



Redland
CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES

GENERAL MEETING

Wednesday 15 December 2010

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF OPENING	7
2	DEVOTIONAL SEGMENT	7
3	RECOGNITION OF ACHIEVEMENT	7
3.1	AUSTRALIAN SAFER COMMUNITIES AWARDS.....	7
4	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE	7
5	RECEIPT AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	8
5.1	GENERAL MEETING MINUTES 17 NOVEMBER 2010	8
5.2	SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES 1 DECEMBER 2010	8
6	MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING MINUTES	8
6.1	REPORT FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.....	8
6.1.1	PETITION (DIVISION 9) MANAGEMENT OF SAFETY ISSUES – CROTONA ROAD EAST, ALEXANDRA HILLS AND CROTONA ROAD, CAPALABA	8
6.1.2	PETITION (DIVISION 4) STEPS AT 36 ORANA ESPLANADE	9
6.1.3	PETITION (DIVISION 1) SAFETY CONCERNS ON BAINBRIDGE STREET, ORMISTON.....	9
6.1.4	STREET RENAMING – FACCIO LANE, RAYMOND STREET AND LORAIN STREET, CAPALABA.....	10
6.1.5	DREDGING AT VICTORIA POINT JETTY	10
6.1.6	PETITION (DIVISION 5) CHANGE OF STREET NAME – CUPHEA STREET, RUSSELL ISLAND TO ANZAC MEMORIAL DRIVE, RUSSELL ISLAND	11
7	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	11
8	PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS	12
8.1	PETITION	12

8.1.1	PETITION (DIVISION 5) REMOVAL OF DOG OFF LEASH AREA AT POINT TALBURPIN	12
9	MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS	12
10	MATERIAL PERSONAL INTEREST AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST	12
10.1	CONFLICT OF INTEREST	12
11	DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE 23 NOVEMBER 2010	14
11.1	DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS	14
11.1.1	AMENDMENTS TO FEES AND CHARGES SCHEDULE 2010/2011	14
11.1.2	DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO MAKE DECISIONS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT APPLICATIONS	17
11.1.3	REQUEST TO CHANGE A DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL FOR A PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR A MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE OVERRIDING THE PLANNING SCHEME AT REDLANDS BUSINESS PARK, 678 GERMAN CHURCH ROAD, REDLAND BAY (<i>This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee</i>)	23
11.1.4	CATEGORY 1 – MINOR COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT AND HOUSEKEEPING (<i>This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee</i>)	23
11.1.5	CATEGORY 2 – COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT AND MINOR IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (<i>This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee</i>)	23
11.1.6	CATEGORY 3 – MODERATELY COMPLEX CODE AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (<i>This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee</i>)	23
11.1.7	CURRENT APPEALS LIST AS AT 5 NOVEMBER 2010 (<i>This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee</i>)	23
12	DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE 7/12/2010	24
12.1	DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS	24
12.1.1	DWELLING HOUSE AND RECONFIGURATION AT 613-635 MAIN ROAD, WELLINGTON POINT (<i>This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee</i>)	24

12.1.2	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR A MULTIPLE DWELLING (X28) AT 171 ALLENBY ROAD, WELLINGTON POINT <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.3	EXTENSION TO CURRENCY PERIOD FOR A RECONFIGURATION OF LOTS (STAGE 1-10) AT BAYVIEW ESTATE – 299-351 HEINEMANN ROAD, MOUNT COTTON (AREAS A & B) <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.4	RECONFIGURATION OF LAND AT 8 NELSON ROAD AND 630-636 MAIN ROAD, WELLINGTON POINT <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.5	EXTENSION OF RELEVANT PERIOD (S.383 OF SPA) AND REQUEST TO CHANGE DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL (S.369 OF SPA) AT 18 & 20 WATERLOO STREET AND 22 TAYLOR CRESCENT, CLEVELAND <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.6	CATEGORY 1 – MINOR COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT & HOUSEKEEPING <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.7	CATEGORY 2 – COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT AND MINOR ASSESSMENTS <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.8	CATEGORY 3 – MODERATELY COMPLEX CODE AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	24
12.1.9	CURRENT APPEALS LIST AS AT 19 NOVEMBER 2010 <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	25
12.2.1	CLOSED SESSION: COURT ORDER VARIANCE FOR WEDDING CEREMONIES AND ASSOCIATED FUNCTION GARDENS AT 196-240 MOUNT VIEW ROAD, MOUNT COTTON <i>(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)</i>	25
13	PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 24/11/2010	26
13.1	PLANNING & POLICY	26
13.1.1	AMENDMENT TO ROAD CLOSURE APPLICATION CLEVELAND POINT RESERVE	26
13.1.2	RESPONSE TO A PETITION TO REDLAND CITY COUNCIL - BUILDING OF A SKATE PARK	31

13.1.3	PURCHASE OF LAND ON RUSSELL ISLAND FOR PARKS AND CONSERVATION PURPOSES	34
13.1.4	JUDY HOLT SPORTSFIELDS LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN REVIEW 2010	38
13.1.5	SMBI COMMITTEE REPORT 16 NOVEMBER 2010 - ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION	42
13.1.6	CAPALABA ACTIVITY CENTRE MASTER PLAN.....	44
13.1.7	REDLAND PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT 1C	56
13.1.8	CORPORATE SUSTAINABLE POPULATION MANAGEMENT POLICY	59
13.1.9	SMBI LAND EXCHANGE POLICY AND GUIDELINE	64
13.1.10	PROPOSED DRAINAGE EASEMENT - THE ESPLANADE, KARRAGARRA ISLAND	69
13.1.11	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT - MT COTTON ROAD, CAPALABA (MORETON BAY ROAD TO BROADWATER ROAD).....	72
13.2	COMMITTEE GENERAL BUSINESS	79
13.2.1	CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN ITEM 1.5 – SMBI COMMITTEE REPORT 16 NOVEMBER 2010	79
13.2.2	CANAL AND LAKE LEVY SPECIAL CHARGES.....	80
13.2.3	LETTER TO PREMIER AND MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & PLANNING	81
14	CUSTOMER SERVICES COMMITTEE 8/12/2010.....	82
14.1	CUSTOMER SERVICES	82
14.1.1	CONSTRUCTION OF PEDESTRIAN FENCE ORANA ESPLANADE VICTORIA POINT	82
14.1.2	MONTHLY REPORT FOR CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITY SERVICES GROUP OCTOBER 2010.....	87
14.1.3	MONTHLY REPORT FOR PROJECT DELIVERY GROUP.....	92
14.1.4	MONTHLY REPORT FOR OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE GROUP	94

14.1.5	WASTE GATE FEE EXEMPTION POLICY FOR NOT FOR PROFIT ORGANISATIONS	100
14.1.6	KINGSTON AVENUE ALEXANDRA HILLS	104
14.1.7	MONITORING AND ANALYSIS OF DUST FROM GRAVEL ROADS - SOUTHERN MORETON BAY ISLANDS	109
14.2	PLANNING & POLICY	113
14.2.1	TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2010 - 2014	113
14.3	GENERAL BUSINESS	116
14.3.1	STATUS REPORT ON CLOSURE OF REDLAND BAY ROAD, CAPALABA	116
15	CORPORATE SERVICES & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE 8/12/2010 ..	117
15.1	CORPORATE SERVICES	117
15.1.1	REDLAND BAY GOLF CLUB INC - PARTIAL SURRENDER OF LEASE AREA	117
15.2	OFFICE OF CEO	121
15.2.1	A REPORT ON THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING OF 20 OCTOBER 2010	121
15.3	GOVERNANCE	130
15.3.1	SPONSORSHIP APPLICATION - 2011 WORLD ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CONGRESS	130
15.3.2	INFORMATION PRIVACY POLICY (POL-3103)	134
15.3.3	CORPORATE BALANCED SCORECARD REPORT - NOVEMBER 2010	137
15.4	CORPORATE SERVICES	140
15.4.1	SAFETY MANAGEMENT AUDIT	140
15.5	PLANNING & POLICY	142
15.5.1	APPLICATION OF PLANNING SCHEME POLICY 3 – INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES CONTRIBUTIONS (CYCLEWAYS, STORMWATER AND TRANSPORT)	142
15.5.2	SUBMISSION TO INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES TASKFORCE	148

15.6	CLOSED SESSION AT COMMITTEE.....	159
15.6.1	DRAFT CORPORATE BUDGET TIMETABLE FOR 2011- 2012 BUDGET	159
15.6.2	ALLCONNEX WATER PRESENTATION	162
15.6.3	ALLCONNEX WATER OWNERS FORUM	162
16	MAYORAL MINUTES	163
17	DIRECT TO COUNCIL REPORTS.....	164
17.1	CUSTOMER SERVICES	164
17.1.1	BIRKDALE LANDFILL FINAL REVISED PROFILE AND REVISED COMMERCIAL GATE FEES	164
17.2	CORPORATE SERVICES.....	168
17.2.1	NOVEMBER 2010 - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS.....	168
17.3	PLANNING & POLICY	173
17.3.1	AMENDMENT TO ROAD CLOSURE REQUEST CLEVELAND POINT RESERVE.....	173
17.3.2	COMMUNITY GARDENS.....	178
18	NOTICE OF BUSINESS.....	183
18.1	NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR REIMERS) – SIGNAGE AT REDLAND CITY REFUSE/TRANSFER STATIONS	183
18.2	NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR HENRY) – ORANA ESPLANADE PRECINCT	184
18.3	NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR TOWNSEND) – PROVISION OF PATHWAYS/FOOTPATHS IN THE REDLAND BAY AREA	185
18.4	NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR WILLIAMS) – PROVISION OF FUNDING FOR PATHWAYS/FOOTPATHS ACROSS REDLAND CITY.....	186
19	MEETING CLOSURE.....	187

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 meets. The Mayor also paid Council's respect to their elders, past and present, and extend that respect to other indigenous Australians who are present.

2 DEVOTIONAL SEGMENT

Pastor George Gebran, Member of the Ministers' Fellowship, led Council in a brief devotional segment.

3 RECOGNITION OF ACHIEVEMENT

3.1 AUSTRALIAN SAFER COMMUNITIES AWARDS

Redland City Council was one of 3 or 4 finalists across Australia and we were highly commended for the Senior Emergency Preparedness Program. The Mayor acknowledged the work of Jenny Shoof, the RAGOSI Committee and Disaster Management Team.

4 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cr M Hobson PSM	Mayor
Cr M Elliott	Deputy Mayor and Councillor Division 7
Cr W Boglary	Councillor Division 1
Cr C Ogilvie	Councillor Division 2 – left meeting at 6.18pm
Cr D Henry	Councillor Division 3
Cr J Burns	Councillor Division 4 – left meeting at 5.03pm
Cr B Townsend	Councillor Division 5
Cr T Bowler	Councillor Division 6
Cr K Reimers	Councillor Division 8
Cr K Williams	Councillor Division 9
Cr H Murray	Councillor Division 10 – left meeting at 4.37pm

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP GROUP:

Mr G Stevenson PSM	Chief Executive Officer
Mr G Underwood	General Manager Planning & Policy
Mr N Clarke	General Manager Governance
Mr P Navin	Acting General Manager Customer Services
Mr M Drydale	General Manager Corporate Services
Mrs T Averay	General Manager Development & Community Standards

MINUTES:

Mrs J Parfitt	Corporate Meetings & Registers Team Leader
---------------	--

5 RECEIPT AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

5.1 GENERAL MEETING MINUTES 17 NOVEMBER 2010

Moved by: Cr Reimers
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the minutes of the General Meeting held on 17 November 2010 be confirmed.

CARRIED

5.2 SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES 1 DECEMBER 2010

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Ogilvie

That the minutes of the Special Meeting held on 1 December 2010 be confirmed.

CARRIED

6 MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING MINUTES

6.1 REPORT FROM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The following items were presented to Council for noting.

6.1.1 PETITION (DIVISION 9) MANAGEMENT OF SAFETY ISSUES – CROTONA ROAD EAST, ALEXANDRA HILLS AND CROTONA ROAD, CAPALABA

Datworks Filename: GOV Petitions
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 25 August 2010 Council resolved that the petition requesting that Council undertake precinct traffic planning to assist with the management of safety issues rat running and dangerous intersections along and around Crotona Road East, Alexandra Hills and Crotona Road, Capalaba be received and referred to the Planning & Policy department for investigation and a report back to Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

A report addressing this matter will be presented to the 2 February 2011 Planning & Policy Committee meeting.

6.1.2 PETITION (DIVISION 4) STEPS AT 36 ORANA ESPLANADE

Datworks Filename: GOV Petitions
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 20 October 2010 Council resolved that the petition requesting that the steps budgeted for in this years budget be put in place in front of No. 36 Orana Esplanade and that the old steps in front of No. 38 Orana Esplanade be made into a ramp, be received and referred to the appropriate area of Council for consideration and a report back to Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That it be noted that a report addressing this matter will be presented to the 2 March 2011 Planning & Policy Committee meeting.

6.1.3 PETITION (DIVISION 1) SAFETY CONCERNS ON BAINBRIDGE STREET, ORMISTON

Datworks Filename: GOV Petitions
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 20 October 2010 Council resolved that the petition requesting that Council:

1. repair the road on Bainbridge Street at Ormiston;
2. provide/install traffic islands on Bainbridge Street to slow down the continuous speeders up and down our street; and
3. provide better street lighting for security issues of residences but also driving visibility;

be received and referred to the appropriate area of Council for consideration and a report back to Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That it be noted that a report addressing this matter will be presented to the 2 March 2011 Planning & Policy Committee meeting.

6.1.4 STREET RENAMING – FACCIIO LANE, RAYMOND STREET AND LORAINÉ STREET, CAPALABA

Datworks Filename: RTT Naming - Roads
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 20 October 2010 this item was noted as 'lying on the table' and in accordance with part 3, Division 5, Section 29(7) of Subordinate Local Law No. 5 (Meetings) a procedural motion is required, '*that the item be taken from the table*' before the matter can be considered and concluded.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That it be noted that this matter will be presented to the 2 February 2011 Planning & Policy Committee meeting for consideration.

6.1.5 DREDGING AT VICTORIA POINT JETTY

Datworks Filename: GOV Notice of Business/Urgent Business to
General Meetings
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 20 October 2010 resolved that a report be prepared on the dredging at Victoria Point jetty affecting the landing of the Coochiemudlo Island ferries as this is affecting more than passenger ferries, it has to do with school children having to get home in a certain time and meet the school's duty of care.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That it be noted that a report addressing this matter will be presented to the 2 March 2011 Planning & Policy Committee meeting.

**6.1.6 PETITION (DIVISION 5) CHANGE OF STREET NAME – CUPHEA STREET,
RUSSELL ISLAND TO ANZAC MEMORIAL DRIVE, RUSSELL ISLAND**

Datworks Filename: GOV Petitions
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 17 November 2010 Council resolved that the petition, requesting that Council give due consideration to and undertake to change the name of Cuphea Street, Russell Island to Anzac Memorial Drive, be received and referred to the appropriate area of Council for consideration and a report back to Council.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

A report addressing this matter will be presented to the 6 April 2011 Planning & Policy Committee meeting.

7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**MOTION TO ADJOURN MEETING**

Moved by: Cr Elliott
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That Council adjourn the meeting for a 15 minute public participation segment.

CARRIED

1. Mr L Hackett, Macleay Island, addressed Council in relation to the Redland Bay Centre & Foreshore Master Plan and parking at Weinam Creek.
2. Ms G Nemeth, Macleay Island, addressed Council in relation to the SMBI Communities Advisory Committee, Asbestos on Macleay Island, the public jetty on Macleay Island and the Integrated Local Transport Plan.
3. Mr R McKoskin, representing concerned citizens of Point Talburpin, addressed Council in relation to a petition against a proposed dog off leash area in Point Talburpin.

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Ogilvie

That the public participation segment be extended for 5 minutes to allow a further speaker to address Council.

CARRIED

4. Ms L Denisenko, Victoria Point, addressed Council in relation to the erection of a steel fence at Orana Esplanade.

MOTION TO RESUME MEETING

Moved by: Cr Reimers
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the meeting proceedings resume.

CARRIED

8 PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS

8.1 PETITION

8.1.1 PETITION (DIVISION 5) REMOVAL OF DOG OFF LEASH AREA AT POINT TALBURPIN

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That the petition, which reads as follows, be received and that it be forwarded to the appropriate officers for consideration as part of the feedback regarding the Dog Off Lease Trial at Point Talburpin, for a decision in the new year:

"We the undersigned, request that Council remove the dog off leash area on the foreshore at Point Talburpin, Redland Bay."

CARRIED

9 MOTION TO ALTER THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Nil.

10 MATERIAL PERSONAL INTEREST AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

10.1 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- **Item 13.1.4 – Judy Holt Sportsfields landscape Master Plan Review 2010**
Crs Reimers and Hobson – see item for details
- **Item 13.1.6 – Capalaba Activity Centre Master Plan**
Cr Williams – see item for details
- **Item 14.1.5 – Waste Gate Fee Exemption Policy for Not for Profit Organisations**
Crs Williams, Reimers, Murray, Bowler, townsend, Henry, Boglary, Elliott, Hobson and Ogilvie – see item for details

ITEMS MOVED 'EN BLOC'

The following items were moved 'en bloc' in accordance with the recommendations before Council:

Development & Community Standards

- Item 11.1.1 Amendments to Fees and Charges Schedule 2010/2011
- Item 11.1.2 Delegated Authority to Make Decisions Relating to Development Assessment Applications.

Planning & Policy

- Item 13.1.3 Purchase of Land on Russell Island for Parks and Conservation Purposes
- Item 13.1.7 Redland Planning Scheme Amendment 1C
- Item 13.1.9 SMBI Land Exchange Policy and Guideline
- Item 13.1.10 Proposed Drainage Easement – The Esplanade, Karragarra Island
- Item 13.2.1 Conflict of Interest in Item 13.1.5 – SMBI Committee Report 16 November 2010

Customer Services

- Item 14.1.2 Monthly Report for Customer and Community Services Group October 2010
- Item 14.1.3 Monthly Report for Project Delivery Group
- Item 14.1.4 Monthly Report for Operations and Maintenance Group
- Item 14.1.6 Kingston Avenue Alexandra Hills
- Item 14.3.1 Status Report on Closure of Redland Bay Road, Capalaba

Corporate Services & Governance

- Item 15.2.1 Report on the Audit Committee Meeting of 20 October 2010
- Item 15.3.1 Sponsorship Application - 2011 World Environmental Education Congress
- Item 15.3.2 Information Privacy Policy (Pol-3103)
- Item 15.3.3 Corporate Balanced Scorecard Report - November 2010
- Item 15.4.1 Safety Management Audit
- Item 15.6.1 Draft Corporate Budget Timetable for 2011-2012 Budget
- Item 15.6.2 Allconnex Water Presentation

COUNCILLOR ABSENCES DURING MEETING

- Cr Murray left the meeting at 4.37pm during item 13.1.2.
- Cr Burns left the meeting at 5.03pm during item 14.1.5.
- Cr Ogilvie left the meeting at 5.13pm and returned at 5.15pm during item 14.1.5.
- Cr Elliott left the meeting at 5.56pm and returned at 5.59pm during item 15.2.2.
- Cr Bowler left the meeting at 6.08pm during item 17.1.1 and returned at 6.14pm during item 18.1.
- Cr Townsend left the meeting at 6.13pm and returned at 6.14pm during item 18.1.
- Cr Ogilvie left the meeting at 6.18pm during item 18.1.
- Cr Boglary left the meeting at 6.20pm and returned at 6.23pm during item 18.2.
- Cr Elliott left the meeting at 6.22pm and returned at 6.24pm during item 18.2.
- Cr Henry left and returned to the meeting at 6.54pm during item 18.3.

11 DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE 23 NOVEMBER 2010

11.1 DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS

[Development & Community Standards Committee Minutes 23/11/2010](#)

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the Development & Community Standards Committee Minutes of 23 November 2010 be received and resolutions noted on items resolved under delegated authority.

CARRIED

11.1.1 AMENDMENTS TO FEES AND CHARGES SCHEDULE 2010/2011

**Datworks Filename: GOV Fees and Charges Documentation
FM Fees and Charges 2010/2011**

**Responsible Officer Name: Tricia Bell
Group Manager Business and Performance**

**Author Name: Tricia Bell
Group Manager Business and Performance**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council adopted the 2010/2011 Fees and Charges Schedule at its Special meeting of 25 June 2010.

A number of minor errors, omissions and clarifications have been identified in the Development and Community Standards Fees and Charges Schedule which need to be corrected. Accordingly, this report seeks approval for the 2010/2011 Fees and Charges Schedule to be amended to reflect these changes. These amendments are detailed below.

There are no new fees proposed as part of this recommendation.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to amend the 2010/201 Fees and Charges Schedules as detailed.

BACKGROUND

Following Council's adoption of the 2010/2011 Fees and Charges Schedule, a number of items were identified as requiring amendment and/or clarification in the schedule. These are outlined below:

- Page 26 Discretionary Discounts: Amend text to refer to all fees in the schedule and not just development applications.
- Page 41 Residential – Category 3 – Display Dwelling: Should read ‘per lot’ and not ‘per application’.
- Page 42 Category 1 – Commercial Uses – Outdoor Dining: Should read ‘base fee’ and not ‘base fee + per unit’.
- Page 45: Telecommunications Facility: Should read ‘\$4000 per application’ and not include reference to additional fees for GFA above 500sqm as per the current listing.
- Page 54 Drainage Design – 4-7 fixtures OR alteration of house drainage: Final charge to read ‘\$159.01’ and not ‘\$159.00’. The current approved fee requires an officer to manually adjust each fee as it is entered into the system. The minor amendment proposed will allow the Proclaim system to automatically calculate each fee.

ISSUES

The adoption of the proposed amendments to the 2010/2011 Fees and Charges Schedule will ensure clarity for Council’s customers and reinforce the Department’s commitment to customer service.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council’s strategy 9.6 - Implement long term asset management planning that supports innovation and sustainability of service delivery, taking into account the community’s aspirations and capacity to pay for desired service levels.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed changes will not impact on the Department’s budget bottom line.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for the Redlands Planning Scheme.

CONSULTATION

All areas of the Development and Community Standards Department were consulted, in particular:

- Group Manager Sustainable Assessment;
- Group Manager Community Standards;
- Group Manager Building and Plumbing Services.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve that the following amendments to the 2010/2011 Development and Community Standards Fees and Charges Schedule be adopted and become effective from 12 December 2010:

- 1. Page 26 Discretionary Discounts: Amend text to refer to all fees in the schedule and not just development applications;**
- 2. Page 41 Residential – Category 3 – Display Dwelling: Should read ‘per lot’ and not ‘per application’;**
- 3. Page 42 Category 1 – Commercial Uses – Outdoor Dining: Should read ‘base fee’ and not ‘base fee + per unit’;**
- 4. Page 45: Telecommunications Facility: Should read ‘\$4000 per application’ and not include reference to additional fees for GFA above 500sqm as per the current listing; and**
- 5. Page 54 Drainage Design – 4-7 fixtures OR alteration of house drainage: Final charge to read ‘\$159.01’ and not ‘\$159.00’.**

CARRIED (en bloc)

11.1.2 DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO MAKE DECISIONS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT APPLICATIONS

Dataworks Filename: D&CS Committee Reports for Noting
Responsible Officer Name: Tricia Bell
Group Manager Business and Performance
Author Name: Tricia Bell
Group Manager Business and Performance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (SPA) was adopted on 18 December 2009 to replace the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* (IPA). A review of the current delegated authority for assessing development applications under IPA has been conducted. The result of this review is a proposed delegation to the Chief Executive Officer providing authority to:

1. Manage and decide development applications made under the relevant planning legislation and exercise associated powers in respect of all development applications; and
2. Exercise Council's powers in respect of appeals and proceedings.

It is intended that the proposed delegation conferring powers under the *Local Government Act 2009*, the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* (IPA), the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* (SPA) and the *Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act 1990* will replace the existing delegation which confers powers under the *Integrated Planning Act 1997* and the *Local Government Act 1993*. This delegation is now 'out of date' and needs to reflect not only the appropriate SPA requirements but also the changes to officer title and responsibility reflected by the recent restructure of the Sustainable Assessment Group.

The key difference to note is that the Delegated Criteria under SPA now includes the potential for the delegated officer to refuse a code assessment application where it is determined not to comply. This is to be undertaken by the delegated officer in consultation with the Chairperson Development and Community Standards Committee and the Division Councillor and is intended to be considered under Category 3. This is included to minimise the potential for a deemed approval where Council is considering a refusal of the application.

When providing further delegated authority to relevant officers, it is intended to retain the Delegation Category Criteria which currently exists as follows:

Category 4 - Major and Significant Assessments: Applications for significant development proposals having State and/or Shire wide significance or highly controversial development attracting significant public interest and submissions.

Minimum Delegation Level: Development and Community Standards Committee.

Category 3 – Moderately Complex Code and impact Assessments: Applications of a moderately complex nature. Generally the mainstream impact assessable applications and code assessable applications of varying level of complexity. The former usually includes submissions of public objection readily addressable by reasonable and relevant conditions. Both may have minor level aspects outside a stated policy position that are subject to discretionary provisions of the Planning Scheme. Applications can be referred to Development and Community Standards Committee for a decision where directed by the CEO.

Minimum Delegation Level: Chief Executive Officer to General Manager Development and Community Standards and Group Manager Sustainable Assessment.

Category 2 – Complying Code Assessments and Minor Impact Assessments: This category is for complying small scale types of Code Assessable applications and Impact Assessable applications without submission of public objection (ie not being adverse submissions). Also includes a number of process related delegations, operational works applications and all other delegations not otherwise listed.

Minimum Delegation Level: Chief Executive officer to General Manager Development and Community Standards, Group Manager Sustainable Assessment and Service Managers (Sustainable Assessment).

Category 1 – Minor Complying Code Assessments and Housekeeping: Complying Policy Based Code Assessment, general housekeeping matters and other applications of a minor nature.

Minimum Delegation Level: Chief Executive Officer to General Manager Development and Community Standards, Group Manager Sustainable Assessment, Service Managers (Sustainable Assessment) Team Leaders (Sustainable Assessment), Senior Planners (Sustainable Assessment) and Senior Engineers (Sustainable Assessment).

PURPOSE

The main aim of the proposed delegation is to enable assessment of development applications to progress within legislative timeframes and facilitate more efficient decision making during the assessment process.

BACKGROUND

On 18 December 2009, the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (SPA) was adopted to replace the Integrated Planning Act 1997 (IPA). Provisions were put in place to ensure delegated authority under IPA was transitioned to SPA to enable Local Government authorities to update and amend their officer delegations.

An instrument of delegation under Categories 1, 2 and 3 of IPA currently exists for officers in the Development and Community Standards (DCS) Department. These delegations are applied relevant to the individual officer's level of involvement and decision making in the development assessment process.

It is intended to replace this current delegation with a new delegated authority which will cover all aspects of IPA (for development applications received prior to 18 December 2009) and SPA (for development applications received after 18 December 2009).

The relevant powers will be conferred under:

- *The Local Government Act 2009;*
- *The Integrated Planning Act 1997;*
- *The Sustainable Planning Act 2009; and*
- *The Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act 1990.*

Aspects of the new delegation to note are:

Delegation Criteria

The Delegated Officer may:

1. for the purpose of deciding a development application:
 - (a) make determinations in respect of development controls in legislation (including subordinate legislation such as local planning instruments) that are administered by the Council and are relevant to the assessment of the development application;
 - (b) determine by way of a written assessment whether the development, the subject of the development application complies with the development controls referred to in item (1)(a) of the Delegation Criteria;
 - (c) approve a development application:
 - (i) requiring code assessment where the development is determined by the Delegated Officer to comply with the relevant codes, or if the Delegated Officer determines that there are sufficient grounds to approve the development application despite conflict/s with the planning scheme;
 - (ii) requiring impact assessment where:
 - i. the development is determined by the Delegated Officer to comply with the planning scheme, or if the Delegated Officer determines that there are sufficient grounds to approve the development application despite conflict/s with the planning scheme; and
 - ii. where no substantive, properly made submissions objecting to a development application have been received during the public notification period. Where objections, but no more than five, have been received for a development application, the Delegated Officer is to refer the draft report to the Divisional Councillor prior to issuing the Decision Notice. The Divisional Councillor and the Chairperson Development and Community Standards

- Committee may choose to refer the application to Council for a decision;
- iii. requiring compliance assessment;
- (d) refuse a development application requiring code assessment where the development is determined by the Delegated Officer not to comply with the relevant development controls in accordance with item 1(a) of the Delegation Criteria in consultation with the Chairperson Development and Community Standards Committee and the Divisional Councillor;
- (e) approve a plan of subdivision under the relevant planning legislation or issue a community management statement notation under the *Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997* where there is compliance with the provisions of any relevant local planning instrument, development approval and legislation (including subordinate legislation); and
- (f) approve an application lodged under the *Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act 1990* if the application is of a type which could have been approved by the Delegated Officer if it was lodged under the relevant planning legislation.
2. Manage appeals and proceedings in the Planning and Environment and Magistrate's Courts and the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee.

Delegation Administrative Procedure

The following procedure is to be undertaken for this delegation:

1. For the purpose of managing and deciding a development application
- (a) the Delegated Officer must consider a report which:
- (i) indicates compliance or otherwise with the Delegation Criteria;
- (ii) ensures that the provisions of the relevant planning legislation and any other relevant legislation (including subordinate legislation) are complied with in respect of the determination of the application;
- (iii) details reasons for refusal, where refusal is recommended or set out the conditions of approval, where approval is recommended;
- (iv) includes a recommendation for approval or refusal, signed by the Delegated Officer; and
- (b) The Delegated Officer must ensure that the provisions of the relevant planning legislation and any other applicable legislation (including subordinate legislation) are complied with in respect of the exercise of the powers in this delegation.
2. For the purposes of managing appeals and proceedings in the Planning and Environment and Magistrate's Courts and the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee:
- (a) A Delegated Officer may instruct the Council's Solicitors to initiate legal proceedings on the Council's behalf;
- (b) A Delegated Officer may issue instructions to the Council's Solicitors and Council Officers in relation to the ongoing conduct of legal proceedings; and

- (c) A Delegated Officer must cause a report to be prepared for the Council's information detailing all decisions made under this delegation.

Limitations to the Exercise of Power

1. Decisions for *Integrated Planning Act 1997* and *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* based development applications must be reported as a summary to the Development and Community Standards Committee.
2. Applications can be referred to the Development and Community Standards Committee for a decision where directed by the Chief Executive Officer and Chair Development and Community Standards Committee.
3. This appointment expires when the authorised officer ceases employment with the local government, or when a person no longer holds the prescribed position stated in Schedule 1 or is reclassified.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications from the new delegation. It is expected that the new delegation will contribute to improved organisational productivity.

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

- Group Manager Sustainable Assessment;
- Service Manager Planning Assessment;
- General Manager Development and Community Standards;
- Senior Internal Auditor.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve that the Chief Executive Officer be:

1. Delegated authority to manage and decide development applications with respect to Categories 1, 2 and 3, made under the relevant planning legislation and to exercise associated powers;
2. Delegated authority to exercise Council's powers in respect of appeals and proceedings; and

3. Authorised to further delegate such authorities to Council officers in accordance with Categories 1, 2 and 3, the Delegation Criteria and Delegation Administrative Procedure, subject to the Limitations to the Exercise of Power outlined above.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve that the Chief Executive Officer be:

1. **Delegated authority to manage and decide development applications with respect to Categories 1, 2 and 3, made under the relevant planning legislation and to exercise associated powers;**
2. **Delegated authority to exercise Council's powers in respect of appeals and proceedings;**
3. **Authorised to further delegate such authorities to Council officers in accordance with Categories 1, 2 and 3, the Delegation Criteria and Delegation Administrative Procedure, subject to the Limitations to the Exercise of Power outlined above; and**
4. **That under Delegation Criteria, 1 (c) (ii) ii be amended to read as follows:**
"Where no substantive, properly made submissions objecting to a development application have been received during the public notification period. Where objections, but no more than five, have been received for a development application, the Delegated Officer is to refer the draft report to the Divisional Councillor prior to issuing the Decision Notice. The Mayor, the Divisional Councillor or the Chairperson Development and Community Standards Committee may choose to refer the application to Council for a decision."

CARRIED (en bloc)

ITEMS RESOLVED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY AT COMMITTEE:

- 11.1.3 REQUEST TO CHANGE A DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL FOR A PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR A MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE OVERRIDING THE PLANNING SCHEME AT REDLANDS BUSINESS PARK, 678 GERMAN CHURCH ROAD, REDLAND BAY**
(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)
- 11.1.4 CATEGORY 1 – MINOR COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT AND HOUSEKEEPING**
(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)
- 11.1.5 CATEGORY 2 – COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT AND MINOR IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**
(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)
- 11.1.6 CATEGORY 3 – MODERATELY COMPLEX CODE AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**
(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)
- 11.1.7 CURRENT APPEALS LIST AS AT 5 NOVEMBER 2010**
(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12 DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE 7/12/2010**12.1 DEVELOPMENT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS**

[Development & Community Standards Committee Minutes 7/12/2010](#)

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Ogilvie

That the Development & Community Standards Committee Minutes of 7 December 2010, be received and resolutions noted on items resolved under delegated authority.

CARRIED**ITEMS RESOLVED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY AT COMMITTEE:****12.1.1 DWELLING HOUSE AND RECONFIGURATION AT 613-635 MAIN ROAD, WELLINGTON POINT**

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.2 PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR A MULTIPLE DWELLING (X28) AT 171 ALLENBY ROAD, WELLINGTON POINT

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.3 EXTENSION TO CURRENCY PERIOD FOR A RECONFIGURATION OF LOTS (STAGE 1-10) AT BAYVIEW ESTATE – 299-351 HEINEMANN ROAD, MOUNT COTTON (AREAS A & B)

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.4 RECONFIGURATION OF LAND AT 8 NELSON ROAD AND 630-636 MAIN ROAD, WELLINGTON POINT

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.5 EXTENSION OF RELEVANT PERIOD (S.383 OF SPA) AND REQUEST TO CHANGE DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL (S.369 OF SPA) AT 18 & 20 WATERLOO STREET AND 22 TAYLOR CRESCENT, CLEVELAND

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.6 CATEGORY 1 – MINOR COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT & HOUSEKEEPING

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.7 CATEGORY 2 – COMPLYING CODE ASSESSMENT AND MINOR ASSESSMENTS

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.8 CATEGORY 3 – MODERATELY COMPLEX CODE AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

12.1.9 CURRENT APPEALS LIST AS AT 19 NOVEMBER 2010

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

**12.2.1 CLOSED SESSION: COURT ORDER VARIANCE FOR WEDDING
CEREMONIES AND ASSOCIATED FUNCTION GARDENS AT 196-240
MOUNT VIEW ROAD, MOUNT COTTON**

(This matter was resolved under delegated authority at Committee)

13 PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE 24/11/2010

Moved by: Cr Bowler
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the Planning & Policy Committee Minutes of 24 November 2010 be received.

CARRIED

[Planning & Policy Committee Minutes 24/11/2010](#)

13.1 PLANNING & POLICY

13.1.1 AMENDMENT TO ROAD CLOSURE APPLICATION CLEVELAND POINT RESERVE

Datworks Filename: P&R Division 02 Planning – Cleveland/NSI
Attachment: [Cleveland Pt Road Closure Drawing](#)
[Cleveland Pt Option 1 Full Ring Road](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Warren Mortlock
Acting Manager, Environmental Management
Author Name: Angela Wright
Principal Advisor Open Space Planning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Environment and Resources Management (DERM) has received two applications regarding a section of gazetted road at Cleveland Point.

One application is from Redland City Council requesting the closure of part of Shore Street North at Cleveland Point. The other application is from the Lighthouse Restaurant requesting a volumetric lease over a section of the gazetted road.

The Lighthouse Restaurant request is over an area that is currently in the requested road closure area. DERM have advised that they are not able to issue a lease of two types of tenure.

In order to support the Lighthouse Restaurant in its future development application the slight amendment to the current road closure application is required.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of:

1. Amendment (as attached) to Council's previous resolution and its application to close the gazetted road at end of Shore Street North, Cleveland Point, north of the Lighthouse Restaurant;

2. Submission of a request for amalgamation of Lot 392 on SL10999 into the new park area;
3. Advice being provided to the Department of Environment and Resources Management (DERM) of the amendment; and
4. The closed road being declared Reserve for Park and Recreation Purposes for which Council will accept trusteeship.

BACKGROUND

Cleveland Point Reserve is currently made up of three parcels of land:

- the lease area for the beacon Redland City Council placed under its trusteeship on 13 October 2010;
- the State owned gazetted road (land use as roadway and approximately one third of the central park recreation space); and
- lots in the south of the reserve owned in freehold by Council.

Council made application for grant funding under the "Living Buildings and Places" - Queensland Heritage Grant Program (Round 3) to upgrade the historic lighthouse at Cleveland Point Reserve. As the lighthouse is currently located within gazetted road reserve, Council gave the undertaking in the grant application to changing the land use to ensure that the lighthouse is under the control of Council.

Council has been successful in obtaining Federal Government funding under the Regional and Local Community Infrastructure Program (Stimulus package) for \$2.52 million. Cleveland Point Reserve, along with Wellington Point, Victoria Point and Capalaba Regional Park will all now benefit from additional funding and the road closure will ensure that park improvements can be delivered without further delays.

Council adopted a master plan for Cleveland Point Reserve in April 2006. The master plan provides the blueprint to Council for the development of the reserve over the next 10 years. During the consultation period, it was recommended by the then Department of Natural Resources and Mines, that a road closure be activated and the land gazettal changed to Parks and Recreation (with the exception of the lease land surrounding the beacon) making the land usage appropriate with the use of the land. The road would then form a ring road within the park.

A road closure and change of the gazettal to Parks and Conservation will fulfil the commitment of Council in the grant application and will also be the final step in the master plan process before the works commence construction in 2010/2011.

ISSUES

The Lighthouse Restaurant

The Lighthouse Restaurant is preparing to make an application to Redland City Council to construct a 2nd story balcony over part of the current road reserve. The

Lighthouse Restaurant has already made application to DERM for a volumetric lease over part of the gazetted road.

DERM has received the request for the permanent road closure from Council over part of the gazetted road that the Lighthouse Restaurant would like to lease.

DERM Response

- Council has been advised by DERM that the proposed balcony would be over two tenures (gazetted road and park).
- DERM has indicated that it would not support an arrangement where a building is constructed over with two different tenures.
- DERM also does not want the applicant to have exclusive use of the ground floor area underneath the 2nd floor balcony and would consider Strata Tenure above ground.
- DERM has requested that RCC consider part of the area that the proposed balcony would encroach on being removed from the road closure as this would provide for a neater leasing arrangement to be offered to the applicant.

Planning Approvals

- The Lighthouse Restaurant has an existing Outdoor Dining approval. The current proposal would alter dining plans and is not covered under the existing approval. The Outdoor Dining approval would require amendments.
- The addition of a deck on the Lighthouse Restaurant building will require an application to Council.
- The area to be left in the gazetted road to accommodate the Restaurant's application is approximately 85m².

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

Outcome 5 – Wise Planning and Design - we will carefully manage population pressures and use land sustainably while advocating and taking steps to determine limits of growth and carrying capacity on a local and national basis, recognising environmental sensitivities and the distinctive character, heritage and atmosphere of local communities. A well-planned network of urban, rural and bushland areas and responsive infrastructure and transport

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

It is estimated that the financial cost for undertaking the above actions is unlikely to exceed \$400. This includes the lodgement fee of \$150 and application fee of \$190. The other cost will be advertising of road closure under section 915 of the Local Government Act.

The area will need to be re-surveyed at a cost of approx \$4,000-\$5,000.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

The Land Use Planning Group will need to be consulted as is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report may result in possible amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme. If the DERM approve the road closure, then mapping of the road will be required to be amended.

CONSULTATION

Comments after consultation with the following have been taken into consideration in the preparation of this report.

- Principal Engineer, Roads & Drainage
- Principal Advisor, Open Space Planning
- Advisor, Capital Works
- DERM
- Design Services Manager
- Survey Project Coordinator
- Surveyor/Survey Officer
- Officer Planning

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To request an amendment to the application made to the Department of Environment and Resources Management under section 99 of the *Land Act 1994*, for the permanent closure of the northern part of Shore Street North, Cleveland Point, north of the Lighthouse Restaurant;
2. To request amalgamation of Lot 392 on SL10999 into the new park area;
3. That the land from this road closure be declared a Reserve for Park and Recreation purposes with Council accepting trusteeship of this land; and
4. That the Chief Executive Officer be the delegated authority, under s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009* to sign all associated documentation.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve to defer this matter pending the provision of any additional information that may be required to make a decision.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To request an amendment to the application made to the Department of Environment and Resources Management under section 99 of the Land Act 1994, for the permanent closure of the northern part of Shore Street North, Cleveland Point, north of the Lighthouse Restaurant;
2. To request amalgamation of Lot 392 on SL10999 into the new park area;

3. That the land from this road closure be declared a Reserve for Park and Recreation purposes with Council accepting trusteeship of this land; and
4. That the Chief Executive Officer be the delegated authority, under s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, to sign all associated documentation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That this item be deferred to the General Meeting of 15 December 2010.

(See Direct to Council Report – Item [17.3.1](#))

13.1.2 RESPONSE TO A PETITION TO REDLAND CITY COUNCIL - BUILDING OF A SKATE PARK

Dataworks Filename: P&R Skate Parks, GOV Petitions
Responsible Officer Name: Warren Mortlock
Acting Manager, Environmental Management
Author Name: Angela Wright
Principal Advisor, Open Space Planning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A petition was submitted to the General Meeting of Council on 24 Sept 2010 from residents who live in the vicinity of Lorikeet Drive Park Thornlands.

The request is for a small skate park to be located within the park.

The Environmental Management Group has been requested to respond to the petitioner in relation to this request.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to provide a recommendation to the petitioners in relation to their request for a small skate park in Lorikeet Drive Park, Thornlands.

BACKGROUND

The following petition was submitted to the General Meeting on 24 Sept 2010.

Item 8.1 of the General Meeting Minutes refers:

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the petition, which reads as follows, be received and referred to the Planning & Policy department for investigation and a report back to Council.

"We the undersigned, request that Council build a small skate park for scooters, skateboards and BMX riders that could be located on the corner of Lorikeet Drive and Swallow Street next to the existing park."

ISSUESRedland Ramp Park Strategy

The Redland Ramp Park Review 2008-2012 does not identify this location as having deficit or lack of ramp park facilities.

Section 2.7 of the review recommends *considering localised pocket facilities that can provide “mellow” obstacles for beginners to practice on in local parks*. Such obstacles are also useful and fun for more advanced skaters and riders, enabling them to practise specific tricks in relative safety away from a busy circuit.

Location to ramp parks

It can be advised that the petitioners live within 2.5kms of both Cleveland and Thornlands ramp parks, notwithstanding that residents from this part of Thornlands have to cross busy Wellington Street to access the Thornlands facility and South and Russell Sts to access Cleveland.

Wheeled play options

Lorikeet Drive Park would be an excellent location for a small pocket facility or wheeled play area. These are small in nature and consist of a concrete area with one or more elements such as a grind rail, fun box or small half pipe.

Vicinity to Kinross Rd Structure Planning Area

It should be noted that Lorikeet Drive Park is within walkable distance from proposed housing developments in the Kinross Rd structure planning area. While access from this area is currently not available or accessible future planning for the structure planning area should ensure that young people have direct access to this park from the north eastern corner of the development where there will be no park facilities, particularly of this nature.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

Outcome 7 – Strong and connected communities – Our health, wellbeing and strong community spirit will be supported by a full range of services, programs, organisations and facilities, and our values of caring and respect will extend to people of all ages, cultures, abilities and needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The wheeled play areas for parks could be included as a new line item in the 10 yr capital works program. The areas could be designed on a scale that made them affordable under each Divisional Parks Infrastructure Fund allocation.

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 Council has been consulted prior to development of this report.

OPTIONS**PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That a ramp park facility not be designed or constructed in Lorikeet Drive Park;
2. That a small wheeled play facility could be designed for Lorikeet Drive Park and construction of the facility be considered in the 2011/2012 Capital Works program or within the 10 year capital works program; and
3. That the Petitioners be advised of this recommendation.

ALTERNATIVE

That a ramp park facility or small wheeled play area not be designed or constructed in Lorikeet Drive Park due to current levels of access and supply of ramp park facilities to Thornlands and Cleveland residents.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That a ramp park facility not be designed or constructed in Lorikeet Drive Park;
2. That a small wheeled play facility could be designed for Lorikeet Drive Park and construction of the facility be considered in the 2011/2012 Capital Works program or within the 10 year capital works program; and
3. That the principal petitioner be advised of this resolution, and they be requested to notify all petitioners of Council's decision.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **That a ramp park facility not be designed or constructed in Lorikeet Drive Park;**
2. **That a small wheeled play facility be designed for Lorikeet Drive Park and construction of the facility be considered in the 2011/2012 Capital Works program or within the 10 year capital works program; and**
3. **That the principal petitioner be advised of this resolution, and they be requested to notify all petitioners of Council's decision.**

CARRIED

13.1.3 PURCHASE OF LAND ON RUSSELL ISLAND FOR PARKS AND CONSERVATION PURPOSES

Dataworks Filename: SMBI Open Space Plan

Attachments: [Zone Map](#)
[Aerial Photograph](#)
[Site 40](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Warren Mortlock
Acting Manager, Environmental Management

Author Name: Angela Wright
Principal Advisor Open Space Planning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A significant parcel of land has been offered to Council on Russell Island by the property's owners. Previous voluntary offers by Council to acquire the lot through purchase or land exchange under the Conservation Acquisition Strategy in 2003/2004 and park acquisition through land exchange under the SMBI Open Space Plan have been unsuccessful.

The Environment Management Group is recommending acquiring the whole of Lot 1 RP73383 for joint conservation, recreation and minor access road construction purposes. Protection of the environment values of the property is considered significant enough to warrant this recommendation. In addition to the protection of the environmental values, acquisition of the lot would also provide for the future recreation use of residents and visitors to the island and allow for the construction of a flood free minor access road to the southern end of Baguette Street.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to request approval to purchase the whole of Lot 1 RP73383 (136 – 146 High St Russell Island) for park, conservation and road construction purposes. Approval to acquire part of the Lot (1.24ha) has previously been gained by Council Resolution of 24 June 2009 (Item 12.3.1 (1) Priority Land Acquisitions for the SMBI Open Space Plan).

BACKGROUND

In 2002, the Conservation Acquisition Strategy (following public notification) identified the subject lot for Council acquisition through voluntary purchase or land exchange for Conservation and Recreation and Open Space purposes.

In 2006, with the commencement of the Redlands Planning Scheme the subject lot was included primarily within the Conservation Zone, with a small area included in the Community Purposes Sub-Area CP7 (to provide alternative flood free access road to several private residential lots located on the southern end of Baguette Street).

In 2007, the western third (1.24ha) of the subject lot is listed as a high priority property for acquisition through land exchange in the SMBI Open Space Plan. Land exchange offers have subsequently been made to the owner but were unsuccessful.

A small part of the lot has been included in the Community Purposes Sub-Area CP7 zone to provide alternative flood free access road to several private residential lots located on the southern end of Baguette Street.

The 4ha lot is zoned conservation, except for a small area zoned for community purposes (road).

On 17 September 2010 the owners of 136-146 High Street Russell Island offered Council their property for purchase. (DW 4990876)

ISSUES

The Environmental Management Group recommends the purchase the whole lot rezoned to open space and conservation. It is further recommended that the conservation area remain in public ownership.

The total size of the property is 40469m². The park would be approx 1.24 ha and the remaining 2.76ha would become a conservation reserve and a portion for road construction purposes.

Conservation Value

The property straddles a low ridge line and, as a consequence and unusually for Russell Island, does not include a wetland. The property does, however, contain Remnant Ecosystem 12.5.3 which occurs on remnant tertiary surfaces. This RE is considered as regionally 'endangered' and locally 'endangered' in the Redland City Biodiversity Strategy 2008-2012. Because of its elevation, much of this vegetation type has been cleared historically on the island and it is unusual to find such a large area of remnant vegetation of this type.

The area of the Remnant Ecosystem is approximately 2.6 ha with the balance considered as non-remnant. The pre-clear mapping indicates that the non-remnant vegetation would also, originally, have been RE 12.5.3.

The Objective of the RCC Biodiversity Policy states that "Redland City Council, in conjunction with all stakeholders, is committed to protecting and rehabilitating biodiversity by undertaking the necessary actions to:

- Maintain viability of ecosystems by retaining all remaining remnant vegetation (remaining 30%) on the mainland, North Stradbroke Island and Southern Moreton Bay Islands.
- Maintain all 39 regional ecosystems as described in the *Vegetation Management Act 1999*."

The acquisition of this property to create a recreational open space and to protect an endangered ecosystem achieves this objective. Furthermore, the non-remnant vegetation could be managed by Council to achieve remnant status. This would

achieve Policy Statement 2. "Rehabilitate native vegetation, wildlife corridors and terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems that have been degraded or have lost ecological function back to a condition of good health."

In addition to the status of the Remnant Ecosystem and the opportunity to increase the amount of an RE through management, the State's SEQ BPA v3.5 analysis considers the subject property as of State significance.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

A diverse and healthy natural environment, with an abundance of native flora and fauna and rich ecosystems will thrive through our awareness, commitment and action in caring.

Our health, wellbeing and strong community spirit will be supported by a full range of services, programs, organisations and facilities, and our values of caring and respect will extend to people of all ages, cultures, abilities and needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The property has been independently valued. The property owners have made a firm written offer which the Property Services Manager is in agreement with.

Funds are provided in the 2010/2011 Budget for purchase of SMBI land under the Open Space Plan recommendations. A contribution would also be made from funds from the Environment Charge.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will require amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme if part of the lot is to become public parkland.

CONSULTATION

The following officers and the Councillor Division 5 have been consulted about this purchase and support this report going to Council; Property Services Manager, Principal Advisor Natural Areas, Principal Advisor Land Use Planning.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

1. Authorise the purchase of Lot 1 RP73383 (136-146 High St Russell Island) for park, conservation purposes and road construction purposes at fair market value;
2. Rezone the property to open space and conservation (split zone) following road construction; and
3. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer, under s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009* to execute all documents in respect to this recommendation.

ALTERNATIVE

Reject the offer of purchase by the owners and remove from the SMBI Open Space Planning priority list.

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

Moved by: Cr Bowler

Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **Authorise the purchase of Lot 1 RP73383 (136-146 High St Russell Island) for park, conservation purposes and road construction purposes at fair market value;**
2. **Rezone the property to open space and conservation (split zone) following road construction; and**
3. **Authorise the Chief Executive Officer, under s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, to execute all documents in respect to this resolution.**

CARRIED (en bloc)

Crs Reimers declared a conflict of interest in the following item, as member of the organisations listed below:

- Patron of Redlands Dog Obedience Club
- Patron of Muddies Cricket Club
- Patron of Multisports Club
- Convenor of the Judy Holt Bushcare Group

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That Cr Reimers did not have conflict of interest and that she be allowed to remain in the Chamber.

CARRIED

Cr Hobson declared a conflict of interest in the following item, as a member of the organisation listed below:

- Patron of Redlands Scottish & Celtic Society Alexandra Hills

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Williams

That Cr Hobson did not have a conflict of interest and that she be allowed to remain in the Chamber.

CARRIED

13.1.4 JUDY HOLT SPORTSFIELDS LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN REVIEW 2010

Dataworks Filename: P&R Judy Holt Landscape Master Plan 2010
Attachment: [Draft Judy Holt Sportsfield Landscape Master Plan Review Report – A planning guide for Council and Community 2010 - 2020](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Judy Spokes
Acting Manager, Community & Social Planning
Author Name: Kristina Dickman
Senior Advisor, Sport & Recreation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environmental Management (EM) and Community and Social Planning (C&SP) are reviewing the Judy Holt Sportsfields Master Plan which was adopted by Council in February, 2004.

The site is a former closed landfill and currently functions as high use sporting grounds and recreational areas.

The 2004 landscape master plan has been reviewed and EM and C&SP are seeking Council approval to take the draft to public consultation.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present to Council the master plan review report and seek approval for its release of the draft to the community for further public consultation and feedback.

BACKGROUND

Judy Holt Sportsfields at Birkdale is classified as a regional sport park that provides activity space for multiple indoor and outdoor sporting and recreation activities. The park is State land held under the trusteeship of Council and is made up of several land parcels. Parts of the park is heavily vegetated and provides significant environmental and habitat values.

Environmental concerns, land use pressures, public use and years of weathering have triggered the need for an holistic approach toward site planning for the future. Council officers began the master planning process in February 2010, by reviewing the existing master plan for the site which was adopted by Council in 2004.

Background information, stakeholder engagement, community concerns and Councillor feedback, compiled over the last 10 months has been considered and consolidated into the draft Judy Holt Sportsfields Landscape Master Plan Review Report (See attachment).

The draft Review Report recommends a staged plan for future works that would integrate with the operational works to remediate the closed landfill sections of the site. The draft landscape master plan also provides for integration with the future closure of Birkdale Landfill site.

A number of key design principles have been integrated into the master planning and outlined in the report to achieve outcomes which are safe, robust, and usable and creates a distinctive sense of place for the Redlands community.

ISSUES

The major design influences for the planning of Judy Holt Sportsfields site include:

- Consideration of the closed landfill area and constraints;
- Protection of the environmental values of the park balanced with the needs of the community
- Maximisation of access to the park and opportunities for walking and cycling;
- Connections to other paths/destinations;
- Recognition that facilities have to meet present day standards;
- Minimisation of potential crime risks through design and lighting solutions;

- Recognition that facilities are intended to be multipurpose, serving the needs of more than one group where possible;
- Consolidation and integration of recreation opportunities;
- Creation of natural and artificial shaded areas;
- Infrastructure development and green design;
- Car parking and vehicle movement and access, pedestrian safety;

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's 'Strong and connected communities' outcome, Strategy 7.5 - 'increase the physical activity participation of residents and deliver programs and incentives that strengthen opportunities for sport and recreation'.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Funds have been allocated in the current 10 year capital budget to upgrade and improve the closed landfill areas of Judy Holt for recreational purposes. Further funding is proposed to be sourced through grant applications to State Government for sport and recreation elements.

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 to date has involved interviews and onsite meetings with both internal and external stakeholders.

External

- Redlands Rugby Union Club
- Redlands Multi-Sports Club
- Muddies Cricket Club
- Redlands Dog Obedience Club
- Birkdale Bushcare

Internal

- Elected Council Representatives;
- Leisure & Recreation Services Manager;
- Recreation Officer (Leisure & Recreation Services);
- Service Manager - Survey Services;

- Principal Adviser - Land Use Planning;
- Principal Adviser – Open Space Planning
- Senior Advisers – Natural Environment Team;
- Senior Adviser – Waste Planning
- Senior Adviser - Parks and Conservation

Consultation for the draft to be open until 21 February 2011.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To note the draft Judy Holt Landscape Master Plan Review Report for the purposes of seeking public comments; and
2. That the consultation period remain open for public comment to at least 21 February 2011.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council does not support the public display of the draft Judy Holt Landscape Master Plan Review Report and the matter be deferred to subsequent meeting of Council pending additional information is provided as directed by Council.

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That Council resolve as follows:

- 1. To note the draft Judy Holt Landscape Master Plan Review Report for the purposes of seeking public comments; and**
- 2. That the consultation period remain open for public comment to at least 21 February 2011.**

CARRIED

13.1.5 SMBI COMMITTEE REPORT 16 NOVEMBER 2010 - ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Dataworks Filename: GOV Committee Minutes - SMBICAC
Attachment: [Committee Report](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Greg Underwood
General Manager Planning & Policy
Author Name: Mark Conlan
Principal Advisor - SMBI Strategies

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The SMBI Communities Advisory Committee met on Tuesday, 16 November 2010 at the Lamb Island Community Hall, Lamb Island. Attached is a copy of the Committee Report from this meeting.

The following reports were considered by the Advisory Committee:

6.1 Infrastructure Planning – Transport infrastructure and service levels

This report follows a presentation made to the Advisory Committee by the Infrastructure Planning Group and Land Use Planning Group at a workshop held on 14 September 2010. This information was presented by Abdish Athwal, Senior Engineer Traffic and Transport, Infrastructure Planning and Mark Conlan, Principal Adviser SMBI Strategy Planning Coordinator.

Recommendation to Advisory Committee was –

That the SMBI Communities Advisory Committee:

1. note the information provided on the transport infrastructure; and
2. support or provide further advice to Council regarding the initiatives outlined in the workshop; and
3. endorse the views of the SMBI Forum in its ILTP submission.

6.2 Community and Social Planning – Other infrastructure and service levels

This report follows a presentation made to the Advisory Committee by the Community and Social Planning Group and the Land Use Planning Group at a workshop held on 13 October 2010. This information was presented by Frank Pearce, Senior Advisor Community Development, Community and Social Planning and Mark Conlan, Principal Adviser SMBI Strategy Planning Coordinator.

Recommendation to Advisory Committee was –

That the SMBI Communities Advisory Committee:

1. note the information provided on community & social and land use planning; and
2. support or provide further advice to Council regarding the initiatives outlined in the workshop.

6.3 Meeting Schedule Revision

This report provides an update on the meeting schedule of the Advisory Committee. Due to meeting clashes for future Council Committee meetings the meeting dates for the February and May meetings have been changed.

Recommendation to Advisory Committee was –

- That the Advisory Committee note the updated changes to the meeting schedule as presented in the attachment.

6.4 Updates and reviews of actions from previous meetings:

Recommendation to Advisory Committee was –

- That the Advisory Committee review and note the update of actions from previous meetings as presented in the attachments.

7 Urgent Business

1. The Committee raised the question of work being undertaken at the Weinam Creek car park prior to the completion of the SMBI Integrated Local Transport Plan (ILTP) Review and the Social and Economic Impact Assessment (SEIA)?

The CEO responded by confirming the outcomes of Council's endorsement of the Redland Bay Centre and Foreshore Master Plan, in that the outcomes of the SMBI ILTP Review and the SEIA will inform the work to be undertaken at Weinam Creek. This issue will be tabled with Council in the near future.

2. The Committee raised the question of Council's Integrated Employment Strategy. This will be presented to Council in the near future.

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

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **To receive the attached SMBI Communities Advisory Committee Report of 16 November 2010; and**
2. **To note that the Chief Executive Officer will deal with any operational or administrative recommendations from this Advisory Committee Report and where necessary, report to an ensuing Planning & Policy Committee meeting with recommendations for consideration by that Committee.**

CARRIED

Cr Williams declared a potential conflict of interest in the following Item, stating that she was a member of CBID (Capalaba Business Improvement District), and that she would vote in the public's interest.

Moved by: Cr Elliott
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Cr Williams did not have a conflict of interest and be allowed to remain in the Chamber.

CARRIED

13.1.6 CAPALABA ACTIVITY CENTRE MASTER PLAN

Dataworks Filename: LUP Planning - Capalaba Master Plan

Attachments: [Attachment 1: Capalaba Centre Master Plan - Submission Review Report](#)
[Attachment 2: Proposed amendments to the Capalaba Centre Master Plan](#)
[Attachment 3: Volume 1 - Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Plan](#)
[Attachment 4: Volume 2 - Planning Study](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Stephen Hill
Acting Manager, Land Use Planning

Author Name: Vanessa Mogg
Strategic Planner, Land Use Planning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy has been prepared in response to the need to develop a planning framework to guide growth and redevelopment within the Capalaba Centre over the next 20 years and beyond.

The Plan was placed on public display between 26 April 2010 and 2 July 2010. At the close of the submission period Council had received a total of ninety two (92) submissions. Each of the submissions has been reviewed and assessed and subsequently presented to a Councillor workshop. Attachment 1 - Capalaba Centre Master Plan Submission Review Report summarises the submissions and provides a recommended response to the specific issues which have been raised.

Attachment 2 - Proposed amendments to the Capalaba Centre Master Plan identifies all recommended changes to the Master Plan and Implementation Strategy as a result of submissions received from the public, State agencies, internal Council Groups and a Peer Review from the Urban Design Alliance Queensland. It is recommended the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation

Strategy be adopted to reflect the proposed amendments as detailed in Attachment 2.

Following adoption the Master Plan will require incorporation of the Plan's actions/initiatives into the Council's Operational Plan/s and future budget/s along with incorporation into the Redlands Planning Scheme.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of:

- the Submission Review Report (Attachment 1) which documents the review of public feedback received during public display of the Capalaba Master Plan;
- proposed amendments to the Capalaba Centre Master Plan (Attachment 2); and
- the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy (Attachment 3) incorporating the amendments as detailed in Attachment 2.

BACKGROUND

The Capalaba Centre Master Plan project commenced mid 2006 in partnership with the State Government. The initial stage of the project was managed by Translink and the then Office of Urban Management and provided a preferred busway alignment and busway station location in Capalaba as part of the Eastern Busway project.

The preferred busway alignment through Capalaba and busway station location was subsequently endorsed by the State Government in 2007, following community consultation. Between 2007 and 2008, Council worked in partnership with the Department of Main Roads and Translink to assess the impact of closing Redland Bay Road to through traffic in order to strengthen pedestrian movements between the two major shopping centres. The traffic modelling found it is technically feasible to close Redland Bay Road between the two major shopping centres provided a number of intersection upgrades occurred in the surrounding road network.

Council assumed project management responsibility of the master planning process in 2008 following completion of the traffic modelling and a State Government agency workshop that developed three conceptual options for Capalaba. These conceptual options provided important insights into challenges and opportunities for the central Capalaba area and background information that informed the development of the Master Plan.

Following the State Agency workshop, an Urban Design Analysis was prepared to provide a clear and concise summary of the statutory and physical parameters of the Capalaba Master Plan area and wider study area.

A community engagement and communications strategy was also prepared at this time. The key community engagement activity involved an incremental Enquiry by Design [EBD] process. This involved three full day workshops, staged over several

months, to provide opportunity for broader community comment in between the workshops. A Project Reference Group [PRG] directly participated in the three EBD workshops. Direct invitations to join the PRG were sent to key State Government agencies, landowners and community/interest groups. Prior to the first workshop, a newsletter with a visioning survey was distributed in Capalaba and surrounding areas. The newsletter provided opportunity for initial community comment on the future of central Capalaba and allowed interested community members to nominate to join the PRG and attend the three workshops.

The first and second EBD workshops were held on 27 November and 11 December 2008. From the first two EBD workshops, a draft vision, planning and design principles, and two conceptual options were prepared. This material was presented to Council at a workshop on 5 February 2009 and publicly displayed from 18 February to 11 March 2009.

Following the public display, the third and final EBD workshop was held on 19 March 2009. At the third workshop, the PRG considered comments made to the public display and developed design responses for a number of precincts that required further consideration.

The three EBD workshops and public comments provided the master plan design team with significant guidance to prepare the Capalaba Centre Master Plan.

The Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy was adopted for the purposes of public display at the General Meeting on 31 March 2010 (item number 10.1.1). The public notification period commenced on 26 April 2010 and concluded on 2 July 2010. At the end of the public notification period 92 submissions were received.

ISSUES

1. CAPALABA CENTRE MASTER PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The Capalaba Centre Master Plan provides a planning framework to guide the revitalisation of Capalaba to 2031 and beyond as an attractive, liveable and sustainable centre that supports the needs of the City's and region's growing community.

Key features of the Capalaba Centre Master Plan include:

- a) clear vision for the future of the Capalaba Centre which has guided the development of the Master Plan;
- b) a set of guiding, planning and design principles based around the following
 - broad themes:
 - a sustainable centre;
 - a connected centre;
 - a centre with a clear identity;

- a vibrant and prosperous centre; and
 - a focus on implementation and delivery.
- c) a planning framework, illustrative plan and set of design guidelines that provide opportunities for the revitalisation of the Capalaba Centre. Key elements include:
- creating an active and vibrant place where the community of residents and businesses are able to live, work, interact and invest;
 - providing for a significant opportunity for increased local employment and economic development;
 - planning for strategic infrastructure through integration of the Eastern Busway alignment and bus station;
 - the re-invention of Redland Bay Road to transform it from a barrier between the two main retail centres into an integral element that facilitates pedestrian movements and connects the centre;
 - establishing a strong east-west pedestrian spine that binds the key civic, retail and environmental assets of the centre;
 - providing a focus for civic life, with the creation of a town square to function as the 'heart' of the centre with the major retail shopping centres engaging with the square;
 - activating the Coolnwynpin Creek corridor through setting the car park further back from the creek edge, allowing rehabilitation and opportunities for several small scale café and restaurant pavilions;
 - opportunities to live in the centre in a range of housing types, supporting a more vibrant street life and 'after hours' economy along with capitalising on high quality public transport;
 - increasing building height in key locations around the town centre to emphasise the 'heart' of the centre;
 - supporting high quality building design utilising podium design principles and promoting sustainable building design including elements such as 'green' roofs;
 - reducing the dominance of at grade car parking through basement and podium parking.
- d) an Implementation Strategy that details the range of actions required to implement the Master Plan over short, medium and long term timeframes and the responsibility for each action. Importantly, the implementation strategy identifies a range of catalyst projects to drive the revitalisation of the Capalaba Centre.

The extension of the Eastern Busway to Capalaba is identified as a key project/driver to the revitalisation of the Capalaba Centre and realisation of the outcomes of the Master Plan. Its delivery into the Capalaba CBD before the planned post 2020 delivery timeframe is therefore considered essential to

achieving the outcomes of the Master Plan. In the shorter term, interim bus priority measures to improve bus movements through the centre are essential;

- e) a Planning Study that outlines the background studies, community engagement and planning context that have informed the Capalaba Centre Master Plan.

2. STRATEGIC CONSULTATION PLAN

The recent public display of the Capalaba Centre Master Plan was supported by a range of consultation/engagement activities (as detailed in the Capalaba Centre Master Plan Strategic Consultation Plan) to engage with the community and key stakeholders. This Consultation Plan was endorsed by Council at the General Meeting on 31 March 2010 (item number 10.1.1).

The key consultation/engagement measures included:

- individual meetings with key stakeholders such as the owners of the two major shopping centres;
- reconvening of the Project Reference Group to present the plan and highlight opportunity to comment;
- direct mail outs to businesses, organisations and households within the Master Plan area;
- interactive displays in the major shopping centres to capture comments from people shopping, working, visiting or travelling through the Master Plan area;
- peer review of the Plan by the Urban Design Alliance.

3. SUBMISSION PERIOD REVIEW

At the close of the display period, Council had received ninety-two [92] submissions from individual community members, community organisations, landowners and developer interest groups. Feedback was received in several forms, including newsletter feedback forms, pro-formas, emails, mail, online submission forms and hand delivered copies. Sixty-eight [68] of the submissions were received by residents or organisations in Capalaba.

Of the 92 submissions received forty-seven were pro-forma submissions from the Capalaba Progress Association.

3.1 *Urban Design Alliance Peer Review*

A Peer Review of the Master Plan was conducted by urban design experts associated with the Urban Design Alliance. The two representatives from the Urban Design Alliance were:

- Malcolm Middleton, Malcolm Middleton Architects

- John Byrne, Consultant Advisor in Urban Design, Urban Planning and Urban Housing and Adjunct Professor in Urban Design at Queensland University of Technology

Both peer reviews provided overall support for the Master Plan. Key comments included:

- Encourage building height in the centre & maximise residential development to activate centre and support business investment;
- Advocate the delivery of the Eastern Busway and the Busway station;
- Maximise the residential domain proposed in the Master Plan;
- Provide strong pedestrian movement networks;
- Mix uses both vertically and horizontally;
- Proceed with catalyst projects;
- Ensure high standards of design are embedded in the implementation of the Master Plan;
- Establish a new and dynamic identity for the Activity Centre; and
- Commence reorientation of the road network.

3.2 State Agency Comments

The state government provided feedback on the Master Plan. Comments were received from:

- Department of Health
- Department of Community Safety
- Department of Communities
- Department of Environment and Resource Management
- Department of Transport and Main Roads
- Department of Infrastructure and Planning

The state government agencies were generally supportive of the Master Plan. The key issues raised through the state agency review relates to traffic impacts on the surrounding regional road network. Discussions are ongoing with the state government to address traffic congestion issues in Capalaba.

3.3 Community and Social Planning Group

Community and Social Planning conducted the Redland City Council Child and Youth Friendly City Project over the first half of 2010 and included the Master Plan as one of the Project's case studies. Key feedback included:

- 1) Embedding the future Redlands Child and Youth Friendly Design Guideline in the Master Plan;
- 2) Providing an additional pedestrian route between the town square and John Frederick's Park;
- 3) Identifying informal play - public spaces within core areas;
- 4) Providing low-key active uses at the regional park end of the east-west pedestrian spine.

It is recommended that the Master Plan be amended to include the above feedback.

3.4 Public feedback

A Councillor workshop was held on 30 September 2010 to discuss key issues raised during the public display period. Issues discussed at the workshop included:

- 1) Population growth and lifestyle
 - Opposition to State Government population targets;
 - Support for accommodating a growing population through medium density rather than through traditional residential development.
- 2) Height and density
 - Concerns regarding the proposed height of buildings and the potential impacts on lifestyle and character;
 - Support for building heights proposed recognising Capalaba is the most suitable location in the City for the building height proposed and will assist in revitalising the centre.
- 3) Strong pedestrian connections
 - Support for a strong east-west pedestrian spine linking the two major shopping centres and civic spaces;
 - Support for creating a pedestrian focused area;
 - Concerns raised regarding the longer-term potential closure of Redland Bay Road.
- 4) Transport connectivity
 - Support for the Eastern Busway to Capalaba to be brought forward;
 - The Eastern Busway should not be relied upon to alleviate traffic congestion;

- Concern that the existing road infrastructure is beyond capacity at present and the development of the Master Plan will add further traffic to the network.

Site specific issues discussed at the workshop included 1 Pittwin Road North (Bunning's warehouse) and 21-23 Pittwin Road North. Other site specific issues raised during the public notification period include:

- 7- 45 Redland Bay Road, Capalaba (Capalaba Park Shopping Centre)
- 39 Old Cleveland Road (Capalaba Business Centre)
- 54 Mount Cotton Road (Rhodes development)
- 29 Loraine Street (Redlands Community Centre Inc.)

The attached Capalaba Centre Master Plan – Submission Review Report (Attachment 1) incorporates a detailed review and recommended responses to all issues raised during the public notification of the Master Plan.

3.5 Summary of submission period outcomes

Attachment 2 - Proposed amendments to the Capalaba Centre Master Plan identifies all recommended changes to the Master Plan and implementation Strategy as a result of submissions received from the public, State agencies, internal Council Groups and the Peer Review undertaken by the Urban Design Alliance Queensland. It is recommended the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy be adopted to reflect the proposed amendments as detailed in Attachment 2.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's Healthy natural environment (1), Green living (2), Wise planning and design (5), Supportive and vibrant economy (6) and Strong and connected communities (7) outcomes.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no immediate financial implications other than costs associated with initiating amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme. Recommendations for further detailed design and commencement of catalyst projects will need to be considered as part of future budgets. In the short to medium term, there are financial implications for the actions/initiatives identified and as such detailed planning and costing will be presented through budget preparation and adoption processes.

The Capalaba Centre Master Plan's preparation and other associated costs were included in the 2009/2010 budget.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the adoption of the Master Plan will result in amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme, including changes to the Major Centre Zone Code as it relates to the Capalaba Centre.

CONSULTATION

Land Use Planning has consulted with the relevant groups of Planning and Policy throughout the preparation of the Capalaba Centre Master Plan.

The Project Reference Group included State Government and community representatives, business owners, Councillors and Council staff.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To adopt the officer recommendations as detailed in Attachment 1 – Capalaba Master Plan Submission Review Report.
2. To adopt the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy incorporating the amendments as detailed in Attachment 2 for the purposes of:
 - a. Informing an amendment of the Redlands Planning Scheme;
 - b. Informing future Council's budget, capital works and operational plans;
 - c. Providing Council with an advocacy tool for liaison with the State Government on key planning issues;
 - d. Guiding and informing future detailed design and planning processes pertaining to the Capalaba Centre;
 - e. Providing further opportunities for engagement with the community and stakeholders throughout the Plans' implementation;
3. To notify all submitters of Council's decision.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council not endorse the Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy and proposed amendments.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the officer recommendations as detailed in Attachment 1 – Capalaba Master Plan Submission Review Report;
2. Adopt the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy incorporating the amendments as detailed in Attachment 2 for the purposes of:
 - a. Informing an amendment of the Redlands Planning Scheme;
 - b. Informing future Council's budget, capital works and operational plans;
 - c. Providing Council with an advocacy tool for liaison with the State Government on key planning issues;
 - d. Guiding and informing future detailed design and planning processes pertaining to the Capalaba Centre;

- e. Providing further opportunities for engagement with the community and stakeholders throughout the Plans' implementation; and
3. Notify all submitters of Council's decision.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the Officer Recommendation as detailed and amended in Attachment 1 – Capalaba Master Plan Submission Review Report;
 - *a northern public esplanade treatment be maintained for a key pedestrian/cycle path and to be further considered for an esplanade road and on-street parking. An indicative area of land 2.5m wide area at the Pittwin Road North frontage increasing to 5m towards the rear of the northern private lot is estimated to be required for the esplanade treatment. The balance of the esplanade treatment is to be located on the existing unformed driveway located on Council land adjoining the northern lot.*

Officer Recommendation

1. *remove the esplanade road from the western edge of the subject lots and adjoining lot to the south;*
 2. *maintain a northern public esplanade treatment for a key pedestrian/cycle path and to be further considered for an esplanade road and on-street parking*
 3. *include recognition within the precinct design guidelines to support the location of an esplanade treatment on Council land with existing driveways, roadways or parking infrastructure.*
 2. Adopt the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy incorporating the amendments as detailed in Attachment 2 for the purposes of:
 - a. Informing an amendment of the Redlands Planning Scheme;
 - b. Informing future Council's budget, capital works and operational plans;
 - c. Providing Council with an advocacy tool for liaison with the State Government on key planning issues;
 - d. Guiding and informing future detailed design and planning processes pertaining to the Capalaba Centre;
 - e. Providing further opportunities for engagement with the community and stakeholders throughout the Plans' implementation; and
 3. Advocate to DTMR that, as a matter of priority, their traffic plans for Capalaba be released with timeframes for implementation; and
 4. Notify all submitters of Council's decision.
-

ADDENDUM (9.12.2010)

At the Planning and Policy Committee meeting of 24 November 2010, an amendment to Attachment 1 – Capalaba Master Plan Submission Report (Item 7.6 21-23 Pittwin Road North) was discussed and adopted.

The specific amendment to Item 7.6 of Attachment 1 has been recorded in the minutes in full, making the recommendation unduly lengthy and diluting the intent of the recommendation.

To rationalise the recommendation, an alternative recommendation 1 is proposed below:

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

Moved by: Cr Williams

Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve to:

- 1. Adopt the officer recommendations as detailed in the amended Attachment 1 – Capalaba Master Plan Submission Review Report;**
- 2. Adopt the revised Capalaba Centre Master Plan and Implementation Strategy incorporating the amendments as detailed in Attachment 2 for the purposes of:**
 - a. Informing an amendment of the Redlands Planning Scheme;**
 - b. Informing future Council's budget, capital works and operational plans;**
 - c. Providing Council with an advocacy tool for liaison with the State Government on key planning issues;**
 - d. Guiding and informing future detailed design and planning processes pertaining to the Capalaba Centre;**
 - e. Providing further opportunities for engagement with the community and stakeholders throughout the Plans' implementation.**
- 3. Advocate to DTMR that, as a matter of priority, their traffic plans for Capalaba be released with timeframes for implementation; and**
- 4. Notify all submitters of Council's decision.**

CARRIED

A division was called for.

Crs Burns, Elliott, Williams, Townsend, Henry, Ogilvie, Boglary & Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Crs Reimers and Bowler voted in the negative.

Cr Murray was not present when this motion was put.

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

13.1.7 REDLAND PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT 1C

Dataworks Filename: LUP Redlands Planning Scheme Amendment 1C

Attachments: [Ministerial Letter](#)
[RPS Amendment 1C - List of Properties](#)
[RPS Amendment 1C - Mapping](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Stephen Hill
Acting Manager Land Use Planning Group

Author Name: Brett Hookway
Strategic Planning Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Planning and Policy Committee on 4 August 2010, Council resolved under delegated authority to submit Redlands Planning Scheme [RPS] Amendment 1C to the Minister for the Department of Infrastructure and Planning as a minor amendment under the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* [SPA] and *Statutory Guideline 02/09 - Making or amending local planning instruments*.

On the 12 October 2010, Council received correspondence from the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning advising that RPS Amendment 1C has been accepted as a minor amendment and Council may proceed to adopt RPS amendment 1C without conditions [Attachment 1 – Ministerial Letter].

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of Redlands Planning Scheme Amendment 1C.

BACKGROUND

Council adopted proposed RPS Amendment 1C at its General Meeting on 25 March 2009 for the purposes of public notification and consultation. The purpose of RPS Amendment 1C is to facilitate future land exchange programs on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands (SMBIs) by including unconstrained Council freehold lots that have been identified as surplus to public requirements in the SMBI Residential zone.

Council decision to publicly notify RPS Amendment 1C followed 1st State Interest Review and approval by the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning to publicly notify the proposed amendment of the RPS.

Amendment 1C was subsequently publicly notified between 28 April and 11 June 2009. All properly made submissions were reviewed and duly considered by Council at its General Meeting on 29 July 2009. On 10 September 2009, RPS Amendment 1C was sent to the Minister for 2nd State Interest Review and Ministerial approval to allow Council to adopt the amendment.

In response, Council received correspondence on 24 May 2010 from the Department of Infrastructure and Planning that Amendment 1C could not be recommended to the Minister for approval. The Department of Infrastructure and Planning (DIP) indicated that this decision was based on internal inconsistencies of Council resolutions on Amendment 1C which made it legally unclear what amendment to the RPS was being proposed. While Council officer representations were made on this matter, the Department maintained its position regarding the inconsistencies and sought Council to address the circumstances created by the resolution of 30 April, 2008.

Through discussions with officers at the DIP, it was considered that the most efficient and expedient method to rectify the issue was to submit amendment 1C as a 'minor amendment' to the Minister under the new Sustainable Planning Act (SPA) 2009. The Minister has now advised that RPS Amendment 1C is a 'minor amendment' and given approval for Council to proceed to adopt RPS Amendment 1C [Attachment 1 – Ministerial Letter].

ISSUES

To implement RPS Amendment 1C, Council needs to resolve to adopt the amendment and provide public notice in the local newspaper and Government Gazette. Following completion of these steps, a copy of the published notice and three certified copies of RPS Amendment 1C is to be provided to the Director General of the Department of Infrastructure and Planning.

The purpose of RPS Amendment 1C is to facilitate a future land exchange program on the SMBIs. A report on the land exchange program will be presented to Council in early 2011.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's 'Wise Planning and Design' outcome 5 – We will carefully manage population pressures and use land sustainably while advocating and taking steps to determine limits of growth and carrying capacity on a local and national basis, recognising environmental sensitivities and the distinctive character, heritage and atmosphere of local communities. A well-planned network of urban, rural and bushland areas and responsive infrastructure and transport systems will support strong, healthy communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

RPS amendment 1C is a budgeted project.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

The RPS will be amended in accordance with RPS Amendment 1C.

CONSULTATION

Land Use Planning group has consulted with officers from the Department of Infrastructure and Planning.

RPS amendment 1C was publicly notified between 28 April 2009 and 11 June 2009.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt Redland Planning Scheme 1C as approved by the Minister for the Department of Infrastructure and Planning in correspondence to Council dated 12 October, 2010;
2. Provide public notice of the adoption of RPS Amendment 1C in a local newspaper and in the Government Gazette in accordance with the Sustainable Planning Act Statutory Guideline 02/09 – ‘Making or amending local planning instruments’; and
3. Provide a copy of the published notice of adoption and three certified copies of RPS Amendment 1C to the Director-General of the Department of Infrastructure and Planning.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve not to adopt RPS amendment 1C.

OFFICER’S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Bowler
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve to:

1. **Adopt Redland Planning Scheme 1C as approved by the Minister for the Department of Infrastructure and Planning in correspondence to Council dated 12 October, 2010;**
2. **Provide public notice of the adoption of RPS Amendment 1C in a local newspaper and in the Government Gazette in accordance with the *Sustainable Planning Act* Statutory Guideline 02/09 – ‘Making or amending local planning instruments’; and**
3. **Provide a copy of the published notice of adoption and three certified copies of RPS Amendment 1C to the Director-General of the Department of Infrastructure and Planning.**

CARRIED (en bloc)

13.1.8 CORPORATE SUSTAINABLE POPULATION MANAGEMENT POLICY

Dataworks Filename: LUP Sustainable Redlands Study
Attachments: [Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Stephen Hill
Acting Manager, Land Use Planning
Author Name: Brett Hookway
Strategic Planning Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A proposed Corporate Population Growth Management Policy was presented to the General Meeting on the 28 July 2010 seeking Council adoption [refer to item 11.3.10]. In response, Council resolved that 'Council supports the adoption of a Population Growth Management Policy in principle but has a workshop on the topic to confirm its position'.

A councillor workshop was subsequently held to discuss the Population Growth Management Policy and Sustainable Redlands Study on the 29 September 2010. At the workshop, Councillors provided suggestions and comments on a range of amendment to refine the policy.

Following the councillor workshop, a further meeting of the Project Steering Group [PSG] was held to discuss and identify amendments to the Corporate Population Growth Management Policy.

As a result of the councillor workshop and PSG meeting, a number of amendments have been made to the policy. Key changes include:

- Renaming of policy to Sustainable Population Management Policy to better reflect the objective of the policy;
- Recognition that there are limits to growth within the population supporting capacity of the Redlands;
- Identification of Council commitments to:
 - Understanding the population supporting capacity of the City;
 - Managing development and population growth within the sustainable population capacity of the City; and
 - Advocating actions on sustainable population management to other levels of Government.
- Simplification of wording and policy statements.

It is recommended that Council adopt the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy – POL-3093 [see Attachment 1 – Sustainable Population

Management Policy] as Council's policy position regarding the defining of a sustainable population and the planning for and management of a sustainable population for the City.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy – POL-3093.

BACKGROUND

The following background is relevant to the Sustainable Population Growth Management Policy:

- At Council's General Meeting on the 28 July, a draft Corporate Population Growth Management Policy was presented to Council for adoption. In response, Council resolved that 'Council supports the adoption of a Population Growth Management Policy in principle, but has a workshop on the topic to confirm its position'.
- On the 29 September 2010, a councillor workshop was held to discuss the Population Growth Management Policy and Sustainable Redlands Study. At the workshop, Councillors provided suggestions and direction on specific amendments to refine the policy.
- Following the workshop, a Project Steering Group Meeting [PSG] was held to discuss the policy and identify amendments. Comments were also provided by senior officers from across the planning and policy department.

ISSUES

Amendments to the Policy

Following the council workshop on the 29 September and subsequent meeting of the PSG, the following amendments have been made to the policy:

1. *New Policy Name* – the policy has been renamed Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy to better reflect the objective of the policy.
2. *Policy Objective* – the objective of the policy has been amended to better reflect Council's position. The redrafted objective states '*to ensure a sustainable population of the City consistent with community aspirations and within environmental, economic and social thresholds*'.
3. *Policy Statements* – The policy statements have been divided into three sections with Council commitments listed in each section. The sections are:
 - a. Understanding the population supporting capacity of the Redlands This section acknowledges that there are limits to growth within the population supporting capacity of the City and details Council's commitments to defining a sustainable population capacity of the City.

This section also commits Council to understanding the implications of emerging and contemporary issues that potentially impact on the sustainable population capacity of the Redlands.

b. Managing development and population growth within the sustainable population capacity of the City

This section details Council commitments to ensure that development and population growth is planned for and managed within the sustainable population capacity of the City.

c. Advocating sustainable population management

This section details Council commitments on advocacy actions on sustainable population management to other levels of Government.

Sustainable Redlands Study

The Sustainable Redlands Study will provide significant contribution to understanding the population supporting capacity of the Redlands. Council officers are currently finalising the engagement of planning consultants Halcrow Pty Ltd to assist with the identification of critical elements influencing population supporting capacity of the City and developing a robust methodology capable of defining a sustainable population of the city within the identified environmental, economic and social thresholds. A Peer Review Group is also currently being established. Further workshops with Council are planned as the proposed study progresses.

Adoption of Corporate Sustainable Population Growth Management Policy

It is recommended that Council adopt the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy – 3093 as Council's policy position regarding the defining of a sustainable population and the planning for and management of a sustainable population for the City.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy supports the vision and many of the outcome areas of the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, with the most relevant outcome area being Wise Planning and Design:

“We will carefully manage population pressures and use land sustainably while advocating and taking steps to determine the limits to growth and carrying capacity on local and national basis, recognizing environmental sensitivities and the distinctive character, heritage and atmosphere of local communities. A well planned network of urban, rural and bushland areas and responsive infrastructure and transport systems will support strong, healthy communities”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Sustainable Redlands Study is a budgeted item in the 2010/2011 year.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

Council endorsement of Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy POL-3093 will not result in amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

The Sustainable Redlands Study will assist in defining a sustainable population capacity for the Redlands and provide data to be used in reviewing the Redlands Planning Scheme and preparing the strategic framework for the City.

CONSULTATION

A councillor workshop held on the 29 September to review the draft Population Growth Management Policy.

Meetings and discussions on the policy and the Sustainable Redlands Study have been held with:

- Associate Professor Neil Sipe [Griffith University];
- Associate Professor Darryl Low Choy [Griffith Univeristy];
- Dr Jago Dodson [Griffith University];
- Dr Jane O'Sullivan [University of Queensland];
- Senior Planners Sunshine Coast; and
- Representatives from Halcrow Planning Consultancy.

A Project Steering Group consisting of the General Manager of Planning and Policy, all Group Manager from Planning and Policy, senior officers from Planning and Policy and representatives from Corporate Governance has been formed to provide guidance and input to the policy and study.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to adopt the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy – POL-3093.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council adopt the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy POL-3093 with any necessary amendments.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to adopt the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy – POL-3093; and

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve as follows:

- 1. To adopt the Corporate Sustainable Population Management Policy – POL-3093; and**
- 2. That external peer review partners be engaged as part of the ongoing study work.**

CARRIED (unanimously)

(Cr Murray was not present when this motion was put)

13.1.9 SMBI LAND EXCHANGE POLICY AND GUIDELINE

Datworks Filename: LUP SMBI Land Exchange – CEO Approved
Attachments: [Corporate SMBI Land Exchange Policy 3100](#)
[Corporate SMBI Land Exchange Policy Guideline 3100-001](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Stephen Hill
Acting Manager Land Use Planning
Author Name: Brett Hookway
Strategic Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting on 25 August 2010, Council resolved that 'a report be brought back to Council to allow review of the delegation to the Chief Executive Officer as adopted at the General Meeting of 27 September 2006 pertaining to entering into land exchanges on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands [SMBIs]'.

Following Council's resolution on 25 August 2010, a Corporate SMBIs Land Exchange Policy [the Policy] and Guideline has been prepared detailing Council's policy position regarding the assessment of land exchange requests received from the owners of land on the SMBIs.

Approval is sought for Council adoption of the Policy and for the CEO to be delegated authority to decide land exchange requests in accordance with the Policy.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of the Corporate SMBI Land Exchange Policy including delegation to the Chief Executive Officer to decide land exchange request in accordance with the Policy.

BACKGROUND

Previous delegation to the Chief Executive Officer to decide land exchange requests

On the 27 September 2006, Council resolved:

'Under section 472 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, Council resolve to delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the power to exchange vacant Council land of similar size and value suitable for residential purposes with land which may involve considerable expenditure to Council to provide infrastructure, or for land which would be of benefit to Council for town planning reasons'.

In accordance with the Council delegation, the Chief Executive Officer has decided land exchange requests received since September 2006. The majority of land exchange requests assessed in this time have been supported on the grounds that the lot has been identified in the Council endorsed Conservation Acquisition Strategy

2002. There have however been a number of requests that have relied on extenuating grounds and are relatively complex in nature. One such request was presented to Council for resolution through confidential report at General Meeting on the 25 August. In response it was resolved that:

‘that a report be brought back to Council to allow review of the delegation to the Chief Executive Officer as adopted at the General Meeting of 27 September 2006 pertaining to entering into land exchanges on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands’.

A Corporate SMBIs Land Exchange Policy and Guideline has been prepared which details Council’s policy position regarding the assessment of land exchange by the CEO under Council delegation.

ISSUES

Assessment of land exchange request

Since Council delegated authority to the CEO to decide land exchange requests, over 100 land exchange requests have been received, reported on and decided by the CEO. Of these requests approximately 74 have been supported and 30 declined.

For a land exchange request to be supported it has been required to meet the CEO delegation. This included:

- The exchange request relates to a private lot/s that has development potential for a dwelling house and its servicing requirements; and
- Town planning merit has been interpreted to include conservation management and protection, residential consolidation, bushfire management, provision of public open space and recreation land, stormwater management purposes and infrastructure servicing issues and provides infrastructure savings ; or
- In addition, where an extenuating ground has been demonstrated and town planning merit also demonstrated the land exchange has been supported

These requirements have been applied consistently to all land exchange requests decided by the CEO. The Policy maintains these requirements and provides a clearer and more transparent approach to guide the CEO in deciding land exchange requests. The extenuating grounds that have been or are proposed to be used to support a land exchange are detailed in the Policy. Council adoption of the Policy will formalise the current approach that has been applied and will provide greater guidance to the CEO and landowners in relation to land exchange requests.

Adoption of Policy

It is recommended that Council adopt the Policy as Council’s policy position regarding the assessment of land exchange requests and delegate authority to the CEO to decide land exchange requests in accordance with the Policy. Council adoption of the Policy will supersede the delegation given to the CEO on the 27 September 2006 to decide land exchange requests

Delegation to the CEO to decide land exchange requests in accordance with the Policy and undertaking land exchanges on the SMBIs provides the following benefits:

- Brings land into Council ownership which provides benefit in public ownership [conservation management and protection, residential consolidation, bushfire management, provision of public open space and recreation land, stormwater management purposes and infrastructure servicing issues and provides infrastructure savings];
- Contributes to achieving a more sustainable settlement pattern and land use on the SMBIs; and
- Provides landowners with the ability to request a land exchange any point in time.

Approval to undertake land exchange request

Approval for Council to undertake land exchange is assessed by the State Government in accordance with section 185 of the Local Government Act 2009 and Finance, Plans and Reporting Regulation 2010. Approval is provided on a case by case basis through Ministerial exemption to the tendering requirements section 176 of the Local Government Act 2009 Finance, Plans and Reporting Regulation 2010.

Next land exchange program

Once RPS amendment 1C is completed, a report will be presented to Council regarding the next land exchange program for the SMBIs. The Policy will only be applicable to land exchange requests received by Council and does not detail which properties will be made a land exchange offer as part of the next land exchange program.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's 'Wise Planning and Design' outcome area 5 – we will carefully manage population pressure and use land sustainably while advocating and taking steps to determine limits of growth and carrying capacity of local and national basis, recognising environmental sensitivities and the distinctive character, heritage and atmosphere of local communities. A well planned network of urban, rural and bushland areas and responsive infrastructure and transport systems will support strong, healthy communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

It is considered appropriate that Council continues to bear the costs of undertaking any approved land exchanges. Property Services have advised that each land exchange costs approximately \$4,000. This cost includes undertaking a Property Assessment on Council land to ensure its development potential, valuations, State Government transfer fees and legal costs.

In addition, the Australian Taxation Office have advised that GST is payable by Council on land exchange transactions. The amount of GST payable by Council is 1/11th of the market value of the Council lot being exchanged. For example, if a

Council lot valued at \$55,000 is exchanged the amount of GST payable equals 1/11th or approximately \$4,950.

The funding to undertake approved land exchanges has been drawn from the environmental levy administered by the Environmental Management Group.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

Once a land exchange is finalised and Council assumes ownership of the lot an amendment to the RPS as part of future amendment packages to the RPS may be necessary to reflect the conservation or open space values of the lot.

CONSULTATION

Council's Property Services Section has been consulted regarding the Policy and Guideline.

Council's Environmental Management Group has been consulted regarding funding to undertake approved land exchanges being drawn from the environment levy.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to:

1. Adopt the Corporate SMBIs Land Exchange Policy 3100 as attached; and
2. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to:
 - b) Decide land exchange requests in accordance with the Corporate SMBIs Land Exchange Policy 3100; and
 - c) Under section 257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, sign all necessary documentation associated with undertaking approved land exchanges.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council adopt the SMBI Land Exchange Policy 3100 with any necessary amendments.

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Bowler
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve to:

1. **Adopt the Corporate SMBIs Land Exchange Policy 3100 as attached; and**
2. **Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to:**

- a) Decide land exchange requests in accordance with the Corporate SMBIs Land Exchange Policy 3100; and
- b) Under section 257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, sign all necessary documentation associated with undertaking approved land exchanges.

CARRIED (en bloc)

**13.1.10 PROPOSED DRAINAGE EASEMENT - THE ESPLANADE,
KARRAGARRA ISLAND**

Dataworks Filename: RTT Acquisitions General
Attachments: [Attachment - Site Plan, The Esplanade](#)
Responsible Officer Name: David Elliott
Manager, Infrastructure Planning
Author Name: Luke Gillis
Advisor, Capital Works

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the design of the upgrade of Mcbean Road, Karragarra Island the lack of a legal point of stormwater discharge became apparent.

This report recommends that Council acquire a 5m wide easement along the western boundary of Lot 6, RP100121 The Esplanade, Karragarra Island to facilitate a lawful point of discharge drainage for stormwater run-off from Mcbean Road. (refer to Attachment)

PURPOSE

To seek Council approval to acquire a 5m wide easement for drainage purposes along the western boundary of Lot 6, RP100121 The Esplanade, Karragarra Island in accordance with the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*.

BACKGROUND

In the process of designing the upgrade to Mcbean Road, Karragarra Island, it was discovered that there is no legal point of discharge for excessive stormwater.

ISSUES

Council has an obligation to manage stormwater discharge from its own land to minimise the risk of flooding to downstream properties. The only practical solution to provide a legal point of stormwater discharge from Mcbean Road is to acquire a drainage easement along the western boundary of 148 The Esplanade (Lot 6 on RP100121).

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority to:
5.12 - Plan, provide and advocate for essential physical and social infrastructure that supports community well-being and manage Council's existing infrastructure assets to ensure current service standards are maintained or improved.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost associated with acquiring the drainage easement is estimated to be \$10,000 including survey, legal fees etc. Funds are available in the current Mcbean Road budget

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 occurred with the Divisional Councillor, Property Services Manager and Project Delivery Group.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve:

1. To acquire a 5 metre wide easement for drainage purposes over 148 The Esplanade, Karragarra Island described as Lot 6 on RP100121 as shown on the attached site plan, and
2. If negotiations to purchase the land for a drainage easement are unsuccessful, continue with resumption action to acquire an easement for drainage purposes over 148 The Esplanade, Karragarra Island described as Lot 6 on RP100121 in accordance with the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*; and
3. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer, in accordance with s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, to:
 - a. sign all necessary documentation associated with the acquisition of this drainage easement; and
 - b. negotiate and settle compensation payable to the affected land owner.

ALTERNATIVE

No alternative proposed.

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Bowler
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To acquire a 5 metre wide easement for drainage purposes over 148 The Esplanade, Karragarra Island described as Lot 6 on RP100121 as shown on the attached site plan; and

2. If negotiations to purchase the land for a drainage easement are unsuccessful, continue with resumption action to acquire an easement for drainage purposes over 148 The Esplanade, Karragarra Island described as Lot 6 on RP100121 in accordance with the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*; and
3. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer, in accordance with s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, to:
 - a) sign all necessary documentation associated with the acquisition of this drainage easement; and
 - b) negotiate and settle compensation payable to the affected land owner.

CARRIED (en bloc)

13.1.11 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT - MT COTTON ROAD, CAPALABA (MORETON BAY ROAD TO BROADWATER ROAD)

Dataworks Filename: RTT Planning – Capalaba Traffic Study

Attachments: [Attachment A - Mt Cotton Road, Capalaba - Plan](#)
[Attachment B - Cardno Eppell Olsen Report - Conclusion](#)

Responsible Officer Name: David Elliott
Manager, Infrastructure Planning

Author Name: Wal Lloyd
Advisor, Traffic Investigations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the General Meeting of 31 March 2010, Council resolved:

“That a report presented to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting to address the following:

What is Council’s longer term plan for handling traffic on Mount Cotton Road, Capalaba, including:

- a) Noise attenuation;*
- b) Access for residents to and from local collector and sub-arterial streets;*
- c) Load and length limits on Mount Cotton Road (between Moreton Bay Road – Broadwater Road); and*
- d) Status of traffic monitoring and use of quarry trucks.”*

Council commissioned traffic consultants Cardno Eppell Olsen to undertake an assessment of future road corridor requirements along Mount Cotton Road, Capalaba, with particular emphasis on the more heavily trafficked section between Moreton Bay and School Roads. Consideration was given to existing road infrastructure and traffic requirements given the anticipated increases in traffic volumes from general through vehicles and proposed developments along the corridor.

This report addresses the issues listed in the resolution and presents planning options and proposals for future works resulting from Council investigations and consideration of the Cardno report.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to address the Council resolution from the General Meeting of 31 March 2010, requesting: *“That a report be presented to a future Planning and Policy Committee meeting to address the following:*

What is Council's longer term plan for handling traffic on Mount Cotton Road, Capalaba, including:

- a) Noise attenuation;*
- b) Access for residents to and from local collector and sub-arterial streets;*
- c) Load and length limits on Mount Cotton Road (between Moreton Bay Road – Broadwater Road); and*
- d) Status of traffic monitoring and use of quarry trucks.”*

BACKGROUND

Mount Cotton Road at Capalaba between Moreton Bay Road and Broadwater Road is classified as a Sub-Arterial road in Council's road hierarchy. Within that corridor the section between Moreton Bay Road and School Road is an undivided two-lane two-way road with on-street parking/cycle lanes on both sides. The speed limit is 60km/h and the carriageway width is generally 6.5m and under its current road layout this class of roadway is accepted to carry up to 15,000 – 18,000 vehicles per day (vpd).

Over a number of years Council has received complaints from the community regarding increased traffic volumes and road safety issues along Mount Cotton Road through Capalaba. Recently there has also been a specific community concern over increased traffic anticipated to be generated from 271 residential unit developments on the eastern side of Mount Cotton Road, immediately south of Moreton Bay Road, to be accessed via Holland Crescent.

To assist in addressing traffic planning issues for the Mount Cotton Road corridor, Council commissioned Cardno Eppell Olsen to undertake an assessment of future road corridor layout requirements for Mount Cotton Road between Moreton Bay Road and School Road, which was completed in July 2010, titled “Capalaba, Mount Cotton Road – Concept Layout Development”. (The summary/conclusion is included as Attachment B)

ISSUES

Access for Residents

School Road was chosen as the southern boundary for this study area because traffic surveys, September 2010, have indicated are that traffic volumes decrease south of School Road from 13,751 vpd to 9,162 vpd. The section south of School Road will be serviceable in its current configuration beyond 2021. (Refer to plan, Attachment A)

The purpose of the Cardno Eppell Olsen (Cardno) July 2010 study was to develop a concept design layout for upgrading the Mount Cotton Road corridor between Moreton Bay Road and School Road. The study criteria were:

- Investigate capacity and access requirements for Mount Cotton Road;
- Undertake traffic counts at all intersections;
- An overall growth rate of 1.5% for traffic on Mount Cotton Road was adopted for calculation of traffic growth in the study;

- Base year 2010;
- Forecast year 2021; (nominal 10 year planning horizon)
- Maintain existing public transport routes;
- Minimise development traffic impacts;
- Investigate feasibility of left-in access from Mount Cotton Road to a proposed residential unit development at the northern end of Aramac Court. (This has since been discounted from consideration due to the refusal of DTMR to accept this option, as it interferes with future planning options for any upgrade of the Moreton Bay Road intersection.)

This section of Mount Cotton Road accommodates five main access points (intersections) to the major residential zones along the corridor, as indicated in (Refer to Attachment B). Each access point, Pittwin Road south, Holland Crescent north, Killarney Crescent north, Holland Crescent south, Killarney Crescent south, was analysed under traffic control scenarios using the SIDRA Intersection 3.2 analysis computer programme.

The table below sets out the proposed short (up to 2013), medium (up to 2021) and long term (beyond 2021) traffic management measures along Mt Cotton Road.

Location	Proposed Upgrade	Comment
Short Term (up to 2013)		
Mt Cotton Road/Holland Crescent North and South Intersections	Improve egress by formalising the two exit lanes	To be undertaken by developer of 54-58 Mt Cotton Road
Mt Cotton Road [Moreton Bay Road to Holland Crescent South]	Install am and pm "clearways"	To be undertaken by developer of 54-58 Mt Cotton Road Will enable peak traffic to disperse quicker and open up more gaps for right turning vehicles out of Holland Crescent north and reduce right turning crashes which account for 58% of all crashes in Mt Cotton Road, as confirmed in the Cardno Study.
Mt Cotton Road adjacent #54	Widen 60m pavement up to 2m	Will provide 2 continuous travel lanes. Estimated cost \$95,000.
Mt Cotton/Killarney North Intersection	Investigate feasibility of installing an interim dedicated right turn land	Request from community. Will improve traffic flows along Mt Cotton Road, particularly at peak hour and provide safer access to Killarney.
Mt Cotton/Killarney North Intersection	Investigate feasibility of providing an interim	Identified as a need for safer pedestrian access

	pedestrian refuge crossing in vicinity of intersection	
Mt Cotton/Pittwin South Intersection	Investigate feasibility of providing a pedestrian refuge crossing in vicinity	Request from recent community consultation
Medium Term (up to 2021)		
Mt Cotton Road/Pittwin Road South Intersection	Restrict traffic to left in/left out	As per Cardno Study
Mt Cotton Road/Holland Crescent North Intersection	Restrict traffic to left in/left out	As per Cardno Study
Mt Cotton Road/Killarney Crescent North Intersection	Install traffic signals	Will be required to provide residents living west of Mt Cotton Road with fair and safe access and a safe pedestrian crossing point as per Cardno Study
Mt Cotton Road/Killarney Crescent South Intersection	Restrict traffic to left in/left out	Due to its close proximity to School Road as per Cardno Study
Long Term (beyond 2021)		
Mt Cotton Road/Holland Crescent North Intersection	Install traffic signals	The Cardno Study indicates that these signals will only operate satisfactorily if a dedicated right turn lane is provided, which may require localised road reserve widening
Mt Cotton Road (Moreton Bay to School Roads)	Four (4) lanes with dedicated cycle lanes and centre median	Will require future localised road reserve widening
Mt Cotton Road (School to Howlett Roads)	Installation of centre median and possible 4 laning	Will require future road reserve widening

Additional Council Resolution items:

The following comments are made in relation to the respective resolution items as headed:

Noise attenuation

Noise attenuation, if deemed to be required in built-up urban areas with direct access residential frontages, is a difficult issue. The only practical options are:

- a) Treat each individual residence; or
- b) Construct sound barrier fencing along the property boundary

Given that in the long term, road widening would be required to achieve two (2) lanes in each direction with a central median and bicycle lanes, if noise mitigation is deemed to be absolutely necessary it would be best addressed in the form of barrier fencing at the time of road widening.

Load and Length Limits on Mount Cotton Road:

- Mount Cotton Road between Moreton Bay Road and Broadwater Road is not a B-Double or Higher Mass Limit (HML) Route, and there is no proposal for it to be approved as such;
- Council cannot reasonably prohibit vehicles from using this road if they fall within the mass and size limit criteria for general access vehicles (GAV), usually limited to 50 tonne gross mass limit (GML) and 20 metres length, travelling along a Sub-Arterial road with no specific physical road infrastructure impediments.

Status of Traffic Monitoring and Use of Quarry Trucks:

- Council recently carried out a manual one day quarry type (truck and dog [trailer]) count along Mount Cotton Road. Some 74 trucks of this configuration were counted of which 17 were observed travelling fully laden towards Capalaba;
- Council will continue to monitor truck movements along Mt Cotton Road.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priorities:

5.12 - Plan, provide and advocate for essential physical and social infrastructure that supports community well-being and manage Council's existing infrastructure assets to ensure current service standards are maintained or improved

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed short term (2012/13) widening of Mt Cotton Road adjacent no. 54 is estimated to cost \$95,000. The proposed medium term and long term upgrade works to be funded from the Transport Trunk Infrastructure account are yet to be costed.

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.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That the proposed short term widening of Mt Cotton Road, Capalaba and the medium term intersection upgrade works identified in this report be listed for consideration in the ten (10) year capital works program;
2. That Council note:
 - a) The proposed short term improvements to be undertaken by the developer at the Mt Cotton Road/Holland Crescent South and North intersections and the clearway installation between Moreton Bay Road and Holland Crescent South;
 - b) The proposed investigations to improve vehicle access into Killarney Crescent North; and
 - c) The proposed investigations to improve pedestrian access across Mt Cotton Road in the vicinity of Killarney Crescent North and Pittwin Road South.

ALTERNATIVE

No alternative proposed

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. That the proposed short term widening of Mt Cotton Road, Capalaba and the medium term intersection upgrade works identified in this report be listed for consideration in the ten (10) year capital works program;
2. That Council note:
 - a) The proposed short term improvements to be undertaken by the developer at the Mt Cotton Road/Holland Crescent South and North intersections and the clearway installation between Moreton Bay Road and Holland Crescent South;
 - b) The proposed investigations to improve vehicle access into Killarney Crescent North; and
 - c) The proposed investigations to improve pedestrian access across Mt Cotton Road in the vicinity of Killarney Crescent North and Pittwin Road South.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **That the proposed short term widening of Mt Cotton Road, Capalaba and the medium term intersection upgrade works identified in this report be listed for consideration in the ten (10) year capital works program;**
2. **That Council note:**

- a) The proposed short term improvements to be undertaken by the developer at the Mt Cotton Road/Holland Crescent South and North intersections and the clearway installation between Moreton Bay Road and Holland Crescent South;
- b) The proposed investigations to improve vehicle access into Killarney Crescent North for planning purposes only at this time; and
- c) The proposed investigations to improve pedestrian access across Mt Cotton Road in the vicinity of Killarney Crescent North and Pittwin Road South.

CARRIED

A division was called for.

Crs Burns, Elliott, Bowler, Williams, Townsend, Henry, Ogilvie, Boglary and Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Cr Reimers voted in the negative.

Cr Murray was not present when this motion was put.

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

13.2 COMMITTEE GENERAL BUSINESS

13.2.1 CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN ITEM 13.1.5 – SMBI COMMITTEE REPORT 16 NOVEMBER 2010

Chief Executive Officer advised that Cr Burns had advised the Chair and Chief Executive Officer, by email before the meeting, that Cr Townsend may have a conflict of interest in the SMBICAC Report Item 13.1.5.

Cr Townsend advised that she did not think that she had a conflict of interest in Item 13.1.5.

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Hobson

That Cr Townsend does not have a conflict of interest in this matter, or could reasonably be taken to have a conflict of interest, therefore Cr Townsend may stay in the room and be part of discussion and voting on this matter.

CARRIED

A division was called for.

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

Cr Burns voted in the negative

Cr Townsend was ineligible to vote.

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

As Item 13.1.5 had already been discussed, the outcome of the discussion regarding the conflict of interest did not warrant the item to be re-addressed.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Bowler
Seconded by: Cr Elliott

That the General Business item be noted.

CARRIED (en bloc)

13.2.2 CANAL AND LAKE LEVY SPECIAL CHARGES**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

1. That Council acknowledges the representations of the four associations (RBRA, APRA, RFRR and SLRA) regarding the Canals and Lakes Special Charges;
2. While Council's current position does not accord with all of the views expressed, that Council nevertheless commits to genuine and thorough consideration of the issues raised by these associations;
3. That Council commits to re-assessing its position on these matters and the various perspectives as a matter of priority;
4. That Council will openly engage affected ratepayers, their representative associations and the broader community with the facts, with the options and implications laid bare and with a proposal for consultation purposes early in 2011; and
5. That Council will then genuinely consider the views during the budgetary process.

CARRIED

A division was called for.

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

Crs Burns, Elliott, Bowler and Townsend voted in the negative.

Cr Murray was not present when this motion was put.

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

13.2.3 LETTER TO PREMIER AND MINISTER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & PLANNING**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

- 1. That a letter be written to the Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure & Planning, notifying them that RCC has approved Master Plans for Capalaba and Cleveland that reflect TOD principles; and**
- 2. That we look to the state to support these initiatives by:**
 - i. Releasing their plans and implement timeframes for intersection upgrades and the Eastern Busway to Capalaba completion; and**
 - ii. Identifying opportunities for decentralisation of state functions to the Redlands.**

CARRIED

14 CUSTOMER SERVICES COMMITTEE 8/12/2010

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Williams

That the Customer Services Committee Minutes of 8 December 2010 be received.

CARRIED

[Customer Service Committee Minutes 8/12/2010](#)

14.1 CUSTOMER SERVICES**14.1.1 CONSTRUCTION OF PEDESTRIAN FENCE ORANA ESPLANADE
VICTORIA POINT**

Datworks Filename: GOV Reports to Committee – Operations & Maintenance (OPM)
Responsible Officer Name: Lex Smith
Manager Operations and Maintenance
Author Name: Wayne Matthews
Technical Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August this year, Operations and Maintenance received notification of an incident that occurred in a section of concrete footpath located at Orana Esplanade, Victoria Point. Following a risk assessment of the pedestrian and cyclist safety of the site, a 150 metre tubular fence was erected. Sections of the community were not happy with the erection of the fence and resulted in Council receiving a petition to have the fence removed. Following this, a second risk assessment recommended that either the fence remain and the path be widened or, the path be relocated away from the drop-off at the shoreline.

PURPOSE

To provide Council with the background to the issues of the pathway and fence at Orana Esplanade and direction to rectify the issues.

BACKGROUND

The Orana Esplanade is regularly used by both local residents and tourists for recreation purposes. The concrete pathway at Orana Esplanade runs parallel with the foreshore and is adjacent to a grassed recreation area. This pathway forms part of Council's Cycling and Walking network (Moreton Bay Cycle Way Link) and the section in question is currently classified as an "off-road path". An "off-road path" is one that is primarily for pedestrians but may be used by cyclists. They are generally narrower than a shared path.

On 23 August 2010, Council received notification of an incident where a small child fell over the edge of the existing pathway. An investigation and risk assessment was carried out by Operations and Maintenance staff and it was found that a medium level of risk existed (M-36 under Council's risk assessment matrix). The investigating officer assessed that the most appropriate risk mitigation measure was to install a tubular galvanised steel fence funded out of the annual foot path hazard reduction program. A public consultation program was developed and quotations sought and received. Unfortunately, due to an administrative error, a contractor was engaged to install the fence in advance of the public consultation being carried out.

150 metres of fence was constructed on 15 October 2010. This resulted in a petition, requesting that Council remove the fence, being presented to the General Meeting of 17 November 2010. Prior to this meeting, Operations and Maintenance staff met with representatives of the local Neighbourhood Watch group to discuss the issue and propose a way ahead. At these discussions, officers gave an undertaking to review the risk assessment, give consideration to removing the fence, and investigate funding options to widen the path in the future.

On receipt of the petition, Council resolved that the petition *"be acknowledged and that Council will take no further action as the matter has been dealt with recently through negotiation with the Principal Petitioner and others and agreement reached that following a new risk assessment the fence can be removed in conjunction with other measures to protect the safety of the public"*

On 18 November 2010, a second Risk assessment was carried out by Council's Risk and Liability Unit. The report made 2 recommendations, the first and preferred recommendation was to leave the fence in place and widen the path. The second was to remove the fence and relocate the path at least 5m from the drop-off.

Widening the path, by adding onto the existing path, will create a path that consists of 3 separate parallel sections of concrete. Not only will this look like a "patchwork quilt" but it will also have ramifications when it comes to replacing this asset as there will be a marked disparity in the age of the various portions of path, and therefore, differing renewal requirements.

Further, with the installation of the fence, the width of the existing pathway has reduced by 0.4 metres to accommodate the fencing. This could have an adverse effect with regards to collisions involving pedestrians and cyclists. Therefore, it was decided that the best course of action was to construct a new path, in line with the Moreton Bay Cycle Link project, away from the drop-off and remove the existing path and fence.

Upgrade to this section of footpath is included in the preliminary planning 2014/2015 capital works program and consists of a 3.0 metre wide concrete footpath which will form part of the Moreton Bay Cycle Way Link. Council's Infrastructure Planning Group have advised that they have funding available in this year's Paths and Trails Rehabilitation program and that they would support the application of sufficient funds from this program to bring the upgrade project forward to 2010/2011.



ISSUES

- Council has a duty of care to ensure Council Land and its pathways are safe to all public and take all measures to mitigate any risks.
- With the installation of the fence, the width of the pathway has reduced by 0.4 metres to accommodate the fencing, as the pathway was built immediately adjacent to the drop-off. This could have an adverse effect with regards to collisions involving pedestrians and cyclists.
- Widening the pathway is required as part of the Moreton Bay Cycle Way Link project.
- Widening the path by adding onto the existing path will create a path that consists of 3 separate parallel sections of concrete.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's Outcome 7 – **“Strong and Connected Communities”** – Our health, wellbeing and strong community spirit will be supported by a full range of services, programs, organisations and facilities, and our values of caring and respect will extend to people of all ages, cultures, abilities and needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Infrastructure Planning Group have funding available in the Paths and Trails Rehabilitation program to cover the estimated \$50,000 cost of replacing the existing

path with a 3m wide shared pedestrian and cycle path. There would no additional budget required for any of the options available.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no Planning Scheme Implications.

CONSULTATION

This report was prepared in consultation with Roads and Drainage Service Manager, Acting General Manager Customer Services and Group Manager Infrastructure Planning.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to relocate the pathway more than 5 metres away from the fall and then to remove the steel fencing.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To leave the steel fencing in its current position and plan to widen the pathway in accordance with Australian Standards and Guides; or
2. To retain the fence and leave the path until it is scheduled for upgrade as part of the capital works program in 2014/15.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to relocate the pathway more than 5 metres away from the fall and then remove the steel fencing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

To retain the fence and leave the path until it is scheduled for upgrade as part of the capital works program in 2014/15.

PROPOSED MOTION

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Hobson

That Council resolve to relocate the pathway more than 5 metres away from the fall and then remove the steel fencing.

On being put to the vote the motion was LOST.

A division was called for.

Crs Williams and Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Crs Reimers, Elliott, Bowler, Townsend, Henry, Ogilvie and Boglary voted in the negative.

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

The motion was declared by the Mayor as LOST.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Elliott

Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to retain the fence and leave the path until it is scheduled for upgrade as part of the capital works program in 2014/15.

CARRIED

A division was called for.

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

Crs Williams and Hobson voted in the negative.

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

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

**14.1.2 MONTHLY REPORT FOR CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
GROUP OCTOBER 2010**

Dataworks Filename: GOV Reports to Committee - Customer & Community Services (CCS)

Attachment: [Customer & Community Service Performance Reporting – October 2010](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Greg Jensen
Manager, Customer & Community Services

Author Name: Jodi Marchant
Group Business Services Coordinator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines the key monthly activities for the Customer & Community Services Group including:

- Human Services Unit;
- Cultural Services Unit;
- Leisure and Recreation Unit;
- Customer Service Unit;
- Redland Performing Arts Centre

PURPOSE

To provide information to the Council on current performance levels and significant issues affecting service delivery.

BACKGROUND

The Customer & Community Services (C&CS) Group delivers a wide range of services at multiple locations throughout the City. The Group comprises five Units; these being Human Services, Cultural Services, Leisure and Recreation Services, Customer Service and Redland Performing Arts Centre.

While the group has its predominant focus on community services delivery a number of the services are operational under the Code of Competitive Conduct (Type 3 Businesses) under the Local Government Act. These include the Redland Performing Arts Centre, Straddie Holiday Parks and School Age Care Services.

Each of the teams in the Group reports monthly against a set of performance indicators. Variations from performance expectations are highlighted in the attached annexure. Achievements are also reported on as well as significant future events. Program deliverables and key projects are reported in tables. Each Service Manager summarises the most significant of these each month within the report to the

Customer Services Committee. The annexure is provided for Councillors for reference to more detailed reporting if required.

ISSUES

Human Services Unit:

Refer attachment 1

- School Age Care;
- Respite;
- Home Assist Secure;
- Community Grants Program;
- Community Development.

Summary of Activities

- The Seniors Emergency Preparedness Project, an initiative of the Community Development Team has won the Queensland 2010 Safer Communities Award in the Local Government Category. This project will now progress to the Australian Safer Communities Awards to be announced in Canberra on 29 November 2010. Community Development Officer, Jennifer Schoof presented this Senior Emergency Preparedness Project at the LGAQ Community Development Conference in Townsville on 19th October.
- Some 500 young people attended the Youth Epic Day Out on 23 October, enabling many young people to engage in fun activities at the Redlands Youth Plaza. This event was delivered in partnership with The Cage Youth Foundation.
- Seniors Mobility Scooter Education Workshop was held on 6th October with 80 people attending, providing essential information to people in the safe use of mobility scooters.
- Clients, staff and volunteers at Killara Place celebrated Oktoberfest enjoying the musical delights of German born Michael Haan, German cuisine, overview of history, fashion & culture.
- 32 Grants applications have been received and assessments have been undertaken with the announcement of successful applications on 18 November 2010.

Cultural Services Unit:

Refer attachment 2

- Libraries
- Redland Art Gallery
- Museums

Summary of Activities

Libraries:

- The "OverDrive" service for downloadable e-books and audio books is now available for library clients to use via the library catalogue.

- Cleveland Library held two "Living on a shoestring" events in October. The events were "The \$21 Challenge" (presented by Naomi Robinson from Simple Savings) and "Budgeting Hints and Tips" (presented by Gerry Messingham of Lifeline, Capalaba). There was a third one scheduled "Money Managing Online Resources" but this had to be cancelled due to ill health of the presenter. The focus of these events was on budgeting and providing people with information and places they could go to find information and how to help themselves.

These events were aimed at people with little or no money and were advertised in the Library Event Calendar, library e-newsletter, Bayside Bulletin snapshot page and by staff in libraries. Overall, 86 people attended the sessions - session 1 had 66 people and session 2 had 20 people. Both presenters are qualified financial advisers, although participants were told that the presenters were not providing proper financial advice, just tips and general information.

Art Gallery:

- On 31st October the second concert in the Compositions of Sound Series was held at Redland Museum. 80 people were in attendance. Guests enjoyed the Art of Song by the Australian Chamber of Musicians. This concert series is presented in partnership between Redland Art Gallery, Redland Museum and Redlands Arts Council.
- There was also the opening of The Coochie Art Group Inc Art Show on 10th October at Redland Art Gallery, Cleveland. The opening was well attended by members and their guests.

Leisure & Recreation Unit:

Refer attachment 3

- Major Venues (Showgrounds, Aquatic Centre and Russell Island Pool);
- Community Halls;
- Recreation (Lifeguard Services);
- Cemeteries;
- Camping Grounds (Straddie Holiday Parks).

Summary of Activities

- Work continued on the construction of the K.E.W.T. Evapotranspiration System at Amity Point Holiday Park. Construction of the system commenced on 30 August 2010 and has progress well and it is anticipated that the K.E.W.T Evapotranspiration System will be commissioned before December 2010.
- The number of recreational swimming patrons was again very low for this period at both the Cleveland Aquatic Centre and the Russell Island pool. This was due to the weather conditions, rain and mild temperatures.

Customer Services Unit:

Refer attachment 4

Summary of Activities

- There are no significant major activities to be reported for this month.

Redland Performing Arts Centre:

Refer attachment 5

Summary of Activities

- Taik Oz is an Australian based group who perform the Japanese drumming art form. The Taik Oz performance of Blessings of the Earth held on 29 October was a big hit with Redland audiences, with the 300 plus crowd giving the performers a “standing ovation” and demanding an encore at the end of the concert. The concert attracted a lot of new patrons to the venue. The performance was a highlight of the 2010 season, and featured the full range of Taik Oz’s dynamic taiko drums including the 250kg ôdaiko Grand Drum.
- RPAC also offered “drumming workshops” with the Taik Oz company, which were held on the concert hall stage, on the afternoon of the performance and attracted 15 people. The workshops were offered as part of the RPAC education program, and the participants ranged in age from adults through to 12 years of age.
The workshops were quite unique and feedback from the participants was that it was an extraordinary experience that they will remember for years to come.
- Another highlight in October was the Redlands on Stage performance, a community hire event, which proved very popular with local audiences with the performance selling out. The concert featured a line up of young Redland performers, and was much enjoyed by all who attended.
- During October, the Community Art Display Space featured an exhibition by Ormiston Garden Club which consisted of photographic images of subject matter associated with gardening.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's following outcomes:

Outcome 7 - **‘Strong and connected communities’** – Our health, wellbeing and strong community spirit will be supported by a full range of services, programs, organisations and facilities, and our values of caring and respect will extend to people of all ages, cultures, abilities and needs. Strategies in this outcome supporting are: 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8 & 7.9

Outcome 8 - **‘Inclusive and ethical governance’** – Deep engagement, quality leadership at all levels, transparent and accountable democratic processes and a spirit of partnership between the community and Council will enrich residents’ participation in local decision making to achieve the community’s Redlands 2030 vision and goals: Strategy 8.5 – Be transparent and consistent in the way we manage the organisation, its risks and obligations and ensure we are delivering against our priorities.

Outcome 9 - **‘An efficient and effective organisation’** – Council is well respected and seen as an excellent organisation which manages resources in an efficient and effective way. Strategy 9.1 – Deliver excellent leadership throughout the organisation for the benefit of the community.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Customer & Community Services Group is within budget expectations.

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 occurred with all Customer & Community Service Managers and the General Manager Customer Services.

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

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve to note the report and annexure.

CARRIED (en bloc)

14.1.3 MONTHLY REPORT FOR PROJECT DELIVERY GROUP

Datworks Filename:	GOV Reports to Committee - Project Delivery Group (PDG)
Responsible Officer Name:	Bradley Salton Group Manager, Project Delivery Group
Attachments:	<u>Attachment 1 as at 19 November, 2010</u> <u>Attachment 2a October, 2010</u> <u>Attachment 2b October 2010</u> <u>Attachment 3 October 2010</u>
Author Name:	Delia Dowthwaite Project Delivery Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Project Delivery Group Monthly Report is presented to Council for noting.

PURPOSE

The report provides a project status as at 19 November and an overall financial summary as at 31 October for projects undertaken by the Project Delivery Group.

BACKGROUND

The Project Delivery Group (PDG) is responsible for the delivery of capital and major operational projects. This involves developing detailed designs and costing for each project, coordinating the quotation or tendering process and the project delivery and/or construction of the work program.

ISSUES

Listed below are projects that reached practical completion between 22 October and 19 November. Refer Attachment 1 for more detail.

- 10911 – Toondah Harbour Boat Ramp Maintenance Dredging/Siltation
- 42114 – Henry Ziegenfusz Reserve, Fitzroy St, Cleveland Carpark
- 40043 – McBean/Nina St, Karragarra
- 40050 – East Rd Karragarra Island
- 40183 – Crest Haven, Lamb Island
- 40179 – Thorneside Rd concrete Footpath
- 47 Reseal projects throughout the City

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

Outcome 8: **'Inclusive and Ethical Governance'** – Deep engagement, quality leadership at all levels, transparent and accountable democratic processes and a spirit of partnership between the community and Council will enrich residents' participation in local decision-making to achieve the community's Redlands 2030 vision and goals. Strategy 8.5 - Be transparent and consistent in the way we manage the organisation, its risks and obligations and ensure we are delivering against our priorities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

No direct financial implications arise from this report.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

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

CONSULTATION

The Survey Services Manager; Design Services Manager; Project Management Services Manager and Construction Projects Services Manager have been consulted in the preparation of this report and are supportive of the recommendation.

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

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve to note the report.

CARRIED (en bloc)

14.1.4 MONTHLY REPORT FOR OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE GROUP

Datworks Filename: GOV Reports to Committee - Operations and Maintenance (OPM)

Attachment: [Operations and Maintenance – October - 2010](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Lex Smith
Manager, Operations and Maintenance

Author Name: Tracy Carrick
Group Administration Co-ordinator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The core activities of the Operations and Maintenance Group are contained within this report and cover the period 1 October to 31 October 2010.

- The Roads and Drainage Maintenance Unit;
- Parks and Conservation Unit;
- Environmental Education Unit; and
- Waste Unit

have all contributed to this report.

The Waste Management Unit is a type 2 business unit and this report will provide Council with a monthly update and on a quarterly basis the unit will report its performance against the key performance indicators in the business performance plan.

PURPOSE

To provide information to Council on the activities undertaken by the Operations and Maintenance Group and on a quarterly basis report on the performance of the Waste Business Unit against key performance indicators.

BACKGROUND

The Operations and Maintenance Group undertakes the day to day operational activities of environmental education and environmental extension programs, the maintenance and operation of Council's waste collection and disposal facilities, the maintenance of roads, drains, marine and quarry facilities and the maintenance of Council's parks reserves and assets. This range of activities is undertaken by Council's day labour and contractor workforce.

The group generally operates between the hours of 7am to 4.45 pm weekdays with an on call service for after hours, however the environmental education operates 6 days per week and many evenings, with the waste facilities operating 7 days per week.

ISSUES**ROADS AND DRAINAGE UNIT – Unscheduled Activities and Significant Events****Graffiti**

94 Instances rectified for a cost of \$ 6 064.25 – 52 instances were street signs

Vandalism

94 instances rectified for a cost of \$ 10 340 – All instances were street signs that were repaired or replaced.

Illegally Dumped Refuse

11.5m³ / 14.085 tonne. Cost to dispose - \$2159.93

Activities Status

Nil comments – All Activities on target.

PARKS AND CONSERVATION UNIT– Unscheduled Activities and Significant Events**Graffiti**

136 instances rectified for a cost of \$12, 984.40

Vandalism

0 instances of vandalism

Illegally Dumped Refuse

2m³ / 1.4 tonne. Cost to dispose - \$99.72

Activities Status

Nil comments – All Activities on target.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION UNIT– Unscheduled Activities and Significant**Events**

- Trees 4 Weeds – our most successful event ever with 1183 bags of weeds bought in and exchanged for free native plants. A great result given this program is nearly 10 years old.

- Halloween at the Black Swamp - about 60 participants in this joint project with Bat care to promote flying-foxes.

IndigiScapes

- The launch of sculptures in the garden at IndigiScapes – an outdoor exhibition in partnership with Sculptors Queensland.
- New identification guide to the eucalypts of the Redlands. Available free of charge from IndigiScapes.

Extension Programs

- Managing Farm Dams workshop had 35 participants on October 2nd 2010.
- 4 new Waterways Extension properties, totalling 4.4ha.
 - Ziegenfusz Rd, Thornlands
 - Woodlands Dve, Thornlands (x2)
 - Venn Pde Thornlands
 - 22 revisits to existing properties

Wildlife Issues

- North Stradbroke Island urban koala count - a total of 28 koalas were recorded during a count that took in Dunwich (8 koalas), Amity (17) and Point Lookout (3). This was up by one on last year's count.
- Glossy Black-Cockatoo Birding Day. 15 volunteers surveyed the mainland and bay islands on October 31st 2010. Still waiting on some data returns but so far, only two birds reported from Macleay Island.

Activities Status

Nil comments – All Activities on target.

WASTE UNIT

Complaints

2 complaints were received during October 2010:

- Banging noise coming from the landfill – this was the noise from equipment used by Council's Ibis Management Consultant, a gas cannon, used to scare off and deter ibis from landing at the landfill tip face. The cannon has been removed as an item of deterrent at Birkdale for future works.
- Odour emanating from Birkdale Landfill – this was related to the weather conditions including wind direction. The odour suppression fence was used immediately upon receipt of the complaint.

Site Reports

Birkdale Landfill and Transfer Station

All operations have been continuing as normal.

Redland Bay Waste Transfer Station

All operations have been continuing as normal.

Giles Rd Hardfill site

All operations have been continuing as normal.

North Stradbroke Island Waste Transfer Stations

All operations have been continuing as normal.

SMBIs and Coochiemudlo Island Waste Transfer Stations

All operations have been continuing as normal.

Waste Education Activities

October 2010

Highlights of the month

- The first home schooling group participated in the new Waste Education excursion on offer this month. The group of student and parents visited Rocky Point Green Power Station, Birkdale Transfer Station, Birkdale (working) landfill and Judy Holt Park (closed landfill). The excursion was a complete success with students aged from Prep to Year 7 engaging in learning activities and tours appropriate to their age group.
- The whole of the year 8 cohort from Redlands College participated in the new high school lesson on waste minimisation in the Redlands. The lesson saw students investigate waste on a global scale before applying their skills to tackle waste on a local scale here in the Redlands. Some of the students are now going on to investigate the possibility of introducing a recycling system to their school, while others are investigating the complex issue of reducing litter in their local area.
- The first playgroup visit was conducted this month with some of Redlands youngest students at Busy Bugs Playgroup. Students and their parents got to get up close and personal with some worms, before helping to 'build' a home for the worms to live in. Feedback from the group was very positive with many parents wanting to know more about worm farms and how to reduce their waste in the Redlands.
- Three local schools applied for a state government grant from the Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) with the help of our local waste education officer. Part of the process required the school to complete their Waste component of their School Environmental Management Plan (SEMP). This plan shows how the school is currently attempting to reduce

waste as well as how they are trying to increase resource recovery. If successful with their grant, these schools will receive free infrastructure to assist them in their waste minimisation strategy, including bins (with nationally recognised bin lids), stickers for the bins, signs and posters as well as paper bins for all the classrooms.

Locations of visits

- FREE2LEARN Homeschoolers (Prep to Year 7)
- Busy Bugs – Playgroup (Pre-school)
- Saint Anthony's Catholic School (3 Year Prep classes)
- Redlands College (4 Year 8 classes)
- Hilliard State School (5 Year 1 classes)

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The activities undertaken within this report primarily support Council's following outcomes:

Outcome 1: “Healthy natural environment” - A diverse and healthy natural environment, with an abundance of native flora and fauna and rich ecosystems will thrive through our awareness, commitment and action in caring for the environment.

Outcome 2: “Green Living” – Our green living choices will improve our quality of life and our children’s lives, through our sustainable and energy efficient use of resources, transport and infrastructure, and our well informed responses to risks such as climate change.

Outcome 3 “Embracing the Bay” – The benefits of the unique ecosystems, visual beauty, spiritual nourishment and coastal lifestyle provided by the islands, beaches, foreshores and water catchments of Moreton Bay will be valued, protected and celebrated.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Operation and Maintenance Group is within budget.

CONSULTATION

This report was prepared in consultation with Unit Service Managers and numerous staff within the Operations and Maintenance group.

OFFICER’S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve to note the report.

CARRIED (en bloc)

The following Councillors declared a conflict of interest, or a perceived conflict of interest, in the following item and remained in the chamber for discussion and decision as they formed more than half of the members present at that time.

- Cr Williams Previous committee member of Redfest and current volunteer.
Member of Capalaba Lions Club
Honorary Member of Rotary Club of Capalaba
Patron of Piranhas Swimming Club
Member of Capalaba State College P & C
Member of Coolwynpin State School P & C
Patron of Capalaba Junior Rugby League
Member of Capalaba Soccer Club
Meals on Wheels Capalaba (husband executive member/volunteer)
Cr Williams voted in the affirmative
- Cr Reimers Patron of Redlands Multi-Sports Club
Patron of Redlands Dog Obedience Club
Patron of Muddies Cricket Club
Conveyor Judy Holt Bushcare Group
Member Redlands Museum
Cr Reimers voted in the affirmative
- Cr Bowler Member of the Management Committee of Redlands PCYC
Cr Bowler voted in the affirmative
- Cr Townsend Redland Bay and Victoria Point Lions Club
Cr Townsend voted in the affirmative
- Cr Henry Member of Thornlands State School P&C
Member of Bayview State School P&C
Member of Redlands District Special School P&C
Member Redlands Museum
Cr Henry voted in the affirmative
- Cr Boglary Member of Wellington Point Lions Club
Member of Wellington Point Rotary Club
Member of Redlands Museum
Cr Boglary voted in the affirmative
- Cr Ogilvie Member Redlands RSL
Patron Redlands United Soccer Club
Patron Redlands Touch Footy Club
Patron NSI All Sports Club
Member of Local Area Ambulance Committee
Cr Ogilvie voted in the affirmative.
- Cr Elliott Member of Alexandra Hills Sporting Club
Cr Elliott voted in the affirmative

Cr Hobson Member, Cleveland Uniting Church, Cleveland
Honorary member, Rotary Club, of Cleveland
Honorary Member, Soroptimist International Bayside, Alexandra Hills
Honorary Vice President, Wellington Point Cricket Club, Wellington Point
Patron of Bay FM 100.3
Patron of Bayside Respite Care Association, Capalaba
Patron of Cancer Council Queensland (Redlands Branch), Cleveland
Patron of Cleveland Local Ambulance Committee, Cleveland
Patron of Cleveland District State High School P&C Association, Cleveland
Patron of Cleveland Symphony Orchestra Inc, Cleveland
Patron of Coochiemudlo Island Surf Life Saving Club Inc, Victoria Point
Patron of Isle of Coochie Golf Club Inc, Coochiemudlo Island
Patron of Music Program – Redlands College, Wellington Point
Patron of Redlands PCYC, Capalaba
Patron of Redlands District Committee on the Ageing (RDCOTA), Cleveland
Patron of Redland City Bands, Cleveland
Patron of Genealogical Society, Cleveland
Patron of Redland Hospital Auxiliary Inc, Cleveland
Patron of Redland Scottish & Celtic Society Inc, Alexandra Hills
Patron of Redland Bayside Disability Services Inc, Cleveland
Patron of Redlands Cricket Inc, Capalaba
Patron of Redland Bayside AUSSI Masters Swimming Club, Victoria Point
Patron of Sporting Club Pipe Band, Victoria point
Patron of University of the Third Age, Cleveland
Patron of Redlands Women’s Information Network (RWIN), Thornlands
Patron of Wynnum Redlands Cycling Club, Cleveland
Cr Hobson voted in the affirmative.

14.1.5 WASTE GATE FEE EXEMPTION POLICY FOR NOT FOR PROFIT ORGANISATIONS

Datworks Filename: WM Waste Policies & Guideline Documents
Attachments: [Corporate Policy POL - 0057](#)
[Corporate Guideline – GL-0057-001](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Lex Smith
Manager, Operations and Maintenance
Author Name: Robert Walford
Project Officer, RedWaste

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The RedWaste Business Unit is responsible for the administration of Fee Exemptions for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations under Council's Community Service Obligations. This report outlines the proposed changes to existing policy and its administration.

PURPOSE

To provide Council with a report outlining changes to Corporate Policy POL-0057 Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations. Council is requested to adopt the proposed policy changes.

BACKGROUND

The RedWaste Business Unit provides fee waivers for eligible Not for Profit Organisations for waste disposal at Councils Waste Handling Facilities. Fee exemptions are funded under Council's Community Service Obligations in support of activities undertaken to raise funds or implement projects for the benefit of the whole community.

The policy relates to the assessment of whether a Not for Profit Organisation is eligible for fee exemption for waste disposal at Council Waste Handling facilities. The fee exemption relates only to waste generated by the organisation.

The Policy is intended to be a clear statement of policy intent that will guide the delivery of Community Service Obligations for Not for Profit Organisation waste disposal.

A review of Corporate Policy POL-0057 Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations has been undertaken in line with recommendation of Internal Audits Review of Customer Service Obligations. This policy was adopted in 1998 and last reviewed in 2002.

ISSUES

There were 91 fee exemptions issued in 2009/10 financial year, many of which were repeat exemptions issued over the allocated 1 disposal event each year. Evidence suggests further development of this Policy in terms of conditions and consistency in application is required.

Changes to Policy include:

- Increase of fee exemption from 1 event per year to 2 events per year
- A 50% reduction in gate fees for waste disposal over the 2 events

In support of Policy changes, the implementation of an IT based tracking and reporting system will be required. This system will link directly to WasteMan and complement existing gatehouse computer systems.

Steps taken to further streamline the application of Policy POL-0057 will greatly reduce Council Officers time in assessing individual requests for fee exemptions. Moreover, consistent application of Policy intent and guidelines will assist Council in understanding the financial implication of providing fee exemptions as Community Service Obligations.

Changes to Policy Document POL-0057 Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations will support Council Officers educating Not for Profit Organisations of the principles of waste minimisation and the waste hierarchy.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation supports Council's Corporate Plan and Vision for Strong and connected communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Existing financial implications result from the provision of fee waivers to Not for Profit Organisations under Council's Community Service Obligations, and will be reviewed as part of the development of the 2011/2012 Budget.

The Policy review will require significant investment of Officers' time in terms of IT development and exemption tracking systems however is expected to enhance Council's allocation of resources under Community Service Obligations and can be completed as part of normal duties.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications to Councils Planning Scheme as result of changes to Policy.

CONSULTATION

The proposed changes to Policy initially arose from review of existing Policy and Audit Review in line with Councils policy review guidelines.

Consultation has occurred with:

- Service Manager Waste Operations
- Senior Advisor Environmental Health (Corporate Planning, Performance & Risk Group)

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to:

1. Accept changes to Corporate Policy POL-0057 - Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations, as attached; and

2. Note the associated Guideline Document GL-0057-001 - Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council requests more information on proposed changes. However, this will result in Council no meeting targets set out in the Audit Report.

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to:

1. Accept changes to Corporate Policy POL-0057 - Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations, as attached; and
2. Note the associated Guideline Document GL-0057-001 - Fee Exemption for Waste Disposal for Not for Profit Organisations.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Elliott
Seconded by: Cr Williams

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **That the Committee Recommendation not be adopted;**
2. **To endorse the existing practice and collect data on waste disposal from not for profit organisations for a 12 month period; and**
3. **That a report be provided to Council at the end of that period.**

CARRIED (unanimously)

(Crs Murray and Burns were not present when this motion was put.)

14.1.6 KINGSTON AVENUE ALEXANDRA HILLS

Dataworks Filename: GOV – Reports to Committee – Operations & Maintenance (OPM)

Responsible Officer Name: Lex Smith
Group Manager Operations & Maintenance

Author Name: Neil Kesur
Service Manager Parks & Conversation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June this year, the Councillor for Division 7 conducted a survey of various residents in Kingston Ave, Alexandra Hills, to seek opinion as to whether the residents concerned wished to keep or remove/replace the *Corymbia torrelliana* (Cadaghi) growing at the front of their property. Five of these residents expressed a desire to have the trees removed/replaced. However one resident in the neighbourhood is vehemently opposed to any of these trees being removed.

There is no opportunity to inter-plant between the Cadaghis with more desirable species due to a lack of space. Therefore the gradual staged removal of these Cadaghis over the years with more desirable species is not possible without first removing some or all of the existing trees.

As a result of the above limitations, along with the general poor condition of street trees in Kingston Avenue, Parks and Conservation decided to broaden their focus for Kingston Avenue and instead look at rejuvenating the whole tree streetscape. A street tree rejuvenation proposal was then formulated and all residents in Kingston Ave were given a chance to comment on this proposal on two separate occasions. A number of different opinions and requests were expressed from residents during consultation process which Parks and Conservation have now incorporated into the proposal. The final proposal now involves the removal of 10 poorly performing trees/shrubs and the planting of 26 new trees. 10 of the new trees are koala food trees.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council direction in relation to the proposed street tree rejuvenation project for Kingston Avenue, Alexandra Hills, which has been formulated by Council's Parks and Conservation unit.

BACKGROUND

In June this year, the Councillor for Division 7, Murray Elliot, conducted a survey of various residents in Kingston Ave, Alexandra Hills, to ascertain if they would like to keep or remove/replace the *Corymbia torrelliana* (Cadaghi) street trees growing at the front of their properties. Five residents responded back indicating that they would like their trees removed/replaced.

The survey was then passed to Parks and Conservation for consideration and action. An assessment of the trees in question revealed all the Cadaghis to be approximately 20-30 years old, large in size and generally in good condition and health. Only two trees possibly warranted further investigation in relation to their health status, but these are not considered compelling issues.

It was further noted that the lack of space and poor positioning of the Cadaghis has resulted in some damage to the guttering in parts of this street, although this is not an unusual situation for many mature street trees in the City.

The assessment also revealed that there is no scope for the staged removal of the Cadaghis without first removing trees. Staged removal is a technique that Parks and Conservation sometimes employ, which firstly involves planting a more desired tree near/next to a less desired tree culminating in the eventual removal of the less desired tree in the years ahead. This technique aims to allow for undesirable trees to be substituted over a period of time without any major canopy/habitat loss or visual impact.

In the case of Kingston Ave, the Cadaghis are uniformly planted close together leaving virtually no room to interplant. Therefore in this instance, any staged removal process would require Cadaghi trees to be removed first, before any other trees could be planted.



Given the above outcome limitations, Parks and Conservation decided to broaden its focus to the many other poor performing tree/shrub specimens in Kingston Ave and therefore develop the notion of rejuvenating the entire treescape of this street. This proposed to remove/replace the many poor performing specimens along with

additional tree plantings where spaces currently exist. Letters outlining this proposal were sent on two occasions to every resident in street seeking feedback.

As a result of these consultations the following responses were received:

- Resident A – do not want a tree planted outside of their property.
- Resident B – do not want a tree planted outside of their property.
- Resident C – do not want a tree planted outside of their property.
- Resident D – Wants to keep a jacaranda tree as it was planted in memory of a deceased family member.
- Resident E – Is vehemently opposed to the removal of any large trees (Cadaghis, pines etc) outside of his property or the removal of any other Cadaghis in the street. The resident feels the Cadaghis are part of the overall streetscape character and avenue effect. The resident also requested that planting of the street occur prior to any tree removals being undertaken.
- Resident F – would like consideration given to removing and replacing the Cadaghis at the front of their property.

Only one of the residents (the last dot point above) surveyed by the Division 7 Councillor, reinforced their desire to have the Cadaghis removed and replaced at the front of their property. The other four residents did not respond again, however they may have been under the impression that their opinion to have the trees removed and replaced has already been expressed.

Following the consultation process with residents, Parks and Conservation are now proposing to remove 10 poorly performing trees/shrubs and compliment this with 26 new trees being planted in the Kingston Avenue area. 10 of the new trees are koala food trees.

At this point in time, Parks and Conservation can see no compelling justification for either the singular or selective removal of Cadaghis in Kingston Ave. The reasons for this include:

- The trees are large in size, generally in good health and provide all the benefits of trees in general. (eg shade, reducing the effects of dust/glare/high temperatures reducing Green House effect etc).
- The Cadaghis are planted uniformly to create an avenue effect and therefore contribute to the streetscape character. There is also no scope to undertake a staged removal process without removing trees first.
- Although the Cadaghis are not koala food trees they still provide important food/habitat source of wildlife such as possums, flying foxes, bees, birds etc especially when the trees are in flower.
- Parks and Conservation see no “on the ground evidence” of Cadaghis being a serious environmental weed in the Redlands, despite its reputation.

- There is not complete agreement among the residents in relation to the proposed removal of Cadaghis. One nearby resident is vehemently opposed to the removal of any Cadaghis in Kingston Avenue whatsoever.

ISSUES

- There is not complete agreement from residents in Kingston Avenue in relation to the proposed removal/replacement of Cadaghis in this street.
- Although Cadaghis are not a koala food tree, they still have important ecological value in terms of providing a refuge and food source for wildlife and all the benefits of large trees in general.
- It is important to note that the removal of any Cadaghis in Kingston Avenue may create precedence for many other fine old Cadaghi specimens to be removed in the City. Parks and Conservation believe that the removal and replacement of less desirable trees (if deemed appropriate) should, where possible, only be carried out as part of a planned staged removal process along with community approval.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The activities undertaken within this report primarily support Council's Outcome 1: **"Healthy Natural Environment"** – A diverse and healthy natural environment, with an abundance of native flora and fauna and rich ecosystems will thrive through our awareness, commitment and action in caring for the environment.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are sufficient funds in the 2010/11 Parks and Conservation budget to meet all costs associated with this street tree rejuvenation project.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no planning scheme implications.

CONSULTATION

Consultation has occurred with the residents of Kingston Avenue, Cr Murray Elliott, Council's Chief Executive Officer, Acting General Manager Customer Services, Group Manager Operations and Maintenance and Council's Tree Services staff.

OPTIONS

1. That Council do not remove any *Corymbia torrellianas* (Cadaghis) in Kingston Avenue at this point in time, further investigate the health issues associated with two Cadaghis and proceed with the proposed street tree rejuvenation project, incorporating the amendments suggested by residents during the consultation process.

2. That Council selectively remove and replace every second *Corymbia torrelliana* in the surveyed area as part of a staged removal process and proceed with the proposed street tree rejuvenation project, incorporating the amendments suggested by residents during the consultation process.
3. That Council remove and replace all *Corymbia torrellianas* in the surveyed area and proceed with the proposed street tree rejuvenation project, incorporating the amendments suggested by residents during the consultation process.
4. That Council do not undertake any further works associated with this project in Kingston Avenue and leave things as they currently exist.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to:

1. Not remove any *Corymbia torrellianas* (Cadghis) in Kingston Avenue at this point in time;
2. Further investigate the health issues of two Cadaghis; and
3. Proceed with the proposed street tree rejuvenation project, incorporating the amendments suggested by residents during the consultation process.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve to:

1. **Act to remove the Cadaghis trees as requested by the affected residents;**
2. **Proceed with the proposed street tree rejuvenation project, incorporating the amendments suggested by residents during the consultation process; and**
3. **That officers prepare a guideline for consideration by Council at a future workshop**

CARRIED (en bloc)

14.1.7 MONITORING AND ANALYSIS OF DUST FROM GRAVEL ROADS - SOUTHERN MORETON BAY ISLANDS

Dataworks Filename: EM Environmental Management – Air Quality
Attachment: [SMBI Air Monitoring Report](#)
[Air Noise Environment Pty Ltd Report](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Lex Smith
Manager, Operations & Maintenance
Author Name: John Frew
Roads & Drainage Services Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dust nuisance for adjacent residences resulting from vehicular traffic on unsealed gravel roads continues to be a significant source of public complaint for Redland City Council. This is particularly so on the Bay Islands where the majority of council's gravel roads are situated. This report seeks to explore the dust issue from a qualitative and quantitative perspective and advise Council on the appropriate responses to be undertaken.

PURPOSE

To advise Council of the recommendations resulting from recently conducted tests carried out on the gravel material used to maintain Council's unsealed roads on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands (SMBI) and the airborne dust generated by traffic on these roads.

BACKGROUND

Airborne dust generated from vehicular traffic on gravel roads has always been an issue for Councils throughout Australia where residential dwellings are located nearby. Redland City Council has a total 174km of formed roads on the SMBI of which 71km will be sealed as of the end of this financial year. This will leave 103km unsealed, the majority of which would be gravel roads. With the ever increasing population has come a corresponding increase in dust complaints.

A number of these complaints have alleged that health problems have either been exacerbated by or caused by airborne dust from Council roads.

As part of Council's duty of care to Redland city residents, a consultant was commissioned to carry out limited monitoring of airborne dust at 2 typical SMBI sites to quantify any problem that might exist and to hopefully enable Council to allay fears.

This monitoring was carried out by Simtars during the period 16-26 November 2009 with the subsequent report being received mid December 2009. (Refer appendix 1) As this report was essentially a compilation of test results, an expert review of the report (see appendix 2) was commissioned by Council to provide comment,

particularly with respect to the potential for health issues to arise as a result of the measured dust particulate concentrations.

ISSUES

The review concluded that while the tests were of a short duration, they were undertaken in circumstances significantly worse than average and therefore long term conclusions were likely to be conservative.

Heavy metals results were either below detection levels or were well within accepted guidelines. All airborne dust results also fell below generally accepted thresholds with the exception of very fine particles which were within the 24hr guideline but outside the annual average guideline. Given the conservative nature of the testing, this uncertainty is not believed to be significant.

The review did not recommend settling this uncertainty with longer duration testing as it concluded that Council's dust mitigation goals would be better served by applying available financial resources to bitumen sealing rather than further testing. Given that the monitoring and review show that Council is satisfying existing health standards, it is still acknowledged that the nuisance aspect of dust generated from unsealed SMBI roads is an ongoing problem. Sealing is generally accepted as the only long term solution and Council does not believe temporary dust suppression measures are either practical or cost effective in comparison.

In support of this stance, the review recommended that Council focus its available resources on sealing roads where dust nuisance is potentially highest. Council currently has a prioritisation model that considers factors such as number of dwellings on the road and amount of vehicular traffic.

The review recommended prioritising on the basis of the proximity of dwellings to the road side. This, in most cases is not at odds with the current model and will be taken into consideration when listing roads for sealing.

The key consideration for Council in relation to dust mitigation and allaying concerns regarding air borne dust is the level of expenditure allocated to sealing SMBI roads. Increases to the funding currently incorporated in the 10yr Capital Works Plan will obviously have an impact on other projects within the plan.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendations primarily support 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 direct financial implications associated with the Officers recommendation although, should Council choose to speed up the sealing programme through the allocation of additional funding, there will be an impact on the 10 yr Capital works Plan.

CONSULTATION

The Service Manager Roads and Drainage Maintenance has consulted with the Group Manager Infrastructure Planning, Principal Engineer Roads and Drainage, Group Manager Operations and Maintenance, Acting General Manager Customer Services and the CEO.

OPTIONS**PREFERRED**

1. Accept Simtars report oe102044f1 and the associated Air Noise Environment Pty Ltd review.
2. No further dust monitoring is carried out at this time.
3. Continue with the capital works program to Seal SMBI roads under the current prioritisation model and with funding as currently programmed.

ALTERNATIVE

Increase funding to the program to seal SMBI roads under the current prioritisation model.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to:

1. Accept Simtars report oe102044f1 and the associated Air Noise Environment Pty Ltd review;
2. Not carry out further dust monitoring at this time; and
3. Continue with the capital works program to Seal SMBI roads under the current prioritisation model and with funding as currently programmed.

PROPOSED MOTION AT COMMITTEE

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Henry

That Council resolve to:

1. Accept Simtars report oe102044f1 and the associated Air Noise Environment Pty Ltd review;
2. Not carry out further dust monitoring at this time; and

3. Consider increasing the Capital Works Program to seal SMBI roads under the current prioritisation model in the upcoming budget considerations.

On being put to the vote the motion was LOST

A division was called for:

Crs Reimers, Townsend and Henry voted in the affirmative.

Crs Burns, Murray, Elliott, Williams and Boglary voted in the negative.

Cr Bowler was not present when the motion was put.

Crs Hobson and Ogilvie were absent from the meeting.

The motion was declared by the Chair as LOST.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve to:

1. **Accept Simtars report oe102044f1 and the associated Air Noise Environment Pty Ltd review;**
2. **Not carry out further dust monitoring at this time; and**
3. **Continue with the capital works program to Seal SMBI roads under the current prioritisation model and with funding as currently programmed.**

CARRIED

A division was called for.

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

Cr Hobson voted in the negative.

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

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

14.2 PLANNING & POLICY

14.2.1 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2010 - 2014

Datworks Filename: ED Planning - Tourism Development Strategy

Attachments: [A strategic direction Tourism in Redlands](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Alan Burgess
Manager Economic Development

Author Name: Paula Rathgeber
Tourism Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EC3 Global has been engaged to conduct industry consultation and develop a draft Tourism Strategy 2010-2014. The development of a Tourism Strategy was delayed whilst the Tourism Advisory Forum considered alternative structures for the delivery of Tourism in the Redlands. In December 2009, Council resolved to not continue with the proposed tourism entity, retaining tourism development under the existing arrangements.

Consultation with the industry and two councillor workshops have been undertaken and a draft document prepared. Committee is being asked to endorse this draft which will be presented to the industry for feedback.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of this document so it can be distributed to the Tourism Industry for feedback. Once feedback is received and included, the Strategy will be brought back to Council to formally adopt the Strategy.

BACKGROUND

Over the past three years Council has undertaken various studies involving various industry groups to consider the structure for the delivery of Tourism in the Redlands. This culminated in December 2009 with a report recommending the establishment of a Council owned entity, controlled by a board of directors. This recommendation was not passed by council and the Tourism unit was directed to continue working under the existing arrangements.

Whilst the work on the Tourism structure was being undertaken the development of a strategic plan for tourism was placed on hold. It was anticipated the proposed new tourism body would undertake this as its first major task.

In June 2010 EC3 Global was engaged by Redland City to undertake the development of the Tourism Strategy 2010-2014.

ISSUES

The objectives of this project are to research, develop, consult and deliver a long term tourism strategy and accompanying strategic marketing plan. The Tourism Strategy and marketing plan will cover the next 4 years, and clearly articulate the City's vision for tourism and ensure a City wide strategic approach for the development and growth of tourism in Redland City.

The development of the strategy will provide a unified, long term focus and an opportunity to develop strong partnerships between civic leaders, local tourism industry operators, the community and other key industry stakeholders.

The strategy will also provide direction on the Council's role in the supply of tourism related infrastructure and amenities including accommodation, tourism attractions, tours, product and information services. The tourism strategy will provide a focus and direction, through a range of strategic initiatives, to support and work with the tourism industry to address the challenges ahead and capitalise on opportunities.

The five key priority objectives are (page 17 – 21):

1. Partnerships and industry engagement and development
2. A clear message and positioning
3. Investing in economic growth through tourism
4. A planned approach to growth and conservation
5. Vibrant communities and tourism events

From these priority objectives twelve initial projects have been identified (page 22).

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's **outcome 6 – Supportive and Vibrant Economy** – Businesses will thrive and jobs will grow from opportunities generated by low impact industries, cultural and outdoor lifestyle activities, ecotourism and quality educational experiences. **Strategy 6.6** – Promote Redlands as a high quality tourism destination and encourage the development of sustainable nature-based, heritage and eco-tourism.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

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

The document has been workshopped with Councillors twice in November 2010 and at several workshops with the local tourism industry. A list of consulted stakeholders is included on page 28 of the attached draft strategy.

OPTIONS**PREFERRED**

Council resolve to approve industry consultation on the draft Tourism Strategy for Redlands 2010 – 2014.

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

Moved by: Cr Bowler
Seconded by: Cr Townsend

That Council resolve to approve industry consultation on the draft Tourism Strategy for Redlands 2010 – 2014.

CARRIED

14.3 GENERAL BUSINESS

14.3.1 STATUS REPORT ON CLOSURE OF REDLAND BAY ROAD, CAPALABA

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Boglary
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That the General Manager Planning & Policy bring forward a status report on closure of Redland Bay Road, Capalaba to include information from discussions with Translink and Department of Main Roads, in relation to major intersections in this area.

CARRIED (en bloc)

15 CORPORATE SERVICES & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE 8/12/2010

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That the Corporate Services & Governance Committee Minutes of 8 December 2010 be received.

CARRIED

[Corporate Services & Governance Committee Minutes 8/12/2010](#)

15.1 CORPORATE SERVICES

Cr Townsend declared a perceived conflict of interest in the following item, stating that her husband is a member of the golf club.

Moved by: Cr Elliott
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Cr Townsend did not have a conflict of interest and that she be allowed to remain in the Chamber.

CARRIED

Cr Townsend remained in the chamber, voting in the affirmative.

15.1.1 REDLAND BAY GOLF CLUB INC - PARTIAL SURRENDER OF LEASE AREA

Dataworks Filename: L.319035
Attachment: [Redland Bay Golf Club Site Plan](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Brian Lewis
Manager Corporate Acquisitions Fleet & Facilities
Author Name: Merv Elliott
Property Services Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Redland Bay Golf Club Inc hold a lease over Council land at North Street, Redland Bay expiring in 2039. Part of the leased area, Lot 342 on SP157222 is improved with a dilapidated timber dwelling and recently erected storage shed. Following negotiations with Council officers, local Councillor and the Club, an agreement has been obtained wherein the Club have agreed to surrender the lease over Lot 342 SP157222 to Council.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council agree to the surrender of a portion of the Redland Bay Golf Club Inc lease area Lot 342 SP157222.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is no longer used by the Club for golfing purposes and recently, the TS Diamantina Sea Cadets have been using the site for cadet activities.

For Council to effectively use the site for community purposes it would be necessary to obtain unencumbered ownership.

ISSUES

The main issue concerning this site is the state of dilapidation of the existing building. The building would need to be demolished to allow an appropriate use of the site.

Negotiations with Redland Bay Golf Club Inc have resulted in an agreement, subject to Council approval, for the surrender of the lease of Lot 342 SP157222 with Council being responsible for the demolition of the building. The cost of demolition has been estimated at \$30,000 to \$40,000.

Once full ownership is obtained, Council has the opportunity of leasing the site to a community/sporting organisation, or maintaining the site for recreational/open space purposes.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority:

"Wise Planning and Design":

5.12: Plan, provide and advocate for essential physical and social infrastructure that supports community wellbeing and manage Council's existing infrastructure assets to ensure service standards are maintained or improved.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Council will be involved in expenditure of \$30,000 to \$40,000 for legal fees and demolition/site remediation costs. No allowance has been made in 2010/11 Corporate Services' budget for this expenditure. Community & Social Planning have agreed to apply for a Q2 budget review for this expenditure or fund from existing budget allocations.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no Planning Scheme implications identified.

CONSULTATION

Property Services Manager has consulted with Manager Community & Social Planning, Senior Adviser Sports & Recreation, Local Councillor and President Redland Bay Golf Club Inc.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To agree to the surrender of the lease held by Redland Bay Golf Club Inc of Lot 342 SP157222;
2. Cost of legal fees and demolition/site remediation to be met by Council;
3. That the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to make, vary and discharge all documents relating to this matter.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council commence compliance action against Redland Bay Golf Club Inc (and TS Diamantina if contractually obligated) to demolish or repair the dilapidated structures on Lot 342 SP157222, in which case Redland Bay Golf Club Inc will opt to retain the lease over this land. This action is not recommended because of the legal uncertainty in achieving this outcome.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To agree to the surrender of the lease held by Redland Bay Golf Club Inc of Lot 342 SP157222;
2. That the cost of legal fees and demolition/site remediation be met by Council; and
3. That the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to make, vary and discharge all documents relating to this matter.

PROPOSED MOTION AT COMMITTEE

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That consideration of this item be deferred to the General Meeting on 15 December 2010.

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

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Elliott
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve as follows:

- 1. If the club agrees to the surrender of the lease held by Redland Bay Golf Club Inc of Lot 342 SP157222;**
 - a. the cost of legal fees and demolition/site remediation will be met by Council; and**
 - b. the Chief Executive Officer be delegated authority to make, vary and discharge all documents relating to this matter;**
- 2. If the club does not agree to the surrender by 22 December 2010, then Council commence compliance action against Redland Bay Golf Club Inc to demolish or repair the dilapidated structures on Lot 342 SP157222.**

CARRIED

15.2 OFFICE OF CEO

15.2.1 A REPORT ON THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING OF 20 OCTOBER 2010

Dataworks Filename: GOV Audit Committee
Responsible Officer Name: Gary Stevenson
Chief Executive Officer
Author Name: Kylie Fernon
Manager Internal Audit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In line with the Audit Committee Charter, the Audit Committee meeting of 20 October 2010 was scheduled to enable discussion and consideration of the following:

- Receipt and Confirmation of Minutes of 11 June 2010;
- Business Arising from Previous Minutes;
- Local Government Finance Standard 2005 – Section 15 Requirements;
- Council End of Month Financial Report;
- Compliance Certificates;
- Internal Audit Plan Status;
- Internal Audit Recommendations Due for Implementation;
- QAO Recommendations Due for Implementation;
- Internal Audit Reports;
- Update from External Auditors;
- Emerging Issues;
- Other Business.

PURPOSE

The authority for the establishment of an Audit Committee is provided for under Section 105 of the *Local Government Act 2009*. It operates in accordance with *Part 10, Subdivision 2, Sections 157-160 of the Local Government (Finance, Plans and Reporting) Regulation 2010*.

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the issues discussed at the meeting on 20 October 2010.

BACKGROUND

The primary objective of the Audit Committee is to assist Council in fulfilling its corporate governance role and oversight of financial measurement and reporting responsibilities imposed under the *Financial Accountability Act 2009*, the *Local Government Act 2009* and other relevant legislation.

To fulfil this objective, it is necessary that a report on discussions and deliberations of the Audit Committee be submitted to Council to enhance the ability of Councillors to discharge their legal responsibility.

ISSUES

The following is a summary of the issues discussed at the meeting of 20 October 2010:

The Chair, Mr Scanlan, declared the meeting open (Item 1), with all members and invitees present (Item 2) with the exception of Cr M Elliott who arrived at 10.00am to replace Cr M Hobson (Mayor) who left at 10.01am. Cr C Ogilvie left the meeting at 10.11am and returned at 10.51am.

3 RECEIPT AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Audit Committee meeting of 11 June 2010 were confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

3.1 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

It was agreed that the following business arising from previous minutes would be addressed during the relevant agenda items:

- As per item 5 (Council End of Month Financial Report) of the minutes of the Audit Committee meeting of 11 June 2010, Virendra Dua requested additional information in relation to:
 - Loan Redemptions and how this affects the bottom line (page 8 of 20);
 - How employee costs are tied to page 8;
 - How capital expenditure and cash funds tie up; and
 - A list of the number of RCC employees (full time, part time, casual, temp, contract).
- As per item 8.1 (Internal Audit Recommendations) of the minutes of the Audit Committee meeting of 11 June 2010, Virendra Dua requested further information on:
 - How many recommendations Council are starting with;
 - What recommendations Council are adding on;
 - What recommendations Council are losing;
 - What recommendations Council are changing; and
 - How many are being transitioned and how that relates to the overall position.
- As per item 9 (Internal Audit Reports) of the minutes of the Audit Committee meeting of 11 June 2010, Mike Hyde General Manager Customer Services

requested that Virendra Dua be provided with a sample of reports that are presented to the Committee regarding Customer Service activities.

- As per item 12.1 (2010-2011 Internal Audit Plan) of the minutes of the Audit Committee meeting of 11 June 2010, the Manager Internal Audit was requested to provide:
 - A scope for audit activity scheduled in quarters 1 and 2;
 - Review the undertaking of IT audits following the outcome of external audit's IT Review; and
 - Risk Registers to be distributed with the minutes.

- As per item 12.6 (*Local Government Act 2009 and Regulations 2010*) of the minutes of the Audit Committee meeting of 11 June 2010, the Manager Corporate Planning Performance and Risk to provide an update of the Act and Regulations.

4 UPDATE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The Chief Executive Officer reported to the Audit Committee on the following significant matters:

1. Policy Reform – there have been a number of initiatives which have been pursued, especially relating to a new Complaints Policy, a Confidential Information Policy and Councillor Advice Guidelines.
2. Structural Reform – Development & Community Standards department is continuing with the reform and is nearing completion. Corporate Services is also undergoing reform which is advancing well.
3. General Manager Customer Services – Mike Hyde is leaving RCC to return to NSW and we acknowledge his contribution to Council. Recruitment of a new General Manager Customer Services and the new Commercial Services Group Manager is being undertaken simultaneously.
4. Risk Management – we have been through the WH&S Enforceable Undertaking Audit and have also been subject to an external audit by WH&S Queensland regarding our management of asbestos and sites contaminated with asbestos.
5. Business Continuity Plan – there has been updating and training sessions for key officers involved.
6. Statutory Reform –
 - Information Privacy Act has presented a number of ambiguities and conflicts with other legislation – seeking some clarification and possible reform of that Act to eliminate those ambiguities and inconsistencies.
 - Imminent Public Sector Ethics Act changes along with the new Public Disclosure Act which replaces the Whistleblowers Protection Act. There are two pieces of work that the State Government is undertaking which are particularly relevant to RCC, one is the Disaster Management Act replacement and the Local Government Electoral Bill.
7. Major Issues –
 - Native Title negotiations with the indigenous community on NSI which will cumulate in a land use agreement. The courts require Council to achieve that by March 2011.

- Communication with state government on its expectations of growth management and the state government requiring us to confirm our commitment to growth management targets and various other issues, including a review of infrastructure charges, which may mean a reduction in revenue.
 - Council also has a number of strategic plans, cumulating in statutory planning outcomes, particularly structure planned areas around the city and there are issues there in relation to the timing and sequencing of development and the adoption of those plans.
 - The State's NSI vision which may have significant potential impact on the communities of NSI and the Council's management of the planning for those communities.
 - The ongoing challenge of the strategic planning for SMBI with a statutory requirement to get those asset management plans in place and Council is currently undertaking a significant review of our financial strategy including rating reform.
 - Water Reform – successful transition. Equity entitlement not resolved. Dividend policy under review.
8. A Core Business and service level review being undertaken – it is in its data gathering stage. This will probably have an impact on budget next year.
9. Reviews of Procurement and Waste Strategy.
10. Conscious of footprint and moving to a less paper dependent office.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the report be noted.

5 COUNCIL FINANCIAL REPORTS

5.1 COUNCIL END OF MONTH FINANCIAL REPORT

Council's end of month report for 31 July 2010 as presented to the General Meeting on 25 August 2010 was presented to the Audit Committee.

Council's end of month report for 30 August 2010 as presented to the General Meeting on 22 September 2010 was presented to the Audit Committee.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the report be noted.

5.2 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM VIRENDRA DUA

The following queries were raised by Virendra Dua with regard to the June 2010 Financial Report:

Query 1: "There is considerable under spend of \$5.7m on goods and services, the variance commentary does not identify which elements of the underspend will be carried forward to FY 2010/11."

Query 2: "There is a considerable under spend of \$10.2m on capital goods and services, the variance commentary does not identify which elements of the underspend will be carried forward to FY 2010/11."

Query 3: “With regards to the above two items, I wonder which strategic outcomes may have been impacted by the significant under spend.”

Query 4: “The capital WIP of \$42m is interesting – given that capex is comprised of a large number of small-medium projects, this may be an indicator that projects are not being closed off on a timely basis, leading to delays in benefits/service flow.”

Query 5: “There is considerable under spend of \$5.7m on goods and services, the variance commentary does not identify which elements of the underspend will be carried forward to FY 2010/11.”

Query 6: “I am trying to understand why the revised budget WIP balance was being forecast to be \$75m, essentially indicating that the entire budgeted Capex for 09/10 would be noted as WIP, rather than being commissioned against asset classes.”

The General Manager Corporate Services presented a report and briefing note to the Committee addressing Virendra Dua’s queries.

- **The Chair commented in relation to the analysis of the EOM financial information reflecting Virendra Dua’s comments and the desirability of having further explanations and noted Council’s comment that this matter is being dealt with, particularly given the public nature of the information.**

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the report and briefing note, in relation to queries raised, be noted.

6 COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATES

Compliance Certificates for the quarter April to June 2010 for Governance, Development & Community Standards, Customer Services, Planning and Policy, Corporate Services and Redland Water were presented to the Committee. The Committee sought and obtained further explanation from the GM Governance about the reasons behind the increased external legal costs incurred by Council.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Compliance Certificates as presented be noted.

7 INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN

7.1 AUDIT PLAN STATUS

The status of the Audit Plan was presented to the Committee for noting. This report included a recommendation to amend the Audit Plan by: deferring the “Review of the reconciliation of fees and charges” and the “Review of asset maintenance/management” to the 2011-2012 financial year; and bringing forward from the 2011-2012 Audit Plan the “Review of contractors insurance and licences” and the “Review of the Privacy Plan.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted:

- The Status of the Audit Plan as presented and supported the proposed changes;
- The unplanned activity status report; and
- The Scoping document for 2010.

8 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS DUE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 INTERNAL AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Senior Internal Auditor presented a progress report of audit recommendations due for implementation to the Committee.

COMMITTEE DECISION

The Audit Committee:

- Noted the Audit Recommendations due for implementation as presented;
- Noted that they are pleased with the format and content of the revised reports and that the suite of reports be repeated for the next meeting;
- Request a further report which highlights those particular recommendations which internal audit consider more business critical; and
- Note the matters which have been resolved.

8.2 QAO RECOMMENDATIONS

The Senior Internal Auditor presented a progress report of QAO audit recommendations due for implementation to the Committee.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the Audit Recommendations Due For Implementation as presented and those recommendations which had been completed in the last quarter.

9 INTERNAL AUDIT REPORTS

The following reports are presented for Audit Committee consideration:

9.1 CORPORATE SERVICES

- Internal Audit Report 27/07/10 – Review of Payroll (distributed separately)
- Internal Audit Report 19/07/10 – Review of the Transfer of Retail Water Assets (distributed separately)
- Internal Audit Report 13/10/2010 – Review Contractors Insurance and Licences to ensure Compliance with Outsourced Contracts

9.2 DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY STANDARDS

- Internal Audit Report 05/10/10 – Review Enforcement Notices to ensure compliance with statutory obligations under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (distributed separately)
- Internal Audit Report 13/10/10 – Review the calculation and payment of developer contributions consistent with development approvals and Council policies (distributed separately)

9.3 ACROSS COUNCIL

- Internal Audit Report 23/08/10 – Review the process for the handover of land and infrastructure from the development application process to Operations and Maintenance (distributed separately)

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the reports be received and noted as presented.

10 2009-2010 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Martin Drydale – General Manager Corporate Services presented an overview of the 2009/10 Financial Statements to the Audit Committee.

11 UPDATE FROM EXTERNAL AUDITORS

Brendan Worrall – WHK Horwath presented the Audit Completion Report and draft management letter.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the WHK Horwath report as presented and that the financial statements go forward for final signing.

12 OTHER BUSINESS

The Manager Internal Audit presented a report for the Committee to note the membership of the Audit Committee as required by the *Local Government Act 2009* and the *Local Government (Finance, Plans and Reporting) Regulation 2010*.

12.1 AUDIT COMMITTEE – CHARTER, MEMBERSHIP, CHAIRPERSON AND QUORUM

The Manager Internal Audit presented a report for the Committee to note the membership of the Audit Committee as required by the *Local Government Act 2009* and the *Local Government (Finance, Plans and Reporting) Regulation 2010*.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the report, with amendments as agreed.

12.2 LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL AUDIT CHARTER

The Manager Internal Audit presented a report for the Audit Committee to note the legislative changes to the Internal Audit Charter, which was amended to incorporate the provisions of the *Local Government (Finance, Plans and Reporting) Regulation 2010*, as well as some minor administrative changes.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the report as presented.

12.3 ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN ISSUE 34 – EXPOSING AND DETERRING MISCONDUCT, FRAUD AND CORRUPTION

The Manager Internal Audit presented a progress report to the Committee on Issue 34 of the Organisational Development Plan – Exposing and Deterring Misconduct, Fraud and Corruption.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the report as presented.

12.4 WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY

The Principal Adviser Workplace Health and Safety presented an update to the Committee on Workplace Health and Safety issues.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the report as presented and the letter tabled from DRA Safety Specialists regarding the Enforceable Undertaking Audit.

12.5 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2009 AND REGULATIONS 2010

The Manager Corporate Planning and Risk presented an update to the Committee on Council's implementation of the legislation that commenced on 1 July 2010 and the processes being undertaken to monitor and report on compliance.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the report as presented and the organised manner in which Council has responded to the new requirements.

12.6 EXTERNAL AUDIT – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RISK ASSESSMENT

Brendan Worrall – WHK Horwath presented an update on the external auditor's review of Council's information systems activity to the Committee.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the Audit Committee noted the report as presented and the outcome of the audit, which concluded that there were no events or conditions identified which are considered to indicate the existence of any moderate or high IT risks, likely to contribute to material misstatement in the 2010 financial statements. Accordingly, no management points were raised.

13 NEXT MEETING

Next meeting of the Audit Committee is scheduled for 3 March 2011 at 10.00 a.m.

14 MEETING CLOSURE

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11.15 a.m.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's 'Inclusive and Ethical Governance' Outcome – Deep engagement, quality leadership at all levels, transparent and accountable democratic processes and a spirit of partnership between the community and Council will enrich residents' participation in local decision making to achieve the community's Redlands 2030 vision and goals

- 8.5 Be transparent and consistent in the way we manage the organisation, its risks and obligations and ensure we are delivering against our priorities

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost to Council for the attendance of the independent Committee Chair and independent external Committee member is \$20,000 per annum. This is provided for in the Internal Audit Group Budget.

CONSULTATION

The Audit Committee minutes are presented for confirmation as a true and accurate record of proceedings at its next meeting.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

The Council resolve to accept this report, which summarises the issues discussed at the Audit Committee meeting of 20 October 2010.

ALTERNATIVE

1. That Council accept this report and request additional information; or
2. That Council not accept this report and request an alternative method of reporting.

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to accept this report, which summarises the issues discussed at the Audit Committee Meeting of 20 October 2010.

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.3 GOVERNANCE

15.3.1 SPONSORSHIP APPLICATION - 2011 WORLD ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CONGRESS

Datworks Filename: CR Sponsorship
Responsible Officer Name: Kathy Petrik
Manager Marketing & Communications
Author Name: Kathy Petrik
Manager Marketing & Communications

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council's Corporate Sponsorship policy was adopted in October 2009, with the policy objective of *"seeking to support and promote a strong and involved community through the sponsorship of events, projects, services or other activities in an equitable and accountable way."* This policy came into force on 1 January 2010.

The definition of sponsorship is defined as *"a business transaction in which a sponsor provides a financial contribution or value in kind to support an event, project, service or activity in return for negotiated commercial and other benefits. It is a business transaction because it involves an exchange that has measurable value to each party in commercial, communication or philanthropic terms"*.

In accordance with the policy and guidelines, all sponsorships over \$5,000 are to be determined by Council. This report provides a recommendation from the internal assessment panel for the sponsorship of the 2011 World Environmental Education Congress (WEEC) in the amount of \$5,000.

In addition, the Redland City Council Environmental Education Unit has indicated it will augment this sponsorship payment by an additional amount of \$5500 from its program funding to maximise its profile through additional sponsorship exposure.

PURPOSE

This report provides background and recommendations to Council for sponsorship of the 2011 World Environmental Education Congress (WEEC) in accordance with its policy and guidelines.

BACKGROUND

This bi-annual event is the 6th World Environmental Education Congress and will be held at the Brisbane Convention & Exhibition Centre from 19 to 23 July 2011. It is expected to attract 1000 to 1200 worldwide delegates.

The Organising Committee includes leading international and Australian environmental educators, as well as the executive of the peak environmental education association in Australia, the Australian Association for Environmental

Education (AAEE). Redland City Council is a member of this peak body and is also represented by an environmental education officer on the congress' organising committee.

The United Nations has declared 2005-2014 the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. The 2011 Congress provides an opportunity to demonstrate how environmental educators are successfully addressing pressing challenges such as climate change and educating young and old so that all are able to enjoy a sustainable future.

The application states that delegate field trips are planned for North Stradbroke Island to learn about the Indigenous heritage and Redlands IndigiScapes Centre during the congress. The local economy can expect to benefit from these field trips as well as being promoted as a tourism destination pre and post event.

Local resources to benefit include: Indigenous community; Redlands IndigiScapes Centre, water transport operators and tourism operators.

Sponsors include: federal, state and local governments, Qld and interstate universities, environmental organisations, not for profit groups.

The internal assessment panel representing the areas of community and social planning; customer and community services; economic development, marketing and communications and environmental management have assessed the value of this sponsorship to Council as \$5,500, or a bronze sponsorship level.

The panel noted that there was an opportunity to promote Redland City Council's leadership as Queensland's Most Sustainable City for 2010 as well as its other innovative educational programs to an international audience.

The sponsorship will allow for Council's logo to be hyperlinked to the Congress website, acknowledged in e-zines and advertisements, registration package, one electronic brochure to be uploaded on the congress abstracts USB stick, endorsement in corporate media releases, use of 6th World Environment Education Congress logo for promotional purposes, logo on sponsor slides.

The Environmental Education Unit will be augmenting this sponsorship by \$5,500 from its program budget to upgrade to a silver level since it is cost effective to do so. This will allow for an additional A4 ½ page advertisement in the program book (valued at \$1,100), an exhibition booth (\$4,000), 2 delegate tickets (\$1780 provisional value – awaiting final confirmation) and a speaking opportunity on the congress program to promote Redland City Council activities.

ISSUES

Redland City Council's Marketing and Communications group will liaise with the sponsored organisation to ensure that all benefits agreed to in the sponsorship agreement are delivered satisfactorily.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

This sponsorship supports the following corporate plan objectives: supportive and vibrant economy, Quandamooka country, embracing the bay and a healthy natural environment.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Sponsorship funding is available in the amount of \$5,500 (inc GST), representing a bronze level of sponsorship to allocate to this application. The Environmental Education Unit has sufficient budget of \$5,500 to augment the sponsorship funds to a silver level.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for the Redlands Planning Scheme.

CONSULTATION

Mayor Melva Hobson; internal assessment committee made up of representatives of Community and Social Planning, Customer and Community Services, Economic Development, Environmental Management, Environmental Education Unit; Marketing and Communications groups; General Manager Governance.

OPTIONS

1. Accept the assessment panel's recommendation to pay \$5,500 (including GST) in sponsorship funding to the 6th World Environmental Education Congress; or
2. Decline approval of sponsorship funding the 6th World Environmental Education Congress; or
3. Vary the amount of sponsorship funding to the 6th World Environmental Education Congress.

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to approve the payment of \$5,500 (including GST) in sponsorship funding to the 6th World Environmental Education Congress.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve to vary the amount of sponsorship funding to the 6th World Environmental Education Congress.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve to approve the payment of \$5,500 (including GST) in sponsorship funding to the 6th World Environmental Education Congress.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve as follows:

- 1. To approve the payment of \$5,500 (including GST) in sponsorship funding to the 6th World Environmental Education Congress; and**
- 2. To note that a similar contribution from Indigiscapes of \$5,500 (including GST) will result in a silver sponsorship at this event.**

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.3.2 INFORMATION PRIVACY POLICY (POL-3103)

Datworks Filename: IM Privacy - General
Attachments: [POL-3103](#)
[GL-3103-001](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Luke Wallace
Manager Corporate Planning Performance & Risk
Author Name: Jo Jones
Service Manager Corporate Planning & Performance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Information Privacy Act 2009* (IP Act) sets out how Councils must manage personal information. The Act contains eleven information privacy principles which set out how Council must collect, store, use and disclose information about individuals as well as outlining the process for individuals to access and amend information Council holds about them. A corporate Information Privacy Policy has been developed to outline Council's commitment to the privacy principles and detailing our commitments and appropriate management of personal information.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the corporate Information Privacy Policy (appendix A). Also, Council is asked to note the guideline which is intended to support the policy (appendix B).

BACKGROUND

The IP Act came into effect in Queensland on 1 July 2009 although the eleven Information Privacy Principles (IPPs) only came into effect for local government on 1 July 2010. The eleven principles cover the way Council must deal with personal information. Personal information is anything which identifies an individual and includes:

- Names, addresses and personal phone numbers;
- email address;
- date of birth;
- drivers licence number;
- physical characteristics (such as height, birthmarks, tattoos);
- bank details;
- photographs;
- sensitive information (political and religious beliefs, medical records, disabilities, sexual preferences);

Many areas of Council collect and use some of this information on a daily basis and are already aware of the need to protect the confidentiality of individuals. Council's systems and processes are compliant with the Act. However, this policy formalises

Council's approach and emphasises the importance of protecting personal information.

The *Information Privacy Act 2009* includes potential penalties for organisations which fail to meet the requirements. Individuals can make a complaint about how Council has handled their information and ultimately, if the matter is referred to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal (QCAT) large fines could be applied to Council (up to \$100,000).

There are eleven IPPs in the *Information Privacy Act 2009*, relating to:

- collection of personal information;
- storage and security of personal information;
- providing information about personal information held by an agency;
- access to and amendments of documents containing personal information;
- accuracy and relevance of personal information;
- use of personal information; and;
- disclosure of personal information.

ISSUES

The policy will clearly set out Council's commitment to the IP Act and the information privacy principles. This policy is relevant to any aspect of Council's operations where personal information is collected, stored, used or passed on. Council's day to day services involve the use of personal information and it is important that we handle this information properly. The new policy will be supported by a guideline which will be submitted for approval by the General Manager Governance.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The proposed privacy policy relates to strategy 9.9 of the Corporate Plan - 'manage the security of and access to Council information'.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The IP Act affects all areas of Council. Whilst it will impact on staff time and some systems and processes, there are no direct financial implications from the introduction of this policy. The failure to adequately address privacy in Council could potentially result in fines or compensation to an individual who makes a privacy complaint about the way we have handled their information.

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 amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme.

CONSULTATION

The policy has been developed in consultation with Managers in Council.

OPTIONS**PREFERRED**

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To adopt POL-3103 Information Privacy; and
2. To note GL-3103-001 Information Privacy guideline.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council request amendments and further research and defer approval of the policy.

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

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve as follows:

- 1. To adopt POL-3103 - Information Privacy policy; and**
- 2. To note GL-3103-001 - Information Privacy guideline.**

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.3.3 CORPORATE BALANCED SCORECARD REPORT - NOVEMBER 2010

Datworks Filename: GOV Corporate BSC Monthly Reporting to Committee

Attachment: [November 2010 Corporate Balanced Scorecard](#)

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

Author Name: Jo Jones
Service Manager, Corporate Planning & Performance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The monthly Corporate Balanced Scorecard report attached provides a high level overview of Council's performance in key areas of Council business using the four balanced scorecard perspectives – Financial, Customer, Internal/Business Processes and People & Learning.

This report is an important component of Council's 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 2010 -15.

The overall rating for November 2010 is satisfactory with a weighted score of 2.32.

PURPOSE

To provide Council with the Corporate Balanced Scorecard report for the financial year to November 2010.

BACKGROUND

The report shows results against each key performance indicator (KPI) for the current month and the previous twelve 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 one of the attached 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 is 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.

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 will be provided in this covering report.

ISSUES

Internal Audit Actions Implemented

There was an improvement this month, with 17 recommendations due. 14 have been satisfactorily implemented. The remaining three recommendations extended, are classed as a low risk.

Workplace Health and Safety Measures

Implementation of the safety management plan remains slightly below target. Significant progress is anticipated in the New Year.

There were two lost time injuries for November, both occurred in Customer Services Department. All injuries are being reviewed in accordance with normal practice to ensure appropriate remedial steps are taken where possible.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's commitment to Inclusive and Ethical Governance. Strategy 8.5 within the Corporate Plan states that Council will be transparent and consistent in the way we manage the organisation, its risks and obligations and ensure we are delivering against our priorities. As part of the Organisational Development Plan, Council is currently reviewing its corporate performance management arrangements and the results of this project will be presented to Council during 2010/11.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

CONSULTATION

The data in this report was provided by responsible managers and has been compiled by the Corporate Planning, Performance & Risk Group.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for November 2010 as attached.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for November 2010 and request additional information.

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

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to note the Corporate Balanced Scorecard for November 2010, as attached.

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.4 CORPORATE SERVICES

15.4.1 SAFETY MANAGEMENT AUDIT

Dataworks Filename: HRM WH&S Audits
Attachment [Appendix A WH&S Safety Audit](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Amanda Daly
Manager - People & Change
Author Name: Peter Gould
Senior Adviser - WHS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a snapshot of the status of the external audit for Council's Enforceable Undertaking, highlighting areas of completion, work in progress and potential risks in meeting the required timeframes.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an update on the progress of meeting the Enforceable Undertaking requirements and strengthening RCC's Safety Management System. The report also outlines where potential resourcing risks may limit the ability to comply fully with the Enforceable Undertaking without further mitigation activity. These resourcing risks will require further scoping as items progress for review.

BACKGROUND

Redland City Council is currently undertaking a 3 year external audit of its Safety Management System as a requirement of the Enforceable Undertaking it has with the Queensland Government.

The initial audit was conducted in 2009 and there will be further audits at six-monthly intervals to monitor compliance with Australian Standard 4360 until the completion of the Enforceable Undertaking in 2012.

The major Audit occurs in August each year and follow up Audits occur each February.

Redland City Council must comply with the Australian Standard 4360 to meet the requirements of the Enforceable Undertaking with the Queensland Government or face further prosecution and fines.

ISSUES

The current Audit Matrix (action plan) identifies all the activities necessary to comply with the Enforceable Undertaking:

- WHS Responsibilities Awareness for RCC Workforce;
- WHS Training;
- Contractor Safety Systems and Auditing;
- Permit to Work Systems;
- Plant Operation;
- Change Management involving safety considerations;
- Hazardous Substances Management;
- Systems of Work Development and Documentation;
- Manual Task Risk Assessment;
- Inspection and Testing of Equipment;
- Safety Element Auditing of the Safety Management System.

Further detail is provided in Appendix A.

In summary, WHSU are progressing well with the implementation of the Safety Management System required improvements. All non compliance items have been addressed and work continues on the partial compliance items. Resourcing is however the major risk for the team. This is particularly apparent for Contractor Management and Permit to Work systems. Additionally, communication and education of the Safety Management System continues to be an issue for RCC. Discussions are occurring with Marketing and Communications regarding resourcing requirements to ensure this task is done well.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic outcome 9 "An efficient and effective organisation" specifically 9.4 "Provide a safe place for staff to work in and support the health and wellbeing of our people".

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Resourcing implications will be advised as projects are scoped.

CONSULTATION

Consultation occurs through Safety Management Committee and briefs to managers and all staff

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to note the attached report.

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.5 PLANNING & POLICY

15.5.1 APPLICATION OF PLANNING SCHEME POLICY 3 – INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES CONTRIBUTIONS (CYCLEWAYS, STORMWATER AND TRANSPORT)

Dataworks Filename: RTT PIPS General
Responsible Officer Name: David Elliott
Manager Infrastructure Planning
Author Name: Tim Mitchell
Planner - Infrastructure Projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At Council's General Meeting of 28 February 2007 (Item 10.2.3), Council resolved to adopt the current planning scheme policy for Transport (Chapter 4), effective 1 March 2007. Furthermore, Council determined the following in terms of how the updated chapter would apply to development proposals (resolution 3 detailed below):

- "3. In cases where a development has an existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (whether Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) within the Wellington Point, East Thornlands and Redland Bay areas, will be required to pay a contribution in accordance with the Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4 Movement Network. Such applications made outside these areas and prior to 1 March 2007 will not pay a transport charge."*

Similarly, at adoption of the Cycleway (Chapter 4A) contributions planning scheme policy on 27 June 2007 (Item 10.2.3), Council resolved to exclude the following from the application of the contributions (resolution 3 detailed below):

- "3. The infrastructure contribution will not be applied to –*
- a) A properly made application received prior to the commencement of the amendment; or*
 - b) An application which has received a Development Permit or Preliminary Approval prior to the commencement of the amendment in respect of one or more of the following:*
 - i. Concurrent Material Change of Use or Reconfiguration;*
 - ii. Material Change of Use;*
 - iii. Reconfiguration."*

These exemptions are also mirrored in the application provisions of Chapter 8 – Stormwater, introduced on 31 October 2007.

It is recommended that Council rescind Council resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 28 February 2007.

It is also recommended that Council rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 27 June 2007.

It is further recommended that Council resolve to apply a new implementation process to Stormwater Infrastructure Charges contributions to proposals made prior to 31 October 2007.

PURPOSE

The purpose of these determinations was to phase-in new contribution rates by providing certainty to existing approvals (not reached contributions payment trigger) and properly made applications that had not reached decision stage. While the resolution on the Transport charge is ambiguous in terms of whether the reference to “applications” outside the local planning areas is a reference to an approved development or a properly made application, the wording of the Cycleway and Stormwater applicable charges is unequivocal.

BACKGROUND

The intent of infrastructure contributions policies is to apply up-front charges to recover the cost of future trunk (shared) infrastructure needed to service development demand undertaken in accordance with the Planning Scheme. The charge methodology recovers the funds for the fair share of the networks used by new development and is in accordance with the State legislation and statutory guidelines.

Infrastructure charges are balanced with a direct connection between the charge and the infrastructure to be provided to meet the demand on services by future users. They are fairly apportioned to future users while avoiding cross-subsidisation of charges between use types and demand catchments. Generally, approved development that has made an infrastructure charges payment has been factored into demand growth assumptions that underpin planned trunk capital works and resultant infrastructure charges.

This is not the case for undetermined applications that are exempted from charges (or amended rates), creating a shortfall in projected demand and therefore, shortfall in charges revenues but still with the same capital spend. Similarly, no allowance would have been made in the planning assumptions for development that had been approved but not made trigger.

The intent of infrastructure charges is to provide certainty to the development industry in order for it to have confidence in the planned feasibility of projected balanced against Council’s need to recover the costs of supplying infrastructure services. While it is reasonable to expect that the charges applicable at the time of development approval don’t change significantly, extending this to properly made applications is at cross purposes with the intent of cost recovery.

It is reasonable to expect that the development industry would also include contingencies in its project planning and costing that would account for increases in

fees and charges given the currency period for development. In accordance with section 341 of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (SPA) the relevant period for approvals are:

- Material Change of Use approvals = 4 years
- Reconfiguration of Allotment = 2 years
- Reconfiguration and Operational Works = 4 years

Furthermore, SPA section 315 states that Council cannot accept a superseded planning scheme application to assess and condition a proposal against an older contributions PSP. In effect, this is a legislative intent that, generally, it is the charging policy in effect at the time of the local government's decision on an application that has effect (or time of payment).

ISSUES

An undetermined development application is unlikely to have been considered in growth assumptions behind the preparations of the plans for trunk infrastructure and resultant modelling of contribution rates. In effect, when Council subsidises or exempts certain development, or phases-in new/amended charges by discounts or other means, its cost recovery is reduced requiring greater reliance on general revenues to fund the infrastructure delivery that is still expected to provide.

While other Local Governments have introduced new contribution rates through limited discounts, many apply a phasing-in approach only to those development proposal that are approved (but yet to reach payment trigger) or at least in decision stage prior to new charges coming into effect. The former limits a council's cost recovery exposure as opposed to a potentially much bigger subsidy associated with also exempting properly made applications.

It could be many years before subdivision plans are sealed, before the issue of certificate of classification for building work or before the change of use happens following a decision on an application, which impacts on a council's capacity to plan and manage its capital budget. However, neither approach avoids the need to also appropriately manage requests for extensions to existing approvals which can similarly have a significant impact on charges received as contributions policies are introduced or charge rates updated.

If the application of the current Cycleways, Stormwater and Transport contributions policies are not made applicable to all development other than that under an existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of a Lot approval, Material Change of Use approval or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval, Council will continue to miss out on vital revenue that is reasonably attributable to new development; consistent with the intent of its infrastructure charging policies to recover the cost of future trunk (shared) infrastructure needed to service development demand.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's strategic priority 5.12 - *Plan, provide and advocate for essential physical and social infrastructure that supports community well-being and manage Council's existing infrastructure assets to ensure current service standards are maintained or improved*

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

By adopting the recommendations of this report Council will be able to collect contributions for the stormwater, transport and cycleway networks from existing developments that have not been given an approval (Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) including subsequent Reconfiguration of Allotment approvals associated with a Development Permit or Preliminary Approval. The collection of these contributions will reduce Council's cost recovery period and ensure less reliance on general revenues to fund infrastructure.

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

In preparing this report, consultation was undertaken with:

- Sustainable Assessment;
- Land Use Planning;
- General Manager Planning and Policy; and
- Engagement has not occurred with the development industry.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. Rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 28 February 2007;
2. Rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 27 June 2007;
3. Development that has existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (whether Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) in the Wellington Point, East Thornlands and Redland Bay local plan areas prior to 1 March 2007 will be subject to a transport infrastructure charge in accordance with the previous Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4 Movement Network;

4. Development that does not have a Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (whether Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) prior to 1 March 2007 will pay a transport infrastructure charge in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4 Transport. This includes subsequent Reconfiguration of Allotment proposals associated with a Development Permit or Preliminary Approval;
5. Development that has an existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (Development permit or Preliminary approval) granted prior to 27 June 2007 is not to pay a charge in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4A Cycleway;
6. Development that has an existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (Development permit or Preliminary approval) granted prior to 31 October 2007 is not to pay a charge in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 8 Stormwater.

ALTERNATIVE

The Council resolve as follows:

1. Sustain resolution 3 of the General Meeting Minutes 28 February 2007;
2. Sustain resolution 3 of the General Meeting Minutes 27 June 2007; and
3. Not to create a new implementation process to Stormwater Infrastructure Charges contributions to proposals made prior to 31 October 2007.

OFFICER'S/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 28 February 2007;
2. To rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 27 June 2007;
3. That development that has existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (whether Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) in the Wellington Point, East Thornlands and Redland Bay local plan areas prior to 1 March 2007 will be subject to a transport infrastructure charge in accordance with the previous Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4 Movement Network;
4. That development that does not have a Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (whether Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) prior to 1 March 2007 will pay a transport infrastructure charge in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4 Transport. This includes subsequent Reconfiguration of

Allotment proposals associated with a Development Permit or Preliminary Approval;

5. That development that has an existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) granted prior to 27 June 2007 is not to pay a charge in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 4A Cycleway; and
6. That development that has an existing Material Change of Use and/or Reconfiguration of Allotment approval (Development Permit or Preliminary Approval) granted prior to 31 October 2007 is not to pay a charge in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 – Contributions and Security Bonding – Chapter 8 Stormwater.

ADDENDUM (15.12.2010)

At the Corporate Services & Governance Committee Meeting on 8 December 2010, a legal review was requested by Council.

Subsequent to the legal review, a revised Officer's Recommendation is proposed.

REVISED OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **To rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 28 February 2007;**
2. **To rescind resolution 3 to Item 10.2.3 of the General Meeting Minutes 27 June 2007; and**
3. **That all contributions for development applications will be paid in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy 3 - Contributions and Security Bonding.**

CARRIED

15.5.2 SUBMISSION TO INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES TASKFORCE

Dataworks Filename: RTT: PIPS General
Attachments: [Annexure A - Feedback Form - Redland](#)
[Annexure B - ICT Report ex App3](#)
Responsible Officer Name: David Elliott
Manager Infrastructure Planning
Author Name: Giles Tyler
Senior Advisor Infrastructure Projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Infrastructure Charges Taskforce set up by the State Government to consider improvements to the current infrastructure charging arrangement of local governments is seeking feedback on recommendations contained in an interim consultation report, with a view to finalising its advice in March 2011.

The key responses in the submission are that Council does not support maximum standard infrastructure charges for any type of development, the capping of charge rates for residential development to a range between \$20,000 - \$30,000 for 3 years, or the deferral of payment of charges to settlement of lot.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide a submission to the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce interim consultation report, as set out in Annexure A and B.

BACKGROUND

One of the State Government's responses to the recent Queensland Growth Management Summit objective '*Promoting Liveable and Affordable Communities*' and its own growth management reform agenda, was to establish the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce. The taskforce was charged with the following terms of reference:

- identify current issues relating to the infrastructure planning and funding framework for Local Government infrastructure in Queensland;
- establish a set of principles that will provide the basis for proposing improvements to current arrangements; and
- consider improvements to the current arrangements and other approaches including streamlining processes, simplifying and standardising charging arrangements where possible.

Those terms of reference excluded:

- abolishing infrastructure charges;
 - reviewing infrastructure planning;
 - reviewing grants and subsidy arrangements; and
-

- reviewing development conditions.

In this interim consultation report, the taskforce lists recommendations to “simplify, streamline and standardise Local Government infrastructure charges arrangements” as one measure within the context of the Queensland government’s broader growth management reform agenda.

The taskforce has now established principles to guide its recommendations addressing key issues relating to current infrastructure charges arrangements identified as having a significant impact on the development industry. The principles include:

- certainty in the timing, predictability and cost of infrastructure charges payments;
- transparency and equity in determining and apportioning the charge;
- clarity of the cost of infrastructure provision;
- clarity in the infrastructure charges and the way they are calculated;
- consistency in the application of the charge;
- simplicity in infrastructure charges arrangements including streamlining the current Priority Infrastructure Plan (PIP) process; and
- consistency in the levels of service standards.

The taskforce’s interim consultation report outlines its recommended changes to the current infrastructure charging framework in Queensland including:

- maximum standard charges (residential development ranging from \$20,000 - \$30,000 applying to all relevant networks including water supply and wastewater for a period of 3 years – final number yet to be confirmed);
- Queensland Government potentially to subsidise Local Function charges (for State-controlled roads) for a period of 3 years;
- annual escalation of the standard charges by a common index;
- deferred payment of charges (e.g. at time of sale, not plan sealing);
- further review of appropriate standard charges for non-residential development;
- charges to be disconnected from the Plans for Trunk Infrastructure (PFTI) – meaning that the PFTI must still be prepared to inform land use planning, capital works, asset management etc, but not directly linked to the charge rates; and
- other administrative improvements to be further explored (including a centralised service centre for the administration of all infrastructure charges across the state)

In arriving at these recommendations, the taskforce is of the opinion that “...*making the infrastructure charging system more efficient will help to reduce uncertainty and costs associated with the time taken to determine and agree upon charges, which has hindered development of new homes, shops and commercial facilities*”.

The taskforce also acknowledges that the highly complex process of preparing long term Priority Infrastructure Plans (PIPs) and highly calibrated financial models for infrastructure costing has “...created uncertainty surrounding current and future infrastructure charges”.

ISSUES

1. *Regulated capped charges*

While it is accepted that we are currently witnessing tighter financing conditions with more risk averse lending institutions, it is difficult to see how current infrastructure charges add to the ‘uncertainty’ of cost as suggested in the Taskforce Interim Report. Redland Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) charges are transparent and readily quantifiable, as are the triggers for payment. They are largely derived using methodologies similar to that of a PIP (full cost pricing and fair apportionment) and it is for this reason that the Redland rates are in the upper end of comparative charges (average total charge approximately \$41,000 for a traditional residential lot), whereas those councils applying older external works type policies tend to have lower charges and recover less. While the variety of applicable charge rates and charging frameworks used by Queensland local governments may benefit from some consistency in method ie. the PIP, this is unrelated to the argument of capping charges.

The development industry is generally accustomed to estimating the interim policy charges of various local governments with reasonable accuracy. PSP charge rates are also fixed by the Sustainable Planning Act (SPA) with only CPI increases. Redland interim PSP charges are considered reasonable and equitably apportioned to users of the programmed infrastructure. Council does not consider this situation will change dramatically with the introduction of a PIP. Consequently, the only real uncertainty that needs to be given weight in project investment decisions is the cash flow between paying up-front charges and revenues from sales.

It is difficult to see how the quantum of infrastructure charges and variation of rates across jurisdictions can be responsible for increased holding costs, time delays and risk, as argued by the taskforce. Similarly, the argument that introducing a standard charge rate will improve investment certainty and thereby increase the capacity to secure project finance can only hold true if a discounted charge allows for an increased rate of return on investment, making it more appealing for the financier to free up lending.

A regulated charge that caps Redland’s infrastructure charge rates to a lower level goes against all that has been worked towards in recognising the true cost of providing trunk infrastructure and meeting a user pays charging system as required by legislation. Consistent with those principles, Council has previously reaffirmed its position that it considers it reasonable that those who benefit from the ‘value uplift’

created by the provision of infrastructure services should pay their fair share of the cost.

Council's infrastructure charges do not seek to recover costs for infrastructure provided at a standard beyond what the market values it at for new developments. The charges simply demonstrate that Council rate revenues have funded a greater proportion of infrastructure delivery prior to implementing full cost pricing and user pays charges. The cap would be inconsistent with the infrastructure charging principles and framework under the SPA, and Council's charging policies developed within that framework at considerable expense and time to Council.

Council's options are limited in making-up the potential revenue shortfall to:

- increase in general rates charges on all ratepayers;
- borrow the funds required for the new infrastructure with interest and redemption costs added to general rates charges; and/or
- pass on the additional costs to new lot purchasers by way of a special rate or charge.

It is considered that the revenue shortfall from a capped charge will be sufficiently significant that the necessary higher rates and borrowings would be unpalatable to the community and inconsistent with Council's borrowings policy and capacity to repay.

Using approximately 800 registered lots (for the year ending June 2010) as a benchmark at a current average charge of \$41,000 per lot (including water supply and sewer), if this were to be capped at \$25,000, Council would be required to fund a shortfall of approximately \$30m over the next 3 years if it were to continue to deliver its trunk capital program (excluding water supply and sewer). Keeping in mind that this program has been developed from estimates of population and employment growth linked to current standards of service.

As discussed above, a capped charge of \$25,000 would result in an annual deficit from contributions of around \$10m which would have to be managed through either:

- funding the shortfall outright through increases in general rates averaging \$165.00 per property per annum
- Increased borrowings of \$10M per annum which would result in debt servicing expenses of approximately \$800,000 per annum (cumulative). This would lead to increases in general rates averaging \$15 per property in year 1 and increasing to an average of \$225 per property in year 15
- a special rate or charge applied to those properties benefiting from the investment which would require a detailed management plan to be established up front. Based on 800 lots this would equate to a minimum charge of \$1,250.00 per property over 10 years and would require Council to fund the infrastructure works initially.

This demonstrates the significant rating impact, capping will have on a relatively small SEQ Council such as Redland, which is also dealing with relatively high growth.

Larger councils with larger rates bases will have a greater potential to absorb any artificial limit on its charges.

While the State recognises that there are many factors that affect housing affordability, it claims its influence is limited to manipulating infrastructure charging and land supply. Interestingly, the breakdown of costs that make up a typical house and land package in SEQ indicates that local government infrastructure charges represent around 4%, while State taxes and charges are also in the order of 3-4% (ie. transfer duty applicable to raw land acquisition by the developer and the owner-occupier acquisition of the final house less first home buyer concessions). Nevertheless, the opportunity for the State to review its taxes and provide a further transfer duty subsidy for a period of time has not been raised a tool at its disposal to help facilitate development activity.

Shifting the cost burden mostly to local government is unlikely to achieve the objective of fostering liveable communities, with underfunded services likely to lead to lower standards.

Being the largest cost next to construction in bringing a house and land package to market, the land component is the one that deserves the most review in terms of developing options to make housing more affordable. Primarily this relates to efficient supply and managing speculation on raw land. The State needs a policy to encourage developers to release banked lands and get more affordable land to market. As at year ending June 2010, the closing stock of approved lots in the Redlands yet to be brought to market by developers was 2,184 (three years supply).

2. *Deferred payment*

The Taskforce suggests that infrastructure charges add significantly to the financing costs of development projects and that removing these up-front costs would provide cash flow certainty to the development industry in uncertain financial times. Council has recognised this last point and currently offers an on-application deferral of charges to approved MCUs to plumbing final inspection rather than at operational works approval. It does not provide a deferral for approved subdivisions, which is ordinarily settled at time of plan sealing.

A number of other councils provide for limited progressive and deferred payments for infrastructure charges aimed at the extenuating circumstances of the development industry through the GFC. Both Gold Coast and Logan apply specific eligibility criteria, an application fee and security in determining a request to defer payment. However, the limiting issue is whether an appropriate form of security can be provided. In the case of Logan, deferral is subject to payment of a security bond equal to 1.15 times the value of the infrastructure contributions. Given the difficulty of developers in securing institutional finance including guarantees, the effectiveness of such schemes is questionable when Council needs security of payment.

Gold Coast deferral criteria include:

- evidence to Council that they are experiencing extenuating circumstances
- suitable security to Council

- all costs to be covered, including Council's, that are associated with the deferral of the charges
- enter into an agreement with council that will be tailored to suit the individual circumstances

Logan's deferral of payment for selected residential development for up to six (6) months, or upon the sale of all or part of the development, subject to the development satisfying the following criteria:

- a) residential development;
- b) existing external infrastructure is in place and adequately sized to serve the existing and proposed development;
- c) no major earthworks required;
- d) no major trunk drainage issues or downstream approval requirements; and
- e) purchasers must be advised that buildings cannot be used or occupied until services are approved by Council and connected.

There is some merit to the argument that removing up-front financing costs of development projects would provide cash flow certainty to the development industry. However, the Taskforce's suggestion that deferral of payment to the time of settlement of a lot is not practical if security is to be offered in the form of a bank guarantee or similar instrument. The only practical solution is that the deferred charges be included as a statutory duty tied to the transfer of the newly created lot. In most cases, transfer duty is paid by the purchaser which in itself raises issues. In particular, there is no guarantee that developers will pass on any savings from reductions in up-front charges (deferred to purchaser) to home buyers, and this Interim Report does not include any measures to require that.

Alternatively, like other circumstances where the vendor is required to pay duties at settlement (eg. certain transfers of options to purchase), a statutory mechanism could be developed to guarantee payment of outstanding charges at this trigger point.

3. Other

There a number of statutory, regulatory, administrative, technical, and financial matters that need to be clarified, including:

- who is to pay for any gap in revenues created by the regulated charge?
- expectations created for a regulated charge to continue beyond 3 years;
- implications for lowering of standards;
- implications for unfulfilled conditions (eg pending payments);
- implications for current development applications (eg. developers may wish to defer until regulated charges come into effect;
- issue of de-coupling plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) from standard charges (eg. likely to be an increase in negotiated decisions if there is a disconnect with adopted network infrastructure plans or PFTI and these plans still have to be shown in published works programs);

- implications for current and future infrastructure agreements;
- does the same level of detailed strategic planning need to be undertaken with a standard charge rate?
- no concrete options for non-residential standard charges;
- selective use of charge rate data in report;
- no reference to the level of current cost recovery;
- no reference to already capped charge rates;

No reference to differences in network components between states and between councils (ie. water supply and wastewater excluded from capped NSW charge), as well as the problems experienced by caps in other states.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

5.12 Plan, provide and advocate for essential physical and social infrastructure that supports community well-being and manage Council's existing infrastructure assets to ensure current service standards are maintained or improved.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed cap on infrastructure charges is likely to have a significant impact on the achievement of Council's long term financial sustainability and key financial performance indicators. Additionally, the means by which Council funds any shortfall in infrastructure charges will be in direct contravention of its borrowing and revenue policies and will restrict future capital programming opportunities through reduced borrowing availability.

If the State introduces the proposed cap on charges, additional financial burden will be placed on Council's general revenues for the delivery of the planned trunk infrastructure and other priority capital projects. Consideration will have to be given on how to fund any further shortfall between the actual cost of providing infrastructure and the amount recovered in infrastructure charges.

In the longer term, Council may need to lower its service standards with a view to better matching service levels to its income streams. However, it is anticipated that this work will not be possible to assess prior to the cap coming into effect as proposed on 1 July 2011.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will not directly involve amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme. The Land Use Planning Group is also aware that if the recommendations of the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce are adopted by the State Government, those recommendations will largely be given effect through amendments to the *Sustainable Planning Act*.

CONSULTATION

Internal consultation has been undertaken with all affected infrastructure providers and managers including Sustainable Development, Infrastructure Planning and Allconnex.

The Sustainable Assessment Group is aware that 2011/12 fees and Charges may need to include any direction by the State Government.

Advice was sought from Allconnex on the implications for that organisation and Council's dividend from it. It is noted that the Taskforce proposes that 50% of the standard charge will be attributed to the water/sewer networks. At an equivalent \$12,500 per lot, Allconnex would have a shortfall in average per lot cost recovery under both policy (approximately \$4,000 per lot) and draft PIP, but to a much lesser extent than Council's additional cost exposure for its trunk networks (around \$12,000 per lot averaged under current policy).

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the State Government setting maximum standard infrastructure charges for any type of development, the capping of residential development to a range between \$20,000 - \$30,000 for 3 years, or deferral of payment of charges to settlement of lot; and
2. To forward the submission to the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce's Interim Consultation Report - Proposed reform of Local Government development infrastructure charges arrangements (November 2010) as set out in Annexure A and B.

ALTERNATIVE

None proposed.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the State Government setting maximum standard infrastructure charges for any type of development, the capping of residential development to a range between \$20,000 - \$30,000 for 3 years, or deferral of payment of charges to settlement of lot; and
2. To forward the submission to the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce's *Interim Consultation Report - Proposed Reform of Local Government Development infrastructure charges arrangements (November 2010)* as set out in Annexures A and B.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the State Government setting maximum standard infrastructure charges for any type of development, the capping of residential development to a range between \$20,000 - \$30,000 for 3 years, or deferral of payment of charges to settlement of lot.
2. To forward the submission to the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce's *Interim Consultation Report - Proposed reform of Local Government development infrastructure charges arrangements (November 2010) as set out in Annexure A and B.*
3. That owing to the potential impacts on Council's financial sustainability, Council will be taking other measures to ensure its views on this proposal are made clear to both the Government and the community.

ADDENDUM (13.12.2010)

At the Corporate Services & Governance Committee on 08 December 2010 Item 5.2 [Submission to Infrastructure Charges Taskforce] an additional recommendation was made by the Committee as follows:

3. *That owing to the potential impacts on Council's financial sustainability, Council will be taking other measures to ensure its views on this proposal are made clear to both the Government and the community.*

To this effect, **Annexure A – Feedback Form** is replaced and additional explanation has been included under **Issues, 1. Regulated capped charges**, as follows:

A capped charge is also inconsistent with the financial sustainability, management and accountability requirements mandated by the Local Government Act. The proposal makes the job of Council that much more difficult to manage its public infrastructure and assets for the long-term benefit and viability of the Redland community; and in the short term, deliver essential services. The resulting funding shortfall would place a significant burden on Council's financial governance and service delivery capabilities in the face of competing priorities of population growth demand for infrastructure provision, and renewal requirements.

Council's infrastructure charges do not seek to recover costs for infrastructure provided at a standard beyond what the market values it at for new developments. The charges simply demonstrate that Council rate revenues have funded a greater proportion of infrastructure delivery prior to implementing full cost pricing and user pays charges. The cap would be inconsistent with the infrastructure charging principles and framework under the SPA, and Council's charging policies developed within that framework at considerable expense and time to Council.

Council's options are limited in making-up the potential revenue shortfall to:

- increase in rates and charges on all ratepayers;
- borrow the funds required for the new infrastructure with interest and redemption costs added to rates and charges; and/or

- pass on the additional costs to new lot purchasers by way of a special rate.

It is considered that the revenue shortfall from a capped charge will be sufficiently significant that the necessary higher rates and borrowings would be unpalatable to the community and inconsistent with Council's borrowings policy and capacity to repay.

Using approximately 800 registered lots (for the year ending June 2010) as a benchmark at an average of \$41,000 per lot (including water supply and sewer) capped at \$25,000, Council would be required to fund a shortfall of \$30m over the next 3 years if it were to continue to delivery its trunk capital program (excluding water supply and sewer). Keeping in mind that this program has been developed from estimates of population and employment growth linked to current standards of service.

As discussed above, a capped charge of \$25,000 would result in an annual deficit from contributions of around \$10m which, if levels of service were maintained, would have to be managed through either:

- funding the shortfall outright through increases in general rates averaging \$165.00 per property per annum (around 14%);
- Increased borrowings of \$10M per annum which would result in debt servicing expenses of approximately \$800,000 per annum (cumulative). This would lead to increases in general rates averaging \$15 per property in year 1 and increasing to an average of \$225 per property in year 15;
- a special rate or charge applied to those properties benefiting from the investment which would require a detailed management plan to be established up front. Based on 800 lots this would equate to a minimum charge of \$1,250.00 per property over 10 years and would require Council to fund the infrastructure works initially.

This demonstrates the significant rating impact, capping will have on a relatively small SEQ Council such as Redland, which is also dealing with relatively high growth. Larger councils with larger rates bases will have a greater potential to absorb any artificial limit on its charges.

MOTION TO SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Ogilvie

That Standing Orders be suspended to allow discussion on this item.

CARRIED

MOTION TO RESUME STANDING ORDERS

Moved by: Cr Elliott
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Standing Orders be resumed.

CARRIED

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

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To not support the State Government setting maximum standard infrastructure charges for any type of development, the capping of residential development to a range between \$20,000 - \$30,000 for 3 years, or deferral of payment of charges to settlement of lot;
2. To forward the submission to the Infrastructure Charges Taskforce's *Interim Consultation Report - Proposed reform of Local Government development infrastructure charges arrangements (November 2010) as set out in Annexure A (as amended) and B*; and
3. That owing to the potential impacts on Council's financial sustainability, Council will be taking other measures to ensure its views on this proposal are made clear to both the Government and the community.

CARRIED (unanimously)

(Crs Murray and Burns were not present when this motion was put.)

15.6 CLOSED SESSION AT COMMITTEE

The Committee meeting was closed to the public under section 72(1) of the *Local Government (Operations) Regulation 2010* to discuss the following items, and following deliberation on these matters, the Committee meeting was again opened to the public.

- 15.6.1 Draft Corporate Budget Timetable for 2011-2012 Budget
- 15.6.2 Allconnex Water Presentation
- 15.6.3 Allconnex Water Owners Forum

15.6.1 DRAFT CORPORATE BUDGET TIMETABLE FOR 2011-2012 BUDGET

Dataworks Filename: FM Corporate Budget
Attachment: [Draft Corporate Budget Timetable 2011/12](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Martin Drydale
General Manager Corporate Services
Author Name: Deborah Corbett-Hall
Acting Service Manager Budget & Management
Accounting

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the budget review project, a draft corporate budget timetable has been produced for the 2011-2012 budget process.

The budget timetable provides the highlights, major milestones and key owners involved in the 2011-2012 budget development process and will be revised with any significant changes during this process.

The Budget Team will circulate a draft document each financial year to permit sufficient time to book the relevant workshops, meetings and workflows into schedules.

PURPOSE

This report presents a summary timetable of key budget milestones required to develop and deliver Council's 2011-2012 budget.

The purpose of this report is for Council to note the 2011-2012 corporate budget timetable. Once the report is noted by Council, the budget workshops can be officially booked and the necessary preparation, report running and analysis can be undertaken.

BACKGROUND

As a key component of the continuous improvement program, Council annually reviews the process of developing, evaluating and delivering the Council budget.

Post the 2010-2011 budget adoption, the Budget Team undertook a full review of the budget process to implement improvements to Budget 2011-2012 and future years. Feedback was sought from all stakeholders in the budget process and comments relating to the timetable and workshops are reflected in the attached draft corporate timetable for budget 2011-2012 where possible.

ISSUES

The budget timetable reflects the activities and processes required to build the 2011-2012 budget. This is a corporate timetable reflecting the major milestones and deliverables, and does not express all of the administrative or technical tasks required throughout the budget development process.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Council's commitment to Vision Outcome 9 "An efficient and effective organisation", specifically 9.5 "Ensure robust long term financial planning is in place to protect the financial sustainability of Council".

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A corporate budget timetable is produced annually to facilitate the budget development process. By noting this timetable there is no further financial implication to Redland City Council.

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 draft corporate timetable has been circulated for review and endorsed by the General Manager Corporate Services, and Manager, Financial Control as well as the departmental Senior Financial Advisers.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve that the proposed corporate timetable for production of the 2011-2012 budget be noted.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council amend or request changes to the draft corporate timetable for budget 2011-2012.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve that the proposed corporate timetable for production of the 2011-2012 budget be noted.

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.6.2 ALLCONNEX WATER PRESENTATION

Mr Kim Wood, Chief Executive Officer, Allconnex Water provided a verbal update to Council on Allconnex quarterly report.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Bowler

That Council resolve to note the update from Chief Executive Officer, Allconnex Water, on Allconnex's quarterly report.

CARRIED (en bloc)

15.6.3 ALLCONNEX WATER OWNERS FORUM

It was noted that this item was deferred as the meeting was about to be inquorate.

16 MAYORAL MINUTES

Nil.

17 DIRECT TO COUNCIL REPORTS

17.1 CUSTOMER SERVICES

17.1.1 BIRKDALE LANDFILL FINAL REVISED PROFILE AND REVISED COMMERCIAL GATE FEES

Datworks Filename: WM Landfill - Birkdale
Attachment: [Final Landform](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Patrick Navin
Acting General Manager Customer Services
Author Name: Patrick Navin
Acting General Manager Customer Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As outlined in the Workshop held 30 November 2010, updating Councillors with information regarding the RedWaste Business Unit and the progress towards the completion of landfilling activities at Birkdale Landfill, a new final profile is needed to be provisionally adopted along with changes to the commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule to attract commercial operators to dispose of commercial waste to Birkdale Landfill to assist Council in meeting the timeframes set out in the Waste Disposal Agreement with Brisbane City Council.

PURPOSE

To provisionally adopt a revised final profile for Birkdale Landfill, to ensure landfilling operations are completed within the timeframes set out in the waste disposal agreement with Brisbane City Council, and adopt changes to the commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule, to assist in meeting the time frames set out in the agreement with Brisbane City Council (BCC) and increase commercial revenue.

BACKGROUND

In 2001, Council adopted a final profile for the Birkdale Landfill, that was, at the time, a change due to emerging issues of building landfills with a relatively flat top surface for use as sporting fields after closure. The profile generally increased the slope angles, increased the available capacity, improved site drainage and overall site performance.

However, based upon the current adopted final profile there is too much capacity left in the landfill. If the current adopted final profile was required to be filled, the landfill, at current waste throughputs, would not reach capacity until around October 2012, some ten months after the end of the six month 'window' to commence the disposal agreement.

At the Special Meeting held 14 September 2010, Council was provided with a number of scenarios to significantly increase waste throughputs by adopting a commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule, and also allowing negotiations with BCC to accept their waste to fill the landfill to the current adopted final profile. However, BCC are not able to transport waste to Birkdale Landfill due to a number of issues, including, but not limited to, the size of their trucks and the size of the landfill tipping area. Further, the market for commercial waste has shifted and the discounts currently offered by Council are not attractive enough to commercial operators to bring waste to Birkdale Landfill.

Based on recent discussions with a major commercial waste service provider in Redlands, a new commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule has been prepared for adoption. This fee schedule is above the full cost price to accept and landfill this estimated volume of commercial waste. Even with the extra estimated commercial waste volumes, the landfill profile still needs to be revised to ensure that landfilling operations are completed within the timeframes set out in the disposal agreement with BCC.

A new final profile has been developed, see attachment, that will leave an area of the landfill unfilled, referred to as the 'lower area'. This profile, subject to geotechnical assessment which may require a slight modification to slope angles, provides a number of options for use after completion of the landfilling activities. These options include using the lower area for future transfer station operations, as a green waste stockpile area, or as an amphitheatre and open space recreational area. All options currently being investigated and will be provided to Council for further discussion prior to any decision being made on the final use of the site and the lower area.

Therefore, it is recommended that the new final profile, as detailed in the attachment, be provisionally adopted by Council, subject to geotechnical assessment, giving Council the option to fill to the current adopted final profile if the market shows significant interest in the changed commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule.

ISSUES

- The current final profile, adopted by Council in 2001, provides too much capacity in the landfill.
- Based upon current waste tonnage throughput landfilling operations would need to continue until October 2012 to fill to the current adopted final profile.
- This timeframe does not meet the requirements of the Waste Disposal Agreement signed with BCC.
- Geotechnical assessment of the new final profile, as detailed in the attachment, is required, however, there are no major changes expected.
- The current commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule, adopted by Council at the September 2010 Special Meeting, has not attracted any significant volumes of commercial waste to Birkdale Landfill.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation supports Council Corporate Plan and Vision for **Green Living** – Our green living choices will improve our quality of life and our children's lives, through our sustainable and energy efficient use of resources, transport and infrastructure, and our well informed responses to risks such as climate change.

And the Vision for **An efficient and effective organisation** – Council is well respected and seen as an excellent organisation which manages resources in an efficient and effective way.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no budget expenditure impacts from the revised final profile or the change in the commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule, however, there is expected that commercial revenue will increase by between \$140,000 and \$200,000 this financial year. There would also be commercial revenue generated into the first quarter of 2011/2012.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications to Council's Planning Scheme as a result of this report.

CONSULTATION

Senior Advisor – Waste Planning
Landscape Architect – Open Space Planning
Service Manager Waste Operations

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to:

1. Provisionally adopt the revised final profile, as detailed in the attachment, however, allow Council to fill to the current adopted final profile if significant interest is shown in the changed commercial waste volume discount; and
2. Adopt the following commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule;

Tonnes/month	Rate incl GST	GST excl
0 to 250	\$118.00	\$107.27
251 to 500	\$75.00	\$68.18
501 plus	\$49.40	\$44.91

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve to:

1. Provisionally adopt the revised final profile, as detailed in the attachment, however, allow Council to fill to the current adopted final profile if significant interest is shown in the changed commercial waste volume discount; and
2. Adopt the following commercial waste volume discount gate fee schedule:

Tonnes/month	Rate incl GST	GST excl
0 to 250	\$118.00	\$107.27
251 to 500	\$75.00	\$68.18
501 plus	\$49.40	\$44.91

CARRIED

17.2 CORPORATE SERVICES

17.2.1 NOVEMBER 2010 - MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS

Dataworks Filename: FM Monthly Financial Reports to Committee
Attachment: [EOM Financial Report](#)
Responsible Officer Name: Martin Drydale
General Manager Corporate Services
Author Name: Kevin Lamb
Service Manager Financial Reporting

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 152(2) of the *Local Government (Finance Plans & Reporting) Regulation 2010* requires the Chief Executive Officer to present the financial report to a monthly meeting.

The attachments to this report present the November 2010 financial statement of accounts to Council and provide detailed analytical commentary. Millions are displayed by an M, and thousands are displayed by a K. It should be noted that the property plant & equipment transferred to Allconnex remains in our balance sheet at 30/11/2010. Accounting treatment/entries will be posted to transfer these balances out when negotiations regarding Council's interest in Allconnex are finalised.

The financial statements demonstrate that six of the seven Financial Stability Ratios Key Financial Performance Indicators exceed targets set in the 2010-2011 budget. These are:

- 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

The following Financial Stability Ratio Key Financial Performance Indicator is outside of Council's target range:

- level of dependence on general rate revenue

With respect to the five measures of sustainability adopted as part of the 2010-2011 budget, Council is currently meeting four of the five targets. These are:

- operating surplus ratio;
 - net financial liabilities ratio;
 - interest cover ratio; and
 - asset consumption ratio
-

Council's system is currently being structured to measure its' asset sustainability ratio.

Council's end of month operating financial result (Earnings Before Interest, Tax and Depreciation – EBITD) is ahead of revised budget by \$4.3M, with operating revenue above budget by \$763 & operating expenditure underspent by \$3.5M. Council's operating surplus after depreciation and interest charges was \$6.5M, a favourable variance of \$4.1M on budget.

The cash held at the end of November 2010 is \$84.6M, equal to 7.2 months cash capacity against an original target of three to four months. This is due primarily to expenditure on Goods & Services being under budget by \$4.2M and Capital Expenditure being under budget by \$3.9M.

PURPOSE

The purpose is to present the November 2010 financial report to Council and explain the content and analysis of the report. Section 152(2) of the *Local Government (Finance, Plans & Reporting) Regulation 2010* 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 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.

ISSUES

The following elements, shown in the attachments, comprise the End of Month Financial Reports for November 2010:

Dashboard and Key Performance Indicators (A)

- Operating Revenue compared with Budget;
- Operating Expenditure compared with Budget;
- Employee Costs compared with Budget;
- Capital Expenditure compared with Budget;
- Key Performance Indicators – Actuals compared with Budget and Targets.

Operating Statement with headline commentary (B)

This shows the percentage variance of year to date actual results compared with year to date budget by colour indicators. Tolerance levels for the variances differ between operational and capital amounts.

Additionally, a **Cash Flow Statement (C)**; **Statement of Financial Position (D)**; and an **Investment Summary and Graphs (E)** have been included to provide the

complete picture of Council's finances. Finally, an **Operating Statement with detailed commentary (F)** 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 and variances are classified as timing or permanent.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation in this report primarily supports the following outcomes:

8. Inclusive and ethical governance

8.7 Ensure Council resource allocation is sustainable and delivers on Council and community priorities

8.8 Provide clear information to citizens about how rates, fees and charges are set and how Council intends to finance the delivery of the Community Plan and Corporate Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The overall financial result for the period ending November 2010 remains strong with EBITD of \$20.0M (\$4.3M ahead of budget). This result is due to total operating revenue of \$68.9M (\$763K above budget) and total operating expenses of \$48.9M (\$3.5M below budget).

Operating Revenue

Rates Charges are unfavourable against budget by \$444K. Utility Charges are unfavourable by \$103K predominantly as a result of O&M \$239K below budget due to timing issues offset by a favourable variance in Infrastructure Planning Group of \$158K due to higher than expected Canal Special Charges & Landfill Remediation Levy. .

Pensioner Remissions are \$114K above budget and budget phasing for these are to be reviewed. Fees and Charges are below budget by \$107K due to rates searches and change of ownerships being \$62K under budget and C&CS \$162K under budget offset by O&M \$112K above budget.

Operating Grants and Subsidies are above budget by \$1.1M primarily due to Corporate Services being above budget by \$1.2M as result of early receipt of Grants Commission grant and Operating Grants.

External interest is favourable by \$426K due to higher than expected investment balances and interest rates.

Other revenue is below budget by \$4K, with waste \$109K, litigation payments \$74K, Toondah Harbour \$25K and other small items above budget more than offset by Allconnex SLA recovery \$238K below budget.

Operating Expenditure

Operational Employee Costs are over budget by \$918K with unfavourable variances across Governance \$133K, Customer Service \$272K, Planning & Policy \$283K, and Corporate Services \$437K (Variance Budget Reduction \$279K), being partially offset by Development & Community Standards \$208K under budget due to vacancies across all groups.

Operational Goods and Services are under year to date budget by \$4.2M with expenditure under budget in PDG \$1.2M, O&M \$430K, Infrastructure Planning Group \$551K, Environmental Management Group \$505K, Community & Social Planning Group \$158K, Information Mgt \$645K, Financial Control group \$213K, People & Change \$245K, Land Use Planning \$200K and Communications \$97K.

Capital Revenue

Contributions and Donations are \$174K under budget in total with PDG \$265K under budget due to delay in receiving RPAC Bond offset by Infrastructure Planning Group \$90K (developer contributions) above budget.

Capital Expenditure

The Capital Expenditure program is 19.0% or \$3.9M below revised budget at the end of November 2010. Main areas behind budget are PDG \$1.6M (primarily due to internal charges & recovery), Infrastructure Planning Group \$938K (Giles/Gordon Roads \$665K, Traffic Signals \$80K), Environmental Management Group \$829K (due to Conservation Land Acquisition), Community & Social Planning \$36K (due to budget phasing error), CAFF \$413K (McMillan Rd land sale \$155K), Information Mgt \$130K, and Financial Control Group \$73K.

Capitalised Employee Costs are \$72K above budget due to O&M \$86K above budget on Roads & Drainage partially offset by PDG below budget by \$16K.

Cash and Investments

The investment of surplus funds for the month returned a weighted average rate of return of 5.25%, which is ahead of the UBS Aust Bank Bill Index of 4.83%. The cumulative position for the year is a favourable return of 5.33% against the UBS Aust Bank Bill Index of 4.90%. These returns are reported on a monthly weighted average return and Council benchmarks the funds against the UBS Australian Bank Bill Index. Interest return is reported on both an annual effective and nominal rate of return. RBA cash rate remains at 4.75% as at the end of November 2010.

CONSULTATION

Consultation has taken place amongst the Executive Leadership Group.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to note the preliminary End of Month Financial Reports for November 2010 and explanations as presented in the following attachments:

1. Dashboard and Key Performance Indicators (A)

2. Operating Statement with headline commentary (B)
3. Cash Flow Statement (C)
4. Statement of Financial Position (D)
5. Investment Summary and Graphs (E) ; and a
6. Operating Statement with detailed commentary (F)

ALTERNATIVE

That Council requests additional information.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/
COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve to note the preliminary End of Month Financial Reports for November 2010 and explanations as presented in the following attachments:

- 1. Dashboard and Key Performance Indicators (A)**
- 2. Operating Statement with headline commentary (B)**
- 3. Cash Flow Statement (C)**
- 4. Statement of Financial Position (D)**
- 5. Investment Summary and Graphs (E) ; and**
- 6. Operating Statement with detailed commentary (F).**

CARRIED

17.3 PLANNING & POLICY

17.3.1 AMENDMENT TO ROAD CLOSURE REQUEST CLEVELAND POINT RESERVE

Datworks Filename: P&R Cleveland Point Reserve
Responsible Officer Name: Warren Mortlock
A/Manager Environmental Management Group
Author Name: Angela Wright
Principal Advisor Open Space Planning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Planning and Policy committee meeting of 24 November 2010, further information was requested of officers in regard to Item 1.1 Amendment to a road closure in Cleveland Point Reserve. Information is provided in this report specifically about possible development applications from the Lighthouse Restaurant, and the processing of a volumetric lease application by Department of Environment and Resource Management.

PURPOSE

The purpose is to provide additional information to Council regarding the requirement for the proposed amendment to the road closure, specifically in relation to possible development applications from the Lighthouse Restaurant.

BACKGROUND

A report was presented to Planning and Policy Committee on 24 November requesting an amendment to the road closure application presently with Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM). Further information is requested by Councillors.

DERM currently has two applications for tenure matters at Cleveland Point Reserve including:

- 2009/009259 - Permanent Road Closure of part of Shore Street North circumferencing Lot 391 on SL10999 to be included into reserve - Applicant is Redland CC;
- 2009/006960 - Permanent road closure adjoining Lot 108 on SL801745 and issue of subsequent volumetric term lease (for balcony area) -, Applicant is Lighthouse Restaurant.

ISSUES

1. Council position on development of the Lighthouse Restaurant

In November 2009, Council was presented with information about the possible future development of the Lighthouse Restaurant. Council generally agreed with the

concept proposed (subject to some recommended changes, including removal of the footprint extending over the tidal area).

In a letter written to DERM on 5 November 2009, Council articulated its position, the main points being that Council:

- *Generally accepted that the proposal to lease area to the north and west of Lot 108 on SL801745 to facilitate a balcony and awning will create a built form that more suitably responds to the coastal location and addresses the parkland to the north and west;*
- *Expressed concern about the car parking demand created by additional floor area on the balcony and the current inability of the site to accommodate car parking;*
- *Expressed concern over the ability to maintain and repair the revetment wall if it has a cantilevered platform over the top if it.*
- *Would not be supportive of a permanent road closure for a small portion of the road reserve;*

Previously in November 2007, Council had written to DERM indicating that it did not support a road closure unless it facilitated the purposes for the reserve set out in Council's landscape masterplan.

“Council does not support the closure of Shore Street North based on the following comments.

1. *Redland Shire Council has adopted a plan that indicates full public use of the reserve including the parkland areas and road reserve.*
2. *Any future road closures that will be supported or requested by Redland Shire Council will be to facilitate the implementation of the adopted Master Plan. In the Request Road Closure section of the Plan, the public will be provided with a pathway system that extends from outside the reserve in the existing road reserve and fully around the perimeter of the reserve. This will enable the public full access to the water-front boulevard. Also in the requested road closure, the adopted plan allows that the public will have full access to a lawn picnic area.*
3. *Cleveland Point Reserve is a hugely popular regional destination park. The existing parkland area is only 3183m². The master plan, however, covers an area of approximately 10,000m², meaning that nearly 7,000m² is road reserve.*
4. *Any future road closures need to take very careful consideration of all existing and future uses and the Landscape Master Plan, and will need to be done comprehensively not in a piece meal fashion. Full surveying of the area would need to be undertaken and the road realigned. The requested closure of 60m is meaningless in context of the adopted Master Plan. The request can only then be seen in light of a possible future request for the exclusive use of the area by the Lighthouse Restaurant.*

5. *It should be noted that the Lighthouse Restaurant already has a significant use of the reserve's parking facilities at no additional cost to the restaurant other than rate payments, and they make no contribution to the existing infrastructure in the reserve including the car-parking. If the restaurant was not adjacent to the park, it would have needed to have provided its own off-street car parking. On the current restaurant site this would have been impossible.*
6. *The current Outdoor Dining Permit held by the Lighthouse enables Council to maintain a set of strict conditions over the Lighthouse Restaurant. It also enables public access to the dining area even if they are not dining at the restaurant. This permit is renewed annually and should suffice for the owner of the Lighthouse Restaurant. The permit would then be able to be reviewed once the Landscape Master Plan has been implemented.*
7. *The parkland area, including the road reserve, should not be providing for any exclusive use for commercial purposes. It should be providing for full public access to one of the Shire's most popular destinations, not only for visitors but also for Shire residents."*

2. Volumetric Lease to the Lighthouse Restaurant

- Request 2009/006960 made by the Lighthouse Restaurant to DERM in 2009
- Request on hold pending the outcome of the road closure amendment 2009/009259
- If the road closure amendment is amended and submitted to DERM, they will assess RCC's request and make a determination on 2009/009259.
- If 2009/009259 is approved, DERM would then notify Council of the request for a volumetric lease made by the Lighthouse Restaurant and ask for agreement in writing
- A report to Council would be required at that stage.

3. Re-development of the Lighthouse Restaurant

- No development application has been lodged to date
- Pre-lodgement occurred on Thursday 2 December 2010 to discuss the proposed extensions comprising of an awning over Shore Street North and an entry awning and a first floor deck over the outdoor dining area.
- Subsequent to any lease being granted, the applicant will need to apply to Council for the following approvals
 - Material Change of Use to extend the existing Refreshment Establishment;
 - (Potentially) Material Change of Use for Outdoor Dining (if dining is conducted on the new deck, which is over public land); and
 - (Potentially) Operational Works for Prescribed Tidal Works (if the construction extends over tidal area).

4. Summary

1. Council has supported in principal the lease of an area by the Lighthouse Restaurant in order for them to extend the building to create a second story veranda for dining.
2. Council has supported a road closure in keeping with the principals and design objectives of the adopted landscape master plan.
3. DERM will be forthcoming with a formal request to Council for support for a lease over the road reserve.
4. The Lighthouse Restaurant will need to make a development application to Council for a material change of use of a road reserve and potentially other applications.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

We will carefully manage population pressures and use land sustainably while advocating and taking steps to determine limits of growth and carrying capacity on a local and national basis, recognising environmental sensitivities and the distinctive character, heritage and atmosphere of local communities. A well-planned network of urban, rural and bushland areas and responsive infrastructure and transport

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

It is estimated that the financial cost for undertaking the above actions is unlikely to exceed \$400. This includes the lodgment fee of \$150 and application fee of \$190. The other cost will be advertising of road closure under section 915 of the *Local Government Act*.

The area will need to be re-surveyed at a cost of approx \$4,000-\$5,000.

No further financial implications are being indicated.

PLANNING SCHEME IMPLICATIONS

The Land Use Planning Group was consulted and it is considered that the outcome of recommendations in this report will result in possible amendments to the Redlands Planning Scheme, such as changes to the Planning Scheme zoning.

CONSULTATION

Consultation has occurred with Development and Community Standards and DERM.

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve as follows:

1. To request an amendment to the application made to the Department of Environment and Resources Management under section 99 of the *Land Act 1994*,

for the permanent closure of the northern part of Shore Street North, Cleveland Point, north of the Lighthouse Restaurant;

2. To request amalgamation of Lot 392 on SL10999 into the new park area;
3. That the land from this road closure be declared a Reserve for Park and Recreation purposes with Council accepting trusteeship of this land; and
4. That the Chief Executive Officer be the delegated authority, under s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, to sign all associated documentation.

ALTERNATIVE

That Council resolve to defer this matter pending the provision of any additional information that may be required to make a decision.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Ogilvie
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve as follows:

1. **To request an amendment to the application made to the Department of Environment and Resources Management under section 99 of the *Land Act 1994*, for the permanent closure of the northern part of Shore Street North, Cleveland Point, north of the Lighthouse Restaurant;**
2. **To request amalgamation of Lot 392 on SL10999 into the new park area;**
3. **That the land from this road closure be declared a Reserve for Park and Recreation purposes with Council accepting trusteeship of this land; and**
4. **That the Chief Executive Officer be the delegated authority, under s.257(1)(b) of the *Local Government Act 2009*, to sign all associated documentation.**

CARRIED

17.3.2 COMMUNITY GARDENS

Datworks Filename: CS Community Gardens

Attachments: [1. Community Gardens Policy](#)
[2. Community Gardens Strategy](#)

Responsible Officer Name: Roberta Bonnin
Manager, Community & Social Planning

Author Name: Frank Pearce
Senior Adviser, Community Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to community interest expressed before and during the Redlands 2030 Community Plan consultation, and the recognised benefits that community gardens bring to a community, Community & Social Planning has developed a Community Gardens Policy and Strategy (Attachments 1 & 2) to facilitate the development of community gardens in the Redlands.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to:

- Update Council on the progress of the development of Community Gardens Policy and Guidelines; and
- Provide direction for the processes necessary to support community gardens, and report on community feedback on these proposed processes; and
- Indicate resources required through the annual budget process and external funding to enable Council to support community garden groups.

BACKGROUND

The current impetus towards the provision of space and support for community gardens in the Redlands has its source in:

- Community views expressed both before and during the Redlands 2030 process
- Ongoing concerns about the environment and climate change
- “Grow Local” movement.

To assist with the development of policy Community & Social Planning researched existing community garden practice in Australia and produced a background paper that highlighted the issues that needed to be considered. A series of workshops with officers, councillors (17/08/10) and the community (24/10/10) as well as community surveys were used to inform policy development.

ISSUES

It is recognised that community gardens have the potential to deliver a range of social, environmental and health benefits to the community.

There are a range of issues pertinent to the development of sustainable community gardens that were raised during the research and the internal and external consultation as listed below in this report.

LOCATION OF GARDENS

Selecting suitable land is essential for the ongoing success of community gardens. Items to be considered when locating community gardens include:

- Other potential uses defined in existing Council plans and strategies
- Availability of water and toilets
- Amenity of neighbours
- Accessibility of the site
- Proximity to public transport
- Site security
- Environmental considerations – e.g. soil & sunlight

An application process is being developed to enable community groups to establish community gardens on Council lands. The process will rely on a cross-Council panel that would pre-identify sites and consider requests from the community for alternate sites. This process is outlined in Attachment 2. This process would form part of operational guidelines. A list of potential sites identified by the community is included in the appendices of Attachment 2.

TENURE OF GARDENS

In accordance with the Leasing of Council Land and Facilities Policy the preferred tenure arrangement for community gardens would be a Permit to Occupy, to be issued for up to 5 years to incorporate not for profit organisations with the necessary levels of public liability insurance. If a community garden group was not incorporated another incorporated group would need to auspice it.

COUNCIL SUPPORT

For best use of resources and to help with the long term sustainability of community gardens a bottom-up approach, where community groups are supported to develop and operate their own community gardens, is recommended. To enable this to occur council support is needed including:

- A co-ordinated cross council approach to assessing, approving and supporting community gardens, including a single point of contact within Council who would assist community garden groups with their dealings with Council and provide organisational support to the groups. Subject to 2011/2012 budget deliberations it is proposed a dedicated part time community gardens officer be appointed.
- Access to Community Grants: The most efficient way for Council to provide financial support for community gardens is through the existing grants process.

Community garden groups could access the mayor's small grant, organisational and project support grants and minor capital grants.

COMMUNITY GARDENS ON NON-COUNCIL LAND

Within the recommended policy framework, Council would be able to support the establishment of community gardens on non-Council land through grants and organisational support providing the group was not-for-profit and properly constituted, with secure tenure over the garden.

Key learnings from previous experience

Several successful community gardens currently exist in the Redlands and there have also been unsuccessful attempts to start others. The learnings from these experiences can be summarised:

- Clear Council processes for the allocation of land and resources are critical for community groups. An uncoordinated Council approach can generate significant community frustration.
- Successful community gardens rely on good relationships with surrounding land owners.
- Competent organisational support has been a key factor in sustaining existing gardens.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN

The recommendation primarily supports Corporate Plan Strong and Connected Communities outcome, strategy 7.6 - Provide practical programs, support and guidance to the community sector in its delivery of highly valued support services and community projects; and the Corporate Plan Green Living outcome, strategy 2.3 - Promote a 'go local' attitude towards working, socialising, shopping, playing and supporting local production of food.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Costs for a new Level 4 Council officer working two days per week plus associated operational expenses are in the order of \$35,000 per annum. This expenditure could be considered through the 2011/12 budget process. The position is nominally proposed to be located in Environmental Education, although there are accommodation issues as the Indigiscapes offices are currently at capacity.

There is opportunity for Council to seek additional funding through the COAG Funding for Healthy Communities. The funding will be made available to 7 Queensland LGAs over a period of 27 months (April 2011 – June 2013) as part of phase 2 of the Healthy Communities Initiative from the Federal Government. If Council is successful in its application, the funding would provide for a Healthy Communities Coordinator position and active and healthy programs in the community. Funding applications close on Friday February 4, 2011.

Council grants to community organisations for community gardens will be covered within the existing Community Assistance Grants budget and guidelines.

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

In the development of this paper and policy, Community and Social Planning have consulted with the following:

- Operations and Maintenance
- Parks and Conservation
- Land Use Planning
- Environmental Education
- Environmental Management
- Community Development
- Community Grants
- Customer and Community Services
- Councillors (via a workshop 17/08/10)
- Community (via surveys and a workshop 24/10/10)

Key themes from the internal consultation were:

- Responsibilities for supporting community gardens should be clearly defined, coordinated and resourced to avoid ad hoc decision making. A single point of contact within Council for the community is preferred
- Allocating land for community gardens needs to be made in the context of other competing uses by a group of officers
- Other options to fulfill the stated objectives of community gardens included supporting gardens on non-council land should be considered in the first instance.
- Resources for community gardens should be provided through the grants processes and not directly from Operations and Maintenance.
- Significant issues for accommodating any additional Environmental Education staff at the Indigiscapes Centre as there is no more room available without expansion to the existing building.

Key themes from the community consultation were:

- Unanimous approval of Council support for community gardens

- Support for Council pre-identifying suitable sites, but also a desire for other sites to be considered through Council processes
- A desire for clear and simple process
- Suggestions for Council support included: organisational support, material support, access to sites, formation of a network of community gardens, a central auspicing body, group insurance and dedicated resource officer(s)

OPTIONS

PREFERRED

That Council resolve to endorse Interim Community Gardens Policy POL – 3101 (Attachment 1); and the Community gardens Strategy (Attachment 2) - subject to resources being made available through the 2011/2012 Budget Workshop process.

Alternative

1. To note Community Gardens Policy POL – 3101 (Attachment 1) and strategy (Attachment 2); and
2. That no additional resources be made available to support community gardens in the Redlands.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION/ COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council resolve to endorse the Interim Community Gardens Policy POL-3101 (Attachment 1); and the Community Gardens Strategy (Attachment 2) - subject to resources being made available through the 2011/2012 Budget Workshop process.

CARRIED

18 NOTICE OF BUSINESS

18.1 NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR REIMERS) – SIGNAGE AT REDLAND CITY REFUSE/TRANSFER STATIONS

Background

The reason I am putting this motion to Council, is because in having consulted with many residents, I have found that the people of Redlands do not know that there are many items which are able to be dumped for free.

This communication strategy and action, of placing signs advising residents of items that can be dumped for free (i.e. no charge) in strategic locations will make the community more aware of the services and will reduce the incidence of rubbish being dumped outside the refuse tip areas.

In accordance with notice given on 24 November 2010, Cr Reimers moved the following motion.

Moved by: Cr Reimers
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

1. That Redland City Council place a large sign advising which items can be disposed of for free, outside each of the Redland City refuse / transfer stations of Birkdale and Redland Bay, and that these signs can be easily read from the road by passing motorists.
2. That Redland City Council place signs at, and/or near, Redland City shopping centers and railway stations advising which items can be disposed of for free at Redland City refuse / transfer stations.

CARRIED

A division was called for.

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

Crs Elliott, Bowler and Williams voted in the negative.

Crs Murray, Burns and Ogilvie were not present when this motion was put.

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

18.2 NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR HENRY) – ORANA ESPLANADE PRECINCT

In accordance with notice given on 8 December 2010, Cr Henry moved the following motion.

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve to undertake a master-planned approach to the Orana Esplanade precinct to ensure that infrastructure provision and time frames are within the expectations of the community, and the capacity of Council to deliver.

After discussion, Cr Henry withdrew this motion and submitted a new motion for consideration.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved by: Cr Henry
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council resolve to advise the community of plans already in place in respect to recreational access to the Orana Esplanade precinct.

CARRIED

A division was called for.

Crs Reimers, Elliott, Williams, Henry, Boglary and Hobson voted in the affirmative.

Crs Bowler and Townsend voted in the negative.

Crs Murray, Burns and Ogilvie were not present when this motion was put.

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

18.3 NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR TOWNSEND) – PROVISION OF PATHWAYS/FOOTPATHS IN THE REDLAND BAY AREA

Background

Redland Bay is one of the fastest growing areas in the Redlands which has a combination of old established areas and new subdivisions.

Pathways/footpaths, although being provided in newer areas, have been generally ignored in the past resulting in gaps. These gaps also exist between subdivisions and needs to be addressed with the utmost urgency.

This motion seeks a report that will address the issues relevant to an increasing problem facing Redland Bay which is in a precarious stage of development where development is outstripping the infrastructure.

In accordance with notice given on 9 December 2010, Cr Townsend moved the following motion.

Moved by: Cr Townsend
Seconded by: Cr Reimers

That Council officers prepare a report with regard to the provision of funding for pathways/footpaths in the Redland Bay area.

CARRIED

18.4 NOTICE OF BUSINESS (CR WILLIAMS) – PROVISION OF FUNDING FOR PATHWAYS/FOOTPATHS ACROSS REDLAND CITYBackground

As a result of competing interests in various divisions and other priorities of Redland City Council, it is necessary to consider the needs of basic infrastructure across the entire city.

Footpaths and cycleways are being delivered in newer areas, however, due to deficient policies of the past, there are gaps in older areas of the City.

This motion seeks a report that will address the issues relevant to all of Redland City and should bring focus to providing the basic infrastructure of paths and footpaths in a timely manner within the expectations of the broader community.

In accordance with notice given on 9 December 2010, Cr Williams moved the following motion.

Moved by: Cr Williams
Seconded by: Cr Boglary

That Council officers hold a dedicated workshop during budget deliberations with regard to the allocation of resources for footpaths across Redland City.

CARRIED

19 MEETING CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 7.09pm.

Signature of Chairperson: _____

Confirmation date: _____