



**Redland**  
CITY COUNCIL

# **MINUTES**

## **GENERAL MEETING**

**Wednesday 29 October 2008  
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 .....	2
5	MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING MINUTES .....	2
5.1	REPORT FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER .....	2
5.1.1	PETITION TO RAISE COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION TO CANAL LEVIES .....	2
5.1.2	REQUEST FOR REPORT – REVIEW OF CURRENT POSITION ON MANAGEMENT OF SHOPPING TROLLEYS .....	2
5.1.3	REQUEST FOR REPORT – PROTECTING SIGNIFICANT VEGETATION .....	3
5.1.4	REQUEST FOR REPORT – RESEARCH ON THE IMPACT OF TRAIL BIKES ON THE REDLANDS.....	3
6	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	3
7	PETITIONS.....	4
7.1	PETITION (DIVISION 10) – OBJECTION TO COUNCIL’S INSTALLATION OF A CONCRETE PATH AT JUANITA STREET, BIRKDALE.....	4
7.2	PETITION – OBJECTING TO THE TRIAL CLOSURE OF SOUTH STREET, CLEVELAND .....	4
8	MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS.....	4
9	DECLARATION OF MATERIAL PERSONAL INTEREST ON ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS .....	5
10	PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 8/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT.....	6
10.1	PLANNING AND POLICY.....	8

---

---

10.1.1	COUNCILLOR NOMINATION TO SOUTHERN REGIONAL ROADS GROUP (RRG) .....	8
10.1.2	VACANT FACILITIES - "THE SHACK", MACLEAY ISLAND AND GIRL GUIDES HUT, RUSSELL ISLAND .....	10
10.1.3	PETITION REQUEST TO CLOSE PATHWAY ADJACENT TO 13 & 15 DIANA STREET, CAPALABA.....	16
10.2	GENERAL BUSINESS.....	21
11	REDLAND WATER AND WASTE COMMITTEE 21/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT .....	22
11.1	REDLAND WATER AND WASTE .....	24
11.1.1	REDLAND WATER & WASTE COUNCIL BUSINESS UNIT REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2008 .....	24
11.1.2	DELEGATIONS UNDER WATER SUPPLY ACT 2008 .....	27
11.2	GENERAL BUSINESS.....	30
12	PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 22/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT.....	31
12.1	ITEM DELEGATED TO COMMITTEE FROM COUNCIL.....	33
12.1.1	ADOPTION OF DRAFT REDLAND BAY CENTRE AND FORESHORE MASTER PLAN .....	33
12.2	PLANNING & POLICY .....	40
12.2.1	COUNCILLOR NOMINATION TO SOUTHERN REGIONAL ROADS GROUP (RRG) .....	40
12.2.2	DRAFT RURAL FUTURES STRATEGY SUBMISSION .....	42
12.2.3	PROPOSED TRIAL CLOSURE OF SOUTH STREET .....	51
12.3	GENERAL BUSINESS.....	55
12.3.1	POTENTIAL FORMATION OF A BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT .....	55
12.3.2	SUBSIDISING PUBLIC TRANSPORT .....	55
12.3.3	DEFERRED REPORT ON PROPOSED TRIAL CLOSURE OF SOUTH STREET .....	55
12.3.4	AMENDMENT TO GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT & PREVENTION POLICY .....	56

---

---

<b>13</b>	<b>FINANCE AND CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</b>	
	<b>22/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT .....</b>	<b>57</b>
	<b>13.1 CORPORATE SERVICES.....</b>	<b>59</b>
	<b>13.1.1 RETIREMENT VILLAGE PENSIONER SUBSIDY .....</b>	<b>59</b>
	<b>13.1.2 SEPTEMBER 2008 - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS.....</b>	<b>71</b>
	<b>13.1.3 SENIOR MANAGERS' REMUNERATION GUIDELINE (GL-3019) .....</b>	<b>76</b>
	<b>13.1.4 REVIEW OF POLICY &amp; GUIDELINE - FLEET VEHICLE SELECTION CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>79</b>
	<b>13.2 CUSTOMER SERVICES.....</b>	<b>87</b>
	<b>13.2.1 AMENDMENT TO HEALTH &amp; ENVIRONMENT FEES &amp; CHARGES 2008-2009 (FOOD SAFETY).....</b>	<b>87</b>
	<b>13.2.2 AMENDMENT OF 2008-09 EVENT FEES FOR CLEVELAND SHOWGROUND .....</b>	<b>92</b>
	<b>13.3 PLANNING AND POLICY.....</b>	<b>96</b>
	<b>13.3.1 CORPORATE BALANCED SCORECARD REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2008 .....</b>	<b>96</b>
	<b>13.3.2 QUARTERLY OPERATIONAL PLAN REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2008 .....</b>	<b>99</b>
	<b>13.4 CLOSED SESSION.....</b>	<b>102</b>
	<b>13.4.1 BUDGET PARAMETERS &amp; CORPORATE BUDGET TIMETABLE 2009/10 .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>MAYORAL MINUTES .....</b>	<b>104</b>
	<b>14.1 QUANDAMOOKA COMBINED ABORIGINAL ORGANISATIONS FORUM .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>DIRECT TO COUNCIL REPORTS.....</b>	<b>105</b>
	<b>15.1 OFFICE OF CEO.....</b>	<b>105</b>
	<b>15.1.1 SHADE STRUCTURES - COMMUNITY BENEFIT FUND - DIVISIONS 5, 7 &amp; 10.....</b>	<b>105</b>
	<b>15.1.2 ESTABLISHMENT OF A WATER RETAILING BUSINESS.....</b>	<b>109</b>
	<b>15.1.3 EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT AND PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR COUNCILLORS .....</b>	<b>113</b>

---

---

15.2	PLANNING AND POLICY .....	116
15.2.1	SOUTH EAST THORNLANDS STRUCTURE PLAN AND ASSOCIATED PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENTS - DELEGATED AUTHORITY FOR PLANNING AND POLICY COMMITTEE .....	116
16	NOTICE OF MOTION UNDER SECTION 451 OF <i>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993</i> .....	119
16.1	NOTICE GIVEN BY CR TOWNSEND (DIVISION 5).....	119
16.1.1	NOTICE OF MOTION TO RESCIND RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF 31 OCTOBER 2007– ITEM 10.1.3 - MACLEAY ISLAND CENTRES STRATEGY REVIEW.....	119
17	URGENT BUSINESS WITHOUT NOTICE .....	120
17.1	QUARRY-RICKERTT ROAD UPGRADE .....	120
	MEETING CLOSURE.....	120

## 1 DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Mayor declared the meeting open at 4.00pm and acknowledged the Quandamooka people who are the traditional custodians of the land on which Council meet. The Mayor also paid respect to their elders past and present and also extended that respect to other Indigenous Australians present.

## 2 DEVOTIONAL SEGMENT

Fr Frank O'Dea of the Redlands Ministers' Fellowship, led Council in a brief devotional segment.

## 3 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cr M Hobson PSM	Mayor
Cr T Bowler	Deputy Mayor and Councillor Division 6
Cr W Boglary	Councillor Division 1
Cr C Ogilvie	Councillor Division 2
Cr D Henry	Councillor Division 3
Cr P Dowling	Councillor Division 4
Cr B Townsend	Councillor Division 5
Cr M Elliott	Councillor Division 7
Cr K Reimers	Councillor Division 8
Cr K Williams	Councillor Division 9
Cr H Murray	Councillor Division 10

### EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP GROUP:

Mr G Stevenson PSM	Chief Executive Officer
Mr R Turner	General Manager Corporate Services
Mr G Underwood	General Manager Planning and Policy
Mr L Smith	Acting General Manager Customer Services

### MINUTES:

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

### APOLOGY

Mr G Soutar	General Manager Redland Water and Waste
-------------	---

#### **4 RECEIPT AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Moved by: Cr Reimers  
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That the minutes of the General Meeting of Council held on 1 October 2008 be confirmed.

CARRIED

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

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

###### **5.1.1 PETITION TO RAISE COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION TO CANAL LEVIES**

At the General Meeting of the 26 September 2007 Council resolved that the petition be received and referred to a committee or officer for consideration and a report to Council.

At the General Meeting on 19 December 2007, Council resolved that consideration of this item be deferred to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting to enable a more detailed report to be prepared and presented to Council.

At the General Meeting of 28 May 2008 Council resolved that the Committee Recommendation not be adopted and that Council resolve to defer this item until further legal advice is received regarding the legitimacy of the benefit area levy in raising monies for repair to revetment walls.

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

###### **5.1.2 REQUEST FOR REPORT – REVIEW OF CURRENT POSITION ON MANAGEMENT OF SHOPPING TROLLEYS**

At the General Meeting of 30 April 2008, it was resolved that a report be prepared and presented to Council to review the current position on the management of shopping trolleys and to provide additional options for compliance.

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

### **5.1.3 REQUEST FOR REPORT – PROTECTING SIGNIFICANT VEGETATION**

At the General Meeting of 28 May 2008, it was resolved that a report be prepared and presented to Council on the steps Council is taking to protect significant vegetation through the Development Assessment process.

A report addressing this matter will be presented to the December 2008 Planning & Policy Committee Meeting.

### **5.1.4 REQUEST FOR REPORT – RESEARCH ON THE IMPACT OF TRAIL BIKES ON THE REDLANDS**

At the General Meeting of 30 July 2008, Council resolved that research on the current impacts of trail bikes on the Redlands natural areas be undertaken.

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

## **6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the proceedings of the meeting adjourn for a public participation segment.

CARRIED

1. Mr R MacDonald, Wellington Point addressed Council in relation to dog off-leash area at Starkey Street, Wellington Point;
2. Mr Jim Henry, Aveo, Cleveland, addressed Council in relation to Retirement Village Pensioner Subsidy;

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the public participation segment be extended to allow for further speakers to address Council.

CARRIED

3. Mr Ted Davies, Lifestyle Estates Retirement Village, Victoria Point addressed Council in relation to Retirement Village Pensioner Subsidy;
4. Mr Frank Bradley of Cleveland addressed Council in relation to infrastructure and services on the Bay Islands.



**MOTION TO RESUME MEETING**

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the proceedings of the meeting resume.

CARRIED

**7 PETITIONS****7.1 PETITION (DIVISION 10) – OBJECTION TO COUNCIL’S INSTALLATION OF A CONCRETE PATH AT JUANITA STREET, BIRKDALE**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

**That Council resolve that the petition, which reads as follows, be acknowledged and that Council will take no further action as the matter has been dealt with.**

**“We, the undersigned, object to the concrete path costing approximately \$40,000 in Juanita Street, Birkdale, which is used by 8-10 people per day.**

**The council would be better off spending it where required. We all have green lawns which is better to look at than concrete.”**

CARRIED

**7.2 PETITION – OBJECTING TO THE TRIAL CLOSURE OF SOUTH STREET, CLEVELAND**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

**That Council resolve that the petition (containing 298 signatures) from business operators and stakeholders from South Street and Enterprise Street, objecting to the trial closure of South Street, be received, referred to the Planning and Policy Department and considered when a further report is prepared and presented to Council in this matter.**

CARRIED

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

Nil

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

Nil

---

**10 PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 8/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That the following Planning & Policy Committee Report of 8 October 2008 be received.

CARRIED

**DECLARATION OF OPENING**

Cr Murray declared the meeting open at 9.00 am.

**RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**Members Present

Cr H Murray	Chair and Councillor Division 10
Cr M Hobson PSM	Mayor
Cr W Boglary	Councillor Division 1 Entered at 9.12 am
Cr D Henry	Councillor Division 3 Entered at 9.03 am
Cr P Dowling	Councillor Division 4
Cr B Townsend	Councillor Division 5
Cr T Bowler	Deputy Mayor & Councillor Division 6 Entered at 9.02 am
Cr M Elliott	Councillor Division 7
Cr K Reimers	Councillor Division 8

Committee Manager

Mr G Underwood	General Manager Planning and Policy
----------------	-------------------------------------

Officers

Mr G Stevenson PSM	Chief Executive Officer
Mr L Smith	Acting General Manager Customer Services
Mr G Soutar	General Manager Redland Water and Waste
Ms R Bonnin	Manager Community and Social Planning
Mr L Purdie	Acting Manager Infrastructure Planning
Mr A Athwal	Senior Engineer Traffic and Transport

Minutes

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Moved by: Cr Hobson  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That leave of absence from today's meeting be approved for Cr K Williams.

CARRIED

**APOLOGY**

Cr C Ogilvie

Councillor Division 2

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT MEETING**

Nil

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Nil

**MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Nil

[The following is a record of councillor attendance at this committee meeting:  
Cr Townsend left the meeting at 9.33 am (end of item 1.3)]

## **10.1 PLANNING AND POLICY**

### **10.1.1 COUNCILLOR NOMINATION TO SOUTHERN REGIONAL ROADS GROUP (RRG)**

**Datworks Filename:** GOV SouthROC - Regional Roads Group  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Greg Underwood  
General Manager Planning and Policy  
**Author Name:** Greg Underwood  
General Manager Planning and Policy

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

With the election of new Councils across Queensland, there is a requirement for all Councils to nominate their representative on the Regional Road Groups (RRG) under the LGAQ/DMR Road Alliance.

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is for Council to nominate a suitable representative to the Southern RRG.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Regional Road Groups (RRG's) are the mechanism used to allocate State Transport Infrastructure Development Subsidies (TIDS) to the individual Local Governments throughout Queensland. Funding allocations are directed to jointly prioritise projects on an agreed priority network of Local Roads of Regional Significance (LRRS). This funding amounts to approximately \$400,000 per annum on average to Redland City Council. Other RRG initiatives include joint transportation modelling and strategic road network planning.

#### **ISSUES**

With the election of new Councils across Queensland, new nominees for the Regional Road Groups need to be decided by Councils.

Previous Mayor, Don Seccombe was the Redland Shire Council's representative on the Regional Roads Group (RRG) and he was also the Chair of this Committee.

Political representatives are drawn from the three (3) local government areas south of Brisbane, i.e., Redland City Council, Logan City Council and Gold Coast City Council.

As well as the political RRG, there is also a Technical RRG made up of officer representatives, again from the local government areas of Gold Coast, Redlands and Logan.

General Manager Planning and Policy is currently the Redland's Technical representative and has also been the Chair of the Technical RRG for the past two (2) years, and up until December 2009.

Both Committees meet on a quarterly basis, a fortnight apart, with the venue currently being the Redland City Council Chambers for both meetings.

### **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 additional costs resulting from this representative being nominated to the Regional Road Groups (RRG)

### **CONSULTATION**

The Mayor and Deputy Mayor were advised on the need for this report.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council nominate a Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council does not nominate a Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.

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

That Council resolve to nominate a Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.

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

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

**That consideration of this item be deferred to the Planning and Policy Committee Meeting to be held on 22 October 2008.**

### **CARRIED**

### 10.1.2 VACANT FACILITIES - "THE SHACK", MACLEAY ISLAND AND GIRL GUIDES HUT, RUSSELL ISLAND

**Dataworks Filename:** CS Planning - SMBI Vacant Facilities  
**Attachments:** [SMBI Vacant Facilities \(Appendices 1, 2 &3\)](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Roberta Bonnin  
Manager Community & Social Planning  
**Author Name:** Colette Torrance  
Project Officer Community & Social Planning

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Two Council owned community facilities on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands (SMBI) became vacant over the last two years due to changing organisational and demographic needs. The original purpose of both facilities - The Shack facility beside the Community Hall on Macleay Island and the Girl Guides Hut beside BICS Community Centre on Russell Island - was to support activities for young people. Early in 2008 Council officers called for submissions from community based organisations to manage/lease either or both facilities.

The aim of the project was to identify uses of these facilities to meet the current and future needs of island communities and to arrange a management model for users of the facility through a community development approach.

Following an Open House and registration process, four formal submissions were received and assessed against selection criteria. Further discussions were held with the applicants to address arrangements for shared use and fit-out issues and costs.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is for Council to endorse recommendations for the use and management of The Shack, Macleay Island and the Girl Guides Hut, Russell Island.

#### BACKGROUND

##### The Shack

The Shack is a demountable building that is situated on High Central Road, Macleay Island adjacent to the Community Hall (see photographs, Appendix 1). It is in reasonably good condition and consists of a main hall area that could accommodate approximately 50 people, a small kitchen facility at one end of the building and a storage room of reasonable size at the other end. The Community Hall amenities can also be available for the users of The Shack. The current status of this building is that it is in a functional condition and has received a Certificate of Classification.

The Shack was a surplus Council demountable building moved by Council from Russell Island to Macleay Island in response to community requests to develop a youth facility on Macleay Island. It was managed by the Bay Island Community

---

Services (BICS) but had a number of different models of youth services and programs being delivered from it, depending on whether volunteers were available to lend assistance.

At times, The Shack was used to deliver structured educational programs such as Russell and Macleay Pathways (RAMPS) and at other times it was used as a drop in centre. Late in 2007, the RAMPS group were asked by BICS to find an alternative venue for their program due to problems experienced with behaviours of the young people. At the time BICS were also interested in expanding their Op Shop services for the community. There have been differing views expressed by sections in the community about how the facility should be used into the future.

### The Girl Guides Hut

The Girl Guides Hut on Russell Island is a large steel clad industrial shed that is situated on Jackson Road directly beside the community centre operated by the Bay Island Community Services (BICS) (see photographs, Appendix 2). The building appears to be structurally sound but requires some internal fit-out to be at a standard acceptable for occupation. There is one area assigned within the building for amenities and has one toilet connected to a damaged septic tank. There is no connection to a power supply within the building. The current status of this building is that it is not in a functional condition and does not currently hold a Certificate of Classification.

The Girl Guides Hut was built by the Girl Guides group on Russell Island with support from the local Lions Club and the Divisional Councillor. The Girl Guides group disbanded in mid 2007 following a steady decline in numbers and problems with replacing a group leader when the original leader retired.

### **ISSUES**

These community facilities provide an opportunity for many groups in the community to access and use the spaces for a range of activities under a community based management arrangement. A review of the facilities undertaken in early 2008 incorporated community priorities identified during the Place Project and investigative and engagement work with both internal and external stakeholders.

Council also carried out discussions with the BICS Coordinator and BICS Board representatives to outline requirements by Council to undertake an open submission process.

A two-part process was established to secure new users for the facilities:

1. An Open House and Registration Day that was held on both islands to communicate information about the facilities and the planned process to secure the future management or lease arrangements for their use. Any groups interested in using the facilities, even if they could not undertake a full lease were invited to "register" their groups' proposed use of the facilities.



2. Council advertised for submissions by organisations who were interested in entering into a formal Permit to Occupy or lease of the facilities.

The intentions of these processes were to match up interested “casual” hirers of the space with the formal submitters to achieve a multi-user approach for the facilities with maximum usage and community benefit.

### *Assessment*

The assessment criteria established for the brief included the following:

- Demonstrated knowledge and commitment to the wellbeing of the SMBI communities – uses and services should demonstrate an inclusive and accessible approach;
- Demonstrated capacity to deliver the proposed services – this may be based on previous experience and/or a well planned approach;
- Demonstrated relevance to the needs of the SMBI communities;
- Demonstrated viability – proposal needs to stack up, can be implemented, appropriate resources at hand to deliver outcomes and realistic for the community and its resources;
- Demonstrates a sustainable approach – services can be delivered now and sustained into the future with a limited risk profile;
- Compatible with other uses in the vicinity of the facility – proposed uses and services do not duplicate or compete with those in close proximity to these facilities.

Council received four (4) formal submissions:

- Three submissions for The Shack facility;
- One submission for the Girl Guides Hut.

### *The Shack*

#### 1. Blue Care

Blue Care proposed to use The Shack to become a central base in the Southern Moreton Bay Island region for residents to access a range of health and aged care provisions including holistic based care and support. Management and staff would be based at The Shack five days per week.

#### 2. Bay Island Community Services

BICS proposal provided accommodation for existing and future businesses and services including health professionals, legal advisors and emergency assistance.

---

Usage of the facility would be based on a five day working week. BICS would continue to provide a voluntary receptionist and booking service to consultants and clients.

### 3. Macleay Island Craft Group

Macleay Island Craft Group proposed use of The Shack four to five days per week for workshops, meetings, craft demonstrations and permanent displays. As equipment and displays would be stored in The Shack, MICG would prefer to have sole use of the facility.

#### *Girl Guides Hut*

### 1. Bay Island Community Services

BICS proposes a “multi usage centre” for the Girl Guides Hut including a youth drop-in centre, arts and craft facility, a support group meeting place, and a fitness and dance venue. BICS anticipate that the hut would be used seven days per week after considerable upgrades to the building. BICS propose these upgrades be facilitated by the Work for the Dole program.

As a result of an assessment of the formal submissions by Customer and Community Services and Community and Social Planning officers and a follow up interview with two of the submitters, it is proposed that Blue Care be offered the management of the Shack facility and that BICS be offered the management of the Girl Guides Hut.

Both Blue Care and BICS are supportive of the proposal to make the facilities available to other user groups during non-core times with a view to providing a broad range of services to the community. In relation to the proposals for the use of the Shack facility, both Blue Care and BICS are keen to discuss their individual approaches so that they may collaborate on future uses of the facility from a community development perspective.

The results of the formal assessment and some additional proposals from the successful applicants are attached (Appendix 3).

A late request from the RKL Heritage Group for sole use of The Shack was received by the Divisional Councillor. Their needs will need to be addressed at a later date.

The expectations by the island communities and submitting organisations are that the future management of the facilities be quickly resolved so that services can be offered through them.

#### *Other Issues*

Both facilities will require some level of fit-out to improve their functionality in accordance with the proposed uses outlined in the submission process. Council will

be asked to consider making some financial allocation to ensure that the Girl Guides Facility complies with the Building Code of Australia and that it is fit for use.

## **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**

There will be some financial implications for this proposal as Council needs to ensure that the facilities are fit for use; however the recommended users are willing to contribute to the costs of fit out and will be solely responsible for their operational costs. Further work costings will be undertaken once tenure has been determined and external funding opportunities explored. Council costs will be considered during annual or quarterly budget processes.

## **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**

Internal consultations were undertaken with:

- Community Development Team;
- Leisure and Recreation Services;
- Open Space Planning;
- Community and Social Planning.

External community engagement activities took place to inform the community about Council's process for securing new lessees for the facilities, to understand community expectations for the use of the facilities, and to determine which groups and individuals were interested in running programs or services for each building. External engagement also created an ideal opportunity for Council to inform the community about what other services and facilities were available.

External community engagement activities included:

- Working with the Department of Communities' SMBI Place project;
- Open House and Registration Day;
- Individual discussions with BICS;
- Liaison with Department of Communities on service provision issues;

- Call for submissions;
- Ongoing discussions with SMBI organisations.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

1. That Blue Care Redland Community Care Services be offered a Permit to Occupy the vacant facility, known as the Shack on Macleay Island, for a period of three (3) years;
2. That Bay Islands Community Services Inc. be offered a Permit to Occupy the vacant facility, known as Girl Guides Hut on Russell Island, for a period of three (3) years;
3. That an assessment of costs to ensure that both facilities meet building standards and are fit for occupancy be undertaken; and
4. That a Council co-contribution to carry out refurbishment work be considered through the budget review process.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

1. That Blue Care Redland Community Care Services be offered a Permit to Occupy the vacant facility, known as the Shack on Macleay Island, for a period of three (3) years; and
2. That the Girl Guides Hut tenancy arrangement be put on hold until the facility meets building standards and has been fully commissioned for community use.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

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

1. That **Blue Care Redland Community Care Services be offered a Permit to Occupy the vacant facility, known as the Shack on Macleay Island, for a period of three (3) years;**
2. That **Bay Islands Community Services Inc. be offered a Permit to Occupy the vacant facility, known as Girl Guides Hut on Russell Island, for a period of three (3) years;**
3. That **an assessment of costs to ensure that both facilities meet building standards and are fit for occupancy be undertaken; and**
4. That **a Council co-contribution to carry out refurbishment work be considered through the budget review process.**

## **CARRIED**

### 10.1.3 PETITION REQUEST TO CLOSE PATHWAY ADJACENT TO 13 & 15 DIANA STREET, CAPALABA

**Dataworks Filename:** RTT: Capital Works Program  
Gov Petitions

**Attachments:** [Attachment 'A' – Aerial Photo of Consultation Area for Diana Street, Capalaba](#)  
[Attachment 'B' – “Community Survey Report” – Diana Street, Capalaba – School Access Pathway – Closure Petition – September 2008](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Abdish Athwal  
Acting Manager Infrastructure Planning

**Author Name:** Abdish Athwal  
Acting Manager Infrastructure Planning

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A petition was received by Council requesting the closure of a pathway adjacent to 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba. At the General Meeting of 28 November 2007, Council resolved that the petition be received and referred to the appropriate area for consideration and a report back to Council. The report recommended that Council not support the closure of the pathway.

A response to the petition was presented to Council on 28 May 2008, when Council resolved that the matter be deferred to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting to allow for further consultation and a survey to be completed.

The November 2007 petition had a total of 133 signatures from a very wide area of Redlands and Brisbane. Of the 133 signatures, 31 signatures from 14 properties were from within the same area as the June 2008 consultation area.

In September 2008, Integrated Open Space Services (IOSS), an independent consultation service, was engaged to undertake an independent survey of local residents to ascertain their response to the petition. The results revealed 42% in favour of the path remaining open, 31% unsure and 27% in favour of closing the path.

Council's Community Safety Officer, Mr Shane Smith, inspected the pathway and contacted the head petitioners, Mr & Mrs Wayne Fing of 13 Diana Street, to ascertain what current Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) issues he was referring to in the Petition. Mr Fing was very vague in his response.

From this meeting Mr Smith ascertained that the problem is not during school hours but occurs mainly on Friday and Saturday nights. The youth congregate under the street light, and sit and make noise. There is some very minor graffiti, which has

been there about 18 months. From the site inspection, Mr Smith was unable to find any issues in contravention of CPTED principles.

Due to the above findings and the results from IOSS survey, which revealed majority support (42%) in favour of the path remaining open, the Officer's Recommendation is that Council resolve to not support the closure of the pathway between 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba.

## **PURPOSE**

To complete a community consultation and prepare a response to a petition requesting that Council close a pathway adjacent to 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba.

## **BACKGROUND**

The owners of 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba arranged a petition of local residents seeking closure of the above mentioned pathway between their respective properties.

A response to a petition was presented to Council on 28 May 2008 when Council resolved that the matter be deferred to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting to allow for further consultation and a survey to be completed.

In September 2008, Integrated Open Space Services (IOSS) an independent consultation service, was engaged to carry-out a three part survey. Also Council's Community Safety Officer, Mr Shane Smith, inspected the pathway and contacted the head petitioner, Mr Wayne Fing to ascertain what current Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) issues he was referring to in the Petition.

## **ISSUES**

This section of pathway is integral with the Diana Street road reserve and its closure therefore comes within the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural Resources and Water (DNRW);

The concrete footpath in Diana Street, including the link to the school, is of relatively recent construction. A 280m section of path in Diana Street was purpose built from Handsworth Street to link with the school via the pathway between the properties;

Closure of the pathway link between the properties would make the footpath in Diana Street virtually redundant and Council would only support the closure provided DNRW could sell the land to the adjoining property owners and not become a maintenance issue for Council.

The November 2007 petition had a total of 133 signatures from a very wide area of Redlands and Brisbane. Of the 133 signatures, 31 signatures from 14 properties were from within same area as the June 2008 consultation area.

While the November 2007 petition does not provide definitive reasons for requesting the closure of the pathway, the common reasons for such requests are the occasional nuisances caused by pedestrian activity and the perceived additional risks to the security of the adjoining properties.

In September 2008, Integrated Open Space Services (IOSS), an independent consultation service, was engaged to undertake an independent survey of local residents to ascertain their response to the petition. The consultation survey was restricted to an area directly affected by the pathway, which is bounded by the south side of School Road, the western side of Ney Road, the northern side of Wentworth Drive to the park, Park Street, Rhoades Street and Capalaba State College. (Refer to Attachment 'A')

The survey consisted of three components:

- i) A door to door interview survey, with one person over 18 per household being interviewed, from the same area as the June 2008 survey;
- ii) On-site survey in Diana Street adjacent to the access pathway, to obtain feedback from adults dropping off/picking up their children;
- iii) Count of people entering and leaving the school.

IOSS survey results revealed majority support (42%) in favour of the path remaining open, with 31% unsure and 27% in favour of closing the path. (Refer to Attachment 'B').

The November 2007 petition stated that "the existence of the pathway does not meet CPTED principle". Council Community Safety Officer, Mr Shane Smith, inspected the pathway and contacted the head petitioners, Mr and Mrs Wayne Fing of 13 Diana Street; to ascertain what current Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) issues he referred to in the Petition. Mr Fing could not clarify which CPTED principles he referred to as not being met. Mr Smith from this contact with Mr & Mrs Fing ascertained that:

- i) The problem is not during school time or hours, the problems occur mainly on Friday and Saturday nights;
- ii) The youth congregate under the street light, and sit - make noise. Allegations of items stolen from 13 & 15. Incident (singular) where a used condom was thrown over the fence. Allegedly where used alcohol cans and bottles have been thrown over the fence;
- iii) Very minor graffiti, which has been there about 18 months;
- iv) Number 13 Diana Street requires a new fence along the footpath;
- v) Mr Fing could not clarify which CPTED principles were not being met.
- vi) From the site inspection, Mr Smith was unable to find any issues in contravention of CPTED principles and requested that Mr Fing set up a meeting, where Mr Smith would attend and discuss the principles referred to. Mr Smith has left message for Mr Fing to contact him but no response has been received from Mr Fing.

The results from IOSS survey revealed majority support (42%) in favour of the path remaining open.

### **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**

No financial implications if the preferred option is adopted.

### **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 Divisional Councillor, Cr Karen Williams has been consulted and does not support the preferred option.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the closure of the pathway between 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba as per the November 2007 petition; and
2. That the principal petitioner be requested to notify all signatories to the petition of Council's decision in this matter.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

No alternative option recommended.

### **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the closure of the pathway between 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba as per the November 2007 petition; and
2. That the principal petitioner be requested to notify all signatories to the petition of Council's decision in this matter.



**PROPOSED MOTION**

Moved by: Cr Hobson

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the closure of the pathway between 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba as per the November 2007 petition;
2. To investigate the installation of a locked gate at both ends on weekends, from Friday night through to Sunday night; and
3. That the principal petitioner be requested to notify all signatories to the petition of Council's decision in this matter.

The motion lapsed for want of a seconder.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the closure of the pathway between 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba as per the November 2007 petition; and
2. That the principal petitioner be requested to notify all signatories to the petition of Council's decision in this matter.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

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

- 1. To support the closure of the pathway between 13 and 15 Diana Street, Capalaba as per the November 2007 petition; and**
- 2. That the principal petitioner be requested to notify all signatories to the petition of Council's decision in this matter.**

**CARRIED**

A division was called for.

Crs Williams, Dowling, Henry, Ogilvie, Boglary, Hobson, Townsend, Reimers and Murray voted in the affirmative.

Crs Elliott and Bowler voted in the negative.

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

**10.2 GENERAL BUSINESS**

The following item of general business was raised:

**1. Cr Elliott**

Cr Elliott requested an update on the status of the Koala Taskforce.

Cr Hobson advised that a letter had been received which indicated that negotiations were still continuing with other government departments. Cr Hobson further advised that she had not heard anything that suggested that the taskforce would be disbanded and that no further comment would be made until she had been officially advised.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

**That the general business item be noted.**

**CARRIED**

## 11 REDLAND WATER AND WASTE COMMITTEE 21/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That the following Redland Water and Waste Committee Report of 21 October 2008 be received.

CARRIED

### DECLARATION OF OPENING

Cr Henry declared the meeting open at 2.02 pm.

### RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

#### Members Present

Cr D Henry	Chair and Councillor Division 3
Cr M Hobson PSM	Mayor
Cr W Boglary	Councillor Division 1
Cr C Ogilvie	Councillor Division 2
Cr P Dowling	Councillor Division 4
Cr B Townsend	Councillor Division 5
Cr T Bowler	Deputy Mayor and Councillor Division 6
Cr M Elliott	Councillor Division 7
Cr K Reimers	Councillor Division 8
Cr K Williams	Councillor Division 9
Cr H Murray	Councillor Division 10

#### Committee Manager

Ms E Bray	Acting General Manager Redland Water & Waste
-----------	--

#### Officers

Mr G Stevenson PSM	Chief Executive Officer
Mr B Taylor	Manager Treatment Operations
Mr K Maguire	Acting Manager Customer Service & Business Performance
Mr J Frew	Acting Manager Operations & Maintenance
Ms S Carseldine	Senior Adviser Financial Management

#### Minutes

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

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT MEETING

Nil

### DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Nil

**MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Nil

[The following is a record of councillor attendance at this committee meeting:

Cr Townsend left the meeting at 2.25 pm (during item 1.1) and returned at 2.31 pm (during item 1.1).

Cr Dowling left the meeting at 2.58pm (during item 1.1).

Cr Williams left the meeting at 3.20 pm (during general business)]

## 11.1 REDLAND WATER AND WASTE

### 11.1.1 REDLAND WATER & WASTE COUNCIL BUSINESS UNIT REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2008

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

**Attachments:** [Business Unit Report - September 2008](#)  
[Appendix A – Wastewater Treatment Plants](#)  
[Supplementary Performance Information](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Soutar  
General Manager, Redland Water & Waste

**Author Name:** Gary Soutar  
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 September 2008 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 Council’s Governance strategic priority to provide a clear organisational direction supported by effective leadership and a framework of policies, plans and strategies that are responsive to the community’s needs and which promote accountable and ethical standards of practice.

### **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; and
- Senior Advisor, Financial Management, RWW.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to accept the Redland Water & Waste Council business unit report for September 2008, 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 Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That Council resolve to accept the Redland Water & Waste Council Business Unit Report for September 2008, as presented in the attachment.**

**CARRIED**

**11.1.2 DELEGATIONS UNDER WATER SUPPLY ACT 2008**

**Dataworks Filename:** WS Legislation – Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008

**Attachment:** [Water Supply \(Safety & Reliability\) Act 2008 - Delegations to CEO](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Eleanor Bray  
Manager Customer Service & Business Performance

**Author Name:** Michelle Vanyai  
Senior Project Officer

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Redland City Council (RCC) is a registered water service provider (WSP) under the *Water Act 2000*. In order for RCC to carry out its obligations as a WSP, it is recommended that Council delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for specific sections of the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008*.

Delegating authority to the CEO of certain sections allows the WSP to carry out operational and enforcement activities under the specified act.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council delegate authority to the CEO of certain sections under the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008*.

**BACKGROUND**

RCC operates as a WSP under the *Water Act 2000* and established Redland Water & Waste (RWW) as a commercial business unit to undertake the operations of the WSP. Recent legislative changes resulted in the removal of some delegated powers for authorised persons from the *Water Act 2000* and inclusion of them in the *Water Supply (Safety & Reliability) Act 2008*. The powers relate to water restrictions and Council's ability to protect the city's infrastructure system and supply.

Authorised persons for these activities were previously appointed by the CEO under the *Water Act 2000* but now need appointment under the *Water Supply (Safety & Reliability) Act 2008*.

In addition, to clarify the CEO's position to act as a person with authority to start proceedings for an enforcement order under sections 475 and 476 of the *Act*, it is considered prudent to formally endorse the CEO as a person authorised to act on behalf of an entity – in this case – Redland City Council as service provider.



## **ISSUES**

The CEO has the power under the *Local Government Act 1993*, section 1132 to delegate authority to employees unless Council resolves otherwise. It is intended that the powers recommended for delegation to the CEO be on-delegated to suitably qualified, experienced and trained officers of Council with the exception of sections 475 and 476.

The attachment outlines the recommended sections for delegation under the *Water Supply (Safety & Reliability) Act 2008*.

## **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 relating to the delegation of authority recommended in this report.

## **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has occurred with:

- Legal Services; and
- Corporate Meetings and Registers Team

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to delegate authority, under section 472 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, to the Chief Executive Officer to exercise the powers and responsibilities relating to Chapter 2, Part 3, sections 33, 34, 36, 37, and 43, and Chapter 5, Part 9, sections 475 and 476 of the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008*.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to not delegate any or all of the recommended powers.

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

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That Council resolve to delegate authority, under section 472 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, to the Chief Executive Officer to exercise the powers and responsibilities relating to Chapter 2, Part 3, sections 33, 34, 36, 37, and 43, and Chapter 5, Part 9, sections 475 and 476 of the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008*.**

**CARRIED**

## 11.2 GENERAL BUSINESS

The following items of general business were raised:

1. Cr Reimers

Cr Reimers raised the issue of the dust levels from the Birkdale landfill site and enquired about the monitoring process. Acting General Manager Redland Water and Waste advised that dust levels were subject to EPA licence requirements and that Council also followed up on all customer complaints.

2. Cr Henry

Cr Henry raised the issue of the transitioning period with respect to the water restrictions regime and the different levels which were intended to be introduced. Cr Hobson advised that medium level restrictions would be introduced by the end of March 2009 with this being reviewed again at the end of June 2009.

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

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That the general business items be noted.**

**CARRIED**

---

## 12 PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 22/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the following Planning & Policy Committee Report of 22 October 2008 be received.

CARRIED

### DECLARATION OF OPENING

Cr Ogilvie declared the meeting open at 9.00 am.

### RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

#### Members Present

Cr C Ogilvie	Chair and Councillor Division 2
Cr M Hobson PSM	Mayor
Cr W Boglary	Councillor Division 1
Cr D Henry	Councillor Division 3
Cr P Dowling	Councillor Division 4
Cr B Townsend	Councillor Division 5
Cr T Bowler	Deputy Mayor and Councillor Division 6
Cr M Elliott	Councillor Division 7
Cr K Reimers	Councillor Division 8
Cr K Williams	Councillor Division 9
Cr H Murray	Councillor Division 10

#### Committee Manager

Mr G Underwood	General Manager Planning and Policy
----------------	-------------------------------------

#### Officers

Mr G Stevenson PSM	Chief Executive Officer
Mr L Smith	Acting General Manager Customer Services
Mr W Dawson	Manager Land Use Planning
Mr M Hunt	Principal Advisor City Wide Planning
Mr D Elliott	Manager Infrastructure Planning
Mr L Purdie	Principal Engineer Roads & Drainage
Ms A Wright	Senior Advisor Open Space Planning

#### Minutes

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

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT MEETING

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the meeting be adjourned for a 15 minute public participation segment.

CARRIED

- Mr D Denovan of Roturn Industries addressed Committee in relation to Item 2.3 – *Proposed Trial Closure of South Street.*

Moved by: Cr Dowling

Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That the meeting resume.

CARRIED

#### **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Nil

#### **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Moved by: Cr Henry

Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That the order of business be altered to discuss item 2.3 *Proposed Trial Closure of South Street* as the first item of business.

CARRIED

[The following is a record of councillor attendance at this committee meeting:

Cr Elliott left the meeting at 10.14am (during discussion on Item 1.1) and returned at 12.30pm (during General Business).

Cr Townsend left the meeting at 11.01am (during discussion on Item 2.1) and returned at 11.06am (during discussion on item 2.2).

Cr Reimers left the meeting at 12.30pm (during General Business).

Cr Murray left the meeting at 12.35pm (during General Business).]

## 12.1 ITEM DELEGATED TO COMMITTEE FROM COUNCIL

### 12.1.1 ADOPTION OF DRAFT REDLAND BAY CENTRE AND FORESHORE MASTER PLAN

<b>Datworks Filename:</b>	<b>LUP Master Plan - Redland Bay Town Centre &amp; Foreshore</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#"><u>Attachment 1 - Redland Bay Centre &amp; Foreshore Master Plan</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Attachment 2 - Redland Bay Centre &amp; Foreshore Master Plan - Communications Plan</u></a>
<b>Responsible Officer Name:</b>	<b>Wayne Dawson</b> <b>Manager Land Use Planning</b>
<b>Author Name:</b>	<b>Wayne Dawson</b> <b>Manager Land Use Planning</b>

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This item was resolved at the Planning and Policy Committee meeting of 22 October 2008. The Committee's decision is now presented to Council for noting only, as part of this report on the Committee's deliberations.

Council at its General Meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2008 resolved as follows:

- 1. That a report to adopt the draft Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan (2008) for public consultation be referred to the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2008 meeting of the Planning and Policy Committee; and*
- 2. That the Planning and Policy Committee be delegated authority, under section 472 of the Local Government Act 1993, to determine the adoption of the draft Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan for public consultation.*

The Redland Bay Centre & Foreshore Master plan (hereafter called the Plan) will provide a set of key outcomes and strategies that strive to achieve a long term vision for planning of that area covered by the Plan. These implementation strategies will enable the achievement of the defined outcomes of the Plan.

The draft Plan has been discussed, with Councillors at a workshop held on the 27<sup>th</sup> June 2008. A number of amendments were requested and are made to a revised draft Plan presented for adoption.

A Communications Plan has been prepared and is presented for Councillors acknowledgement.

### PURPOSE

To seek a determination from Committee to proceed to public consultation on the draft Plan.

---

## BACKGROUND

The Plan's inception arose from the recognition of a number of pressing land use, social, environmental, open space, transport and foreshore management issues confronting the Redland Bay township. Additionally, it was an opportune time to put in place well defined strategies (short to long term) which would achieve the following overall outcomes:

- To strengthen the role and identity of the Redland Bay township and its relationship to Moreton Bay including its function as a destination for waterfront and marine-based recreational activities and its key role as the principal gateway to the Southern Moreton Bay Islands (SMBI).
- To rationalise the pattern of land use to achieve efficient, integrated and improved urban design and open space outcomes that will enhance the character and amenity of the Redland Bay township and its foreshore.
- To identify sustainable development opportunities and protect environmental values.
- To provide sustainable transport solutions to the SMBI and establish a walking (pedestrian), cycling and public transport friendly environment in the township and its foreshore.
- To identify and address the impacts of the proposed strategy outcomes on local transport infrastructure.
- To create, reinforce and enhance pedestrian, bicycle, recreation and environmental linkages within the Redland Bay township and its environs.

Following a contextual analysis of the study area (including an opportunities and constraints assessment) the Plan sets out a series of Outcomes and Strategies sought to be achieved. These Outcomes and Strategies are grouped under the following themes:

- A. Urban Planning and Design
- B. Open Space
- C. Commerce and Industry
- D. Settlement Patterns, Population Projections and Employment Trends
- E. Transportation
- F. Community Facilities and Development
- G. Environmental Protection

To assist in understanding measures to implement these strategies, the Core Area of the plan is divided into three (3) localities (based on the precincts defined in the contextual assessment). Each locality has a concept and Indicative Master Development Plans component based on the implementation actions outlined for that locality. Additionally in the case of Locality B (Marine Activities & Village Precinct) the concept and master development plan proposes a three (3) stage implementation framework. This framework represents the following time periods – short term (1-3 years), medium term (3-10 years) and longer term (10+ years).

The Plan, while providing a focus on the Core Area, does also identify a wider context to the planned integration and coordination of open space networks (and

---

associated infrastructure) and the provision of pedestrian and cycling infrastructure throughout the township.

## **ISSUES**

For the sake of consistency, the issues covered in this report are grouped correspondingly to the Outcomes and Strategy themes set out in the Plan (refer to Part 3 of the Plan). This is not intended to be an all inclusive overview.

### ***A. Urban Planning & Design***

- Enhancement of the public amenity of the foreshore area and other public spaces;
- Establish a growth strategy for the Redland Bay District Centre;
- Relationship between built form and streetscape(s);
- Appropriate form and scale of development in the Study Area;
- Maximise appreciation of principal views and vistas to Moreton Bay, Open Space Areas and the like;
- Accessibility to public amenities, open space, foreshore areas and facilities.

### ***B. Open Space System***

- Provision of Open Space areas with appropriate level of facilities and embellishments;
- High interconnection as a network throughout the urban community of Redland Bay;
- Basis for developer contribution to achieving the above points;
- Foreshore/Shoreline open space trial for the Study Area and linkages to the broader Shire network.

### ***C. Commercial and Industry***

- Recognition of the long-term importance of this principal water based passenger and vehicular terminal to the SMBI;
- Service and Marine industry activities in Weinam Creek;
- Supporting primacy of the Redland Bay District Centre while providing local service centre opportunities within walkable distances to residential localities;
- Opportunity to promote and to expand tourism based employment/businesses.

### ***D. Settlement Patterns***

- Population density increases in and around centre and transport nodes;
- Provision of diverse housing forms for increased consumer choice. [Both these points are reflected in the Redlands Planning Scheme zoning and this Plan acknowledges these outcomes];
- Planned relationship to public spaces eg foreshore, open space areas, streetscapes.

### ***E. Transport***

- Conflict between the foreshore area as a public open space, recreation asset versus the demand pressures for increased car parking;
- Planning for a continuation of current trends without change is unsustainable. A number of options were discussed in Councillor Workshops:



- i) Efficient public transport services, interconnections and mode frequency, etc
- ii) Multi deck parking station as part of terminal development.
- iii) Acquisition of land for at ground and potentially decked parking longer term;
- iv) Shuttle service to parking area located away from foreshore urban areas, example: in association with potential location to be pursued by Translink for future Park and Ride Facilities highly accessible to Cleveland – Redland Bay Road corridor.

Council after weighing up these and other options provided direction to target increase public transport opportunities such as:

- i) Continuing upgrade of bus services and bus service connections to principal centres/interchanges;
  - ii) Advocate for earlier implementation of integrated ticketing system by Translink [ties to (i) above];
  - iii) Containment of car parking provision on public land and user pays pricing for upgraded, secure parking;
  - iv) To influence behavioural change and the attractiveness in the use of other modes of travel in lieu of private motor vehicle;
  - v) Promote fast vehicular ferries including subsidy(s);
  - vi) Incorporate into RPS the potential opportunity to pursue commercial car parking as part of mixed use multi-story developments on private properties in Banana, Outridge Streets. [This policy position was drafted into the RPS].
- Provision of attractive future public transport facilities, maintaining the medium to long term opportunities in the coastal area between the Weinam Creek channel to the vehicular barge facilities. Identification of a marine facilities Investigation area in this locality.
  - Efficiency of the boat ramps and provision of associated trailer parking spaces.
  - Pedestrian and bicycle movement and circulation networks – safe and convenient both for recreation and as a means of transport to the urban facilities of Redland Bay township and beyond.
  - To encourage the Department of Transport to investigate the feasibility of providing Islands commuter parking in the future park and ride facility (located in the southern area of the City with high accessible to Cleveland - Redland Bay Road – the main southern arterial road) as identified in the Translink Network Plan for SEQ.

#### ***F. Community Facilities and Development***

- Enhancement of cultural characteristics and community identity of Redland Bay.
- Increase in attractive well designed community facilities to service the needs of a growing local community and broader district community (including SMBI for particular community services).
- Recognition of the forecasted changes in the demographic profiles of this community.
- Opportunity for development contributions to the provision of community facilities.

**G. Environmental Protection**

- Recognition, preservation and enhancement of environmental values associated with the foreshore watercourses, wetlands, conservation and open space areas.
- Rehabilitation programs in existing areas as above identified.
- Management of development impacts eg employing water sensitive urban design principles.

**Communications Plan**

A Plan has been prepared by Marketing and Communications in consultation with Land Use Planning and is included in this report as Attachment 2. The key messages as set in Section 5 include:

- The master plan will guide how publicly controlled and managed land is used long-term in the Redland Bay town centre and foreshore area.
- Now is the time to have input into the document that will guide the future character of the area, complementary to the Redlands Planning Scheme.
- Your opinion is important to Council and will be taken into consideration.
- Specific aspects of the plan will have additional consultation to refine detail once master plan adopted.

Additionally the messages are that the master plan aims to deliver a number of long-term outcomes for the Redland Bay area including:

- increased use of public transport, walking and cycling (alternative transport modes to private cars) to reduce reliance on cars in the area and minimise parking issues at the foreshore;
- better use of community open spaces, linking Redland Bay town centre and foreshore areas;
- planning that encourages further refinement of the character of Redland Bay town centre and foreshore, that make the most of the views and vistas of Moreton Bay;
- strengthening the role and function of the Redland Bay Centre in the city and its relationship with Moreton Bay, including its destination for water and marine-based recreational activities;
- balancing the competing land uses for primary foreshore areas, acknowledging the area is the principal gateway to the SMBI;
- Recognising potential future opportunities for marine facilities, subject to detailed investigations, impact analysis of environmental, economic, social and land use issues, and associated feasibility assessments.

The consultation period will run for 6 weeks from 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2008 with the close of submissions being 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2008.

The community will be afforded opportunity to access the documents through Council web-site, at customer service centres and libraries. Staffed displays will be conducted at various locations both in the southern mainland centres and on the islands (Russell/Macleay).

Feedback can be provided online through an electronic feedback form, in hard copy on the same form or by letter.

## **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 Plan provides the basis for further detailed planning (including a potential future review of infrastructure charges), works programming and budgeting.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

The Plan is generally consistent with the provision of the Redlands Planning Scheme (2006) and the draft Local Growth Management Strategy (2008). Further review will be conducted following finalisation of the Plan to determine the necessary amendments to the RPS.

## **CONSULTATION**

Infrastructure Planning, Environmental Management, Community and Social Planning and Economic Development have had input into the Plan's preparation. The draft Plan has been workshopped with Councillors on three (3) occasions. Queensland Transport and the Department of Natural Resources have also been consulted and comments have been included in the Plan.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to adopt the draft Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan (2008) – Attachment 1 for the purpose of public consultation.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

1. That Council resolve to adopt the draft Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan (2008) appended as attached for public consultation purposes except where amended by resolution of Council; or
2. That Council resolve not to adopt the draft Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/  
COMMITTEE RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

**That Council resolve to adopt the draft Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan (2008) – Attachment 1 for the purpose of public consultation.**

**CARRIED (Unanimously)**

Cr Elliott was not present when this motion was put.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That the Committee Resolution be noted.**

**CARRIED**

## **12.2 PLANNING & POLICY**

### **12.2.1 COUNCILLOR NOMINATION TO SOUTHERN REGIONAL ROADS GROUP (RRG)**

**Datworks Filename:** GOV SouthROC - Regional Roads Group  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Greg Underwood  
General Manager Planning and Policy  
**Author Name:** Greg Underwood  
General Manager Planning and Policy

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

With the election of new Councils across Queensland, there is a requirement for all Councils to nominate their representative on the Regional Road Groups (RRG) under the LGAQ/DMR Road Alliance.

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is for Council to nominate a suitable representative to the Southern RRG.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Regional Road Groups (RRG's) are the mechanism used to allocate State Transport Infrastructure Development Subsidies (TIDS) to the individual Local Governments throughout Queensland. Funding allocations are directed to jointly prioritise projects on an agreed priority network of Local Roads of Regional Significance (LRRS). This funding amounts to approximately \$400,000 per annum on average to Redland City Council. Other RRG initiatives include joint transportation modelling and strategic road network planning.

#### **ISSUES**

With the election of new Councils across Queensland, new nominees for the Regional Road Groups need to be decided by Councils.

Previous Mayor, Don Seccombe was the Redland Shire Council's representative on the Regional Roads Group (RRG) and he was also the Chair of this Committee.

Political representatives are drawn from the three (3) local government areas south of Brisbane, i.e., Redland City Council, Logan City Council and Gold Coast City Council.

As well as the political RRG, there is also a Technical RRG made up of officer representatives, again from the local government areas of Gold Coast, Redlands and Logan.

General Manager Planning and Policy is currently the Redland's Technical representative and has also been the Chair of the Technical RRG for the past two (2) years, and up until December 2009.

Both Committees meet on a quarterly basis, a fortnight apart, with the venue currently being the Redland City Council Chambers for both meetings.

### **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 additional costs resulting from this representative being nominated to the Regional Road Groups (RRG)

### **CONSULTATION**

The Mayor and Deputy Mayor were advised on the need for this report.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council nominate a Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council does not nominate a Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.

### **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve to nominate a Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.

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

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That Council resolve to nominate Cr Elliott as the Councillor Representative to the Southern Regional Roads Group.**

### **CARRIED**

## 12.2.2 DRAFT RURAL FUTURES STRATEGY SUBMISSION

**Datworks Filename:** Draft Rural Futures Strategy

**Attachments:** [Attachment A - Council's Submission to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning on the Draft Strategy](#)  
[Attachment B - Council's Submission On Action Plan Initiatives](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Wayne Dawson  
Manager, Land Use Planning

**Author Name:** Martin Hunt  
Principal Advisor – City Wide Planning

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State Department of Infrastructure and Planning recently released the *Draft Rural Futures Strategy for South East Queensland* and has called for public submissions by the 3<sup>rd</sup> November, 2008.

This report sets out the major elements of the draft strategy, background discussion and recommended course of action. In brief, the State Government has released a draft Rural Futures Strategy for public comment. The basis of this strategy is *to guide sustainable economic development and community development in rural South East Queensland* and to tie in with the rural objectives under the South East Queensland Regional Plan.

The draft Strategy is in itself a broad policy document setting out a range of issues relevant to rural areas including identifying current and likely future problems and suggested actions for addressing those issues. The stated intent of the Strategy is to create stronger rural economies, manage resources, develop rural communities and infrastructure and provide leadership to ensure that these measures are implemented.

The draft Strategy states that it will eventually be accompanied by an 'action plan' which will identify short and medium term priorities for implementation of the strategy over the next three to five years. At this stage the action plan, which is the central component for putting the Rural Strategy into place, has not been commenced.

The Council of Mayors (CoM) has established a Rural Futures Reference Group to review the document. Officers of Council have attended the inaugural meeting of the group to discuss a co-ordinated response to the State on the draft Strategy. The view of the reference group has been that, while the draft Strategy contains important policy direction, the main component (being the action plan) is still missing and so, before proper comment can be made, it needs to be viewed as a complete package of policy and implementation (action) measures. Some concern has also been raised that the timeframe of the action plan will not address the most urgent issues facing rural areas.

---

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to:

- Inform Council as to the nature and content of the Draft Rural Futures Strategy;
- Provide Council with some background to current discussion on the strategy;
- Recommend a submission response for Council on the Draft Rural Futures Strategy; and,
- Recommend two initiatives to be incorporated in the proposed Rural Futures Strategy action plan.

## BACKGROUND

On the 8th September 2008, the State Department of Infrastructure and Planning (DIP) released the Draft Rural Futures Strategy (Draft Strategy) for public comment.

The draft Strategy is a non-statutory policy document supporting the South East Queensland Regional Plan and is intended to guide sustainable economic and community development in rural South-east Queensland. It broadly outlines actions to address economic development, healthy and productive rural landscapes, water resources, community development and institutional arrangements. Public submissions on the draft strategy will close on the 3rd November 2008.

A final Rural Futures Strategy is proposed to be released in late 2008, before finalisation of the SEQ Regional Plan review in mid-2009.

The Draft Strategy was prepared in response to one of the SEQ Regional Plan's desired regional outcomes being:

*Rural communities that are strong and viable with sustainable economies that contribute to the health, character and liveability of the region.*

This outcome called for the development of a Rural Futures Strategy to maintain and enhance economic prosperity, environmental wellbeing and quality of life in the rural areas of south East Queensland.

To achieve this outcome, the Draft Strategy identifies five core areas with suggested actions for each:

1. **Economic Development:** key elements are strengthening rural economies; tourism and outdoor recreation; infrastructure; and, climate and energy challenges.
2. **Healthy and Productive Rural Landscapes:** key elements are rural land management; rural planning; healthy waterways; and, environmental stewardship and ecosystem services.
3. **Water Resources:** key elements are coordination of water management; and, water use efficiency.



4. **Community Development:** key elements are provision of a skilled labour force; social infrastructure; community-based transport; and community wellbeing and safety.
5. **Leadership and Collaboration:** key elements include community representation; management arrangements; political representation; and, implementation and monitoring.

The suggested actions outlined for each key element are broad in nature and are indicative of the action plan that is to be included in the Final Strategy.

It is important to note that while the Draft Strategy was endorsed for public comment by the Rural Futures Committee, not all the comments and proposals contained in the Draft Strategy were endorsed by the Committee.

The main focus of the draft strategy is on listing the major issues for rural areas which need to be addressed and suggesting potential actions for solving them. For example, under the heading of Economic Development, suggested actions for strengthening rural communities include:

- *Identify opportunities to integrate market-based mechanisms into regional and local planning and policies to maintain and enhance regional ecosystem services.*
- *Identify opportunities for rural businesses to participate in carbon trading arrangements.*
- *Facilitate targeted research to support agriculture in areas undergoing land use change.*
- *Investigate opportunities to assist with the relocation of farms or family operations affected by incompatible development.*

Again these are listed as potential actions with no clear direction as to how they may be achieved. The strategy must therefore be considered as a “first step” document designed to establish the policy background to a later action plan which will give clearer guidance as to how these issues may be fully addressed.

While some reference is made in “Rural Planning” to removing potential for land use conflicts, protection of rural landscape values and sustaining benefits to the community derived from the natural environment; there is little direction as to how the intrinsic tension between expanding urban communities, rural production and protection of the environment can be resolved. Even the preparation of rural precinct plans may not protect areas against development pressure as the urban footprint is reviewed every 5 years through the SEQRP review process. Rural areas are still very much viewed in some quarters as holding areas for future urban development despite the Urban Footprint / Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area provisions of the Regional Plan. The draft strategy itself recognises that:

*The SEQ Regional Plan seeks to address some of the challenges primary producers face by limiting further urban development in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area, thereby protecting the future of agricultural lands and rural communities. On the urban fringe, however, where rural lands are close to urban development, expectations and speculation about future urban development are likely to continue.*

Some elements of the plan appear to be out of date already. Only two references are made regarding the Redlands. One regarding the “Redlands Farmers Market at Mt. Cotton” and the second referencing the Redlands rural production in 2001 (approx. \$22m in crops and \$38m in livestock) placing Redlands Shire (then) 7th in terms of value of agricultural production of the 17 SEQ local authorities. This can be updated using 2006 data.

### Discussion

The Western Sub-Regional Organisation of Councils (WESROC) called a meeting in Ipswich on the 18th September 2008 to discuss the draft rural futures strategy and to identify how best to respond to the DIP regarding the Draft Rural Futures Strategy.

The meeting was attended by planning representatives of seven (7) SEQ councils and was the first meeting undertaken by the Council of Mayors SEQ Rural Futures Reference Group. Discussion at the Reference Group meeting centred on the view that the document was a broad policy document composed of generic statements but was rather short on detailed actions to be implemented. It was noted that the document stated in the Executive Summary that:

*The strategy will be accompanied by an action plan that identifies short and medium-term priorities for the implementation of the strategy by project partners over the next three to five years.*

The draft strategy proposes that the action plan will identify:

- The actions to be undertaken;
- The agencies/organisations responsible for the actions;
- Funding;
- Timelines; and,
- Indicators for monitoring success.

However, no ‘draft action plan’ had been released with the draft strategy and some concern was expressed that the final strategy may come out with an action plan that had not been reviewed or accepted by the Councils likely to be affected. Furthermore, the strategy proposes implementation over the next 3 to 5 years which is a considerable delay and will do little to resolve current issues affecting rural communities or assist current rural planning projects.

The Reference Group meeting proposed that a submission on the Draft Strategy should identify specific actions and initiatives from represented councils and urge the state government to produce a funded action plan for review as a matter of priority.

Correspondence has been forwarded by the CoM executive director to the State conveying this position

## ISSUES

In light of the November 3rd timeframe for submissions, the Reference Group has proposed the following:

1. The Qld Government be informed as to CoMs reservations regarding the limited time available for consultation on the Draft Strategy;
2. Rather than prepare a detailed response to the contents of the Draft Strategy at this stage, the CoM response focus on specific actions and initiatives which should be incorporated in the "action plan" referred to in the Draft Strategy;
3. Each of the SEQ councils identify specific actions and initiatives, for inclusion in a consolidated CoM "action plan" proposal for submission to the Queensland Government by 3rd November 2008'
4. Each action/initiative be capable of being sufficiently defined (and costed) in time for inclusion in the 2009-10 State Budget; and
5. The Department of Infrastructure and Planning be requested to hold a workshop, prior to the 3rd November 2008, to enable SEQ Councils to present and discuss their proposed actions and initiatives.

The Reference Group requested that, subject to agreement to the above proposals, Council assist in the CoM Draft Strategy submission process by providing advice on the identification of specific actions and initiatives that should be incorporated in the future strategy's action plan.

Rural Precinct Planning is identified in the SEQ Regional Plan as an innovative planning approach to encourage sustainable rural areas, with pilot studies listed as a suggested action in the Draft Strategy. Rural Precinct Guidelines were released by the State Government in August 2007 and Redland City Council was nominated by the CoM to prepare a pilot project on rural tourism and lifestyle amenity horticulture.

In August 2007 the State Government released voluntary guidelines to help SEQ councils establish rural precincts aimed at protecting rural land while streamlining applications for business. To support the implementation of the guidelines OUM would fund 4 pilot projects with Noosa Shire (Ecotourism), Boonah Shire (Rural Industry), Maroochy Shire (Agriculture) and Redland Shire (Rural Tourism) being awarded \$25 000 (plus the promise of in-kind resources) in December 2007. OUM outlined the process for developing these pilots based on Implementation Guideline No. 6 – Regional Precinct Guidelines:

As a result of workshopping this matter with Councillors and ELG, it was decided to broaden the initiative to be a Rural Future Study for the whole Rural Landscape and Rural Production area of the City. In developing a locally based strategy, actions

which may include preparation of Rural Precinct Plan(s) and Redland Planning Scheme (RPS) refinements or amendments and the pursuit of other economic, social and environmental initiatives, would be identified.

The CoM submission process is an opportunity for Council to be involved in the Rural Futures Strategy and to possibly secure funding for studies into rural development programs to help build sustainable rural communities while maintaining an appropriate environmental balance. This outcome would assist in the development of the City's Rural Futures Study. It has therefore been recommended that council support the third point set out above and advise the SEQ Rural Futures Reference Group of two RSC rural initiatives (Rural Tourism and Speciality Horticulture) to be included in any future action plan. Details of these two initiatives are contained in Attachment B to this report.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to Enhance employment participation and the community's standard of living through encouraging economic development opportunities in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications for Council.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not directly result in amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

### **CONSULTATION**

External consultation with officers of the Western Sub-Regional Organisation of Councils (WESROC) and Council of Mayors Rural Futures Reference Group.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED OPTION**

1. To confirm support for actions (1-5) proposed by the Council of Mayors Rural Futures Reference Group as set out in this report; and
2. To confirm the submission to the Council of Mayors SEQ Rural Futures Reference Group of two rural futures actions as attached. (Attachment B).

**ALTERNATIVE OPTION**

Council advise the Council of Mayors Rural Futures Reference Group that it does not support proposed actions (1-5).

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To forward the submission as attached (Attachment A) on the draft SEQ Rural Futures Strategy to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning;
2. To confirm its support for actions (1-5) proposed by the Council of Mayors Rural Futures Reference Group as set out in this report; and
3. To confirm the submission to the Council of Mayors SEQ Rural Futures Reference Group of two rural futures actions as attached (Attachment B) for inclusion in a co-ordinated submission to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To forward the submission as attached (Attachment A) on the draft SEQ Rural Futures Strategy to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning with the following amendment;
  - a. That a new sentence be added to the submission which reads as follows:

*That the DIP be advised that the Rural Futures Strategy should not limit the ability of individual local governments to determine planning in their rural areas.*
2. To confirm its support for actions (1-5) proposed by the Council of Mayors Rural Futures Reference Group as set out in this report; and
3. To confirm the submission to the Council of Mayors SEQ Rural Futures Reference Group of two rural futures actions as attached (Attachment B) for inclusion in a co-ordinated submission to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning with the following amendments:
  - a. That a new sentence be added to the submission which reads as follows:

*That the DIP be advised that the Rural Futures Strategy should not limit the ability of individual local governments to determine planning in their rural areas.*
  - b. That a new dot point be added to "Issues to be considered for the background study" which reads as follows:
    - *Opportunities for use as carbon sink.*

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Bowler  
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That the Committee Recommendation be adopted with the following additions to Recommendation 3 to read as follows:

- 3c. That Council advises that it will not support any action which may be proposed by the Rural Futures Strategy or subsequent Action Plan for rural areas which would detrimentally impact upon the strategy outcomes of either the *Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2006* and *Management Program 2006-2016 (Koala Policy)* or the Premier's Koala Taskforce Report; and
- 3d. That Council will also oppose any measures for "rural development" which are likely to negatively impact upon habitat protection, environmental enhancement or wildlife and vegetation conservation planning in the SEQ region.

With the Council resolution to now read as follows:

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To forward the submission as attached (Attachment A) on the draft SEQ Rural Futures Strategy to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning with the following amendment;
  - a. That a new sentence be added to the submission which reads as follows:

*That the DIP be advised that the Rural Futures Strategy should not limit the ability of individual local governments to determine planning in their rural areas.*
2. To confirm its support for actions (1-5) proposed by the Council of Mayors Rural Futures Reference Group as set out in this report; and
3. To confirm the submission to the Council of Mayors SEQ Rural Futures Reference Group of two rural futures actions as attached (Attachment B) for inclusion in a co-ordinated submission to the Department of Infrastructure and Planning with the following amendments:
  - a. That a new sentence be added to the submission which reads as follows:

*That the DIP be advised that the Rural Futures Strategy should not limit the ability of individual local governments to determine planning in their rural areas.*
  - b. That a new dot point be added to "Issues to be considered for the background study" which reads as follows:
    - *Opportunities for use as carbon sink.*

- c. That Council advises that it will not support any action which may be proposed by the Rural Futures Strategy or subsequent Action Plan for rural areas which would detrimentally impact upon the strategy outcomes of either the Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2006 and Management Program 2006-2016 (Koala Policy) or the Premier's Koala Taskforce Report; and
- d. That Council will also oppose any measures for "rural development" which are likely to negatively impact upon habitat protection, environmental enhancement or wildlife and vegetation conservation planning in the SEQ region.

**CARRIED**

### 12.2.3 PROPOSED TRIAL CLOSURE OF SOUTH STREET

**Dataworks Filename:** RTT: Road Closure - Temporary

**Attachments:** [Figure 1 - Proposed Trial Closure Location in South Street](#)  
[Figure 2 – Preliminary Layout – Permanent Closure of South Street](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Len Purdie  
A/Manager Infrastructure Planning

**Author Name:** Abdish Athwal  
Senior Engineer Traffic & Transportation

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council at its General meeting of 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008 resolved that officers investigate the implementation of a 6 month road closure of South Street, Cleveland between Swallow Street and Industry Court.

An investigation was carried out and a plan for the closure was developed with an estimated cost.

Impacts to road uses as a result of the closure were also identified.

The road closure is referred to Council for their consideration.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to advise Council on how a trial closure of South Street between Swallow Street and Industry Court could be achieved.

#### BACKGROUND

There have been ongoing issues from residents at the Southern end of South Street about industry activities and noise.

Council at its General meeting of 1 October 2008 resolved “*That officers investigate how to implement a six month trial involving the closure of South Street between Swallow Street and Industry Court, during which time noise levels and other impacts can be monitored.*”

An investigation was carried out and it was determined that a temporary road closure of South Street could be implemented between Swallow Street and Industry Court.

Solid barriers installed across South Street between Industry Court and the entrance to the pound will close the road. Vehicles can turn around at the cul-de-sac in Industry Court and at the gravel area next to the pound entrance. Pedestrian access can be provided for by gaps in the barriers. The proposed location of the trial closure is presented in Figure 1.

---



The Local Government Act 1993, Section 915, Limited Closure of Roads by Local Government allows a Local Government by public notice to close a road or part of a road, permanently or temporarily to traffic provided that there is an alternative route available.

## **ISSUES**

The trial road closure in South Street will affect its operation:

- There will be no through road connection in the industry area with access only from either South Street or Enterprise Street. This could impact on the way that a business operates, effect emergency response and is a reversal of the best practice arrangement which is presently in place.
- A number of on street parking space will be removed to accommodate the road closure in an area where on-street parking is currently at a premium.
- Based on the findings of the October report to Council, a trial or permanent closure will not improve the noise issues for the adjoining residential area.

Public consultation for the temporary closure with industries that it impacts on has not been undertaken. Prior to proceeding with a trial closure consultation should be undertaken with all industries in the South/Enterprise Streets precinct. If Council's consultation policy on traffic measures is used as the basis then 75% of affected businesses would need to be in support of the closure measures.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation in this report 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**

It is estimated that the cost to install the barriers, signage, and gravel to the turn around area on the pound access and maintain the temporary closure for six (6) months would be in the order of \$100,000.

A permanent closure of South Street was also investigated and a preliminary layout is presented in Figure 2. The proposal allows for two (2) cul-de-sacs that will cater for heavy vehicles. Widening the existing road for the cul-de-sac could impact on vegetation within the road reserve. The estimated cost to provide a permanent closure in South Street would be in excess of \$800,000.

## **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 undertaken with the General Manager Planning and Policy Department and Land Use Planning Group.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

For Council's consideration and direction.

### **ALTERNATIVE 1:**

That Council resolve to take no further action in relation to a closure of South Street.

### **ALTERNATIVE 2:**

That Council resolve to undertake consultation in accordance with Council's Traffic Management Consultation Policy.

## **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

For Council's consideration and direction.

## **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That this item be deferred to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting.

## **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

**That consideration of the item be deferred and that a new report be presented to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting which includes details of the following:**

- 1. Analysis of the available options for access and egress in and around South Street environs;**
- 2. Proposal for community consultation to ascertain potential impacts and how these could be mitigated, monitored and reported; and**
- 3. Concepts plans and financial implications of options.**

Following discussion on the matter, Cr Henry moved that the motion be put.

The procedural motion to put the motion was put to the vote and CARRIED.

A division was called for.

Crs Townsend, Reimers, Murray, Elliott, Bowler, Henry, Ogilvie, Boglary and Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Crs Williams and Dowling voted in the negative.

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

The Mayor then put the original motion.

On being put to the vote, the motion was **CARRIED**.

A division was called for.

Crs Townsend, Reimers, Murray, Elliott, Bowler, Henry, Ogilvie, Boglary and Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Crs Williams and Dowling voted in the negative.

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

## **12.3 GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **12.3.1 POTENTIAL FORMATION OF A BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**

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

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That a report be prepared and presented to Council outlining the potential formation of a BID (Business Improvement District) in the precinct now formally recognised as CBD (Capalaba Business District).**

**CARRIED**

### **12.3.2 SUBSIDISING PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

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

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

**That a report be prepared to consider the costs/benefits of Council subsidising more regular and comprehensive public transport across the city.**

**CARRIED**

### **12.3.3 DEFERRED REPORT ON PROPOSED TRIAL CLOSURE OF SOUTH STREET**

#### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

Assurance that the deferred report on South Street will cover critical components of:

1. Community consultation to ascertain potential impacts and how these could be mitigated;
2. Communications Plan;
3. Monitoring report (changes to noise);
4. Analysis & reporting on feedback and data collected; and
5. More details on financial implications;

with input from Communications, Community & Social Planning and Land Use Planning.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Williams

**That the Committee Recommendation not be adopted and that no further action be taken.**

**CARRIED**

**12.3.4 AMENDMENT TO GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT & PREVENTION POLICY**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

**That the terms of the policy (POL-3022) be investigated with a view to amending the policy to create 'exclusion zones' at skateparks for non-offensive graffiti as long as rider safety is not compromised.**

**CARRIED**

---

### 13 FINANCE AND CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 22/10/08 - RECEIPT AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That the following Finance and Corporate Management Committee Report of 22 October 2008 be received.

CARRIED

#### DECLARATION OF OPENING

Cr Townsend declared the meeting open at 2.00 pm.

#### RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

##### Members Present

Cr B Townsend	Chair and Councillor Division 5
Cr M Hobson PSM	Mayor Entered at 2.05 pm
Cr W Boglary	Councillor Division 1
Cr C Ogilvie	Councillor Division 2
Cr D Henry	Councillor Division 3
Cr P Dowling	Councillor Division 4
Cr T Bowler	Deputy Mayor and Councillor Division 6 Entered at 2.01 pm
Cr M Elliott	Councillor Division 7
Cr K Reimers	Councillor Division 8
Cr K Williams	Councillor Division 9
Cr H Murray	Councillor Division 10

##### Committee Manager

Mr R Turner	General Manager Corporate Services
-------------	------------------------------------

##### Officers

Mr G Stevenson PSM	Chief Executive Officer
Mr G Underwood	General Manager Planning and Policy
Mr L Smith	Acting General Manager Customer Services
Mrs K Phillips	Manager Financial Services
Ms N Barton	Service Manager Revenue and Recovery
Mr B Lewis	Manager Corporate Acquisitions, Fleet and Facilities
Mr A Blacklock	Supply Chain Manager
Mr J Horsey	Fleet Co-ordinator
Mr L Wallace	Manager Corporate Planning, Performance and Risk
Mr J Casabella	Team Leader – Health and Environment
Mr R Cook	Leisure and Recreation Services Manager

##### Minutes

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

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT MEETING**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the meeting be adjourned for a 15 minute public participation segment.

CARRIED

1. Mr Ted Davies, Resident of Lifestyle Estates, Victoria Point, addressed Committee in relation to *Retirement Village Pensioner Subsidy*;
2. Mr David Sim, representing retirement village operators, addressed Committee in relation to Retirement Village Pensioner Subsidy.

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That the meeting resume.

CARRIED

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Nil

**MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That the confidential item 4.2 (as listed on the agenda) – *Retirement Village Pensioner Subsidy* be brought forward and discussed as the first item of business.

CARRIED

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Moved by: Cr Henry  
Seconded by: Cr Hobson

That the confidential item 4.2 (as listed on the agenda) – *Retirement Village Pensioner Subsidy* be discussed in open forum.

CARRIED

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Nil

[The following is a record of councillor attendance at this committee meeting:  
Cr Williams left the meeting at 3.34 pm (during item 1.3).]

## 13.1 CORPORATE SERVICES

### 13.1.1 RETIREMENT VILLAGE PENSIONER SUBSIDY

**Dataworks Filename:** R&V Policy  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Kerry Phillips  
Manager Financial Services  
**Author Name:** Noela Barton  
Service Manager Revenue & Recovery

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the investigation into the financial and procedural implications of extending Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy to pensioner occupants residing in retirement villages.

Eligibility to Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy extends to all households where the property owner (solely or jointly) is the holder of a Department of Veteran's Affairs card or a Queensland pension card and is responsible for payment of rates and charges applied to the property. At present the rebate is \$300 per annum for pensioners on the maximum rate of pension and \$150 per annum for pensioners on a part rate of pension.

The General Services charge applied to unit occupiers in retirement villages includes the portion of general rate that applies to the unit they occupy. The General Services charge is a formula established by the number of residents and accommodation units in the village, the unit type and floor area. To ensure equity for resident unit holders Rating Services would need to establish the gross square metres of the land area covered by the UCV, the gross floor area of each residential unit, apartment and communal building, and the total common land area to be in a position to apportion the general rate charge on the dwelling that the benefit is sought.

To financially administer an extension of the eligibility of this policy it is estimated that:

- Of the facilities that provided information to this report, officers estimate 1,008 Independent & Assisted Living Units/Apartments. While it is predicted that the majority of residents are self-funded retirees, if 40% were on an age pension with 100% responsibility for the General Service charge, the estimated cost of the subsidy at \$300 per annum would be \$120,960 per annum.
- At a minimum to develop a software solution will be in the vicinity of \$10,000.
- Rating Services will require an officer to process the pension applications, confirm pensioner status with Centrelink and calculate the rebate. Based on the former Position Description evaluation of a pension liaison officer role, it would be a level 3 officer with a salary range of \$48,294.39 - \$51,793.80.

The following table has been prepared to appreciate the distribution of rates and charges for 2008-2009 by one retirement village registered under the *Retirement*

---



*Villages Act 1999*. This village has 91 independent living units and 27 serviced apartments. The column on the far right of the table has been added as a comparison between the pensioner owner/occupier and the pensioner resident occupier.

Charge Type	Per Annum \$	Apportioned by number of Units/Apartments Per Annum \$	Apportioned by number of Units/Apartments Per Week \$	Pensioner Owner / Occupier Per Week \$
General Rate	14,918.92	126.43	2.43	16.45
Environment Levy	87.80	0.74	0.01	1.68
Landfill Remediation Levy	26.00	0.22	0.00	0.50
State Government Fire Levy	9,327.20	79.04	1.52	0.70
<b>Utility Charges</b>				
Boundary Meter 100mm	5,175.00	43.85	0.84	3.98
Refuse/Recycle 240lt	6,440.00	54.57	1.04	4.42
Refuse Addit. 240lt	1,152.00	9.76	0.18	
Recycle 240lt	640.00	5.42	0.10	
Sewerage	44,958.00	381.00	7.32	12.21
Water consumption (2,704 kl qly average)	13,844.48	117.33	2.26	2.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>82,724.92</b>	<b>818.38</b>	<b>15.74</b>	<b>42.89</b>
<b>Less Subsidies</b>				<b>-9.36</b>
<b>Total</b>				<b>33.53</b>

The comparison in this table clearly demonstrates that a resident in a retirement village receives a benefit of reduced rates and charges that comes from the distribution of costs across the village residents, a benefit that is far greater than the subsidies the pensioner home owner is entitled to.

If eligibility was extended to pensioner occupants in retirement villages, and using the above example, if the pensioner resident had 100% responsibility for the General Services charge and was on a maximum rate of pension under Corporate Policy 2557 - Council Pensioner Rebate Policy, they would receive \$300 per annum, but they will only contribute \$126.43 toward the General Rate. In effect, the \$300 would off-set the general rate component by 100% and the balance becomes an income supplement to the Aged Pension. Under section 1034 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, Council may only remit wholly or partially the payment of a rate, not more than the rate.

Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy is not the correct vehicle to alleviate the on-going costs incurred by residents in retirement villages. Residents already receive a substantial benefit of reduced rates and charges through the advantage of communal housing.

The officer's recommendation is that pensioner residents, who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village, other than on a freehold arrangement, remain ineligible to entitlements under Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy.

## PURPOSE

This report presents the findings of the investigation into the financial and procedural implications of extending Corporate Policy 2557 Council Pensioner Rebate Policy to pensioner occupants residing in retirement villages.

## BACKGROUND

- 30 July 2008 - Petition (Division 4) – Objection to Council's change in pension concession rates and removal of pensioner discount.
- 30 July 2008 – Council resolved that the General Manager Corporate Services provide a report outlining the implications of applying for pensioner rebates and payment options.
- 27 August 2008 – Council resolved to investigate and determine the financial and procedural implications of applying entitlements under the council pensioner rebate policy to pensioner occupants in retirement villages.

## ISSUES

Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy has been in effect for over 25 years and is applied directly against the General Rate. Council has always promoted the rebate as assistance to pensioners to remain in their own homes. Eligibility extends to all households where the owner (solely or jointly) is the holder of a Department of Veteran's Affairs card or a Queensland pension card and is wholly responsible for the rates and charges on the property. At present, the rebate is \$300 per annum for pensioners on the maximum rate of pension and \$150 per annum for pensioners on a part rate of pension.

Within Redland City there is a number of purpose built accommodation facilities that are marketed to the 55+ age bracket. The range of care provided varies from independent and assisted living units to hostel style accommodation through to high care nursing facilities. The majority are commercial enterprises of which some are registered under the *Retirement Villages Act 1999*. A small number are owned and operated by not-for-profit organisations registered as a charity such as the Uniting Church and the Netherlands Retirement Village Association of Queensland Inc.

A retirement village can offer residents facilities which include:

- A gated community;
- Gardens;
- On-site shopping;
- Transport;
- Laundry;

- Dining;
- Emergency call access; and
- Recreational / social facilities (such as gymnasium, pool, bus trips, concerts etc).

The villages are generally situated in a position to gain maximum access to public transport. Residents have the right to use and enjoy the amenities, communal facilities and common areas of the village. Some villages will have varying degrees of care on offer – independent living units, serviced apartments, personalised care, and nursing home.

The type of accommodation agreements vary dependent on the accommodation facility and care required; however as a broad summary they include:

- Weekly rental;
- Accommodation bonds;
- Freehold accommodation tenure;
- Leasehold accommodation tenure; and
- Licence accommodation tenure.

Retirement villages registered under the *Retirement Villages Act 1999* require a residence contract to be signed between the village operator and the resident which must comply with section 10 of the *Retirement Villages Act 1999*. There is no standard contract that applies to all retirement villages. The registered village operators in the Redland City area sell accommodation on the basis of:

- Freehold accommodation tenure;
- Leasehold accommodation tenure; and
- Licence accommodation tenure.

In addition to purchasing the right to reside in a retirement village (the Ingoing Contribution), residents are required to pay on-going fees to the village operator referred to as a General Services charge. Along with this, they may also purchase other Personal services that the village provides such as laundry, meals, cleaning, hairdressing, etc. While no direct comparison can be drawn between villages, as all schemes, contracts and service agreements vary, the type of expenses covered in the general services charge are items such as:

- Village insurance which may include insurances such as public liability, products liability, building, contents not owned by residents, worker's compensation, officer bearer's liability, machinery breakdown, personal accident;
- Payment to the Maintenance Reserve Fund (sect 97 *Retirement Villages Act 1999*);
- Council rates and charges;
- Property maintenance;
- Gardening;

- Access to community facilities;
- Protection Services;
- Emergency Nursing Services;
- Cleaning of communal areas;
- Facility Management;
- Recreation Services;
- Computer with Internet and email access;
- Transport;
- Contributions to a Maintenance Reserve fund; and
- GST payable for services by or to the village operator.

The General Services charge is **not** a straight distribution across the village per unit/bed. A formula is arrived at based on the number of residents and accommodation units in the village, the unit type and floor area. As an example, the Public Information Document (effective from 17/3/06) obtained from one local retirement village lists 29 types of self-contained units in the General Services charge list. The date on the charge list is for new residents 1/7/2006 and the cost per week varied for 1 person from \$95.67 to \$153.27 or for 2 people from \$131.00 to \$188.55.

At the time of printing of the Public Information Document, the local retirement village had 118 units comprised of 91 independent living units and 27 serviced apartments. For the period 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007 Council applied a general rate charge on the local retirement village's property of \$13,750.17, which applied on a straight calculation across the 118 units equates to \$2.24 per unit per week. In 2008-2009 this retirement village will pay \$14,918.92 in general rate or \$2.43 per unit per week.

The following table has been prepared to appreciate the distribution of rates and charges incurred for this retirement village in 2008-2009. A column has been added to the far right of the table as a comparison between the pensioner owner/occupier and the pensioner resident occupier.

Charge Type	Per Annum \$	Apportioned by # of Units / Apartments Per Annum \$	Apportioned by # of Units / Apartments Per Week \$	Pensioner Owner / Occupier Per Week \$
General Rate	14,918.92	126.43	2.43	16.45
Environment Levy	87.80	0.74	0.01	1.68
Landfill Remediation Levy	26.00	0.22	0.00	0.50
State Government Fire Levy	9,327.20	79.04	1.52	0.70
<b>Utility Charges</b>				
Boundary Meter 100mm	5,175.00	43.85	0.84	3.98
Refuse/Recycle 240lt	6,440.00	54.57	1.04	4.42
Refuse Addit. 240lt	1,152.00	9.76	0.18	
Recycle 240lt	640.00	5.42	0.10	

Sewerage	44,958.0 0	381.00	7.32	12.21
Water consumption (2,704 kl qtly average)	13,844.4 8	117.33	2.26	2.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>82,724.9 2</b>	<b>818.38</b>	<b>15.74</b>	<b>42.89</b>
<b>Less Subsidies</b>				<b>-9.36</b>
<b>Total</b>				<b>33.53</b>

If eligibility to Corporate Policy 2557 - Council Pensioner Rebate Policy was extended to aged pensioners in Retirement Villages, using the above example, if a pensioner resident in a retirement village had 100% responsibility for the General Services charge and was on a maximum rate of pension under Corporate Policy 2557, they would receive \$300 per annum, but they will only contribute \$126.43 toward the General Rate. The intention of the Council Pensioner Rebate is to lighten the general rate burden and is provided as a direct rebate on the general rate, however as this example demonstrates it would off-set the general rate component by 100% and the balance becomes an income supplement to the Aged Pension. Under section 1034 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, Council may only remit wholly or partially the payment of a rate, not more than the rate.

To gain an appreciation of the expenses incurred, another local retirement village operator, which operate a number of retirement villages in Australia, show in their Income Statement for the year ended 30 June 2007 that of an expenses cost of \$15.06 million, rates comprise \$0.4 million (2.8%) of this. The most significant costs were for Employee Benefits expense \$7.9 million (52.52%), Management Fees \$1.9 million (12.94%) and Other Expenses \$1.5 million (9.98%).

At the present time, 1,180 Island pensioner residents and 6,664 mainland pensioner residents are eligible for the Council Pensioner Rebate. To be eligible for the Council Pensioner Rebate they must be responsible for the payment of all rates and charges levied on their land.

The following table provides a guide to the property Unimproved Capital Valuations [UCV] for this group.

Valuation Range	Count of Properties
>100,000	826
100,001 - 200,000	5,021
200,001 - 300,000	1,414
300,001 - 400,000	338
400,001 - 500,000	113
>= 500,000	132
Total	7,844

The average UCV is \$179,875 and the median is \$165,000. The minimum a mainland pensioner resident will pay is \$601.29 per year (\$11.56 per week) and an

island resident \$761.29 (\$14.64 per week). The average general rate paid by a mainland pensioner is \$855.83 (\$16.45). Where the pensioner resident has 100% ownership and is on the maximum rate of pension, the percentage of benefit ranges from 6.52% to 49.89% of the general rate with the average property receiving 35.05%.

The average mainland pensioner property attracts the following rates, charges and subsidies:

<b>Charge Type</b>	<b>Per Annum \$</b>	<b>Per Week \$</b>
General Rate	855.83	16.45
Environment Levy	87.80	1.68
Landfill Remediation Levy	26.00	0.50
State Government Fire Levy	36.70	0.70
<b>Utility Charges</b>		
Water Access	207.00	3.98
Sewerage	635.00	12.21
Refuse/Recycle (240lt)	230.00	4.42
Water consumption (Average cons. 200klpa)	153.50	2.95
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2,231.83</b>	<b>42.89</b>
Council Pensioner Rebate 100% ownership/Maximum rate of pension	-300.00	-5.76
State Government Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme	-180.00	-3.46
State Government Pensioner Fire Subsidy Scheme	-7.34	-0.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,744.49</b>	<b>33.53</b>

This group will generally not have bulk buying power when it comes to their property's maintenance. They will pay the insurance on their home and contents. If they are unable to maintain their own garden they will pay the services of a gardener - the average cost to mow a city block is around \$40. If they are no longer able to clean their own home or cook their own meals, they will pay for these services albeit at a reduced rate if they are assessed as in need of assistance. They generally won't have the convenience of public transport at their door. If they want to use a gymnasium they incur the same cost as every other public member. If they need emergency medical assistance they will either pay for a service such as Care Alert or rely on the Queensland Ambulance service to despatch help. If they don't have a pool in their back yard they will use the public pool and pay on entry. However, it is unwise to draw any comparison for living expenses between an aged pensioner in their own home and an aged pensioner in a retirement village as they are significantly different lifestyles.

The argument that has been put forward by retirement village residents is that Council discriminates against them because they are not eligible for the Council Pensioner Rebate. However, as a direct comparison, a resident in a retirement village

**already** receives a substantial benefit of reduced rates and charges that comes from the distribution of costs across the village residents.

A local retirement village resident, the liaison officer with the Association of Residents of Queensland Retirement Villages, proposed in his address to Council on 20 August 2008, that the administration of the Council Pensioner Rebate to residents in a registered Retirement Village would not be burdensome to either the village or Council. In earlier research, officers looked at the administration models provided by Cairns, Brisbane and the Gold Coast. Officers felt none of the models were equitable as they are a straight calculation by the number of units, yet as demonstrated in this paper the portion of general rate contained in the General Service charge will differ, as the General Services charge is a formula established by the number of residents and accommodation units in the village, the unit type and floor area. Apart from the Cairns model no follow-up was undertaken to ensure the resident received the full benefit.

As identified in the report dated 20 August 2008, Council's rating software does not have the capacity to maintain a rebate of this nature and it is impractical to expect that in the automated environment in which Rating Services operate to use Microsoft Excel to administer the rebate. It would be advantageous to develop a database solution. It is estimated that to develop a software solution at a minimum will be in the vicinity of \$10,000. Rating Services would require an officer to process the pension applications, confirm pensioner status with Centrelink and calculate the rebate. Based on the former Position Description evaluation of a pension liaison officer role, it would be a level 3 officer with a salary range of \$48,294.39 - \$51,793.80.

To ensure equity for resident unit holders, the formula that Council would need to apply is to establish the gross square metres of the land area covered by the UCV, the gross floor area of each residential unit, apartment and communal building, and the total common land area to be in a position to apportion the general rate charge on the dwelling that the benefit is sought. Each village would need to supply to Council each quarter the following information:

- Name and property number of the retirement village;
- Whether the village is registered under the *Retirement Villages Act 1999*;
- The gross square metres of the land area covered by the UCV, the gross floor area of each residential unit, apartment and communal building, and the total common land area (only required once if fully constructed or quarterly if village is under continual construction);
- Name and contact details of the Village operator;
- The number and type of accommodation styles; and
- A completed pensioner application with the following details:
  - Name of pensioner applicant/s;

- Name of other people who may reside with the pensioner applicant in the unit/villa to determine ownership share;
- Name the Accommodation Agreement is held in;
- Type of Accommodation Agreement;
- Pension Card number/s;
- Type of pension received; and
- Date of entry to unit/apartment.

There is also the issue of equity, which is one of Council's rating principles. The proposal put forward to Council is that eligibility should only be extended to retirement villages registered under the *Retirement Villages Act 1999* and only to residents who reside under a lease arrangement. However, this would exclude licence accommodation arrangements and aged accommodation facilities that are not registered.

There is also the issue of private rentals where the tenant is an aged pensioner. In deriving the rent amount the landlord will include a component of rates and charges. The myth is that an aged pensioner in a rental situation is better off than a resident in a retirement village because they are eligible for rent assistance. Rent assistance is not paid directly to the landlord, rather it is provided as an income supplement. The maximum payment of rent assistance is \$107.20 per fortnight if the fortnightly rent is more than \$238.33. The median Redland City rental price for a 3 bedroom house in 2008 is \$350 per week or \$340 per week for a 2 bedroom unit. Therefore at this year's rental prices on a 2 bedroom unit a pensioner in receipt of rent assistance will pay \$286.40 per week. The aged pension for a single person is \$273.40 per week, a shortfall of \$13.00.

Mention has also been made to the issue that pensioners currently eligible for the Council Pensioner Rebate receive assistance from the State Government by way of the State Government Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme. The amount available under this scheme is up to \$180 per annum dependent on the percentage of property ownership and is applied directly against rates and utility charges. The State Government Fire Levy also attracts a pensioner rebate funded by the State Government of up to 20% of the levy which also is applied directly against the levy.

Since 2005, two attempts have been made at a State level to extend eligibility for the State Government Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme to pensioners residing in retirement villages. The first was a Bill presented on 23 March 2005 by the Hon K R Lingard to amend the *Local Government Act 2003* to extend the Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme to residents living in a retirement village under a lease arrangement. The Bill was defeated on the basis that:

- No legislative amendment to the *Local Government Act 1993* [LGA] was required as the Queensland Government Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme is a policy administered by the Department of Communities and is not a scheme administered under the LGA; and



- No financial analysis on the costs, impacts and benefits had been conducted to support the Bill.

In 2006, two petitions were presented to extend the eligibility to the Queensland Government Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme to residents living in retirement villages under a registered lease arrangement. The response was tabled in Parliament 21 November 2006. In part the response states:

*Owners of freehold property are legally liable to their local government for the payment of rates and charges, whereas residents of retirement villages under a leasehold arrangement are only required to contribute towards the overall cost of maintaining and operating the complex, which includes a rates component.*

*The provision of concessions to pensioners, seniors and veterans is a major commitment for the Queensland Government. In addition to the rate subsidy, the range of concessions includes ambulance, public transport (local rail, bus and ferry and long-distance rail travel within Queensland), car and boat registration, electricity and a variety of health services, such as spectacles, dental, medical aides and patient travel.*

Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy is not the correct vehicle to alleviate the on-going costs incurred by residents in retirement villages. Residents are clearly already receiving a substantial benefit of reduced rates and charges through the advantage of communal housing.

The correct vehicle to alleviate the on-going costs incurred by this segment is the federal government who are directly responsible for support affecting Australian society and living standards. While they do provide financial rent assistance to residents in retirement villages, it is only available if the Ingoing Contribution is less than or equal to \$117,000 (Centrelink Fact Sheet RT007.0807). In Redland City, it appears that a resident will pay in the vicinity of \$300,000 to \$450,000 as an Ingoing Contribution.

The officer's recommendation is that pensioner residents, who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village, other than on a freehold arrangement, remain ineligible to entitlements under Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy.

## **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**

To financially administer an extension of the eligibility of Corporate Policy – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy it is estimated at:

- Of the facilities that provided information to this report officers estimate 1,008 Independent & Assisted Living Units/Apartments. While it is predicted that the majority of residents are self-funded retirees, if 40% were on an age pension

with 100% responsibility for the General Service charge the estimated cost of the subsidy at \$300 per annum would be \$120,960 per annum.

- It is estimated that at a minimum to develop a software solution will be in the vicinity of \$10,000.
- Rating Services would require an officer to process the pension applications, confirm pensioner status with Centrelink and calculate the rebate. Based on the former Position Description evaluation of a pension liaison officer role, it would be a level 3 officer with a salary range of \$48,294.39 - \$51,793.80.

## **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**

- General Manager Corporate Services;
- Manager Financial Services;
- Community Development Officer – Seniors;
- Rating Services.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That pensioner residents who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village, other than on a freehold arrangement, remain ineligible to entitlements under Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

Council resolve to develop a policy for Retirement Village residents occupying a dwelling that is other than on a freehold accommodation arrangement to provide financial assistance by way of a subsidy apportioned against the general rate.

## **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve that pensioner residents, who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village, other than on a freehold arrangement, remain ineligible to entitlements under Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy.

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That a policy be developed to allow for pensioner residents who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village to be eligible for rating entitlements; and
2. That this be on a pro-rata basis and apply to the General Rates component only.

The motion lapsed for want of a seconder.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve that pensioner residents, who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village, other than on a freehold arrangement, remain ineligible to entitlements under Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy.

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry

Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That consideration of this item be deferred in order to consider the implications of the recent information received.

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

A division was called.

Crs Dowling, Henry, Ogilvie and Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Crs Bowler, Elliott, Murray, Reimers, Townsend, Boglary and Williams voted in the negative.

The motion was declared by the Mayor as LOST.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Williams

Seconded by: Cr Townsend

**That Council resolve that pensioner residents, who occupy a dwelling in a retirement village, other than on a freehold arrangement, remain ineligible to entitlements under Corporate Policy 2557 – Council Pensioner Rebate Policy.**

**CARRIED**

**13.1.2 SEPTEMBER 2008 - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS**

**Dataworks Filename:** FM Monthly Financial Reports to Committee  
**Attachment:** [September 2008 Monthly Financial Reports](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Kerry Phillips  
Manager Financial Services  
**Author Name:** Deborah Hall  
Finance Officer

---

**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 September 2008 financial statement of accounts to Council and provide detailed analytical commentary.

All of the seven Key Financial Performance Indicators exceeded targets set at the beginning of the financial year. These are:

- level of dependence on general rate revenue;
- ability to pay our bills – current ratio;
- ability to repay our debt – debt servicing ratio;
- cash balance;
- cash balances – cash capacity in months;
- longer term financial stability – debt to assets ratio; and
- operating performance.

Council's end of month operating financial result (Earnings Before Interest, Tax and Depreciation – EBITD) is ahead of budget by \$3.3 million, with operating expenditure favourable by \$2.7 million and operating revenue favourable by \$0.6 million.

The cash flow position for the year is ahead of forecast levels by \$4.2 million, although Council started the year with \$9.1 million more than was previously budgeted. The cash held is ahead of the target range at \$75.1 million.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose is to present the September 2008 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 Redland City 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 September 2008:

### **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)**

Classifies variances between revised budget and actual results as being either timing or permanent variances, as well as favourable or unfavourable. Timing variances are anticipated to disappear once 30 June 2009 figures are produced. Permanent variances imply the variance will remain into the next financial year.

### **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.

An **Operational Statement by Strategic Priority (E)**; a **Balance Sheet (F)**, an **Investment Summary (G)**, a **Statement of Cash Flows (H)**, **Financial Stability Ratios Report (I)**, **Community Benefit Fund Report (J)**, **Fuel Consumption Report (K)**, **Type III Business Activities Report (L)** and a **Quarterly Operational and Capital Projects Report (M)** have been included to provide the complete picture of Council's finances.

## RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation in this report primarily supports Council's strategic priority to support the organisation's capacity to deliver services to the community by building a skilled, motivated and continually learning workforce, ensuring assets and finances

are well managed, corporate knowledge is captured and used to best advantage, and that services are marketed and communicated effectively.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The overall financial position as at end September 2008 remains strong with EBITD of \$14.9 million (\$3.3 million ahead of budget). This result is due to total operating revenue of \$44.7 million (\$0.6 million ahead of budget) and total operating expenditure of \$29.8 million (favourable variance of \$2.7 million).

### **Operating Revenue**

Rates and utility charges are unfavourable by \$0.1 million, due in the main to water as the read period was short - this variance is expected to disappear by June 2009. Fees and charges are under budget by \$0.3 million due in part to the slowing of the market since the budget was adopted. The fees and charges unfavourable variances are all timing variances at this stage. Operating grants and subsidies is over budget by \$51,000, timing variances in the main, although of particular note is the Federal Assistance Grant of \$78,000 which is a permanent positive variance. Interest rates and surplus funds have been higher than anticipated, resulting in a \$0.4 million variance in external interest and other revenue is favourable by \$0.6 million due in the main to a state government subsidy for street lighting \$0.6 million.

### **Operating Expenditure**

Employee costs are under budget by \$0.2 million due to vacancies, goods and services is under budget by \$2.7 million due to several factors including seasonal variations in parks and conservation and underspends in the bulk water purchase. Transaction costs are less than budgeted by \$35,000 although this variance is expected to diminish by June 2009.

### **Capital Revenue**

Capital contributions and donations are over budget by \$0.1 million due in the main to better than expected developer contributions to Redland Water and Waste. The unfavourable timing variance of \$0.9 million in capitalised grants and subsidies will be addressed at the first quarterly budget review in October 2008.

### **Capital Expenditure**

Contributed assets are under budget by \$0.5 million, due to the time lag in capturing assets whilst the completion of the previous year-end is undertaken. Capitalised goods and services is under budget at the end of September by \$3.6 million, the majority of variances are expected to be timing at this stage, although \$0.5 million of Redland Water and Waste capital projects will be a permanent underspend and will be addressed at the quarter one budget review. Capitalised employee costs are over budget by \$41,000 due in the main to staff being used instead of contractors and this is presently under investigation.

The investment of surplus funds for the month returned a weighted average rate of return of 7.41%, which is under of the UBS Bank Bill Index of 7.90%. This unfavourable return was expected due to the uncertainty of world financial markets although the funds are capital guaranteed. These returns are reported on a monthly

weighted average return and Council benchmarks the funds against the UBS Australia Bank Bill Index. Interest return is reported on both an annual effective and nominal rate of return.

The cash balance exceeds the target range of \$32 million to \$42 million at the end of September 2008, at \$75.1 million which is equivalent to 6.25 months cash capacity.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

### **CONSULTATION**

Consultation has taken place amongst the Executive Leadership Group.

### **OPTIONS**

#### **PREFERRED**

That Council note the End of Month Financial Reports for September 2008 and explanations as presented in the attachments.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council requests additional information.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to note the End of Month Financial Reports for September 2008 and explanations as presented in the following attachments:**

- 1. Corporate Financial Report Card;**
- 2. Report Card Analysis;**
- 3. First Council Financial Report;**
- 4. Second Council Financial Report;**
- 5. Operational Statement by Strategic Priority;**
- 6. Balance Sheet;**
- 7. Investment Summary;**
- 8. Statement of Cash Flows;**
- 9. Financial Stability Ratios Report;**
- 10. Community Benefit Fund Report;**

11. Fuel Consumption Report;
12. Type III Business Activities Report and a
13. Quarterly Operational and Capital Projects Report.

**CARRIED**



**13.1.3 SENIOR MANAGERS' REMUNERATION GUIDELINE (GL-3019)**

**Datworks Filename:** HRM Senior Management

**Attachments:** [Senior Managers' Remuneration Guideline](#)  
[Attachment 1A Contract of Employment for Group Managers](#)  
[Attachment 1B Contract of Employment for General Managers](#)  
[Attachment 1C Contract of Employment for Chief Executive Officer](#)  
[Attachment 2 Redland City Council Senior Managers' Performance Pay Program](#)  
[Attachment 3 Salary Packaging – Items](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Peter Tragardh  
Manager - Human Resources

**Author Name:** Peter Tragardh  
Manager - Human Resources

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At the General Meeting of Council on 31 January 2007, Council adopted an amended Guideline, GL-3019 – Senior Managers' Remuneration, which included proforma contracts of employment for Group Managers / General Managers / Chief Executive Officer. As outlined in this Guideline, any amendments require approval from Council.

Approval is now sought for the following amendments:-

1. *Senior Managers' Remuneration Guideline – GL-3019* - The section relating to 'Grievances' is amended to reflect that the Grievance/Dispute Resolution Procedure in the current Redland Shire Queensland Local Government Officers' Award 1998 Certified Agreement 6 (2005) has replaced the obsolete 'Resolution of Workplace Grievances' guideline.
2. *Attachment 1C (COE – Chief Executive Officer) - 'CEO' amended to 'Mayor' in the paragraph relating to 'Dispute Resolution Procedures.*
3. *Attachment 2 (Senior Managers' Performance Pay Program)* - The addition of 'pro rata payment of performance' clauses in section 4 'Level and Timing of Performance Pay' as requested by the Executive Leadership Group.
4. Inclusion of a clause to reflect the Council resolution regarding payment of a motor vehicle allowance where the CEO, General Manager, or Group Manager elects to enter into a novated lease arrangement for the provision of a motor vehicle.

In addition, the Guideline document has been amended to reflect the change of status from 'Shire' to "City" and a correction made to the population figure estimate.

Attachment 3 (examples of salary sacrificing options) remain unchanged and as adopted in March 2005.

## **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to detail some minor amendments to the Senior Managers' Remuneration Guideline and attachments (GL - 3019) as detailed below and to request that Council adopt the revised Guideline and attachments, as amended and attached.

## **BACKGROUND**

At the General Meeting of Council on 31 January 2007, Council adopted an amended Guideline, GL-3019 – Senior Managers' Remuneration, which included proforma contracts of employment for Senior Managers / Group Managers / General Managers / Chief Executive Officer. As outlined in this Guideline, any amendments require approval from Council.

Approval is now sought for the following amendments:-

1. *Senior Managers' Remuneration Guideline – GL-3019* - The section relating to 'Grievances' is amended to reflect that the Grievance/Dispute Resolution Procedure in the current Redland Shire Queensland Local Government Officers' Award 1998 Certified Agreement 6 (2005) has replaced the obsolete 'Resolution of Workplace Grievances' guideline.
2. *Attachment 1C (COE – Chief Executive Officer)* - 'CEO' amended to 'Mayor' in the paragraph relating to 'Dispute Resolution Procedures.
3. *Attachment 2 (Senior Managers' Performance Pay Program)* - The addition of 'pro rata payment of performance' clauses in section 4 'Level and Timing of Performance Pay' as requested by the Executive Leadership Group.
4. Inclusion of a clause to reflect the Council resolution regarding payment of a motor vehicle allowance where the CEO, General Manager, or Group Manager elects to enter into a novated lease arrangement for the provision of a motor vehicle.

In addition, the Guideline document has been amended to reflect the change of status from 'Shire' to "City' and a correction made to the population figure estimate.

Attachment 3 (examples of salary sacrificing options) remain unchanged and as adopted in March 2005.

## **ISSUES**

No issues are identified with these amendments.

**RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation in this report primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide a clear organisational direction supported by effective leadership and a framework of policies, plans and strategies that are responsive to the community's needs and which promote accountable and ethical standards of practice.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**CONSULTATION**

Amendments have been made in consultation with the Executive Leadership Group.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve to adopt the Senior Managers' Remuneration Guideline (GL-3019) and attachments, as amended and attached.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Townsend

Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That consideration of this matter be deferred.**

**CARRIED**

### 13.1.4 REVIEW OF POLICY & GUIDELINE - FLEET VEHICLE SELECTION CRITERIA

**Dataworks Filename:** FM Passenger Fleet Policy  
**Attachment** [GL-2812 – Staff Passenger Vehicle Fleet](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Brian Lewis  
Manager Corporate Acquisitions, Fleet & Facilities  
**Author Name:** Jon Horsey  
Fleet Coordinator

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Fleet Vehicle Guideline Selection Criteria were previously approved by Council at its General Meeting on 02/05/07. The guideline requires that the criteria for selection of Council's staff passenger vehicles are to be reviewed prior to tendering and establishment of any contract for the purchase of motor vehicles on behalf of Council.

#### PURPOSE

To provide information in support of the recommended amendments to the evaluation weighting criteria contained in the attached Policy POL-2812 & Guideline **GL-2812** and to seek approval to adopt proposed changes.

#### BACKGROUND

##### Current Criteria

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Whole of Life Costs                             | 65% |
| 2. Greenhouse gas emissions                        | 30% |
| 3. Australian content                              | 5%  |
| 4. Mandatory safety criterion – ABS & dual airbags |     |

##### Recommended criteria

###### **Mandatory criteria**

- Safety Preference for ANCAP 4 (ANCAP 3 as a minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP

###### **Weighted selection criteria**

- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| 1. Whole of Life Costs  | 60% |
| 2. Environmental impact | 35% |
| 3. Local content        | 5%  |

## Clarifications of proposed criteria amendments

### **Safety**

Previously the only stipulation within the policy in respect to safety was a mandatory requirement for airbags and **Antilock Braking System**.

However, in light of our evolving and continuing commitment to the following:

- Duty of care;
- OH&S;
- Chain of responsibility;
- Work related road safety.

and the knowledge that 48% of all workplace related injuries are sustained during motor vehicle incidents / accident, it is recommended that we undertake to specify both minimum and desirable criteria in line with the standards set by ANCAP.

The Australasian New Car Assessment Program (ANCAP) gives consumers consistent information on the level of occupant protection provided by vehicles in serious front and side crashes. The program is supported by Australian and New Zealand automobile clubs, the States government road and transport authorities of NSW, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia, the New Zealand Government, the Victorian TAC and IAG Ltd.

The application of ANCAP standards will meet our responsibility to our workplace.

These ANCAP related standards are as follows:

- A minimum mandatory requirement for ABS & dual airbags (driver & passenger)
- A minimum, mandatory rating of, but not restricted to ANCAP 3 – with a desirable, but not restricted to ANCAP 4 rating.

It is widely considered that these standards are a minimum benchmark level with the recent addition and development of ANCAP 5, which given time and further industry safety developments will continue to evolve.

In retaining the mandatory requirement of ABS and Airbags we will for the short term ensure that a complete minimum standard is set, however, as ANCAP progresses features such as these are fast becoming a pre-requisite for rating qualification – even at the lower end of the scale.

It is further noted that the requirement to describe further safety features in any more depth is not required as the industry standard and generic safety standards are employed across the manufacturers and are specified fully within the ANCAP qualification system.

It should also be noted that although we endeavour to achieve these standards as a minimum, they are only guaranteed to exist within the passenger vehicle (ie car) market at present and have not fully extended into the light commercial goods vehicles (ie utes and tray backs etc). However, this continues to evolve and in the meantime the individual manufacturer's specifications and safety features should be considered on an individual basis, whilst at all times holding the safety of the driver and passengers at the fore.

### **Whole of Life Costing**

Unchanged from previously – Whole of Life Costing (WOL) is a technique to establish the total cost of ownership. It is a structured approach which addresses all the elements of this cost and can be used to produce a spend profile of the product over its anticipated lifespan.

The results of a WOL analysis can be used to assist management in the decision making process when there is a choice of product. The accuracy of WOL diminishes as it projects further into the future, so it is most useful as a comparative tool when long term assumptions apply to all the options and consequently have the same impact.

Council's procedure to calculate the WOL of any plant item is – total acquisition costs plus, lifecycle and maintenance costs ie, consumables, disposables and service etc. (A number of these components are forecast using historical and manufactures/industry data) Plus disposal costs where applicable, minus proceeds from sale.

### **Environmental Impact**

Previously the only measure considered was greenhouse gas emissions. However, in order to consider the bigger picture it is recommended that the total environmental impact of the vehicle is taken into consideration.

It is proposed to use the data from the Australian Government website [www.greenvehicleguide.gov.au](http://www.greenvehicleguide.gov.au). This website scores/compares individual vehicles under fuel type, fuel consumption, CO<sup>2</sup> grams per kilometre, greenhouse rating and air pollution rating.

### **Local Content**

This was previously defined as the level of Australian content in the manufacture of the vehicle; however following some lengthy research into the definitions previously employed we have found many of the points of definition to be dated if not defunct.

In view of the ever evolving globalisation of the world's car manufacturing market, it is widely found that many of our "Australian" manufacturers are sourcing more numerous services and components from overseas.

With a view that “in terms of pricing – the market is going backwards” – it can clearly be noted that the previously established manufacturers such as Holden, Ford and Toyota for example are now sourcing or manufacturing varying volumes of their components or products from overseas, in some cases –entire units.

On the other hand, and in light of interpretation, it has been suggested that one particular Brand was “more Australian than another” in view of the fact that the raw product – namely steel – was sourced in Western Australia before being exported overseas for part manufacture and subsequent vehicle production prior to being imported back for sale here.

Consequently, whilst considering the major components of our evaluation (as listed above) it is recommended that we should consider **Local Content** to both enable us to support businesses within the local community and further demonstrate our commitment to the afore mentioned weighting criteria.

ie: the vehicle - where possible - is purchased and subsequently and/or as a minimum, supported (after sales service & parts etc) by local dealerships (within the Redlands), thus supporting both local businesses and the local economy, reducing the logistical ramifications of the units ongoing support etc, therefore further reducing both WOL costs and greenhouse gas emissions created by delivery of parts and service.

With regards to the wider **Australian content** – as previously defined – we have found that, in the main, the major players within the industry (ie Ford, Holden, Toyota etc) all have a “manufacturing “ interest within the country and can all generically claim to have some type of inclusion under that banner in some form or another – ie. A number of particular models and or assembly plants etc, thus qualifying as a manufacturer, but not necessarily on each and every model of vehicle.

### **Components of each Selection Criteria**

#### **Whole of Life Costs**

- Acquisition cost;
- Stamp duty;
- Disposal cost;
- Scheduled and unscheduled maintenance;
- Fuels;
- Tyres and batteries including environmental levies;
- Registration;
- CTP Insurance/self insurance premiums;
- Warranties;
- FBT (when applicable);
- Carbon tax.

#### **Environmental impact**

- Fuel Types

- Combined fuel consumption ie. Urban etc.
- CO<sub>2</sub> grams per kilometre
- Greenhouse rating
- Air pollution rating

### **Local content**

- Dealerships within the geographic boundaries of the City
- Spare parts availability
- After sales support & responsiveness
- Delivery

### **ISSUES**

There are no issues identified with these amendments

### **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**

Financial implications will not be quantifiable until responses are received as a result of undertaking the tender process. However, it is probable that due to the increased requirements for Environmental and Safety Criteria to be fulfilled, increased costs may eventuate.

Should the current budget allocated for the 08/09 Fleet Replacement Program found to be inadequate post the tender process, a budget submission will be requested at the appropriate quarterly review.

The maximum value for each level of vehicle shall be in accordance with clauses 1.1 a) through h, as detailed in the Staff Passenger Fleet Guideline GL-2812.

### **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

None Identified.

### **CONSULTATION**

Fleet Coordinator has consulted with Industry experts such as, Australian Accident Research Centre, Australian Fleet Managers Association, Royal Automobile Club of Qld and the following:

- [fcai.com.au](http://fcai.com.au) – Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries;
- [ancap.com.au](http://ancap.com.au) - Australian new Car Assessment Program;
- [greenvehicleguide.gov.au](http://greenvehicleguide.gov.au) Rates new Australian vehicles based on greenhouse and air pollution emissions;



- Holden Safety Guide – (attached) – Demonstrates examples of typical safety features found in vehicles today

## OPTIONS

### PREFERRED

That the amended selection criterion & weightings listed below be approved and that the Guideline GL-2812 is also amended to reflect the changes.

#### Mandatory Criterion

- Safety Preference for ANCAP 4 (ANCAP 3 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP

#### Weighted Selection Criteria

- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| 1. Whole of Life Costs  | 60% |
| 2. Environmental Impact | 35% |
| 3. Local Content        | 5%  |

### ALTERNATIVE

That the current criteria remain unchanged or further criteria and weightings be approved.

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve that the amended selection criterion and weightings listed below be approved and that the Guideline GL-2812 is also amended to reflect the changes.

#### Mandatory Criterion

- Safety Preference for ANCAP 4 (ANCAP 3 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP

#### Weighted Selection Criteria

- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| 1. Whole of Life Costs  | 60% |
| 2. Environmental Impact | 35% |
| 3. Local Content        | 5%  |

## PROPOSED MOTION

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve that the amended selection criterion and weightings listed below be approved and that the Guideline GL-2812 is also amended to reflect the changes.

#### Mandatory Criterion

- Safety Preference for ANCAP 5 (ANCAP 4 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP

Weighted Selection Criteria

- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| 1. Whole of Life Costs  | 50% |
| 2. Environmental Impact | 45% |
| 3. Local Content        | 5%  |

Following further discussion, Cr Elliott withdrew his motion.

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That the Officer's Recommendation be adopted with an amendment to the Mandatory Criterion to read as follows:

- *Safety Preference for ANCAP 5 (ANCAP 4 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP*

On being put to the vote the motion was LOST.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve that the amended selection criterion and weightings listed below be approved and that the Guideline GL-2812 is also amended to reflect the changes.

Mandatory Criterion

- Safety Preference for ANCAP 5 (ANCAP 4 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP

Weighted Selection Criteria

- |                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| • Whole of Life Costs  | 55% |
| • Environmental Impact | 40% |
| • Local Content        | 5%  |

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

**That the Committee Recommendation be adopted with the following amendment:-**

Mandatory Criterion

- **Safety Preference for ANCAP 5 (ANCAP 3 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP**

With the Council Resolution to now read as follows:

**That Council resolve that the amended selection criterion and weightings listed below be approved and that the Guideline GL-2812 is also amended to reflect the changes.**

**Mandatory Criterion**

- **Safety** Preference for ANCAP 5 (ANCAP 3 as a Minimum)  
Australasian New Car Assessment Program ANCAP

**Weighted Selection Criteria**

- **Whole of Life Costs** 55%
- **Environmental Impact** 40%
- **Local Content** 5%

**CARRIED**

## 13.2 CUSTOMER SERVICES

### 13.2.1 AMENDMENT TO HEALTH & ENVIRONMENT FEES & CHARGES 2008-2009 (FOOD SAFETY)

**Datworks Filename:** PH Food Act (2006)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Tim Donovan  
Manager Assessment Services  
**Author Name:** Joseph Casabella  
Team Leader - Health & Environment

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Health and Environment Team within Council is responsible for administering and enforcing the *Food Act 2006*, including the issuing of licences and design approvals of food businesses.

Since the formalisation of an internal business realignment, a number of synergies were identified across administrative areas that have allowed Council to improve and introduce efficiencies.

As a result of the efficiency gains in the area of licensing, the Regulatory and Health Unit has been required to adapt to processes within the property and database system (PROCLAIM) to facilitate an improved streamlined process. In order to progress to the next phase with bulk event processing, an amendment to the fees and charges will need to be approved.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this amendment is to further clarify and separate the fees and charges that relate to food business licences and approvals, allowing Council to further progress with modifications to the PROCLAIM system and introduce bulk event processing.

#### BACKGROUND

In 2001, Council implemented a module within its property database system (PROCLAIM) that would allow an improved ability to issue licences and approvals under the *Food Act*. Since the initial implementation of the PLUS module within PROCLAIM, Council has been readily able to adapt to changes to legislation, where processes have been aligned to legislative requirements, including the ability to electronically process applications.

To further enhance the PLUS module and given the efficiency gains as a result of business realignment, the Regulatory and Health Unit is now able to introduce "bulk event processing". The basis of this administrative change is to now facilitate a streamlined licensing system where all food business licences will expire at the same anniversary date (date of expiry). The invoicing, renewal and issuance of licences can now be operated by a single administrative officer, over a 3 month period.

---

Under the current fees and charges document, Council has a single combined fee that relates to a licence and approval for new food business applications depending on the food business risk. In order to implement the modifications needed to the PLUS module, this combined fee will need to be replaced by separate charges for a food business licence and a food business approval.

It is expected that the proposed fee for both new licences and approvals will be in accordance with the Activity Based Costed model used for the preparation of the current fees and charges document, where there will be no overall increase in fees.

The current fees and charges that relate to food business licensing and approval are prescribed below.

<b>Fee description</b>	<b>Current Charge</b>
<b>Application for <i>approval and initial licence</i> of a low risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$562.90
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$589.20
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$610.20
<b>Application for <i>approval and initial licence</i> of a medium risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$657.50
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$683.80
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$714.40
<b>Application for <i>approval and initial licence</i> of a high risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$724.90
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$749.10
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$778.50

It is proposed that the fees prescribed below will replace the current charges relating to food business licences and approval.

<b>Fee description</b>	<b>Proposed Charge</b>
<b>Application for approval of a low risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$255.70
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$282.00
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$303.00
<b>Application for initial licence of a low risk food business</b>	<b>\$307.20</b>
<b>Application for approval of a medium risk food business:</b>	

- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$256.70
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$283.00
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$313.60
<b>Application for initial licence of a medium risk food business</b>	<b>\$400.80</b>
<b>Application for approval of a high risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$271.90
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$296.10
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$325.50
<b>Application for initial licence of a high risk food business</b>	<b>\$453.00</b>

## ISSUES

The main issues relate to the separation of a combined fee in to two single charges relating to new food business licences and approvals. This amendment does not affect existing food business operators as a separate renewal charge currently exists.

## 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

There will be no financial implications with the proposed amendments. There will be no increased or decrease in revenue as a result of the proposed changes.

## PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

## CONSULTATION

The Manager Assessment Services and the Regulatory and Health Services Manager were consulted on this matter and agree with the Officer's Recommendation.

**OPTIONS****PREFERRED**

That Council resolve to amend the fees and charges relating to the approval and initial licence of food business as prescribed below.

<b>Fee description</b>	<b>Proposed Charge</b>
<b>Application for approval of a low risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$255.70
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$282.00
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$303.00
<b>Application for initial licence of a low risk food business</b>	<b>\$307.20</b>
<b>Application for approval of a medium risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$256.70
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$283.00
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$313.60
<b>Application for initial licence of a medium risk food business</b>	<b>\$400.80</b>
<b>Application for approval of a high risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	\$271.90
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	\$296.10
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	\$325.50
<b>Application for initial licence of a high risk food business</b>	<b>\$453.00</b>

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council not approve the division of a combined charge for food business licence and approvals.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve to amend the fees and charges relating to the approval and initial licence of food business as prescribed below.

<b>Fee description</b>	<b>Proposed Charge</b>
<b>Application for approval of a low risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$255.70</b>
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$282.00</b>
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$303.00</b>
<b>Application for initial licence of a low risk food business</b>	<b>\$307.20</b>
<b>Application for approval of a medium risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$256.70</b>
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$283.00</b>
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$313.60</b>
<b>Application for initial licence of a medium risk food business</b>	<b>\$400.80</b>
<b>Application for approval of a high risk food business:</b>	
- Floor area small 0-100m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$271.90</b>
- Floor area medium 101-300m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$296.10</b>
- Floor area large >301m <sup>2</sup>	<b>\$325.50</b>
<b>Application for initial licence of a high risk food business</b>	<b>\$453.00</b>

**CARRIED**



### **13.2.2 AMENDMENT OF 2008-09 EVENT FEES FOR CLEVELAND SHOWGROUND**

**Datworks Filename:** CP Cleveland Showgrounds - General  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Greg Jensen  
Manager Customer & Community Services  
**Author Name:** Gene Rodgers  
Recreation Officer

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Cleveland Showground is the primary outdoor venue for large events in Redland City, with an annual schedule of seven to ten events per calendar year. In recent years, all but one of these events has been run by Not for Profit groups. As such, these groups charge a minimal or no admission fees and seek only to cover costs for their events, and several of the events are major fundraisers for charities such as the Queensland Cancer Fund.

Fees in the 08/09 budget for "Not for Profit" and "Reduced" events have increased due to a change in the method of calculation. For 2008/09 a 25% and 50% reduction in fees was approved to make it consistent with the fee reductions for community halls. The result has been an increase in actual fees to Not for Profit groups and Reduced Rate hirers of over 100%. This sharp increase in council fees for use of the grounds and buildings would possibly mean the event organisers would not use the showground in future or might even cancel the event.

A new schedule has been developed that levies a flat fee rather than a percentage discount on the profit fee. This flat fee is consistent with a 5.2% increase in fees from the prior financial year.

#### **PURPOSE**

To seek Council approval to amend the Fees and Charges for Major Venues for events at the Cleveland Showground for Not for Profit organisations and organisations approved at a Reduced Rate.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Over the past two budgets Council has approved "Profit Rates" in the Fees and Charges for use of Councils community facilities i.e. Community Halls, Capalaba Place. A reduction of this "Profit Rate" then applies for "Not for Profit" (25%) and "Reduced Rate" events (50%). This fee structure was extended to include the Cleveland Showground in the 08/09 Budget where the "Profit" event fees were increased by the CPI rate of 5.2%. However, this has inadvertently resulted in an increase of double to triple the rate of previous years for hirers in "Not for Profit" events and "Reduced" events categories.

Prior to this decision for the 2008/09 financial year a flat rate was included in the Fees and Charges. The change to this methodology has inadvertently lead to a significant fee increase for Not for Profit and Reduced Rate hirers.

## ISSUES

The fees for events at Cleveland Showground run by Not for Profit groups have for many years been set at a discounted rate - as low as 33% in some cases - compared to "Profit" events. To increase that rate to be 75% of "Profit" rates - as used for other council facilities - means the costs for "Not for Profit" events may threaten the future of some of these events.

It is therefore recommended that an acceptable fee for use of Cleveland Showground by both Profit, Not for Profit and Reduced Rate events be set separately and not on a percentage reduction basis and that they be increased by 5.2% over 2007-08 fees.

A comparison of the fees is indicated below and includes a new recommended rate for 2008/09.

<b>FEE COMPARISON TABLE</b>						
<b>EVENT FEE PER DAY (\$)</b>	<b>AMP HALL</b>	<b>AMP FOOD</b>	<b>EHH</b>	<b>JHP</b>	<b>MAIN ARENA</b>	<b>WHOLE</b>
2007-08 Profit	\$404.00	\$67.50	\$270.00	\$270.00	\$402.00	\$2020.00
2007-08 Not for Profit	\$135.00	\$27.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$135.00	\$674.00
2007-08 Reduced Rate	\$67.00	\$13.90	\$47.00	\$47.00	\$68.00	\$325.00
2008-09 Profit	\$425.00	\$70.50	\$284.10	\$284.10	\$422.90	\$2125.10
2008-09 Not for Profit (% discount)	\$318.75	\$52.90	\$213.10	\$213.10	\$317.20	\$1593.80
2008-09 Reduced Rate (% discount)	\$212.50	\$35.25	\$142.05	\$142.05	\$211.45	\$1062.55
2008-09 Not for Profit Recommend Fee	\$142.00	\$28.40	\$105.20	\$105.20	\$142.00	\$709.00
2008-09 Reduced Rate Recommended Fee	\$70.50	\$14.60	\$49.50	\$49.50	\$71.50	\$342.00

**AMP** = Albert Morris Pavilion  
**JHP** = Joe Howell Pavilion  
**NFP** = Not for Profit

**EHH** = Edgar Harley Hall  
**WHOLE** = Whole Showground

## 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

There are no financial implications anticipated as the budget for 2008/09 was estimated using a 5.2% increase in fees compared to 2007/08.

## 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

This issue has been discussed with the Leisure & Recreation Services Manager and the Manager Customer & Community Services.

## OPTIONS

### PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That the Fees and Charges for 2008/09, for Major Venues for events at the Cleveland Showground, for Not for Profit organisations and organisations approved at a Reduced Rate, be amended as per the table below;

<b>EVENT FEE PER DAY (\$)</b>	<b>AMP HALL</b>	<b>AMP FOOD</b>	<b>EHH</b>	<b>JHP</b>	<b>MAIN ARENA</b>	<b>WHOLE</b>
2008-09 Not for Profit Recommended Fee	\$142.00	\$28.40	\$105.20	\$105.20	\$142.00	\$709.00
2008-09 Reduced Rate Recommended Fee	\$70.50	\$14.60	\$49.50	\$49.50	\$71.50	\$342.00

2. That the Fees and Charges for 2008/09 for Major Venues for events at the Cleveland Showground for Not for Profit organisations and organisations approved at a Reduced Rate be amended as per the table below and that the events currently approved for the Reduced Rate remain the Redlands Easter Family Festival and the Redland Spring Festival:

**ALTERNATIVE**

That the current Fees and Charges remain unchanged with a 25% reduction for Not for Profit Groups and 50% reduction for Reduced Rate hirers and that the events currently approved for the Reduced Rate remain the Redlands Easter Family Festival and the Redland Spring Festival.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That the Fees and Charges for 2008/09, for Major Venues for events at the Cleveland Showground, for Not for Profit organisations and organisations approved at a Reduced Rate, be amended as per the table below;

<b>EVENT FEE PER DAY (\$)</b>	<b>AMP HALL</b>	<b>AMP FOOD</b>	<b>EHH</b>	<b>JHP</b>	<b>MAIN ARENA</b>	<b>WHOLE</b>
<b>2008-09 Not for Profit Recommended Fee</b>	<b>\$142.00</b>	<b>\$28.40</b>	<b>\$105.20</b>	<b>\$105.20</b>	<b>\$142.00</b>	<b>\$709.00</b>
<b>2008-09 Reduced Rate Recommended Fee</b>	<b>\$70.50</b>	<b>\$14.60</b>	<b>\$49.50</b>	<b>\$49.50</b>	<b>\$71.50</b>	<b>\$342.00</b>

2. That the events currently approved for the Reduced Rate remain the Redlands Easter Family Festival and the Redland Spring Festival.

**CARRIED**

### 13.3 PLANNING AND POLICY

#### 13.3.1 CORPORATE BALANCED SCORECARD REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2008

<b>Datworks Filename:</b>	<b>GOV Corporate BSC Monthly Reporting to Committee</b>
<b>Attachment:</b>	<a href="#"><u>Balanced Scorecard Report – September 2008</u></a>
<b>Responsible Officer Name:</b>	<b>Luke Wallace 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 our business using the four Balanced Scorecard Perspectives – Financial, Customer, Internal/Business Processes and People & Learning.

This report is an important component of our performance management framework. The other main report provided to Council and the community is the quarterly Operational Plan Report that focuses on performance against each of the programs in the Corporate Plan.

The overall rating for September 2008 is Satisfactory, with a weighted score of 1.90.

#### PURPOSE

To provide Council with the Corporate Balanced Scorecard Report for the financial year to September 2008.

#### BACKGROUND

The report shows results against each KPI for the current month and the previous 12 months. Longer term trends and comparisons incorporating the same month last year are included to provide a better understanding of current performance levels.

A summary of this month's results is provided on page two of the report and shows the overall score for Redland City Council, including the rating (the small coloured indicator at the right hand side). An outstanding result is shown as green, above standard and satisfactory shown as yellow and an unsatisfactory result is shown as red. The overall rating for Council and for each perspective is determined by the relative weightings of the performance measures.

The subsequent pages of the report provide details of the performance measures in each perspective. The actual performance results each month are displayed as a graph, with the red and green lines showing the normal expected range for the

measure. The red line represents the minimum satisfactory level and the green line represents the outstanding level. The rating for each measure is also shown as a green tick (outstanding), a yellow line (satisfactory and above standard) or a red cross (unsatisfactory).

Explanation of results is provided by the responsible manager in the commentary each month. Where a significant issue arises from the data that requires further explanation it will be provided in this covering report.

## **ISSUES**

Most measures are performing well within the target range. Those measures performing outside the target range are:

- Financial Perspective (page 3)
  - Cash levels within targets
  - Capital works program financial performance
- Customer Perspective (page 4)
  - Development application assessment performance index
- People & Learning Perspective (page 6)
  - Workplace Health & Safety Action Plan actions completed.

Please see that comments provided by managers in the attached report (pages indicated above). The attached report shows that these measures are either close to meeting the target range or are improving. At this stage there are no major concerns about these results. Further discussion will only be included in this covering report when performance results raise significant issues.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation in this report primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide a clear organisational direction supported by effective leadership and a framework of policies, plans and strategies that are responsive to the community's needs and which promote 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.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

There are no implications for the Planning Scheme arising from this report.

## **CONSULTATION**

The data and components in this 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 September 2008, as attached.

**ALTERNATIVE**

That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for September 2008 and request additional information.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for the month of September 2008, as attached.**

**CARRIED**

**13.3.2 QUARTERLY OPERATIONAL PLAN REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2008**

**Dataworks Filename:** Gov - Corporate Performance Reporting - Quarterly

**Attachment:** [Quarterly Operation Plan Report – September 2008](#)

**Responsible Officer Name:** Luke Wallace  
Manager Corporate Planning Performance & Risk

**Author Name:** Grant Bennett  
Service Manager Corporate Planning & Performance

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The 2007-08 Operational Plan sets out the most important projects and initiatives that Council decided to pursue this financial year towards achieving the long-term objectives in the Corporate Plan 2006-2010. Council approved this Operational Plan on 17 June 2008 prior to the approval of the Budget.

Regularly monitoring progress against this Operational Plan is an important element of Council's Corporate Governance process, and it is also a requirement of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

The attached report therefore shows the status of all projects in both practical and financial terms, and shows progress against performance targets for other measures.

**PURPOSE**

To ensure good corporate governance of the organisation by monitoring performance against Council's approved Operational Plan 2008-09.

**BACKGROUND**

The attached report provides information to Council on the progress in the first quarter of all projects, initiatives and performance indicators in the Operational Plan 2008-09. This is the first report for 2008-09 and the opportunity has been taken to update and improve the standard and format of information provided to Council and the community.

For projects/initiatives, the report now includes both financial information (where operational or capital funds have been specifically allocated) and practical information to give a more comprehensive picture of progress. Where no budget is shown, this indicates that the work involved is being done solely in-house by Council staff and/or the project is part of a larger program of work and therefore does not have discrete funds allocated to it. Practical progress of projects is rated against a status indicator, being one of the following: *Completed, On Track, Delayed, Not Commenced, Revised or Cancelled*.



For performance indicators, actual performance is shown as a blue dot on a graph where the red line (minimum satisfactory performance level) and the green line (outstanding performance level) show the planned or expected performance range.

In both cases, performance commentary is provided by the responsible officers to explain the progress achieved to date.

## ISSUES

The Operational Plan 2008-09 includes some 118 performance measures. The attached report for the September quarter shows that the vast majority of projects/initiatives and performance measures are on track to meet the expected performance by the end of the year. It also shows that a number are planned to commence later this financial year.

There are seven (7) projects/measures which are delayed or behind target. They are:

- Development Assessment Program
  - 2.4.1 Development applications processed on time (page 8);
  - 2.4.2 Building applications processed on time (page 8);
- Waste Management Program
  - 3.2.3 The Community Waste Education Program (page 9);
- Marine Facilities Program
  - 3.6.3 Determining the future needs for public boat ramps (page 11);
- Arts & Culture Program
  - 4.2.4 The Redlands Performing Arts Centre success (page 14);
- Organisational Improvement Program
  - 7.6.2 Delivery of the Workplace Health & Safety Improvement Plan (page 28);
  - 7.6.4 Worker's Compensation Hours lost (page 29).

Please see the comments provided by managers in the attached report (pages indicated above) which explain what has happened and action being implemented to bring them back into line with plans where applicable. At this stage there are no major concerns about these results. Further discussion will only be included in this covering report when performance results raise significant issues.

When the Operational Plan was approved, one project, "*Completion of background research for the review of the RCC Open Space Plan*" was inadvertently included under two programs, being the Rural Landscape & Green Space Program and the Sport & Recreation Program. Advice from the Environmental Management Group is that this project sits best under the Sport and Recreation Program and it is therefore proposed to delete it from the Rural Landscape & Green Space Program for reporting purposes. It is reported under Sport and Recreation in the attached report.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation in this report primarily supports Council's strategic priority to provide a clear organisational direction supported by effective leadership and a framework of policies, plans and strategies that are responsive to the community's needs and which promote 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.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

There are no implications from the recommendations in this report that would require any amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

## **CONSULTATION**

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

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend

Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To note the Operational Plan Report for the 2008-09 September Quarter, as attached; and**
- 2. To amend the Operational Plan 2008-09 by removing the performance measure "Completion of background research for the review of the RCC Open Space Plan" from the Rural Landscape & Green Space Program.**

**CARRIED**

### 13.4 CLOSED SESSION

#### MOTION TO CLOSE COMMITTEE MEETING

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

##### 13.4.1 Budget Parameters & Corporate Budget Timetable 2009/10

The reason that is applicable in this instance is as follows:

*“(c) the local government’s budget.”*

CARRIED

#### MOTION TO REOPEN COMMITTEE MEETING

That the meeting be again opened to the public.

CARRIED

##### 13.4.1 BUDGET PARAMETERS & CORPORATE BUDGET TIMETABLE 2009/10

**Dataworks Filename:** FM - Corporate Budget  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Kerry Phillips  
Manager Financial Services  
**Author Name:** Katharine McCarthy  
Acting Service Manager Budget Financial  
Modelling & Group Support

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A confidential report, from General Manager Corporate Services dated 13 October 2008, regarding the timetable for the corporate 2009/10 budget, was discussed in closed session

#### OFFICER’S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To adopt the budget parameters detailed in the confidential attachment;**
  - 2. That the proposed timetable for production of the 2009/10 budget be noted; and**
-

3. That the confidential report dated 13 October 2008 from the General Manager Corporate Services, along with the attachment, remain confidential.

**14 MAYORAL MINUTES****14.1 QUANDAMOOKA COMBINED ABORIGINAL ORGANISATIONS FORUM**

Moved by: Cr Hobson

That Council resolve, in response to a request from the Quandamooka Combined Aboriginal Organisations (Quandamooka Forum) on Wednesday, 29 October 2008 at a meeting with Redland City elected members and Council officers, to fly the Aboriginal Flag, subject to Council review of its obligations under State government protocols, compliance with relevant regulations and review of Council's current flag infrastructure.

**CARRIED**

## **15 DIRECT TO COUNCIL REPORTS**

### **15.1 OFFICE OF CEO**

#### **15.1.1 SHADE STRUCTURES - COMMUNITY BENEFIT FUND - DIVISIONS 5, 7 & 10**

**Dataworks Filename:** G & S Applications - Community Benefit Fund - Divisions 5 & 7

**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Stevenson  
Chief Executive Officer

**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 a total amount of \$23, 334.00 (GST exclusive) to be allocated for the provision of new shade structures in Divisions 5 and 7. The installations have been requested by the respective Councillors.

Division 5 shade structure (\$11,587.00 GST exclusive) will be installed in Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay. Division 7 shade structure (\$11,747.00 GST exclusive) will be installed in Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba. Both projects are to be managed by the Project Delivery Group.

### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval from Council for an allocation from the Division 5 portion of the CCBF for \$11,587.00 (GST exclusive) and for an allocation from the Division 7 portion of the CCBF for \$11,747.00 (GST exclusive). This funding will be used for the provision of one new shade structure in Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay and one new shade structure in Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba.

### **BACKGROUND**

Divisional Councillors for Division 5 and 7 arranged on site park inspections with the Services Manager Parks and Conservation and the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape at varying times to discuss park upgrades within their divisions.

During these site inspections, the matter of shade structures over play equipment was discussed and quotations for new installations at Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay (Division 5) and Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba (Division 7) were requested.

As all projects related to shade structures are to be managed by the Project Delivery Group (PDG), the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape referred the request for quotations to the PDG.

The PDG have supplied the following costs:

**Lanyard Place Redland Bay - Job Number 42254**  
TOTAL \$11,587.00

**Gundagai Drive Capalaba - Job Number 45726**  
TOTAL \$11,747.00

The quotations were submitted to the respective Divisional Councillors for approval and sufficient funds are available for these two projects to proceed.

## **ISSUES**

No issues have been 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 5 Councillor supports this project and has sufficient funds to allocate an amount of \$11,587.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 5 portion of the CCBF.

The Division 7 Councillor supports this project and has sufficient funds to allocate an amount of \$11,747.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 7 portion of the CCBF.

These costs include all Building Approval Fees, project management costs and contingencies.

## **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 Councillors for Division 5 and 7 have initiated these two projects through site inspections with the Services Manager Parks and Conservation and the Senior Advisor Urban Landscape.

The Senior Advisor Urban Landscape has consulted with the Landscape Architect Open Space Planning to review the provision of both shade structures within each

park. It was identified that Gundagai Drive Park has mature trees within the vicinity of the play equipment and that a shade structure may not be necessary.

Both Councillors have been provided with CBF applications for these funds to be approved. The CBF applications for the shade structure in Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay and Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba have been signed.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To approve an allocation of \$11,587.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 5 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay and
2. To approve an allocation of \$11,747.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 7 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council not approve the allocation of \$11,587.00 (GST exclusive) for Division 5 and \$11,747.00 (GST exclusive) for Division 7 from their respective portions of the Community Benefit Fund.

## **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To approve an allocation of \$11,587.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 5 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund, for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay ; and
2. To approve an allocation of \$11,747.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 7 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba.

## **REASON FOR AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

Due to timing and operational issues, Cr Murray requested that the supply and installation of a shade structure in Vic Arthur Park be included as an additional recommendation in this report.

## **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

**That the Officer's Recommendation be adopted with an additional Recommendation 3 to read as follows:**

3. **To approve an allocation of \$15,460 (GST exclusive) from the Division 10 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund, for the supply and**



**installation of a shade structure in Vic Arthur Park, Fisher Road, Thorneside.**

With the Council Resolution to now read as follows:

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. To approve an allocation of \$11,587.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 5 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund, for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Lanyard Place Park, Redland Bay ;**
- 2. To approve an allocation of \$11,747.00 (GST exclusive) from the Division 7 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Gundagai Drive Park, Capalaba; and**
- 3. To approve an allocation of \$15,460 (GST exclusive) from the Division 10 portion of the Councillors' Community Benefit Fund, for the supply and installation of a shade structure in Vic Arthur Park, Fisher Road, Thorneside.**

**CARRIED**

**15.1.2 ESTABLISHMENT OF A WATER RETAILING BUSINESS**

**Dataworks Filename:** WS Planning – Water Reform  
**Attachments:** [Key Issues](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Stevenson  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Author Name:** Ray Turner  
General Manager Corporate Services

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Major changes to the provision of water and sewerage services by local governments have been initiated by the State Government over the past 18 months. This has seen the establishment of State Government owned entities to manage bulk water assets such as dams and water treatment plants (Seqwater), and the assets to allow movement of water around the grid and the storage of treated water (Linkwater). Another State Entity will be formed to own and manage manufactured water (desalination) assets and purified recycled water assets.

The State Government has also enacted legislation that will require the ten SEQ councils to form a single local government owned Distribution Entity and three Retail Entities.

The Distribution Entity will own and manage assets to distribute water from the state owned treated storage assets to the customers and to manage the treatment and distribution of wastewater.

The three Retail Entities will be solely involved in purchasing treated water and selling it to water consumers. Other than basic internal systems assets and furniture and fittings, the Retailers will not own or operate any water and wastewater infrastructure assets.

The State Government set a number of criteria that local governments must follow in the establishment of the retail entities:

1. There will be three retailers.
2. No retailer should service more than 40% of the connected properties in SE Queensland. This was to ensure there would be no barriers in place for Full Retail Contestability (FRC) should the State decide to introduce this.
3. All retailers will be around the same size.
4. Brisbane City Council will be one retailer.
5. Each retailer's operating area will be geographically contiguous where possible.

6. The State will provide two years notice of FRC.
7. Each SEQ council will hold equity in a retailer.
8. The Retail Entities will be operational from 1 July 2010.

Based on the directions from the State, the Council of Mayors has identified the preliminary equity holders of the three retail entities as:

**Retailer 1:** Brisbane City Council.

**Retailer 2:** Sunshine Coast Regional Council, Moreton Bay Regional Council, Somerset Regional Council, Lockyer Valley regional Council, Ipswich City Council.

**Retailer 3:** Gold Coast City Council, Logan City Council, **Redland City Council**, Scenic Rim Regional Council.

Under the current State direction, Redland City Council will have no option but to form a retailer with the neighbouring Councils as detailed in Retailer 3.

The State Government, through the Queensland Water Commission, has produced a project plan for their involvement in the establishment of both the retailing and distribution entities to June 2010. Included in this plan is the enacting of legislation to allow for the establishment of the retailing entities in their final form.

The Council of Mayors, through the Water Reform Program, has established a comprehensive governance structure to guide the establishment of the retailing and distribution entities from the SEQ councils' perspective.

There are a significant number of issues that RCC must take cognisance of in the establishment of Retailer 3. These can be grouped under Regulatory/Statutory, Operational, and Financial/Commercial and an initial selection of these issues is shown in Attachment 1. This list of issues is not definitive.

To ensure that Retailer 3 is operational from 1 July 2010, it is imperative that all councils involved commence work on the creation of this entity immediately.

Representatives from Retailer 3 councils have held a preliminary meeting and will commence more formal meetings on 7 November 2008.

The Chief Executive Officer will establish a project team from across RCC with the General Managers of Redland Water & Waste and Corporate Services guiding the project. One of the first tasks of this project team will be to establish a RCC project plan to ensure all tasks are undertaken and objectives and timeframes are met.

Resource requirements, including funding arrangements, will be included in future reports to Council once finalised.

## **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to present information on the establishment of South East Queensland water retailers and to seek Council endorsement of RCC's future participation in a water retailing business.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

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

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Initial costs will be in the form of officers' time. A funding arrangement for the establishment of all retailers is currently being finalised by the Water Reform Project under the Council of Mayors. RCC may be required to inject start up funds for Retailer 3. Details will be provided to Council when they are known.

## **CONSULTATION**

The Chief Executive Officer and General Manager Redland Water and Waste have been consulted. Councillors were provided with a briefing note by the General Manager RWW on 22 August 2008 and were presented with details regarding the establishment of a water retailing entity at a workshop on 9 September 2008.

## **OPTIONS**

### **PREFERRED**

1. That Redland City Council take steps to form a water and sewerage retailer with Gold Coast City Council, Logan City Council, and Scenic Rim Regional Council in accordance with State Government directions;
2. That the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to sign appropriate documentation to establish the retailing entity; and
3. That a monthly report be presented to Councillors through the Finance and Corporate Management Committee on progress, including actions and issues, of the establishment of the business.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

That Council not take steps to establish a water retailing entity at this time.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/  
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Dowling  
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

**That Council resolve as follows:**

- 1. That Redland City Council take steps to form a water and sewerage retailer with Gold Coast City Council, Logan City Council, and Scenic Rim Regional Council in accordance with State Government directions;**
- 2. That the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to sign appropriate documentation to establish the retailing entity; and**
- 3. That a monthly report be presented to Councillors through the Finance and Corporate Management Committee on progress, including actions and issues, of the establishment of the business.**

**CARRIED**

A division was called for.

Crs Townsend, Reimers, Murray, Elliott, Bowler, Dowling, Boglary Hobson and Ogilvie voted in the affirmative.

Crs Williams and Henry voted in the negative.

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

### 15.1.3 EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT AND PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR COUNCILLORS

**Dataworks Filename:** GOV Councillors – Expenses Reimbursement Policy  
**Attachment:** [POL-3076](#)  
**Responsible Officer Name:** Gary Stevenson  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Author Name:** Ray Turner  
General Manager Corporate Services

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Councillors have identified changes they require to POL-3076 Expenses Reimbursement and Provision of Facilities for Councillors:

- Inclusion of examples of mandatory and discretionary training in the definition section of the policy;
- Where the Mayor has delegated the attendance at a function to a councillor on the Mayor's behalf; all costs will be recorded against the Mayor's annual allocation for such costs (clause 1.7);
- Inclusion of a motor vehicle clause (clause 2.4) that defines councillor usage of pool vehicles;
- Inclusion of a clause 2.8, Provision of Meals, that defines when councillors will be provided with light meals while at Council chambers;
- Inclusion of clause 2.9, Councillor Newsletters, that reflects the entitlement that has existed for a number of years;
- Inclusion of clause 2.10, Salary Sacrificing that reflects the entitlement that was available during the last term of council.

Section 250 AT of the *Local Government Act 1993* requires that a public notice of the revised policy must be placed in the local newspaper. The full policy is available on Council's website.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to present amendments to POL-3076 Expenses Reimbursement and Provision of Facilities for Councillors that are required by councillors.

#### CONSULTATION

Councillors have directed the changes to POL-3076.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

That Council resolve that the revised policy POL-3076 Expenses Reimbursement and Provision of Facilities for Councillors, as attached, be adopted.

**DISCUSSION**

During discussion on the matter Cr Williams moved the following motion:

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That Council resolve into Open Forum to permit Councillors to freely contribute to the discussion.

CARRIED

Moved by: Cr Williams  
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve out of Open Forum.

CARRIED

It was agreed that the following amendments be incorporated into the policy document:

Attachment A

2.4 Motor Vehicles - to delete dot points 1 and 2 and to delete the words "*Coochiemudlo Island*" from dot point 3;

2.9 Councillor Newsletters – from the 3<sup>rd</sup> line of the paragraph, to delete the word "*within*" and insert the words "prior to" after the word "months";

with the updated policy document to reflect these amendments.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Williams

**That Council resolve that the revised policy POL-3076 Expenses Reimbursement and Provision of Facilities for Councillors, as amended and attached, be adopted.**

CARRIED

A division was called for.

Crs Dowling, Henry, Ogilvie, Boglary, Hobson, Townsend, Reimers and Murray voted in the affirmative.

Crs Elliott, Bowler and Williams voted in the negative.

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



## **15.2 PLANNING AND POLICY**

### **15.2.1 SOUTH EAST THORNLANDS STRUCTURE PLAN AND ASSOCIATED PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENTS - DELEGATED AUTHORITY FOR PLANNING AND POLICY COMMITTEE**

**Dataworks Filename:** LUP - South-East Thornlands Structure Plan Project

**Responsible Officer Name:** Wayne Dawson  
Manager Land Use Planning Group

**Author Name:** Stephen Hill  
Principal Advisor - Local Area and Strategic Planning

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council at the General Meeting held 27 February 2008 (Item 11.3) resolved to commence public notification of the draft South–East Thornlands Structure Plan and associated amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme. The public notification period commenced on 4 March 2008 with the closing date extended until 2 June 2008.

At the close of the submission period Council had received seven hundred and sixty nine (769) submissions.

A number of workshops have recently commenced with Councillors to review public submissions received during the public display period.

South East Thornlands has been identified as one of twelve (12) committed areas under the Queensland Housing Affordability Strategy – Greenfield Land Supply in South East Queensland. The strategy indicates committed areas should be able to be brought to market within six (6) months (December 2008).

To assist the State Government in achieving this time frame, it is recommended that Council delegate authority to the Planning and Policy Committee on the 19 November 2008 to finalise the review of public submissions and to consider the adoption of amended statutory provisions of the Structure Plan, for referral to the State Government for a final state interest check and approval.

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council delegate decision making authority to the Planning and Policy Committee on 19 November 2008 to finalise the review of public submissions and to consider the adoption of amended statutory provisions of the South East Thornlands Structure Plan for referral to the State Government.

## **BACKGROUND**

At a Special Meeting dated 21 August 2006, Council resolved to endorse the draft Structure Plan and associated amendments of the Redlands Planning Scheme for referral to the Queensland State Government for the purposes of First state Interest Review.

By letter dated 20 January 2008, the Acting Minister for Infrastructure and Planning confirmed no state interest would be adversely affected by the proposed South-East Thornlands Structure Plan and associated scheme amendments and Council could proceed to public notification.

## **ISSUES**

Public notification of the draft Structure Plan and associated Planning Scheme amendments commenced on 4 March 2008 and closed following an extension on 2 June 2008. At the close of the submission period 769 submissions had been received. A series of workshops have recently commenced with Councillors to review all submissions received during the public exhibition period.

The Queensland Housing Affordability Strategy - Greenfield land supply in South East Queensland (SEQ) identifies the South-East Thornlands area as one of twelve "committed areas" that should be made available for housing as soon as possible. It is also however important to note the Strategy also recognises that the objective of improving housing affordability should not override other considerations such as the protection and enhancement of areas of environmental significance and that robust planning processes are required to identify lands most appropriate for residential and other uses. Significantly, the strategy indicates committed areas that should be able to be brought to the market within six months (December 2008). Delegating decision making authority to the Planning and Policy Committee on 19 November 2008 will assist the State Government in achieving this timeframe.

## **RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN**

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to preserve a balance with urban, rural, bushland, village, coastal and island character of the Redlands by managing growth. In addition the Structure Plan and associated amendments will contribute to the achievement of the Natural Environment, Essential services, Community Health and Well being and Economic Prosperity strategic priorities in the Corporate Plan.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The South East Thornlands Structure Plan is a budgeted program prepared in accordance with budget estimates.

## **PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS**

Once finalised the South-East Thornlands Structure plan will primarily be implemented by amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme (RPS).

## CONSULTATION

A number of workshops have recently been undertaken with Councillors to review submissions to the South-East Thornlands Structure Plan.

## OPTIONS

### PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That a report be referred to the Planning and Policy Committee on the 19 November 2008 to finalise the review of public submissions received in response to the public exhibition of the South East Thornlands Structure Plan and to consider the adoption of an amended Structure Plan for referral to the State Government for final State Interest check and approval; and
2. That the Planning and Policy Committee be delegated decision making authority, under section 472 of the *Local Government Act 1993*.

### ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve not to delegate decision making authority to the Planning and Policy Committee on 19 November 2008.

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Elliott  
Seconded by: Cr Dowling

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That a report be presented to the Planning and Policy Committee on the 19 November 2008 to finalise the review of public submissions received in response to the public exhibition of the South east Thornlands Structure Plan and to consider the adoption of an amended Structure Plan for referral to the State Government for final State Interest check and approval; and
2. That the Planning and Policy Committee be delegated authority, under section 472 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, to determine this matter.

## CARRIED

**16 NOTICE OF MOTION UNDER SECTION 451 OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993****16.1 NOTICE GIVEN BY CR TOWNSEND (DIVISION 5)****16.1.1 NOTICE OF MOTION TO RESCIND RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF 31 OCTOBER 2007– ITEM 10.1.3 - MACLEAY ISLAND CENTRES STRATEGY REVIEW**Background

At the General Meeting of 31 October 2007, item 10.1.3 of the Minutes, Council resolved as follows:

1. *To adopt the Macleay Island Centres Strategy Review for planning purposes with the exception to include an amendment to the Macleay Island activity network in the Redlands Planning Scheme to expand the Local Centre zone at Nunkeri Drive / High Central Road with the inclusion of additional lots (Lots 7 and 8 on RP126474) included in a sub-area of the Local Centre Zone to provide specific opportunities for uses such as bulky goods showroom, garden centre and landscape supply depot and the like; and*
2. *That the amendment be drafted by the Land Use Planning Group and presented to Council for approval as part of Amendment 2 of the Redlands Planning Scheme.*

In accordance with notice given on 23 October 2008, Cr Townsend moved as follows:

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Townsend  
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

1. **That Council rescind its decision in relation to item 10.1.3 of the General Meeting Minutes of 31 October 2007 (Macleay Island Centres Strategy Review);**
2. **That Council adopt the Macleay Island Centres Strategy Review as presented to the meeting on 31 October 2007 for planning purposes;**
3. **That the Redlands Planning Scheme be amended to change the zoning of Lot 8 on RP126474 from Open Space to SMBI Residential consistent with current zoning of adjoining properties; and**
4. **That a report be presented to a future Planning & Policy Committee meeting on how a detailed investigation, master planning & feasibility analysis can be progressed on Council owned land on Macleay Island which is zoned Island Industry and Council owned land on Russell Island which is zoned community purposes sub-area CP9 - Future Island Investigation.**

**CARRIED** (unanimously)

**17 URGENT BUSINESS WITHOUT NOTICE**

Permission was granted for Cr Murray to move the following motion:

**17.1 QUARRY-RICKERTT ROAD UPGRADE**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Murray  
Seconded by: Cr Henry

**That Council resolve that, as part of the public information strategy prepared for the projected upgrade to the Quarry-Rickertt Road corridor, information sessions will be held, attended by Council officers.**

**CARRIED**

**MEETING CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 7.04 pm.

Signature of Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Confirmation date: \_\_\_\_\_