a means of monitoring the performance of RWW for the activities of water, wastewater and waste.

The first part of the report comprises a "snapshot" of the business unit's achievement in meeting KPIs (year-to-date) and financial report card.

The report then provides specific financial report and commentary, capital expenditure (graphically) and a detailed customer overview.

The main body of the report focuses on actual levels of achievement against the KPIs for the month. Where exceptions have occurred and targets not met, an explanation is given as well as action taken to improve performance.

The report closes with a summary of the major issues for each group during the month.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide and maintain water, wastewater and waste services to sustain our community.

Providing this report also supports the organisational leadership goal of good governance by providing accountability of RWW's performance in a way that is open to the public.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications resulting from this report. Financial implications may result where Council requests a performance review or requests an increase in performance standards.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has occurred with:

- Manager Customer Service & Business Performance, RWW;
- Manager Treatment Operations, RWW;
- Manager Technical Support, RWW; and
- Senior Advisor, Financial Management, RWW.

**OPTIONS****PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to accept the Redland Water & Waste Council business unit report for February 2007, as presented in the attachment.

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council accepts the report and requests additional information or a review of performance.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Barker

Seconded by: Cr Henry

**That Council resolve to accept the Redland Water & Waste Council Business Unit Report for February 2007, as presented in the attachment.**

**CARRIED**

**11.1.2 POL-2592 WATER CHARGE REMISSIONS FOR CONCEALED LEAKS****Dataworks Filename:** Water Charge Remissions for Concealed Leaks**Attachments:** [Appendix 1 - current version](#)  
[Appendix 2 - comparison of other Councils](#)  
[Appendix 3 - calculations](#)  
[Appendix 4 - amended policy POL-2592 for adoption](#)  
[Appendix 5 - relevant guideline for info only](#)  
[Appendix 6 - table showing review of remissions for Dec 2006](#)**Responsible Officer Name:** Eleanor Bray  
Manager Customer Service & Business Performance**Author Name:** Caryn Puljic  
Principal Administration Officer

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Policy POL-2592 *Water Charge Remissions for Concealed Leaks* was adopted by Council on 28 May 2003. As part of the annual review of this policy, an amendment is proposed to provide greater equity to customers as the value of the remission has become less as the cost of water has increased.

**PURPOSE**

To propose an amendment to policy POL-2592 *Water Charge Remissions for Concealed Leaks*.

**BACKGROUND**

The current policy, POL-2592 *Water Charge Remissions for Concealed Leaks*, attached as appendix 1, was adopted by Council on 28 May 2003 and is to be measured yearly.

The objective of this policy is to allow a remission of water consumption charges in cases of concealed leaks in an internal water service of a metered property while still maintaining responsibility for fixing the leak with the property owner.

It is not proposed to amend the objective, but to recommend a change to the remission calculation. The policy statement requires that a remission of water consumption charges be given so that the owner is only charged for the estimated loss due to the concealed leak at the estimated cost of treating and pumping the water to the property. However, the current cost of water treatment and pumping is 83.2c per kilolitre, which exceeds the current first tier water consumption charge of 69.63c per kilolitre. The implication of this is that the value of the remission is often minimal, particularly in cases of low estimated water loss. The result being that the

remission is often not worth the effort required for customers to apply for, or for Council to process the application.

To determine the best way to calculate the remission of water consumption charges, a review of concealed leak policies from other south-east Queensland (SEQ) Councils was undertaken. The results and methods are detailed in appendix 2. An analysis of the different methods for calculating remissions, identified in the review, was conducted on 3 scenarios of low, medium, and high water loss. The detailed calculations are shown in appendix 3. Based on the review of other Councils' policies and the analysis of the methods, it is proposed to adopt the method used by a number of other Councils. This method charges customers for 50% of the estimated water loss due to the concealed leak at the current water consumption charge, and to cap the maximum rebate at \$300 (alternative option 2). Furthermore, it is proposed to reduce the minimum estimated water loss required for a remission to 25KL, from 50KL in one reading period. These amendments will provide a larger remission of water consumption charges while maintaining the owner's responsibility for the maintenance of the internal water service.

To support these amendments, it is proposed that only one remission, instead of 2 as outlined in the current policy, will be allowed for any property, unless evidence is provided that the internal service has been completely replaced. Furthermore, it is proposed that a 10-year timeframe within which a customer receives a remission be applied. That is, only one remission every 10 years will be allowed for any property, unless evidence is provided that the internal service has been completely replaced.

These changes would take effect upon the adoption of the amended policy irrespective of any claims made prior to the adoption date. Upon adoption, the amended policy would take effect on 1 July 2007.

An overview of the current policy and options for the revised calculation of remissions is provided.

## **ISSUES**

### **Option 1 Current policy: Remission calculated on customer's average consumption and treatment and pumping cost of estimated water loss**

Currently, the customer's average consumption is calculated using their consumption history over the previous 12-month period. The treatment and pumping cost of the estimated water loss is based on the difference between the customer's average and actual consumption. The remission is based on the total of the customer's average consumption for the current period and the treatment and pumping cost of the estimated water loss.

For example, in the case of a 'medium' water loss (see appendix 3) as a result of a concealed leak, the customer's actual average daily consumption is 3.03KL (there are 94 days in the reading period). Based on this, the existing charge is \$272. However, the customer's estimated average daily consumption (based on their consumption history over the previous 2 quarters) is 0.9KL, which equates to an

estimated average daily loss of 2.13KL (3.03KL-0.9KL). Therefore with the current policy, the new charge is based on the customer's estimated average daily consumption of 0.9KL calculated by the relevant tier charge, plus the treatment charge on the estimated water loss. Under this scenario the following bill would apply (the detailed calculations are in appendix 3):

Customer's bill without rebate would be	= \$272
Average bill	= \$ 62
Calculated rebate	= \$ 43
Final Bill	= \$229

Advantage:

This method is designed to recoup the cost of the water loss to Council and maintains the owner's responsibility for maintenance of the internal water service and conservation of water. A high return is provided to Council.

Disadvantage:

This method provides a fairly small rebate particularly in cases of low estimated water loss, because the current cost of treatment and pumping is 83.2c per kilolitre, which exceeds the current minimum water consumption charge of 69.63c per kilolitre.

**Option 2: Remission calculated on customer's average consumption only with a maximum rebate of \$100**

This method is used by Brisbane City Council (BCC) and uses the customer's average consumption (based on their consumption history) to estimate consumption. The remission is based on the customer's average consumption for the current period and is capped at \$100.

Using the same situation as described in option 1, the following bill would apply:

Customer's bill without rebate would be	= \$272
Average bill	= \$ 62
Calculated rebate	= \$100
Final Bill	= \$172

Advantage:

This method is more favourable for customers especially in the lower level water loss scenarios where water use for the period is logically based on their water use in previous periods and in effect no penalty would apply. It is a simple method for customers to understand. Capping the rebate at \$100 enables the full cost of the water loss to be recovered in cases of larger losses.

Disadvantage:

This method can be very unfavourable for customers in cases of high estimated water loss, because capping the rebate at \$100 means that regardless of the water loss only \$100 would ever be returned to the customer. However, in instances of small water losses, Council receives little or no income to recover the cost of treating and supplying the water.

**Option 3: Remission calculated on 50% of the estimated water loss with a \$300 cap on remission**

This method is used by Logan City (LCC), Caloundra City (CCC), Maroochy Shire (MSC), and Pine Rivers Shire (PRSC) Councils. Gold Coast City Council (GCCC) also uses a similar method. This method uses the difference between the customer's average consumption (based on their consumption history) and the actual consumption to estimate water loss. The remission is based on half of the estimated water loss. We also propose capping the rebate at \$300 to enable the cost of water loss to be recovered in cases of large losses, and to limit the impact on community service obligations (CSOs). A review of remissions over the month of December 2006 was undertaken, which determined that \$300 would be a sufficient maximum rebate value, affecting only 3% of remissions in that month.

Using the same situation as described in options 1 and 2, the following bill would apply:

Customer's bill without rebate would be	= \$272
Average bill	= \$ 62
Calculated rebate	= \$105
Final Bill	= \$167

**Advantage:**

The outcome in this water loss scenario is little different to option 2. However, in a high water loss scenario the rebate could reach \$300 whereas option 2 never exceeds \$100. This option is more equitable for customers as it takes into consideration cases of low, medium, and high water loss. Council is still charging customers for half of the water loss, which recovers some funds in all situations and maintains the owner's responsibility for maintenance of the internal water service and conservation of water. Capping also limits the impact on CSOs.

**Disadvantage:**

In comparison to the current policy, customers would be eligible for larger remissions, which will require the budget for CSOs to be reviewed and increased.

In line with providing a more equitable position for customers, it is proposed to reduce the minimum estimated water loss required for a remission to 25KL, from 50KL, per reading period. A reduction to 25KL is considered viable because the price of water has nearly doubled since the adoption of the current policy, 28 May 2003, from 37.2c/KL to 69.6c/KL. In 2003, a 50KL limit was equivalent to a minimum value of \$18.60, whereas currently a 25KL limit is nearly equivalent to this amount (\$17.40).

Because of the impact upon CSOs, in addition to capping the rebate at \$300, it is proposed that only one remission, instead of 2 as outlined in the current policy will be allowed for any property unless evidence is provided that the internal service has been completely replaced after an initial rebate has been provided. Furthermore, it is proposed that a 10-year timeframe within which a customer receives a remission be applied. That is, only one remission every 10 years will be allowed for any property,



unless evidence is provided that the internal service has been completely replaced. This would serve to increase the responsibility of customers to monitor and maintain their internal water service.

POL-2592 has been amended based on this recommended option and is attached as appendix 4. Guideline document GL-2592, which has been developed to outline the process for application of remissions and assist with achieving policy outcomes, is also attached for reference as appendix 5.

A summary of the current policy and options is provided below based on the scenario described in the development of the options.

	<b>Average bill</b>	<b>Bill with concealed leak</b>	<b>Rebate value</b>	<b>Bill with concealed leak less rebate</b>
Option 1 Current Policy (average consumption plus treatment cost on loss)	\$62	\$272	\$43	\$229
Option 2 (average consumption – max rebate \$100)	\$62	\$272	\$100	\$172
Option 3 (recommended) (50% of loss – max rebate \$300)	\$62	\$272	\$105	\$167

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide and maintain water services & support the provision of infrastructure to sustain our community.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

A review of remissions over the month of December 2006 was undertaken and re-calculated based on the recommended option to determine the impact on CSOs. Details are provided in appendix 6.

The following table outlines the CSO payment for 2005-06, the expected CSO payments for 2006-07 based on current pricing, and the expected CSO payment for 2007-08 based on the amended policy and an estimated increase on current pricing.

Year	Number of Offsets	Total CSO Payment
2005-06	292	\$40,634
2006-07	178 (to date)	\$26,820 (expected)
2007-08	356 (estimate based on 2006-07)	\$57,931

Sufficient funding would need to be allocated of approximately \$57,930 to accommodate the increase.

## CONSULTATION

Consultation has occurred with:

- Manager Customer Service & Business Performance
- Acting Team Co-ordinator Water Billing Services
- Manager Finance
- Senior Advisor Financial Management

## OPTIONS

### PREFERRED

That Council resolve to adopt the amended Corporate Policy, Water Charge Remissions for Concealed Leaks (POL-2592), attached as Appendix 4, effective 1 July 2007.

By adopting this preferred option, Council adopts option 3 as outlined in this report, whereby water charge remissions for concealed leaks are calculated on 50% of the estimated water loss, with a maximum rebate of \$300.

### ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve to not adopt the changes to the current policy POL-2592.

## OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Barker

Seconded by: Cr Henry

**That Council resolve to adopt the amended Corporate Policy, Water Charge Remissions for Concealed Leaks (POL-2592), attached as Appendix 4, effective 1 July 2007.**

## CARRIED

**11.1.3 PROCUREMENT FOR PRESSURE & LEAKAGE MANAGEMENT PROJECT**

**Datworks Filename:** WS - Pressure & Leakage  
**Attachment:** [Letter from Minister for Local Government to Mayor & CEO](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Troy Kasper  
Manager Technical Support  
**Author Name:** Nalaka Vitharana  
Senior Planning Engineer

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The *Water Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2006* amended the *Water Regulation 2002* (the Regulation), to require “each participating local government acting collectively with each other participating local government to achieve the collective savings of 60ML/day of reticulated water by implementing a system of pressure and leakage management.”

The Regulation requires that this project be completed by 31 August 2008 and the timeframe is not negotiable.

In correspondence received from the Minister for Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation (DLGPSR), Andrew Fraser, the Minister expressed his support for Councils wishing to pursue exclusion from the tender process to undertake work funded through the pressure and leakage management project.

As the timeframe for delivery is extremely tight and the availability of contractors will be a significant issue, the tender requirements in the *Local Government Act 1993* (the Act) are likely to use up considerable time without providing the desired outcome of receiving multiple competitive bids.

This report recommends that Council resolves to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge any contract required for the delivery of Schedule 10C Item 7 (i.e. Pressure and Leakage Management) of *Water Regulation 2002*.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to obtain a Council resolution to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge any contract required for the delivery of Schedule 10C Item 7 of *Water Regulation 2002*.

**BACKGROUND**

In August 2006, the Queensland Parliament passed the *Water Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2006* which amends the *Water Regulation 2002*. As previously advised, the latest amendment requires Councils and water service providers (WSPs)

to achieve measures and outcomes and reporting requirements by specific dates to help secure the water supply for the south-east Queensland (SEQ) region.

Redland Shire Council (RSC) has requirements specified in Item 9 Schedule 10B, Items 2,3,7, 8 and 9 in Schedule 10C and Items 2,3,7,8 and 9 in Schedule 10D of the Regulation.

Schedule 10C Item 7 requires *“each participating local government acting collectively with each other participating local government” to achieve “the collective savings of 60ML/day of reticulated water by implementing a system of pressure and leakage management”*

Details of Redland Water & Waste’s (RWW’s) pressure and leakage project were presented to Council’s General Meeting in January 2007. The Regulation requires that this project be completed by 31 August 2008.

LGIS has a panel of providers, established through the Local Buy system. This panel (BUS 137-0706) commenced on 27 November 2006 and provides specific local government rates for both categories of equipment and services. Twelve companies have been appointed to each category, however, at this stage there is only one panel member that regularly undertakes construction activities.

## **ISSUES**

This timeframe for completion of RWW’s pressure and leakage project is not negotiable and has been reinforced in a letter from the Deputy Premier to all Councils requiring the project be given high priority in meeting the deadlines.

RWW intend to invite companies that have been appointed to the LGIS panel of providers to undertake the works wherever possible, however, as the timeframe for delivery is extremely tight and the availability of contractors is likely to be a significant issue, the requirements in the Act relating to tenders are likely to expend considerable time without providing the desired outcome of receiving multiple competitive bids.

The Minister for DLGPSR, Andrew Fraser, has written to the Mayor and CEO (attached), advising his support for Councils wishing to pursue exclusion from the tender process to expedite undertaking work funded through the pressure and leakage management project. In the letters, the Minister indicated that the water emergency as declared by legislation in August 2006 was sufficient grounds to invoke the exception from compliance with the tender process of a genuine emergency.

Whilst the Minister only referenced section 486(1)(b) which applies to Councils, section 483(2)(b) also applies the exception of genuine emergency to authority delegated to officers.

In the case of Redland Shire Council the Chief Executive Officer has delegated authority to enter into contracts under this provision up to \$500,000. The issue is that

it is likely that contracts in the excess of \$500,000 will be required for this emergency work.

It is therefore recommended that Council resolve to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge any contract required for the delivery of Schedule 10C Item 7 (i.e. Pressure and Leakage Management) of *Water Regulation 2002*.

It is intended that when the delegated authority has been exercised for this project, it will be reported via the Redland Water and Waste Business Report at the subsequent Redland Water and Waste committee.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide and maintain water services and support the provision of infrastructure.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is some potential for procurement of goods and services at above market value, however this potential would exist whether the tender requirements of the Act were complied with or not due to the limited number of goods and service providers in the market and the compressed delivery timeframes for all WSPs in SEQ.

### **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has occurred with:

- LGIS regarding the extent to which the Local Buy panel will satisfy current requirements particularly in relation to construction activities,
- DLGPSR regarding the intent of the letter from the Minister, and
- The Manager Technical Support, RWW.
- Manager Legal Services

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to delegate authority, under s.472 of the Local Government Act 1993, to the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge any contract required to fulfil Redland Shire Council's obligations under Schedule 10C Item 7 of the Water Regulation 2002.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council approve all contracts over \$500,000 required to fulfil Redland Shire Council's obligations under Schedule 10C Item 7 of the Water Regulation 2002.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Barker  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

**That Council resolve to delegate authority, under s.472 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, to the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge any contract required to fulfil Redland Shire Council's obligations under Schedule 10C Item 7 of the *Water Regulation 2002*.**

**CARRIED**

## **11.2 GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **11.2.1 OVERVIEW OF CURRENT WATER SITUATION**

General Manager Redland Water & Waste gave Committee an overview of the current water situation including, proposed restrictions, 'Institutional Arrangements for Urban Water Supply in South East Queensland', 'Cost Recovery and Pricing For Urban Water Supply in South East Queensland' and 'The Audit of council water assets proposed by the Premier'. The following issues were raised and agreed:

1. Redland Shire Council to request a change to the Commission's pool filling restriction times to keep Council's existing times of Midnight – 7am and 4pm – Midnight.
2. Redland Shire Council has no issues on WEPS.
3. Council noted that RSC was being defined as a beneficiary without defining beneficiary and requested a better definition
4. Council noted some concession included in the report but the concessions do not go far enough and don't represent fair compensation for a community that has already paid for their water security. The Federal and State Government should pay for many of the new assets and not pass on the costs to ratepayers.
5. Council noted the proposed method for asset valuations would undervalue our assets thus lowering the potential Rate of Return and proposed a different method be requested.
6. Council noted that the report excluded councils from a market based trading system for no good reason although it was noted there must be a public benefit test applied to this logic by the QCA
7. Councillors would like to see the Sommerville/Price WaterHouse Coopers Audit report.
8. Council noted the need to continue to work with the COM and the State Government to ensure the unique situation in Redlands is recognised and water security is provided for all.

### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Barker  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

**That the report be noted.**

**CARRIED**

The following record of proceedings forms part of the Committee's report relating to motions which were proposed in General Business and, on being put to the vote, were declared as lost.

### **PROPOSED MOTION 1**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie

Seconded by: Cr Henry

1. That Council resolve to reject the State Governments proposed institutional and water pricing arrangements as outlined in the Water Commission's discussion paper of February 2007;
2. That Council urges the State Government to consider a 'cap and trade' system like that employed in other states and other parts of Queensland;
3. That Council requests that a review of current legal advice about Council's options be undertaken; and
4. That Council rejects the model for the following reasons:
  - a. It is a clumsy and hard to regulate system that will introduce a bureaucratic layer at both local and State Government level;
  - b. It does not deliver efficient price triggers to guide future investment in infrastructure;
  - c. It does not provide an accurate mechanism to guide water use to its highest and best use;
  - d. It does not provide future incentives for demand efficiency and supply substitution; and
  - e. It does not adequately address or compensate Councils that have secured their water supply through wise investments in the past.

On being put to the vote the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Henry and Ogilvie voted in the affirmative.

Crs Williams, Beard, Elliott, Burns, Dowling, Seccombe and Barker voted in the negative.

Crs Murray and Bowler were not present when this motion was put.

The motion was declared by the Chair as LOST.



**PROPOSED MOTION 2**

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Beard

That Council resolve to advise of our serious concerns with the State Government's proposed institutional and water pricing arrangements as outlined in the Water Commission's discussion paper of February 2007 as it does not adequately address or compensate Redland residents who have secured their water supply through wise investments in the past.

On being put to the vote the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Williams and Ogilvie voted in the affirmative.

Crs Beard, Elliott, Burns, Dowling, Seccombe and Barker voted in the negative.

Crs Murray, Bowler and Henry were not present when this motion was put.

The motion was declared by the Chair as LOST.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Barker  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

**That the report be noted.**

**CARRIED**

## 12 FINANCE AND CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 21/03/07 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Burns

That the Finance and Corporate Management Committee Report of 21 March 2007 be received.

CARRIED

### 12.1 CORPORATE SERVICES

#### 12.1.1 FEBRUARY 2007 - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS

**Datworks Filename:** FM Monthly Financial Reports to Committee  
**Attachment:** [Financial Report – February 2007](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Kerry Phillips  
Manager - Financial Services  
**Author Name:** Kevin Lamb  
Services Manager - Financial Reporting

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 528(1) of the *Local Government Act 1993* requires that Council's statement of accounts be presented at an ordinary monthly meeting.

The attachments to this report present the February 2007 statement of accounts to Council and provide detailed analytical commentary. In summary six of the seven Key Financial Performance Indicators exceeded targets set at the beginning of the financial year. These related to:

1. level of dependence on rate revenue;
2. ability to pay bills – current ratio;
3. cash balance;
4. cash balance – cash capacity in months,
5. longer term financial stability – debt to assets ratio and
6. operating performance.

Only one Key Financial Performance Indicator fell outside Council's set parameters. This related to the ability to repay the debt indicator, which was 23.5% for February, which is outside the set target of below 17%. This is solely due to the early repayment of QTC loans. This indicator will fall back within the comfort zone before year end.

The operating financial result (Earnings Before Interest, Tax and Depreciation – EBITD) is ahead of budget by \$5.5 million, with operating expenditure favourable by \$5.8 million and operating revenue unfavourable by \$0.3 million.

Capital expenditure is \$4.7 million or 15.6% behind budget expenditure levels at the end of February.

The cash flow position for the year is above forecast levels by \$11.1 million at 28 February 2007. This is principally due to favourable variances experienced in relation to higher receipts for rates and charges \$6.7 million (due to budget phasing only), operating grants and subsidies \$0.4 million and other revenue \$0.3 million, and lower than anticipated payments in relation to materials and services \$2.1 million and property plant and equipment \$4.7 million. These are offset by unfavourable variances in relation to lower than anticipated receipts from fees and charges \$0.9 million, capital grants and subsidies \$0.9 million and proceeds from sale of non current assets \$0.9 million.

## **PURPOSE**

The purpose is to present the February 2007 report to Council and explain the content and analysis of the report. Section 528 of the *Local Government Act 1993* requires the Chief Executive Officer of a local government to present statements of its accounts to the local government.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Corporate Plan contains a strategic priority to ensure the long term financial viability of the Shire and provide public accountability in financial management. For organisational effectiveness, it is important that Council receive and understand the monthly financial statements.

## **ISSUES**

The following elements, shown in the attachments, comprise the End of Month Financial Reports for February 2007:

### **Corporate Financial Report Card (A)**

1. Operating Revenue compared with Budget;
2. General Operating Costs compared with Budget;
3. Capital Expenditure compared with Budget;
4. Cash Position; and
5. Employee Costs compared with Budget.

## **Report Card Analysis (B)**

### **Council Financial Report 1 (C)**

Shows the percentage variance of year to date actual results compared with year to date budget by colour indicators.

### **Council Financial Report 2 (D)**

Shows year to date actual results compared with annual and year to date budgets. This report has a brief commentary on all year to date variances greater than \$20,000.

A **Balance Sheet (E)**, an **Investment Summary (F)**, a **Statement of Cash Flows (G)**, **Financial Stability Ratios report (H)**, **Community Benefit Fund Report (I)** and **Type III Business Activities (J)** have been included to provide the complete picture of Council's Finances.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to ensure the long term financial viability of the Shire and provide public accountability in financial management.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The overall financial position remains strong with EBITD of \$25.1 million (\$5.5 million ahead of budget). This result is due to total operating revenue of \$96.8 million (unfavourable variance of \$0.3 million) and total operating costs of \$71.7 million (favourable variance of \$5.8 million).

The capital expenditure program is \$4.7 million or 15.6% behind targeted expenditure levels at the end of February.

The investment of surplus funds for the month returned a weighted average rate of return of 6.54% that compares favourably to the benchmark UBSWA Bank Bill Index of 6.35%.

Council's cash position at the end of February is ahead of budgeted levels. The cash balance remains strong at \$52.5 million, equivalent to 5.6 months cash capacity.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has taken place amongst the Executive Leadership Group.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council note the End of Month Financial Reports for February 2007 and explanations as presented in the attachments.

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council requests additional information.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams

Seconded by: Cr Beard

**That Council resolve to note the End of Month Financial Reports for February 2007 and explanations as presented in the following attachments:**

- **Corporate Financial Report Card;**
- **Report Card Analysis;**
- **First Council Financial Report;**
- **Second Council Financial Report;**
- **Balance Sheet;**
- **Investment Summary;**
- **Statement of Cash Flows;**
- **Financial Stability Ratios report; and**
- **Community Benefit Fund report.**

**CARRIED**

---

**12.1.2 LAND TO BE REMOVED FROM THE LAND RECORD - VALUELESS LAND**

**Datworks Filename:** R&V Intention to Acquire Valueless Land  
**Attachments:** [Schedule 56](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Kerry Phillips  
Manager Financial Services  
**Author Name:** Noela Barton  
Service Manager Revenue & Recovery

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A review of all rate accounts has identified a number of parcels of land (described in the attached "Schedule 56") with overdue rates where reference to the land may be removed from the rate record. Section 1051A of the *Local Government Act 1993* gives Council certain powers as follows:

- (1) *A reference to a particular parcel of rateable land in the land record of a local government may be removed, on the local government's resolution, if:*
  - (a) *rates levied on the land by the local government for at least 3 years are overdue; and*
  - (b) *the overdue rates total more than:*
    - (i) *the unimproved value of the land; or*
    - (ii) *the market value of the land; and*
  - (c) *if paragraph (b)(i) applies—the land is considered to be:*
    - (i) *valueless; or*
    - (ii) *of so little value that, if offered for sale, it would not realise the overdue rates.*

All of the parcels of land contained in the attached "Schedule 56" are considered to be suitable to have reference to them removed from the rate record as they meet the requirement of 1051A 1(a) and 1(b.ii). The parcels of land share the following characteristics:

Current zoning – Conservation (sub area CN1);  
Land purpose – Vacant Land;  
Period rates overdue – greater than three (3) years;  
Rates balance – greater than the Market value;  
Unlikely to receive building approval.

This report seeks Council approval to initiate proceedings to recover the overdue rates on the parcels of land described in the attached "Schedule 56" as the overdue rates position of all of these parcels of land meets all of the provisions of the abovementioned Section 1051A. On resolution, a Notice of Intention to Acquire the Land will issue to the land owners and encumbrances.

The land will be acquired by Council if the rates are not paid in full within six (6) months from the issue date of the Notice of Intention and all rates payable for the

---

land discharged. If the rates are paid in full within six (6) months from the issue date of the Notice, reference to the land will be restored to the land record.

## **PURPOSE**

To request Council resolve to recover overdue rates and charges on the parcels of land described in the attached "Schedule 56" dated 21 March 2007 by removing reference to the land from the rate record.

## **BACKGROUND**

Rate Notices are issued on a quarterly basis to the owners of these parcels of land and remain unpaid. Reminder Notices proved to be ineffective. Legal action has not been commenced as it is not commercially viable and is more expensive due to additional costs. The zoning of the land indicates that it is unlikely that an application to build on the land would be approved.

A market value for all of these parcels of land has been obtained and the overdue rates total more than the market value. The unimproved capital value [UCV's] in most cases is more than the overdue rates, however it must be noted that there has not been a revaluation on the land since 30/6/2005, which is prior to the implementation of the Redlands Planning Scheme that introduced new zonings and building restrictions on Conservation zoned land.

The attached "Schedule 56" provides details of the parcels of land proposed to be removed from the land record.

## **ISSUES**

Rates are not being paid on these lands and removing them from the land record will ensure that budget estimates of revenue from rates will be more accurate.

If rates are not paid in full within six-months from the issue date of the Notice of Intention to Acquire, the land will be acquired by Council and all rates payable for the land discharged.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to ensure the long term financial viability of the Shire and provide public accountability in financial management.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

If a local government resolves to remove a reference to rateable land from its land record and the rates are not paid in full within 6 months of the issue date of the Notice of Intention to Acquire, then Council must acquire the land and all rates payable for the land must be discharged.

Council's Environmental Protection Area advises that they anticipate an annual outlay of approximately \$200.00 per parcel of land will be required to maintain the said land if it is acquired.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has been conducted with the Debtor Management Team Coordinator and the Pollution Prevention Unit for land surveys (due diligence of care) as laid out in Council's Contaminated Land Policy and various departments within Council.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To remove reference to the scheduled lands as identified in the attached Schedule 56 from Council's land record, as:
2. rates levied on each of the parcels of land for at least three (3) years are overdue; and
3. the overdue rates on each of the parcels of land is more than the market value of that land; and
4. the lands are considered to be of so little value that if offered for sale they would not realise the overdue rates; and
5. That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal Transfer Documents for land where rates are not paid within six (6) months from the issue date of the Notice of Intention to Acquire.

### **Alternatives**

1. Commence legal action to recover overdue amounts. This is considered ineffective and is more expensive due to additional costs; or
2. Attempt to sell the property for arrears of rates. Due to the possibility that building permits may not be approved, the land is unlikely to sell; or
3. Take no action against the defaulting ratepayers. This would adversely impact on Council's strategic priority to ensure the long-term financial viability of the Shire and provide public accountability in financial management.



**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Beard

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To remove reference to the scheduled lands as identified in the attached Schedule 56 from Council's land record, as -**
  - a. rates levied on each of the parcels of land for at least three (3) years are overdue; and**
  - b. the overdue rates on each of the parcels of land is more than the market value of that land; and**
  - c. the lands are considered to be of so little value that if offered for sale they would not realise the overdue rates; and**
- 2. That the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign and seal Transfer Documents for land where rates are not paid within six (6) months from the issue date of the Notice of Intention to Acquire.**

**CARRIED**

### 12.1.3 REVIEW OF CORPORATE POLICY POL-2556 PENSIONER GENERAL RATE DEFERRAL POLICY

**Dataworks Filename:** R&V Policy  
**Attachments:** [POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Kerry Phillips  
Manager Financial Services  
**Author Name:** Noela Barton  
Service Manager Revenue & Recovery

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A review has been conducted of Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy in line with Council's policy review schedule. The policy was adopted in February 2004 and reviewed six months later as directed by Council.

Since its adoption, the policy has been accessed by only one pensioner ratepayer for a short period between 2004 and 2005.

At the time the policy was introduced, 2.8% (234 properties out of a possible 8,416) of the pensioner segment of ratepayers had arrears greater than \$10. At present that figure is 1.9% (164 properties out of a possible 8,828).

The minimal activity and the low percentage of overdue properties within this ratepayer segment highlights, that from a financial viewpoint, this segment of the community is financially responsible.

While it has not been demonstrated that there is a need for this policy, it is viewed that the policy does provide a social benefit net in the event of financial difficulty; therefore it is recommended that the policy remain in force as adopted in February 2004.

#### PURPOSE

To request Council resolve to note the review of Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy and that the policy remain in force as adopted in February 2004.

#### BACKGROUND

Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy was adopted in February 2004 and reviewed six months later as directed by Council.

#### ISSUES

A review has been conducted of Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy in line with Council's policy review schedule. The policy was adopted in February 2004 and reviewed six months later as directed by Council.

---

Since its adoption the policy has been accessed by only one pensioner ratepayer for a short period between 2004 and 2005.

At the time the policy was introduced 2.8% (234 properties out of a possible 8,416) of the pensioner segment of ratepayers had arrears greater than \$10. At present that figure is 1.9% (164 properties out of a possible 8,828).

The minimal activity that has occurred on this policy and the low percentage of overdue properties within this ratepayer segment highlights that from a financial viewpoint this segment of the community is financially responsible.

While it has not been demonstrated that there is a need for this policy, it is viewed that the policy does provide a social benefit net in the event of financial difficulty therefore it is recommended that the policy remain in force as adopted in February 2004.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to ensure the long term financial viability of the Shire and provide public accountability in financial management.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Since its adoption the policy has been accessed by only one pensioner ratepayer for a short period between 2004 and 2005. The deferred portion of General Rate was paid in full.

### **CONSULTATION**

- Debtor Management;
- Financial Services Manager
- General Manager Corporate Services.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to note the review of Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy and that the attached policy remains in force as adopted in February 2004.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to declare obsolete Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy for the reason that the minimal activity that has occurred on this policy and the low percentage of overdue properties within this ratepayer segment highlights that from a financial viewpoint this segment of the community is financially responsible and there does not appear to be a need for the policy.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Beard

**That Council resolve to note the review of Corporate Policy POL-2556 Pensioner General Rate Deferral Policy and that the attached policy remain in force as adopted in February 2004 .**

**CARRIED**

## 12.2 CUSTOMER SERVICES

### 12.2.1 PDG-45128-REDLANDS YOUTH PLAZA DELEGATED AUTHORITY

**Datworks Filename:** Project Index-PDG-45128  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Lex Smith  
Manager, Project Delivery Group  
**Author Name:** Pamela McDonnell  
Administration Officer, Project Delivery Group

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tender for the Redlands Youth Plaza involves construction of a skate plaza which incorporates a multipurpose active skate and BMX street plaza space.

As part of the 2006/07 Budget, Council has approved funding in the sum of \$822,135.00 for the project, which includes \$347,000.00 being a subsidy from Department of Sport, Recreation and Racing (SRR).

Environmental Management has undertaken a detailed design which is now complete and the project has come to the Project Delivery Group for tender and construction.

The Redlands Youth Plaza will consist of:

- Multipurpose active skate and BMX street plaza space;
- Areas for music, dance and performance;
- Skate BMX bowl within a streetscape environment.

This project is currently in the procurement phase.

#### PURPOSE

This report seeks Council approval to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge a contract with the successful tenderer for the Redlands Youth Plaza for the construction of a skate plaza, incorporating a multipurpose active skate and BMX street plaza space.

#### BACKGROUND

Authority was delegated by Council to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) on 30 October 2002 to accept tenders and quotations and in addition to make, vary and discharge contracts. This delegation was limited to tenders and quotations not exceeding \$500 000.

The tender for the Redlands Youth Plaza exceeds this delegated authority.

## ISSUES

### Description of Redlands Youth Plaza

This project involves the construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza which is a multipurpose active skate and BMX street plaza space.

However, the plaza concept goes beyond the active use only and has been designed to allow additional use of the built and surrounding elements for music, dance, performance and spectator space for non active participants.

This facility, while being an active space of regional significance, also provides for the needs of young people to recreate, socialise and participate in other ways which is important to the recreation and social needs of the local community.

### Description of Tender Process

The project will be tendered in separable portions. Separable Portion 1 – Stage 1; Separable Portion 2 – Stage 1 and 2. The reason for the project being tendered in this way is that based on a Quantity Surveyor's (QS) estimate, it appears there is currently insufficient funds to complete the entire project so it has been split into two stages. Depending on the final tender prices, and if available funding can be obtained, will determine the options available to Council.

It is estimated that the works will take approximately 18 weeks. Hence to expedite the tender award process, Delegated Authority is sought for the Chief Executive Officer to make, vary and discharge all contracts associated with the project.

## RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to build safe, strong and self reliant communities with access to community services, infrastructure and opportunities for participation in community life.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Total available budget is \$1,041,135.00, which comprises of original budget of \$822,135.00 which includes funding from SRR of \$347,000.00. Manager Environmental Management has advised that \$219,000.00 will be available from the reallocation of funds of the roadwork program.

### QS Estimate

The QS estimate has provided a breakdown of costs for Stage 1 and Stages 1 and 2 which is outlined in the following table:

	<b>\$ (excl GST)</b>
<b>OPTION 1 – Stage 1</b>	\$876,000.00
Escalation to June 2007 (3%)	\$26,000.00
<b>TOTAL OPTION 1</b>	<b>\$902,000.00</b>
<b>OPTION 2 – Stage 2</b>	\$229,000.00
Escalation to June 2008 (9%)	\$21,000.00
<b>TOTAL OPTION 2</b>	<b>\$250,000.00</b>
<b>OPTION 3 – Stages 1 &amp; 2</b>	\$1,025,000.00
Escalation to June 2007 (3%)	\$31,000.00
<b>TOTAL OPTION 3</b>	<b>\$1,056,000.00</b>

For Option 1, the QS estimate is \$902,000.00 (exclusive of GST). For Option 3 the QS estimate is \$1,056,000.00 (exclusive of GST). Both these amounts include 10% contingency. However, these amounts do not include the internal project management fees of approximately \$40,000.00 which will be sought at a later budget review.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The project complies with the Redland Shire Council Planning Scheme and will not have any implications for the Redlands Planning Scheme.

### **CONSULTATION**

The Manager Project Delivery Group has consulted with the Manager of Environmental Management, Senior Advisor Open Space Planning and officers from the Project Delivery Group, all of whom have endorsed the officer's recommendation.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to accept tenders and quotations for the implementation and construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza which are most advantageous to Council under section 490 of the Local Government Act;
2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make vary and discharge contracts for the implementation and construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza under section 482 of the Local Government Act; and

3. To authorise the Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal all relevant documentation associated with the implementation and construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza.

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to not delegate this authority, which may result in an anticipated delay.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams

Seconded by: Cr Beard

**That Council resolve as follows:**

1. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to accept tenders and quotations for the implementation and construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza which are most advantageous to Council under section 490 of the Local Government Act;
2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make vary and discharge contracts for the implementation and construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza under section 482 of the *Local Government Act*; and
3. To authorise the Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal all relevant documentation associated with the implementation and construction of the Redlands Youth Plaza.

**CARRIED**



## 12.3 PLANNING AND POLICY

### 12.3.1 MONTHLY BALANCED SCORECARD REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2007

<b>Dataworks Filename:</b>	<b>Gov - Corporate Balanced Scorecard Monthly Reporting to Committee</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#"><u>Monthly Balanced Scorecard Report for February 2007</u></a>
<b>Responsible Officer Name:</b>	<b>Warren Van Wyk Manager Corporate Planning Performance &amp; Risk</b>
<b>Author Name:</b>	<b>Grant Bennett Service Manager Corporate Planning &amp; Performance</b>

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The monthly Corporate Balanced Scorecard report, as attached, provides a high level overview of Council's performance in key areas of council business.

This report provides the performance results and comments for the month of February 2007. Performance is shown in one of four ranges: Outstanding (green), above standard (yellow), satisfactory (orange) or unsatisfactory (red). The overall rating for each Perspective is determined by the relative weightings of each KPI it includes.

The overall rating for Redland Shire Council for the month of February is Outstanding.

### PURPOSE

To provide Council with the Corporate Balanced Scorecard report for the month of February 2007.

### BACKGROUND

The performance management framework for Redland Shire Council includes the requirement for reports to Council on a monthly and quarterly basis as follows:

1. The monthly Corporate Balanced Scorecard (BSC) report to Council of overall organisational performance. This report comprises a concise set of high level KPI's that have been developed to reflect organisational performance against financial, customer, internal/business processes, and people and learning perspectives. This report provides Council with a monthly snapshot on how the organisation is performing in key areas of our business.
2. A more detailed quarterly operational plan performance report that focuses on performance at a program level. This report comprises a summary of performance against all KPI's and more detailed comments from Managers about performance that falls above or below an acceptable range.

## ISSUES

The following comments provide an overview of performance under each scorecard perspective and the associated key performance indicators.

### Financial Perspective

#### February Rating: Outstanding

Proven Earnings Before Interest Tax & Depreciation (EBITD) Savings to Budget (weighting 20%) rated at the outstanding level with a favourable variance to budget at the end of February. This is primarily due to materials and services being underspent by \$5.3 million, employee costs being underspent by \$565,000 and operating grants and subsidies of \$310,000 received earlier than expected, offset by rates and utility charges \$838,000 behind anticipated levels. Full details are provided in the monthly finance report.

Cash Levels within Targets (weighting 8%) rated in the satisfactory range, with the timing of rates receipts in February temporarily pushing us away from the target of 4 months cash available.

The Capital Works Program Financial Performance KPI (weighting 12%) compares expenditure on finalised projects with budget. The budget for projects that have been completed to date this financial year was \$9,246,760 and actual was \$8,811,805 representing a 4.7% saving year to date and is an outstanding result.

### Customer Perspective

#### February Rating: Above Standard

Capital works program practical completion (weighting 15%) reports on the % of capital project milestones achieved compared to plan and continues to rate in the outstanding range. The result year to date of 130% indicates that milestones overall are being achieved ahead of schedule.

Project Delivery Group continues to be well ahead of target with 588 milestones achieved of 413 due, representing 146 out of 233 capital projects having reached practical completion so far this year. Corporate Services is also ahead of schedule with 185 achieved against 166 due and Planning and Policy is also on target. Redland Water and Waste achieved all 5 milestones due this month, and YTD 42 milestones have been achieved against 45 due. The three RW&W milestones outstanding YTD are Dunwich Irrigation Area, NSI small capital projects and Mount Cotton Chlorination project.

Compliance with the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines (ADWG, weighting 2.5%): Drinking water quality fully complied (100%) with all 4 key ADWG parameters: e-coli levels, turbidity, pH levels, and manganese levels.

Compliance with our EPA Licence for Wastewater (weighting 2.5%) rated as outstanding, with no non-compliances during February. The YTD result is that 99.9%

of the volume of effluent discharged year to date was compliant with the EPA's requirements.

% of development assessment, integrated commercial and land development applications processed within IPA timeframes (weighting 10%) was 95% of decisions made within statutory timeframes in February, with the YTD result therefore remaining static at 94%, which is 1% below the satisfactory level.

### **Internal Perspective**

February Rating: Outstanding

Asset Management Plans Actions Completed (weighting 7.5%) again increased, this time by 2% to 90% and as a result achieved an above standard rating for February.

% of Internal Audit Actions completed within agreed timeframes (weighting 7.5%), again rated as outstanding with 100% of audit recommendations completed on schedule.

### **People & Learning Perspective**

February Rating: Outstanding

The Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate (weighting 5%) YTD result improved as a result of no lost time injuries occurring in February.

% implementation of the Tri-Safe audit action plan (weighting 10%) remains at the outstanding level with all actions due completed.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide effective organisational leadership through strategic planning and accountable and ethical standards of practice.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

No direct financial implications arise from this report. The report does contain several indicators that either reflects financial performance to date, or which will have had a direct or indirect impact on financial performance.

### **CONSULTATION**

The data and comments in the report were provided by relevant managers and were compiled by the Corporate Planning, Performance and Risk Group.

**OPTIONS****PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for the month of February 2007.

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for February 2007 and request additional information.

**OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Beard

**That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for the month of February 2007.**

**CARRIED**

## 13 DIRECT TO COUNCIL REPORTS

### 13.1 REDLAND WATER & WASTE

#### 13.1.1 RESPONSE TO QUEENSLAND WATER COMMISSION

**Datworks Filename:** WS Planning – Water resource strategy  
WS Pricing of Recycled Water  
WS Water Resource Charging

**Attachment:** [Response Letter to Queensland Water Commission](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Jim Pruss  
General Manager Redland Water & Waste

**Author Name:** Jim Pruss  
General Manager Redland Water & Waste

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Queensland Water Commission draft documents on Institutional Arrangements and Cost Recovery and Pricing for Urban Water Supply in South East Queensland were released on 9 March 2007 and the Commission has requested that comments be received by close of business Thursday, 5 April 2007.

At the Redland Water and Waste committee meeting of 21 March 2007, it was requested that the Chief Executive Officer and General Manager Redland Water and Waste prepare a draft response to the Queensland Water Commission to be tabled for review at the General Meeting of Council on 28 March 2007. A copy of the draft response is attached for Council consideration.

#### PURPOSE

To present the draft letter from Council to the Queensland Water Commission containing Council's formal response to the draft documents on Institutional Arrangements and Cost Recovery and Pricing for Urban Water Supply in South East Queensland.

#### BACKGROUND

The Queensland Water Commission draft documents on Institutional Arrangements and Cost Recovery and Pricing for Urban Water Supply in South East Queensland were released on 9 March 2007 and the Commission has requested that comments be received by close of business Thursday, 5 April 2007.

#### ISSUES

The issues raised at the Redland Water & Waste committee of 21 March 2007 have been included in the draft formal letter with suggested responses for Council's review and approval.

---

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation has taken place between the Chief Executive Officer and General Manager Redland Water and Waste.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Barker  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to endorse the formal response letter to the Queensland Water Commission on Institutional Arrangements and Cost Recovery and Pricing for Urban Water Supply in South East Queensland, as attached.**

**CARRIED**

## **13.2 PLANNING AND POLICY**

### **13.2.1 SUBMISSION ON EASTERN BUSWAY**

**Datworks Filename:** RTT Eastern Busway  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Greg Underwood  
General Manager Planning and Policy  
**Author Name:** David Elliott  
Manager Infrastructure Planning Group

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The preferred Eastern Busway alignment was released by the State Government (Translink) for public consultation on 21 February 2007. The draft Concept Design and Impact Management Plan (CDIMP), which assesses the benefits and impacts of the busway has also been made available for consultation.

TransLink in a letter dated 19 March 2007 has invited Council to lodge a submission, the closing date for which is 4 April 2007.

Given the very short response time, it is recommended that Council delegate to the Chief Executive Officer authority to sign and lodge the formal submission by Council.

#### **PURPOSE**

To seek resolution from the Council to delegate to the Chief Executive Officer authority to sign and lodge the Council's submission on the Eastern Busway.

#### **BACKGROUND**

In June and July 2006, the draft busway plans were displayed for public consultation. Council made its submission at that time. TransLink responded to Council's submission on 19 March 2007.

Translink has now finalised a draft preferred alignment and has put this on display for further public consultation.

The preferred alignment of busway including draft CDIMP is available on the Translink web site.

#### **ISSUES**

Translink representatives provided a complete set of documents on the preferred alignment and CDIMP to Council officers on 12 March, 2007. These documents have been distributed to relevant officers of the Council.

Officers are currently reviewing these documents and the submission report is being compiled.

Council's main comments on draft busway plans provided in 2006 were generally taken into account in the preparation of draft preferred alignment. These included locating busway underground in Capalaba Town Centre and considering the provision of a Park and Ride facility to the south of Moreton Bay Road.

Translink confirmed that the busway has been designed to allow for the extension of the busway east of Capalaba, if there is a future need.

The main issues being considered for the submission relate principally to the proposed timing and staging of the busway in the vicinity of the Capalaba Town Centre.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide and maintain water, waste services, roads, drainage and support the provision of transport and waterways infrastructure.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications as a result of the submission.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

### **CONSULTATION**

Draft preferred alignment and CDIMP documents have been sent to Managers Community and Social Planning, Environmental Management and Land Use Planning for feedback and consultation.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To make a submission to Translink on the draft Eastern Busway Concept Design and Impact Management Plan Study Report; and
2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to sign off and lodge the submission.



**ALTERNATIVE**

To not make a submission on draft Concept Design and Impact Management Plan Study Report.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Burns  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To make a submission to TransLink on the draft Eastern Busway Concept Design and Impact Management Plan Study Report; and**
- 2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to sign off and lodge the submission.**

**CARRIED**

**14 MAYORAL MINUTE****14.1 STATE EQUESTRIAN FACILITY****BACKGROUND**

Minister for Local Government, Planning and Sport, Andrew Fraser, has released a 'request for proposals' for a new State Equestrian Facility and is offering a government contribution of \$1.9 million to the successful bidder. Applications close 14 May 2007 with the successful facility to be completed by 30 September 2009.

The intention of the facility is to provide a venue suitable for dressage, showjumping and reining with community access as well as elite level competitions.

Council is currently undertaking a review of equestrian facilities in the Shire with the intent to develop a new equestrian park. This is an opportunity for Council, sporting organisations and the private sector to contribute to the development.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Seccombe

**That Council:**

- 1. Strongly support the location of the State Equestrian Centre (for dressage, showjumping and reining) as invited by the Department of Local Government Planning Sport and Recreation within Redland Shire;**
- 2. Support any application to locate the Equestrian Centre in Redland Shire provided that meets the satisfaction of the Chief Executive Officer; and**
- 3. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to sign any letter of support on behalf of Council.**

**CARRIED**

**15 NOTICE OF BUSINESS****15.1 NOTICES GIVEN BY CR BOWLER (DIVISION 6)****15.1.1 AMENDMENT TO REDLANDS PLANNING SCHEME TO REZONE WHOLE OF SITE LOT 3 ON RP907141 – 141 BUNKER ROAD, VICTORIA POINT**

Cr Bowler moved the following motion in accordance with the notice given:

Moved by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to amend the Redlands Planning Scheme to rezone the whole of the site described as Lot 3 on RP907141, 141 Bunker Road, Victoria Point, to 'Conservation'.

The Mayor ruled that the Notice of Business given by Cr Bowler with respect to amendment to the Redlands Planning Scheme rezoning as previously indicated was contrary to the intent of the previous motion on this matter. A motion had been discussed on this matter and meeting protocol dictated that there could not be two motions on the books on the same matter at the same time. The Mayor ruled that he could not accept the motion at this meeting; however Cr Bowler could present this Notice of Business at a subsequent meeting.

**15.1.2 REPORT ON AMOUNT OF RATES COLLECTED ON THE SOUTHERN MORETON BAY ISLANDS SINCE 1973**

Cr Bowler moved the following motion in accordance with the notice given:

Moved by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve that a report be prepared and presented to Council identifying the amount of general rates, including water, pool and electricity levies that have been collected on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands since 1973, which is when Council took over the collection of rates, and that all figures be identified on a yearly basis.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that following discussions with the General Manager Corporate Services, it was ascertained that the rating data for these properties was not available from 1973 as requested in Cr Bowler's Notice of Business, due to system changes. This data was however available from 1995-96.

On the basis of the above information, the Mayor ruled that he could not accept the motion as it stood.

Cr Bowler then moved as follows:

Moved by: Cr Bowler  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That Council resolve that a report be prepared and presented to Council identifying the amount of general rates, including water, pool and electricity levies that have been collected on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands since 1995-96.

On being put to the vote, the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Henry, Bowler and Elliott voted in the affirmative.

Crs Barker, Ogilvie, Dowling, Burns, Beard, Williams, Murray and Seccombe voted in the negative.

The motion was declared by the Mayor as LOST.

**16 URGENT BUSINESS WITHOUT NOTICE****16.1 GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT****COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Williams

**That a report on the effectiveness of Council's strategy for Graffiti management in the Shire be prepared for Councillors, to include:**

- 1. Council's policy for removal and education; and**
- 2. The report should be completed in sufficient time to be considered in budget discussions for the 2007-08 budget deliberations.**

**CARRIED**

A division was called for.

Crs Barker, Dowling, Elliott, Beard, Williams and Seccombe voted in the affirmative.

Crs Ogilvie, Henry, Burns, Bowler and Murray voted in the negative.

The motion was declared by the Mayor as **CARRIED**.

**17 MEETING CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 5.27pm.

Signature of Chairperson: \_\_\_\_\_

Confirmation date: \_\_\_\_\_