

LGAT Motions – Suggested Council position and supporting comments

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
That LGAT seek that the State Government provides a strategic commitment of a 4 year resources funding program for the implementation of international (Non English) visitor interpretive signage to ensure the dispersal of the increased international tourism economic benefits across the state.	Support	While the issue of dispersal is not critical to Hobart the provision of multi-language tourism signage both within and on the approaches to Hobart is considered sensible and will enhance our destination appeal.
That LGAT pursue legislative changes which would: 1. Require a councillor who is standing for State or Federal Parliament to take a leave of absence from Council for the period between accepting the nomination and declaration of the poll. 2. Require a councillor who is elected to State or Federal Parliament to resign their council position following declaration of the poll.	Support	
That LGAT lobby for a change to the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> to allow for a recount on the previous election to be used to fill a vacancy of Mayor at any time throughout the term, instead of the current provision for a by-election which applies up to six months prior to the next ordinary election, which can be costly for a community.	For the Council to determine	This motion would require an amendment to the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> to implement.
That LGAT lobby the State Government to remove the 'materiality' test as it relates to conflict of interest set out in Part 2 of the Model Code of Conduct.	Support	City of Hobart motion

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
That the Local Government Association of Tasmania recommends that the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> be amended to allow a Mayor (or their delegate) to qualify a Council or council committee agenda item that relates to the performance of or contractual arrangements with the General Manager.	For the Council to determine	This would require legislative change which may have unintended consequences.
That LGAT lobby for a change to the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> to remove the word alderman from the Act entirely, leaving only councillor.	For the Council to determine	Section 25 of the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> states that a person elected to a city council is a councillor but may be known as an alderman. When the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> was introduced, the Hobart City Council resolved at its 23 May 1994 meeting as follows: <i>'That elected members be referred to as Aldermen.'</i> (See attached Council decision).
That the Local Government Association of Tasmania lobby the University of Tasmania for the continuation of the Bachelor of Health Science (Environmental Health) or similar tertiary degree that is eligible for the Environmental Health University Course Accreditation with Environmental Health Australia.	Support	The availability of this degree within Tasmania is critical to the ongoing availability of qualified staff for local and state governments to fulfil this significant statutory role.
That LGAT seek that the State Government provides a strategic commitment of a 4 year resources funding program working with Local Government and established industry training providers for the implementation of targeted VOC Training initiatives to ensure the dispersal of employment and apprenticeship opportunities from all emerging industry investment and expansion opportunities across the state.	Support	

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
<p>That LGAT lobby the State Government to amend the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> to provide the Tasmanian Audit Office with the power to consider whether an Australian Accounting Standard should be applied to Local Government and to what extent.</p>	<p>Not Support</p>	<p>It is true that new or amended accounting standards can lead to unintended consequences for some entities, or sectors, at times.</p> <p>However, on balance, it is considered that accounting standards should continue to be fully applicable to local government. The alternative would lead, as noted in the Tasmanian Audit Office's comments, to divergence from other jurisdictions and associated loss of comparability.</p> <p>All clients can discuss the applicability of any requirement of any accounting standard, on materiality grounds, if it wishes.</p>
<p>That LGAT seek that the State Government, in conjunction with the Tasmanian Audit Office, provides a strategic commitment to lobby for a new change in accounting standards for depreciation calculation and management of all state and federal government funded projects, as the present model significantly disadvantages low growth communities and undermines opportunities to reinvigorate and re-energise local economic prosperity and community wellbeing.</p>	<p>Not Support</p>	<p>This motion is not entirely clear in its purpose. However, the Tasmanian Govt Agency comment in the meeting agenda perhaps encapsulates the issue in a better fashion. The agency comment is that <i>"It is unclear from the motion how depreciation expense can disadvantage low growth communities and undermines the opportunities to reinvigorate and re-energise local economic prosperity and community wellbeing. It seems that the question is implying that because of the future depreciation expense associated with such assets, councils are likely not to take up</i></p>

		<p><i>opportunities, such as those arising from grants, to acquire or construct them, thereby disadvantaging communities. Decisions to construct or acquire assets should reflect an analysis of total whole of life costs of such assets, including depreciation expenses, compared to benefits accruing to the community.</i></p> <p>In other words, state and federal provide capital grants at various times for capital assets. They do not however, provide recurrent funds for the operation, maintenance and depreciation of those assets. The motion is therefore suggesting that because of this, councils may not take up capital grants, thus disadvantaging communities. The proposed solution of seeking a change to accounting standards to not require depreciation, or to somehow lessen depreciation, is not a sensible one and counter to the whole notion of financial sustainability. As the agency states, decisions to construct or acquire assets (even those where the capital cost is funded by way of grants) should reflect an analysis of total whole of life costs of such assets, including depreciation.</p>
--	--	--

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
<p>A). That Councils and the Local Government Association of Tasmania work with the Local Government Division of Premier and Cabinet to review the various accounting methodologies being used by Councils with a view to developing standardised reporting; and</p> <p>B) Address some of the complexities such as volume/length of reporting driven by disclosures required in the Local Government Act and International Accounting standards which are not necessarily relevant to Council operation and reporting.</p>	<p>A) Not Support B) Not Support</p>	<p>A). Standardised reporting is an issue that has been tried at various levels in the past. At face value, it has merit. However, there are legitimate reasons for differences between councils. So long as accounting policies, estimates and judgements are fully disclosed and explained in the annual financial statements this is considered appropriate. Further, financial statements must be prepared in accordance with applicable accounting standards which therefore provides for standardisation. The statements are then subject to audit.</p> <p>B). As noted at a previous motion above, it is considered that accounting standards should continue to be fully applicable to local government. The alternative would lead, as noted in the Tasmanian Audit Office's comments, to divergence from other jurisdictions and associated loss of comparability. All clients can discuss the applicability of any requirement of any accounting standard, on materiality grounds, if it wishes.</p>
<p>A. Advocate on behalf of all Councils the deep concern at the level of the Fire Service Contribution that councils are expected to collect from ratepayers each year on behalf of the State Fire Commission; and</p> <p>B. Seek justification for the excessive level of financial burden that has been imposed over the last five years.</p>	<p>A) Support B) Support</p>	<p>As required by the <i>Fire Service Act 1979</i> the City collects the fire service rate on behalf of the Tasmanian Government and then passes it on to the Tasmania Fire Service. Council earns a 4% collection fee for this service. The City uses the revenue from the collection fee to reduce the amount required from Rates.</p> <p>In the September prior each year Council prepares a return for the State Fire Commission. The return includes the number of</p>

		<p>properties in each brigade district and aggregate Assessed Annual Values (AAVs) for properties above or below the minimum AAV. The State Fire Commission use this, based on a rolling 6 year average of AAVs to calculate our required contribution. This calculation is complex and very difficult to understand or pre-empt a \$value. Council has no control or input over the quantum of the fire service contribution that councils are required to collect from ratepayers on behalf of the State Fire Commission. Council is not advised why the contribution has increased in a particular year or what the increased amount will be used to fund. There is therefore a lack of transparency making it difficult to explain to ratepayers who are required to pay the amount as part of Council rates.</p> <p>The fire service contribution annual increases are always considerably more than CPI in any given year and have ranged from a 4.3% increase in 2016-17 to a 6.8% increase in 2014-15. In 2014-15 the City's contribution was \$8.8M, in 2018-19 the figure is \$10.74M, representing a 22% increase over the last 5 years. In a climate where the community's capacity to pay large rate increases is limited, it is very difficult to justify to ratepayers these large increases to council rates.</p>
<p>That LGAT lobby the State Government to take greater responsibility for the management of streams.</p>	<p>Not Support</p>	<p>CoH currently is responsible for and maintains all watercourses within the municipality, other issues such as improvements to the Urban Drainage Act are considered a more important issue.</p>

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
That LGAT request that the State Government provide the necessary resources and undertake an urgent review of the <i>Building Act 2016</i> to address the shortcomings being experienced by Local Government in relation to the operation of this Act.	Support	While the motion does not identify the shortcomings being experienced, the Act has been in force for 18 months and a number of drafting errors and unintended consequences in its application have been identified. A review and any subsequent legislative improvements is supported.
That the Local Government Association of Tasmania lobby the State Government for the introduction of legislation to ban the provision of petroleum-based single-use take-away food packaging currently used to enable prepared food or beverages to be carried from the retailer's premises.	Support	City of Hobart motion
The LGAT urgently consider through its appropriate body a response to the recent increase in costs of recycling to Local Government as a consequence of changes to the Chinese government's policies and consider development of a range of responses, including collective negotiations between the Federal and State Governments and other stakeholders, to prompt a market response for recycling opportunities in Tasmania.	Support	City of Hobart motion
The LGAT lobby all councils to adopt the use of reusable and compostable items for use in council sponsored events.	Support	City of Hobart motion

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
That LGAT seek from the State Government a strategic commitment of a 4 year resources funding program for the implementation of all Tourism destination action plans to ensure the dispersal of the increased tourism economic benefits across the state.	Support	The tourism destination action plans are an important part of Tasmania's tourism framework and are necessary for regions to better plan for tourism in their respective areas.
That Tasmanian Councils, through LGAT, support a container deposit scheme within Tasmania and call on the State Government to investigate the best model for implementation within the State/	Support	Such a scheme would assist the Council in our objective of zero waste to landfill by 2030
That LGAT seek from the State Government a strategic commitment to developing and implementing in the new state-wide planning scheme provisions to allow the as of right development of existing small titles of land in the rural production zone that does not compromise or fetter agricultural production capacity and provides opportunities to diversify and reinvigorate local economic prosperity and community wellbeing.	Abstain	This motion is not relevant to the City of Hobart planning context.
That Members note a lack of input into the location of telecommunications towers and other similar infrastructure emitting radiation/microwave links and request that LGAT investigate options to allow councils to have more input prior to the submission of the Development Application.	Support	There is considerable public interest in this matter that warrants greater local government engagement at an early stage.

Motion	Support/Not Support/ Abstain	Comment
That Local Government consult with Fruit Growers Tasmania and the State Government regarding the biosecurity risk with roadside fruit trees on state and local roads.	Support	The biosecurity of the State is important to the viability of the wider agricultural sector and gaining a better understanding of the risks associated with this issue would be of benefit.
That LGAT seek from the State Government a strategic commitment, resources and a funding program for the implementation of a State and Federal Government services decentralisation action plan to leverage and ensure the dispersal of employment opportunities across the State.	Support	
That LGAT lobby the State Government and Spirit of Tasmania to ensure the availability of sailings adequately meets demand of Tasmanian residents, tourists and other users and that affordable pricing is available to users.	Abstain/Not Support	Given there are two new ships being built for the crossing there is insufficient evidence provided by the mover to support this motion.
That the Local Government Association of Tasmania be requested to lobby the State Government to ensure that the State is taking sufficient measures and allocating sufficient resources to provide affordable, low cost housing, particularly in rural and outer suburban areas.	Support	In light of recent statistics relating to housing affordability and availability, particularly in Hobart, the Council is supportive of any additional measures that could be undertaken by the State Government to improve housing options. It is noted that the City is participating on the City Deal Affordable Housing Working Group with State Government, Federal Government and other Greater Hobart councils.

463

Council Minutes 20.
23/5/94.

- 27. FRANKLIN SQUARE, ELIZABETH STREET - TWO BUS SHELTERS -
DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION 940443 - 470
Ref. C.P. (2) (Public) Supp. 14, 16/5/94.

That pursuant to Section 6 (iii) of the Land Use Planning and Approval Act, 1993 authority be granted for the Director of Development Services to issue a planning permit pursuant to Part 2 of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme, 1982 for the proposed two bus shelters at Franklin Square subject to no statutory representations being received.

HAIGH
ZUCCO

That the recommendation be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED.

POLICY AND BUDGET

- 28. ELECTED MEMBERS NAME - 13-2-1
Ref. P.& B. (Public) 4, 12/5/94.

That elected members be referred to as Aldermen.

FISHER
ZUCCO

That the recommendation be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED.

ALDERMEN ALTY,
VALENTINE AND BRISCOE
DISSENTED.

WORKS

- 29. ALTERATIONS TO GUTTER CROSSINGS AND FOOTPATH REINSTATEMENT
- POLICY GUIDELINES - 42-1-3
Ref. Works (Public) 4.3, 10/5/94.

That: A. The following guidelines be endorsed, in relation to the costs associated with vehicular crossing adjustments and the reinstatement of footpaths:

...cont/-

20