



**CITY OF HOBART**

## **AGENDA**

The Hobart Workshop Committee Meeting  
Open Portion  
Tuesday, 10 February 2026  
at 4.00pm  
Lady Osborne Room



*City of* **HOBART**

## THE MISSION

**Working together to make Hobart a better place for the community.**

## THE VALUES

**The Council is:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>People</b>                    | We care about people – our community, our customers and colleagues.  |
| <b>Teamwork</b>                  | We collaborate both within the organisation and with external stakeholders drawing on skills and expertise for the benefit of our community. |
| <b>Focus and Direction</b>       | We have clear goals and plans to achieve sustainable social, environmental and economic outcomes for the Hobart community.                   |
| <b>Creativity and Innovation</b> | We embrace new approaches and continuously improve to achieve better outcomes for our community.   |
| <b>Accountability</b>            | We are transparent, work to high ethical and professional standards and are accountable for delivering outcomes for our community.           |

## ELECTED MEMBER COMMITMENTS

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Respectful and Cooperative Behaviour</b>     | We will treat each other, staff, and stakeholders respectfully, fostering a collaborative environment.   |
| <b>Conduct and media use</b>                    | We will advocate using transparent, evidence-based arguments, respect majority decisions, avoid public criticism of employees, and maintain workplace safety by refraining from harmful communication. |
| <b>Objective, evidence-based communication:</b> | Our discussions and advocacy are grounded in reliable, shared evidence, avoiding personal attacks and promoting respectful debate before public commentary.  |
| <b>Roles and responsibilities:</b>              | We recognise our duty to represent our community while being accountable, engaging in critical debate and holding others to account respectfully.  |

---

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

---

**Business listed on the agenda is to be conducted in the order in which it is set out, unless the committee by simple majority determines otherwise.**

### **APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY.....</b>            | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....</b>               | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS .....</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>4. INDICATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.....</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>5. TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS.....</b>              | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>6. REPORTS .....</b>                              | <b>6</b>  |
| 6.1 Change of Council Meeting Time .....             | 6         |
| 6.2 Short Stay Levy Bill 2025.....                   | 8         |
| <b>7. ITEMS FOR WORKSHOPPING.....</b>                | <b>17</b> |
| 7.1 Safer Hobart Program.....                        | 17        |
| 7.2 Mount Nelson Local Area Mobility Plan .....      | 35        |
| <b>8. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE .....</b>             | <b>42</b> |
| <b>9. CLOSED PORTION OF THE MEETING.....</b>         | <b>43</b> |

**The Hobart Workshop Committee Meeting (Open Portion) held Tuesday, 10 February 2026 at 4.00pm in the Lady Osborne Room.**

The title Chief Executive Officer is a term of reference for the General Manager as appointed by Council pursuant s.61 of the *Local Government Act 1993* (Tas).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Alderman L A Bloomfield (Chairperson)  
Deputy Lord Mayor Councillor Dr Z E Sherlock  
Councillor J L Kelly  
Councillor L M Elliot  
Councillor R J Posselt  
Councillor B Lohberger  
Councillor G H Kitsos

**Apologies:**

**Leave of Absence:**  
Nil.

**NOMINEE MEMBERS:**

Lord Mayor Councillor A M Reynolds  
Alderman M Zucco  
Councillor W F Harvey  
Councillor M S C Dutta  
Councillor W N S Coats

**1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

---

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

The minutes of the Open Portion of the Hobart Workshop Committee meeting held on [Monday, 19 January 2026](#), are submitted for confirming as an accurate record.

**3. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS**

---

Ref: Part 2, Regulation 10(7) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*.

**Recommendation**

That the Committee resolve to deal with any supplementary items not appearing on the agenda, as reported by the Chief Executive Officer.

#### **4. INDICATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

---

Ref: Part 2, Regulation 10(8) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*.

Members of the Committee are requested to indicate where they may have, or are likely to have, interest in the agenda.

#### **5. TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS**

---

Regulation 17 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*.

A Committee may close a part of a meeting to the public where a matter to be discussed falls within 17(2) of the above regulations.

In the event that the Committee transfers an item to the closed portion, the reasons for doing so should be stated.

Are there any items which should be transferred from this agenda to the closed portion of the agenda, or from the closed to the open portion of the agenda?

## **6. REPORTS**

---

### **6.1 Change of Council Meeting Time**

---

**File Ref: F26/6619**

---

Report of the Acting Manager Legal and Corporate Governance of 4 February 2026.

Delegation: Committee



City of **HOBART**

**MEMORANDUM: HOBART WORKSHOP COMMITTEE**

**Change of Council Meeting Time**

Three Elected Members will be attending the Company Directors Course through the Australian Institute of Company Directors (AICD) on Monday, 23 February 2026, which is scheduled to run until 4.30pm. This conflicts with a Council meeting which is scheduled to commence at 4.00pm.

Accordingly, it is recommended to move the start time of the Council meeting of 23 February 2026 from 4.00pm to 5.15pm.

**RECOMMENDATION**

***That the Council meeting scheduled to be held at 4.00pm on Monday, 23 February 2026, be moved to 5.15pm on the same day.***

*As signatory to this report, I certify that, pursuant to Section 55(1) of the Local Government Act 1993, I hold no interest, as referred to in Section 49 of the Local Government Act 1993, in matters contained in this report.*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarah Cornish'.

Sarah Cornish  
**ACTING MANAGER LEGAL AND  
CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

Date: 4 February 2026  
File Reference: F26/6619

**6.2 Short Stay Levy Bill 2025**  
**File Ref: F26/613; 24/46**

---

Report of the Manager Strategic Land Use Planning and Director Strategic and Regulatory Services of 4 February 2026 and attachments.

Delegation: Committee

**REPORT TITLE:** **SHORT STAY LEVY BILL 2025**

**REPORT PROVIDED BY:** Manager Strategic Land Use Planning  
Director Strategic and Regulatory Services

## 1. Report Summary and Key Issues

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Committee's endorsement of the City of Hobart's submission (Attachment A) to the State Government's draft Short Stay Levy Bill 2025 (the Bill).
- 1.2. The City of Hobart's role in this matter is as a key local government stakeholder and planning authority. While the Short Stay Levy (SSL) is a State taxation instrument administered by the State Revenue Office (SRO), the City has a legitimate interest in minimising community confusion between taxation and planning approvals, advocating for evidence-based housing outcomes, and ensuring effective intergovernmental coordination.
- 1.3. Endorsement of the submission (Attachment A) supports a constructive, solutions-focused position on implementation, messaging, and use of revenue in ways that best promote housing affordability and urban outcomes for Hobart. This Report outlines key details and issues with the draft Bill and includes the City's submission recommendations.
- 1.4. The draft Bill establishes a statutory framework for the imposition, collection, and administration of a levy on short stay accommodation in Tasmania. The draft Bill sets out who is liable to pay the levy, the rate of the levy, registration and reporting obligations, and enforcement mechanisms. However, the draft Bill does not specify or prescribe how revenue raised by the levy will be spent. It is silent on expenditure, allocation, or earmarking of funds
- 1.5. In summary, the City of Hobart (the City) supports the intent of the Bill to promote economic activity and improve housing affordability. However, the City questions the effectiveness of allocating the revenue solely to first home buyer initiatives and recommends that amendments be considered to ensure the revenue is directed to its intended purpose, rather than absorbed into general revenue.
- 1.6. Key themes of the City's submission
  - 1.6.1. Supports in principle the short stay levy, noting alignment with approaches in other jurisdictions.
  - 1.6.2. Highlights the need to clearly separate taxation from planning: payment of the levy does not constitute planning approval; exemption from the levy does not imply exemption from planning controls.

- 1.6.3. Raises concerns regarding transparency and accountability for potential exemptions under Clause 21, including requesting consultation with affected councils for any broad or urban-area orders.
- 1.6.4. Confirms that councils have no compliance role but requests a clear SRO enquiry pathway and referral protocols to handle community enquiries efficiently.
- 1.6.5. The submission consolidates established economic research indicating that demand-side subsidies (e.g. first-home-buyer grants or duty relief) can be capitalised into house prices in supply-constrained markets, with limited sustained improvement to overall affordability. By contrast, directing revenue to social and affordable housing supply better targets structural constraints and can improve affordability outcomes without stimulating additional demand pressure in the entry-level market.
- 1.6.6. Referencing the experience of other jurisdictions, the submission advocates that hypothecating SSL revenue to supply-side housing programs would provide clearer accountability, greater policy coherence with planning and infrastructure delivery, and better alignment with local government objectives.
- 1.6.7. Data sharing: requests periodic, privacy-compliant, aggregated reporting (e.g. by local government area) to support monitoring of short stay activity and evidence-based planning.

## 2. **Recommendation**

**That:**

1. ***The Committee endorse the draft submission to the Tasmanian Government in response to the draft Short Stay Levy Bill 2025, marked as Attachment A to this report.***
2. ***The CEO be authorised to finalise the submission, making any minor editorial amendments that do not change its intent, and to lodge it with the Department of Treasury and Finance.***
3. ***The Lord Mayor write to the Treasurer and the Minister for Housing, enclosing the endorsed submission and confirming Council's willingness to assist with implementation discussions.***
4. ***The submission be published on the City's website upon lodgement.***

### 3. Discussion and Background

3.1. Ahead of the 2024 State election, the Tasmanian Government announced its intention to introduce a 5 per cent levy on short-stay accommodation as part of its election policy Making it easier for Tasmanians to own their own home – 5% Short Stay Levy. The proposal outlined the following parameters:

- all proceeds from the levy would be used to support first home buyers;
- the levy would apply to short-stay accommodation listed on platforms such as Airbnb and Stayz;
- the levy would exclude hotels, pubs, bed and breakfasts, and caravan parks; and
- the cost of the levy would be borne by short-stay guests rather than property owners.

3.2. On 18 December 2025 the State Government released its draft Bill for consultation. The draft bill establishes a statutory framework for the imposition, collection, and administration of a levy on short stay accommodation in Tasmania. The Bill sets out who is liable to pay the levy, the rate of the levy, registration and reporting obligations, and enforcement mechanisms

However, the Bill does not include any provisions relating to the use, allocation, or purpose of the revenue raised. There is no hypothecation of funds, no establishment of a dedicated fund or account, and no requirement that levy proceeds be applied to specific policy objectives such as housing supply, tourism infrastructure, local government support, or regulatory enforcement.

Under the Bill, levy amounts are payable to the Commissioner and administered under the Taxation Administration Act 1997, indicating that revenue would flow into general government revenue and be managed through the normal budget and appropriation processes.

It is our understanding that statements regarding how the revenue will be spent are policy commitments only and are not legally binding unless addressed through separate legislation or budgetary measures. Details of these are yet to be released.

3.3. Comparing the Bill to Victoria and Australian Capital Territory (ACT)

3.3.1. Victoria

In Victoria, a 7.5% SSL has been introduced and is seen as a housing supply mechanism. The Victorian Government estimates annual revenue at around \$70 million with the funding

to be channelled through Homes Victoria earmarking it for social and affordable housing.

The policy rationale is the levy is to act as compensation for long-term rental stock lost to short-stay accommodation, and as a mechanism to support new housing delivery, rather than buyer-side assistance. We see this a structural housing supply response, rather than a demand-side affordability measure.

### 3.3.2. Canberra (ACT)

The ACT's 5% SSL is not allocated to housing or any single program. Instead, revenue flows into general government revenue. The ACT Treasurer has stated it will support a raft of budget funding items including health, education, transport, tourism and housing. Projected revenue is approximately \$3.8 million in the first year, rising slightly thereafter. The ACT has been explicit in stating that raising revenue is the primary purpose and any impact on housing availability will be modest.

### 3.3.3. Tasmania

It is expected that the 5% SSL will raise approximately \$11 million annually and will contribute to the existing First Home Owner Grant Program (\$30,000 to eligible first home buyer who build or purchase a new home) and the First home owner duty relief program (no stamp duty on homes valued up \$750,000).

### 3.3.4. Although all three jurisdictions apply levies to short-stay accommodation, they are fundamentally different policy instruments once revenue allocation is considered:

- Victoria uses it as a housing supply mechanism.
- Canberra uses it as a general revenue measure.
- Tasmania uses the levy as a targeted affordability offset.

- 3.4. Economic and housing policy literature consistently finds that buyer subsidies (including stamp duty concessions) tend to be absorbed into higher prices when supply is constrained. Tasmania's supply constraints (infill capacity, infrastructure timing, construction costs) mean this risk is real.
- 3.5. The Tasmanian Government itself has acknowledged that the levy's housing benefit is indirect and relies on demand relief rather than increased stock. We have therefore recommended in the submission that a Victorian approach be considered given this is the strongest model for improving overall housing affordability over time.

#### 4. Legal, Risk and Legislative Considerations

- 4.1. The Short Stay Levy (SSL) proposed will be a state-administered taxation measure. Local government will have no regulatory or revenue-collection role under the Bill.
- 4.2. Given the definitions of 'short stay accommodation' vary in the Bill to the Planning Scheme's definition of 'Visitor Accommodation' there could be some operator confusion if they are exempt from the levy but still require planning permits/approvals and vice versa.
- 4.3. The Minister's power to declare exempt premises by order (s 21) could shift the scope over time, creating ongoing alignment issues with planning classifications and compliance messaging.
- 4.4. Residual risk to the City is assessed as low and relates primarily to customer experience and communications rather than legal exposure, noting that enforcement and revenue administration sit entirely with the State.

#### 5. Strategic Planning and Policy Considerations

- 5.1. The submission demonstrates a strong alignment with Council's adopted strategic directions, particularly in relation to housing affordability, sustainable land use planning, effective governance, and advocacy for systemic reform. The submission supports the State's policy intent where it aligns with community outcomes, while clearly articulating risks and refinements required to ensure consistency with Council's long-term vision and statutory responsibilities.
- 5.2. The submission supports the community vision for a liveable, inclusive and affordable capital city by recognising the impacts of short stay accommodation on permanent housing supply and residential amenity. It supports measures that may moderate these impacts, while advocating for levy revenue to be directed toward social and affordable housing supply, rather than demand-side subsidies. This approach aligns with community expectations that housing affordability be addressed structurally and equitably, and that residential neighbourhoods remain places for long-term living.
- 5.3. The submission also reinforces the importance of transparent and clear planning systems, consistent with the community aspiration for a city that is well managed, easy to navigate, and fair to residents, property owners and visitors
- 5.4. The submission aligns with Council's objective to maintain vibrant and liveable neighbourhoods by highlighting the cumulative effects of short stay accommodation on housing availability and residential amenity. It supports policy settings that balance the visitor economy with long-term community needs.

## 6. Financial Viability

### 6.1. Financial Considerations:

|                          | <b>2025-26</b><br>\$'000 | <b>2026-27</b><br>\$'000 | <b>2027-28</b><br>\$'000 | <b>2028-29</b><br>\$'000 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Revenue</b>           |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Existing Revenue         | N/A                      | N/A                      | N/A                      | N/A                      |
| Additional Revenue       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| <b>Total Revenue</b>     |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| <b>Expenditure</b>       |                          | N/A                      | N/A                      | N/A                      |
| Operating                |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Capital                  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| <b>Total Expenditure</b> |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| <b>Net Cost</b>          |                          |                          |                          |                          |

### FTE Impact

|               | <b>2025-26</b> | <b>2026-27</b> | <b>2027-28</b> | <b>2028-29</b> |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Change in FTE | N/A            | N/A            | N/A            | N/A            |

*Detail the change in the level of full-time equivalents within the group should the requested level of additional funding be required.*

- 6.1.1. There are no direct financial implications for the City arising from endorsement or lodgement of the submission.
- 6.1.2. No change to FTE is proposed. Any minor administrative workload associated with referral of SSL enquiries to the SRO will be absorbed within existing staffing.
- 6.1.3. The submission does not commit Council to expenditure.

### 6.2. City Economy Strategy:

- 6.2.1. The proposal aligns with the City Economy Strategy 2023–2028 by advocating for policy clarity that supports a balanced visitor economy and housing availability within the city.
- 6.2.2. It promotes transparent government settings that provide certainty for businesses and residents and supports evidence-based decision-making.

6.3. Economic Impact:

6.3.1. Economy-wide effects of the SSL will be determined by State policy design and market behaviour. The City's advocacy for revenue to be directed to social and affordable housing seeks to improve long-term housing supply outcomes without adding demand-side price pressures.

6.4. Consultants

6.4.1. No external consultants were engaged in the preparation of this report or the submission.

**7. Climate and Sustainability Considerations**

7.1. The recommendation to endorse and lodge an advocacy submission has a neutral direct climate impact.

7.2. Indirectly, if SSL revenue were directed to well-located social and affordable housing, this could support more compact urban form and lower transport emissions. As the Bill does not specify revenue use, these potential benefits are noted in principle only.

**8. Community and Business Engagement and Collaboration**

8.1. Given the State-wide scope and the Government-led consultation process, no targeted external engagement was undertaken by the City for this report.

8.2. Following endorsement, the submission will be provided to the Department of Treasury and Finance and published on the City's website for transparency.

**9. Innovation and Continuous Improvement**

9.1. The submission advocates for periodic, privacy-compliant, aggregated data sharing by the State to enable continuous improvement in monitoring short stay activity and evidence-based planning.

9.2. Internally, officers will develop a simple referral protocol so SSL-related enquiries received by the City are directed to the SRO, improving customer experience and ensuring consistent messaging.

*As signatory to this report, I certify that, pursuant to Section 55(1) of the Local Government Act 1993, I hold no interest, as referred to in Section 49 of the Local Government Act 1993, in matters contained in this report.*



Jennifer Lawley  
**MANAGER STRATEGIC LAND USE  
PLANNING**



Karen Abey  
**DIRECTOR STRATEGIC AND  
REGULATORY SERVICES**

Date: 4 February 2026  
File Reference: F26/613; 24/46

Attachment A: CoH Submission to Short Stay Levy Bill 2025 (Supporting information) 

## 7. ITEMS FOR WORKSHOPPING

---

The City of Hobart utilises the workshop forum as allowed under the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025 as a mechanism to receive information in relation to specific matters.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Committee, any matter that is listed on the agenda for workshopping may not be the subject of a Committee decision, other than a resolution that the item be noted.

### 7.1 Safer Hobart Program File Ref: F26/1631

---

Report of the Project Manager Safe City, Manager Economic Development and Director Community and Economic Development of 4 February 2026.

**REPORT TITLE:** SAFER HOBART PROGRAM

**REPORT PROVIDED BY:** Project Manager Safe City  
Manager Economic Development  
Director Community and Economic Development

## 1. Report Summary and Key Issue

- 1.1. This report details the proposed establishment of the Safer Hobart Program (the program) a dedicated, Council-led community safety and engagement initiative designed to enhance safety, visibility and community connection across Hobart's public spaces, with a primary focus on the CBD.
- 1.2. The program will utilise existing identified positions, reshaping their functions to support a coordinated and proactive response to community safety issues, business concerns, and emerging social challenges in the city.
- 1.3. The Safer Hobart model draws on best practice from other Australian cities where local governments have implemented community-facing safety officer programs as a complement to traditional policing.
- 1.4. These programs have proven effective in improving perceptions of safety, offering early intervention, strengthening local partnerships, and providing public reassurance through a consistent, visible presence.
- 1.5. By adopting a similar approach, Hobart will benefit from enhanced community engagement capability, increased support for vulnerable individuals, and improved responsiveness to low-level safety and amenity concerns.
- 1.6. The initiative is strongly aligned with the City of Hobart's strategic commitments, including the Capital City Strategic Plan 2023 objectives relating to wellbeing, public safety and resilience, and supporting local businesses and economic activity.
- 1.7. It also directly responds to the Hobart Community Vision aspiration for a city that feels "friendly and safe" for all.
- 1.8. Importantly, this proposal addresses repeated feedback from Tasmania Police, the Safer Hobart Alliance, local businesses and community service providers, who have called for a more visible, proactive and coordinated Council-led presence across public spaces to complement CCTV, security contracts and policing operations.
- 1.9. The Safer Hobart program provides a structured and achievable mechanism to meet these expectations while enhancing Hobart's commitment to being a safe, inclusive and welcoming city.

- 1.10. Subject to the feedback received by the Hobart Workshop Committee, a further report will be provided to the Council at its meeting of 23 February 2026, seeking the Council's endorsement of the establishment of the Safer Hobart Program.

## **2. Workshop Purpose**

- 2.1. For the Hobart Workshop Committee to review the report titled *Safer Hobart Program*, and the accompanying presentation, and provide feedback.

### 3. Discussion and Background

#### Background & Context

- 3.1. In Tasmania Section 20 of the *Local Government Act 1993* establishes that councils are responsible for the health, safety and welfare of their communities, representing community interests and ensuring peace, order and good governance.
- 3.2. Modern expectations of local government have evolved significantly, with communities increasingly looking to councils to play a more visible and proactive role in public safety, amenity and wellbeing.
- 3.3. While State and Federal Governments hold primary responsibility for crime and policing, local governments across Australia now play an important role in community safety through stewardship of public spaces, strategic partnerships, education, early intervention and localised problem-solving.
- 3.4. The City of Hobart has the opportunity to strengthen its leadership in this area by adopting a more relationship driven, community focused model of safety engagement.
- 3.5. Hobart continues to face persistent issues including anti-social behaviour, youth offending, public intoxication, rough sleeping-related vulnerability, property damage and safety concerns raised by retailers.
- 3.6. These issues directly influence perceptions of safety, levels of business confidence and community wellbeing. Community expectations have grown as Tasmania Police shift toward targeted, intelligence-led policing, leaving identifiable gaps in day-to-day public presence
- 3.7. Feedback from business groups, the Safer Hobart Alliance, community service providers and Tasmania Police consistently identifies the need for a visible, approachable and proactive Council presence to support early engagement, de-escalation and localised problem-solving.
- 3.8. The City has made considerable investment in community safety infrastructure, including a large CCTV network, external security patrols, late-night precinct initiatives, community education and ongoing stakeholder engagement.
- 3.9. While these initiatives contribute value, they do not provide the continuous, relationship-based engagement required to address underlying issues or support vulnerable community members.
- 3.10. As a result, contracted security services are often ad-hoc in nature and unable to support longer-term localised solutions. They also do not fulfil Council's broader aspirations for community wellbeing, business support or integrated safety outcomes.

- 3.11. An Internal Audit report on Community Safety was prepared by WLF Accounting and Advisory in November 2022, which identified several key gaps in the City's current model, including limited outcomes-focused partnerships, challenges accessing and utilising CCTV data, lack of a proactive community safety workforce and the need for improved collaboration frameworks with Tasmania Police.
- 3.12. These findings strongly support the development of a dedicated Council-led safety and engagement function.
- 3.13. Although the City has invested heavily in modern CCTV infrastructure, the system's effectiveness is limited by its reactive nature. CCTV footage can identify incidents but cannot intervene, reassure, educate or connect vulnerable individuals to services.
- 3.14. Any response arising from CCTV monitoring typically requires escalation to Tasmania Police and is subject to competing priorities.
- 3.15. This highlights the need for an internal Council team capable of responding to low-level issues, gathering insights and supporting coordinated intervention.
- 3.16. It is also noted that the strong partnership with Tasmania Police includes direct access to the CCTV network, improving law enforcement capability but still requiring complementary on-ground Council presence.
- 3.17. Discussions have also occurred with Tasmania Police regarding service capacity in the Hobart CBD. It is important to note that Police staffing levels are determined exclusively through Government allocation, not through fee-for-service arrangements.
- 3.18. Tasmania Police already provide regular patrols within the CBD as part of their core operational duties; however, these patrols cannot be expanded or redirected based on external payment.
- 3.19. Consideration to pay Tasmania Police to deliver services in place of the Safer Hobart Program is therefore not feasible. Such an arrangement is not supported within the policing model, would not guarantee additional coverage and would not provide the community-focused, engagement-based functions that Council requires.
- 3.20. This proposed program fills this specific gap by delivering proactive, relationship-based engagement that policing cannot replicate.

### **Current Council Resourcing & Security Investment**

- 3.21. The City's existing annual security expenditure of approximately \$750,000 encompasses essential operational requirements such as building security, lock-up duties, parking revenue collection and precinct-specific safety patrols. These services are not discretionary and cannot be re-purposed.

- 3.22. These contracts are necessary to maintain compliance, asset protection and operational continuity across multiple Council services.
- 3.23. A review of all security contracts is underway to ensure value for money and alignment with Council priorities. However, significant cost savings are unlikely and any reductions would relate only to limited patrol functions rather than community stewardship/engagement roles.
- 3.24. Parking officers, while present in the CBD, operate within strict compliance routes and are not resourced or trained to engage in community safety functions. Their duties are time-critical and focused on regulatory enforcement, not public safety engagement.
- 3.25. It would be unreasonable to expect parking officers to absorb the specialised functions of the proposed program. However, Parking Services have collaborated constructively by contributing one identified position to support the initiative.

### **Proposed Solution - Establish Safer Hobart Program**

- 3.26. Three existing Council positions have been identified for reallocation to form the foundation of the Safer Hobart program, enabling cost-neutral establishment while maintaining essential service obligations.
- 3.27. These officers will be deployed as a unified team reporting to the Project Manager Safe City, ensuring coordinated operations and clear accountability.
- 3.28. The program will deploy officers with a strong focus on customer service, business reassurance and community safety engagement. They will act as a visible Council presence throughout the CBD.
- 3.29. Initial deployment will focus on the Hobart CBD, with potential future expansion based on evidence and need.
- 3.30. Primary responsibilities will include business engagement, monitoring of local by-law compliance, supporting vulnerable individuals through referrals, collecting localised data, and working directly alongside Tasmania Police and community partners to enhance public safety.
- 3.31. The team will assume responsibility for proactive monitoring and management of CCTV insights, strengthening Council's capability to identify patterns, respond early and coordinate services.
- 3.32. Comprehensive training will be provided to ensure staff are skilled in de-escalation, trauma-informed practice, community engagement, by-law awareness and safe operating procedures.

### **Possible Program Name**

- 3.33. Throughout this report the staff have been referred to as officers or staff. However, in this type of work the title 'officer' can mean different

things, so careful consideration needs to be given to what the program and the roles are called.

3.34. Provided below are the names that have come up in research and discussion, which if this program is supported a decision will need to be made on the name of the program and the roles.

- Safer Hobart Stewards
- Safer Hobart Rangers
- Safer Hobart Engagement Team
- Safe City Liaison Team
- Safer Hobart Officers

3.35. All options could also be interchanged with Hobart Safe City as the focus.

3.36. City of Melbourne calls them Community Safety Officers

3.37. City of Perth calls them Rangers.

## **Objectives**

3.38. The program aims to improve both perceptions and experiences of safety in Hobart's public spaces by providing a consistent, proactive, people-focused presence.

3.39. Staff will operate under an Educate–Engage–Refer model, prioritising personal safety and non-confrontational engagement. This approach aligns with Council values and supports safe interactions with vulnerable or at-risk individuals.

3.40. Staff will support local by-law compliance through education and evidence-gathering, enhancing collaboration with investigative compliance teams.

3.41. Officers will serve as the primary Council resource for Smoke-Free Area education and compliance, supported by training and authorisation under relevant legislation.

3.42. Staff will engage with vulnerable community members to connect them with appropriate support services, improving individual outcomes and reducing escalation pathways.

3.43. Current public perceptions of safety are influenced by visible issues such as homelessness, youth-related incidents, public drinking, graffiti, property damage and other anti-social behaviours.

3.44. The Safer Hobart program will use proactive patrolling to engage early with individuals who may be vulnerable or at risk, with the aim of disrupting escalating behaviours, reducing harm and improving overall community wellbeing through positive presence and early intervention.

- 3.45. Staff will maintain strong awareness of the services and referral pathways available across the homelessness, youth, mental health, alcohol & drug and community support sectors.
- 3.46. They will be equipped with the skills and confidence to proactively connect people with these services, making real-time referrals wherever possible. This increases the likelihood of early support, reduces escalation and enhances coordination with partner agencies.
- 3.47. These community interactions will be accurately documented, with data captured on engagement type, referral needs, locations, patterns and priority issues. This information will support more coordinated service delivery, inform Council strategy and provide evidence for advocating to State and Federal agencies about unmet demand and systemic needs.
- 3.48. A core objective of the program is to support and reassure local businesses while contributing to broader improvements in community wellbeing.
- 3.49. At present, the Council has limited scheduled direct engagement with CBD businesses, it is primarily facilitated around specific projects. This creates gaps in communication around emerging safety concerns, business confidence and the day-to-day experience of workers and customers in the city centre.
- 3.50. The program will establish a reliable, proactive link between Council and the business community. Regular engagement will allow businesses to raise concerns, share observations and receive timely support from Council staff. This increased visibility also strengthens trust and partnership with retailers, hospitality venues, service providers and commercial operators.
- 3.51. During routine patrols, officers will also support the monitoring of business-related compliance areas such as outdoor dining layouts, footpath signage and roadside vending. Their role is educative and supportive, helping businesses navigate requirements and identify minor issues before they escalate.
- 3.52. At this stage staff will not be expected to enforce compliance, however engagements would be recorded and would support or provide additional evidence for City of Hobart Compliance Officers and the City Inspector.
- 3.53. Given the broad scope of the program, the roles and responsibilities of the Safer Hobart program will be clearly communicated to the public.
- 3.54. Consistent messaging, branding and community awareness materials will ensure residents, businesses and visitors understand the purpose of the service, how it operates and how to engage with it effectively.

## Roles and Responsibilities Breakdown

3.55. The roles are intended to operate initially on a Monday to Friday, business-hours model, with a primary focus on the Hobart CBD to support businesses, workers and daytime community activity.

3.56. In practice, a typical day may involve the following:

- Following established patrol routes within the Hobart CBD, informed by known community safety “hot spots” and locations where people report feeling least safe.
- Engaging proactively with business owners and staff to provide reassurance, support and a visible Council presence, while acting as a consistent point of contact for safety-related concerns.
- Gathering real-time information on emerging community safety issues, local needs and environmental or amenity concerns encountered during patrols.
- Engaging respectfully with community members who may appear vulnerable or at risk, using soft-skills-based, trauma-informed approaches to understand individual circumstances.
- Identifying further support needs through engagement and facilitate referrals to external service providers operating in Hobart using established referral pathways.
- Undertaking Smoke-Free Area education and engagement, providing information to community members and businesses about smoke-free requirements and monitoring compliance.
- Supporting business by-law compliance through education and engagement, with a focus on early guidance and relationship building.
- Through regular patrols, identifying individuals who may have remained in particular areas of the CBD for extended periods and initiate appropriate engagement where this aligns with community perceptions of safety.
- Making referrals in the field where appropriate and escalate matters to Tasmania Police in accordance with established protocols when required.
- Ensuring all engagements, referrals, observations and incidents are accurately recorded, with follow-up actions completed in a timely and accountable manner in line with reporting requirements.

3.57. Different agencies and levels of government deliver different functions and services relating to the Safer Hobart purpose. The table below

provides a breakdown of the proposed responsibilities under the program.

| <b>Emergencies 000</b>               | <b>Tasmania Police 131444</b>               | <b>Safer Hobart Program</b>                               |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Fire                                 | Anti-social behaviour                       | Abandoned vehicles  |
| Life or property is threatened       | Assault                                     | Animal control  |
| Serious accident or crime            | Burglary / vehicle break-in                 | Begging   |
| Serious or life-threatening injuries | Criminal damage                             | Busking   |
|                                      | Drug use / drug paraphernalia               | Footpath obstructions                                     |
|                                      | Found property / suspicious items           | Littering   |
|                                      | Indecent / obscene behaviour                | Permit checks   |
|                                      | Stealing / shoplifting (including attempts) | Smoking in Smoke Free areas                               |
|                                      | Consuming alcohol in the street/park        | Street trading  |
|                                      | Suspicious behaviour                        | Unauthorised signage in public                            |
|                                      | Threats                                     | Referral activity:<br>- Rough sleeping<br>- Youth welfare |
|                                      | Traffic incidents                           | Business and community engagement in CBD                  |
|                                      | Trespassing                                 | De-escalation of anti-social behaviour                    |
|                                      | Weapon possession                           | Compliance related engagement/education                   |
|                                      | Welfare concerns                            |   |

#### **4. Legal, Risk and Legislative Considerations**

##### **Risks**

- 4.1. Under Section 20 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, councils are required to provide for the health, safety and welfare of their communities.
- 4.2. Establishing the **Safer Hobart** program directly supports this obligation by strengthening the City's capacity to positively influence safety, amenity and wellbeing within public spaces.
- 4.3. As community expectations evolve, the need for an active, visible and skilled Council presence has become increasingly important to fulfilling this mandate.

- 4.4. The introduction of dedicated officers represents an essential investment in Council's ability to meet its responsibilities.
- 4.5. No existing Council role currently provides ongoing, proactive engagement with community members, vulnerable individuals and businesses in public spaces, for the purpose proposed for this program.
- 4.6. The WLF Community Safety Audit confirmed a significant gap in the City's capability to deliver active, on-ground community safety functions, demonstrating the need for a formalised, trained and well-supported internal team.

### **Officer safety**

- 4.7. The nature of the role will require interactions with vulnerable individuals and situations that may present varying levels of personal risk.
- 4.8. A strong emphasis will be placed on officer safety through comprehensive training in situational awareness, de-escalation, trauma-informed practice and safe working protocols.
- 4.9. Clear operational guidelines, real-time supervision and established escalation pathways to Tasmania Police will ensure that officer safety remains paramount.
- 4.10. Body-worn video will support accountability, evidence gathering and incident management.

### **Community perception**

- 4.11. Public expectations around community safety responses can be divided. Some stakeholders expect assertive enforcement, while others are concerned about over-policing or the criminalisation of vulnerability.
- 4.12. Transparent communication about the Programs purpose, centred on an Educate–Engage–Refer model, will help manage community expectations and reinforce that this is a supportive, non-confrontational service.
- 4.13. Clear uniform branding and consistent messaging will assist in building trust and understanding.

### **Legislative compliance**

- 4.14. Officers will be required to meet legislative obligations under the *Local Government Act*, relevant by-laws, public health legislation and privacy requirements.
- 4.15. As authorised officers for specific compliance functions (e.g., Smoke-Free Areas), staff will receive targeted training to ensure safe, consistent and lawful decision-making.

- 4.16. Additional obligations relating to CCTV monitoring and privacy management will be addressed through structured training, procedural oversight and adherence to Council's privacy governance framework.

## Risk Mitigation

- 4.17. **Comprehensive training**

All officers will undergo extensive induction and ongoing professional development. This includes de-escalation training, Safe City Hub operational procedures, mental-health first-aid education, trauma-informed practice, cultural competency and legislation relevant to authorised officer roles.

- 4.18. The Educate–Engage–Refer model clearly outlines the boundaries of the role and ensures staff do not engage in enforcement activities beyond their remit.

- 4.19. **Risk assessments and inter-agency coordination**

Continuous risk assessments will guide roster planning, shift deployment and engagement activities.

- 4.20. Regular briefings and information sharing with Tasmania Police and relevant community services will ensure situational awareness and support early, coordinated interventions.

- 4.21. Clear operational protocols including criteria for escalation and withdrawal will guide and protect staff in higher-risk situations.

- 4.22. **Privacy / authorised officer compliance**

Given the officers involvement in CCTV monitoring and data handling, staff will receive specific training in privacy obligations, authorised officer responsibilities, data security and ethical use of information.

- 4.23. This includes compliance with the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004* and internal policies. Strong governance controls will ensure appropriate use, retention and disclosure of information.

- 4.24. Further risk mitigation measures include:

- ongoing supervision and peer support
- body-worn video with strict privacy safeguards
- formalised reporting and documentation standards
- participation in cross-agency meetings to support aligned responses
- regular reviews of operational policy, procedures and safety practices

- 4.25. These measures collectively ensure that the Safer Hobart program is compliant, safe, well-governed and support a modern, community-focused approach to public safety.

## 5. Strategic Planning and Policy Considerations

5.1. This initiative has strong strategic alignment with Hobart: A community Vision for our island capital in particular:

- 3.4 *Our city feels friendly and safe - but we know not everyone experiences our city this way, and we could do better.*
- 1.3.6 *People want to spend time in our city because it is comfortable, safe and wonderful. Our visitors feel a sense of friendliness and magic that they miss when they leave.*
- 2.6.3 *We are a safe city, where everyone feels safe and is safe, including in public spaces. We look after each other.*
- 4.5.6 *We listen to the needs of our business communities.*
- 5.6.3 *We develop appropriate long-term and sustainable solutions by investing in skills, systems and processes in conjunction with the community and a variety of partners.*

5.2. It also strongly aligns with the Capital City Strategic Plan 2023:

- 2.2.4 *Build and leverage our evidence base, experience and community knowledge to understand those who are most disadvantaged, excluded and vulnerable and develop appropriate initiatives.*
- 2.4.1 *Protect and improve public and environmental health, wellbeing and safety.*
- 2.4.2 *Ensure that Hobart is a safe and liveable city by enhancing community wellbeing and public safety and security.*
- 4.2.2 *Actively support and engage with local businesses, business groups and networks, industry associations, key institutions and other stakeholders in the Hobart economy.*
- 7.1.6 *Support members of the community who are experiencing homelessness.*
- 7.3.3 *Ensure City-owned assets and public spaces are accessible, of high quality and provide a high level of amenity to meet community and visitor requirements.*
- 7.3.5 *Measure, manage and support the effective use of city facilities, infrastructure and public spaces.*

5.3. This proposal is also strongly aligned with the *City Economy Strategy 2023-2028* and the *City for All: Community Inclusion and Equity Framework*. There is a specific action in the *City for All Implementation Plan (Draft)* in the Community Safety and Crime Prevention priority area

to: *Continue to advocate for the establishment and recognition of Community Safety and Enforcement positions within the Council to ensure the effective management and stewardship of public spaces.*

## 6. Financial Viability

### 6.1. Financial Considerations:

|                          | 2025-26<br>\$'000 | 2026-27<br>\$'000 | 2027-28<br>\$'000 | 2028-29<br>\$'000                |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Revenue</b>           |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| Existing Revenue         |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| Additional Revenue       |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| <b>Total Revenue</b>     |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| <b>Expenditure</b>       |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| Operating                | 300.2             | 300.2             | 300.2             | 300.2 (plus growth requirements) |
| Capital                  |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| <b>Total Expenditure</b> |                   |                   |                   |                                  |
| <b>Net Cost</b>          | 300.2             | 300.2             | 300.2             | 300.2 (plus growth requirements) |

6.2. The figures outlined in the table above reflect the cost to Council, but this is not new expense, as mentioned earlier in the report the three (3) roles are being created through repurposing existing roles. This budget reflects the cost of those three (3) roles. No new funding will be required for this program at this point, and any new funds will be subject to Council decisions.

### FTE Impact

|               | 2025-26 | 2026-27 | 2027-28 | 2028-29 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Change in FTE |         |         |         |         |

*Detail the change in the level of full-time equivalents within the group should the requested level of additional funding be required.*

- 6.2.1. This initiative will utilise current identified vacant positions, ensuring that staffing requirements are met without the need for additional FTE funding.
- 6.2.2. Operational costs will be absorbed within existing allocations, with minimal new expenditure anticipated beyond uniforms, training and operational equipment.

### 6.3. City Economy Strategy:

- 6.3.1. This proposal aligns to the following strategic priorities listed in the City of Hobart City Economy Strategy 2023 – 2028:
  - 6.3.2. Partner with key stakeholders to deliver initiatives that support the needs of our wider community and strengthen our local economy as a small island state capital city.
  - 6.3.3. 1.5 Partner and deliver programs that are inclusive, foster well-being and enhance quality aspects of city life, including short-term tactical interventions to improve public amenity

Hobart is viewed as a desirable commercial, cultural, residential and visitor destination.

- 6.3.4. 3.6 Partner with State Government and business to develop initiatives to improve safety and security.

#### 6.4. Economic Impact:

- 6.4.1. Improving perceptions of safety in the CBD has a direct economic benefit. A proactive and approachable Council presence increases business confidence, encourages foot traffic, reduces disruptions associated with anti-social behaviour and enhances Hobart's attractiveness to visitors, investors and residents.

#### 6.5. Consultants

- 6.5.1. The WLF Community Safety Final Report identified key opportunities to strengthen Council's approach to community safety, including the need for more active, on-ground engagement and improved coordination across partnerships and data sources.
- 6.5.2. The Safer Hobart program directly addresses these recommendations, ensuring Council's investments in safety infrastructure and partnerships are more effective to achieve meaningful outcomes.

### 7. Climate and Sustainability Considerations

- 7.1. Through regular direct community patrolling staff would have a role in monitoring city assets and public infrastructure, reporting any identified issues to the relevant areas of the organisation.
  - 7.1.1. They may also become aware of businesses using single-use plastic takeaway packaging etc. which would be reported to waste team.

## 8. Community and Business Engagement and Collaboration

- 8.1. The *Safer Hobart* program has been developed through extensive consultation with key stakeholders, including the Safer Hobart Alliance, Tasmania Police, local businesses, community service providers and internal Council teams.
- 8.2. These discussions have helped shape the program, ensuring it reflects local needs, complements existing services and supports a coordinated, citywide approach to community safety.
- 8.3. Tasmania Police have expressed strong support for the initiative, recognising the value of a trained, on-ground Council presence that can identify emerging issues early, provide timely information and assist with non-policing matters that affect operational resources.
- 8.4. The Safer Hobart Alliance has unanimously endorsed the program. Alliance members identified the need for improved community engagement, early intervention capability and more visible Council resources in public places. The program directly responds to these priorities.

## 9. Innovation and Continuous Improvement

- 9.1. The *Safer Hobart* program builds on prior recommendations outlined in the WLF Business Improvement Audit (2023), which highlighted opportunities for the City to strengthen community safety outcomes through more proactive, on-ground engagement for improved results with stakeholders.
- 9.2. The initial investment of three dedicated staff to this role is seen as a setup phase with considerable focus to establish current community needs and demands.
- 9.3. Ideally this would be seen as a two (2) to three (3) year investment to measure success.

**Year 1** – will focus on establishment, workforce capability and the development of baseline measures. Consideration of extended probation (6 months) to ensure we have the right staff for the role. This includes setting initial benchmarks for community and business perceptions of safety, initiating consistent on-ground engagement, and establishing robust reporting and data-collection frameworks.

**Year 2** – Focus on reviewing Year 1 outcomes and measuring changes against established baselines, including perceptions of safety, engagement volumes and referral outcomes.

Evidence-based data collected by staff will be used to identify emerging issues, service gaps and areas requiring enhanced response. This review phase will inform refinements to deployment models,

training and operational focus, ensuring the program remains responsive to community and business needs.

**Year 3** – By Year 3, the program will undergo a more comprehensive evaluation to assess effectiveness, value and long-term sustainability. This will include consideration of ongoing commitment, potential program adjustments and whether staffing levels or service scope should be increased, reduced or re-configured.

- 9.4. Findings will support informed decision-making about the future of the Safer Hobart program, with emphasis on continuous improvement, evidence-led service design and alignment with Council's strategic objectives.
- 9.5. The officers will be expected to provide ongoing reporting of activities and engagements. This is an important component of the program to provide measurable success and identify ongoing community needs with evidence.
- 9.6. Reporting will also enable the City of Hobart to reassure positive public perceptions of community safety investment and ongoing commitment for a Safe City.

#### **Measurables / Reporting – Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

- 9.7. **Perceptions of Safety Surveys:** Monitoring community and business confidence through current survey reportings.  
Priority to set a baseline for community feelings of safety with the ability to measure successes of the program over time.
- 9.8. **Referral Pathways Data:** Monitoring reporting of referrals – i.e. rough sleeping, youth welfare concerns and school attendance.
- 9.9. **Service Demand Trends:** including the volume and nature of engagements, interactions, and de-escalation incidents.
- 9.10. **Stakeholder Feedback:** from Tasmania Police, businesses, service providers and the broader community.
- 9.11. **Business Engagement:** the number and frequency of contacts, issues raised and business satisfaction indicators.
- 9.12. **Compliance-Related Engagements:** observations relating to outdoor dining, footpath trading, Smoke-Free Areas, dogs, mobile vendors and other local by-law topics.
- 9.13. **Smoke-Free Area Activity:** number of educational interactions, warnings issued and referrals to regulatory teams.

*As signatory to this report, I certify that, pursuant to Section 55(1) of the Local Government Act 1993, I hold no interest, as referred to in Section 49 of the Local Government Act 1993, in matters contained in this report.*



Tai Gavin  
**PROJECT MANAGER SAFE CITY**



Nick McGuire  
**MANAGER ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT**



Ben Artup  
**DIRECTOR COMMUNITY AND  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Date: 4 February 2026  
File Reference: F26/1631

**7.2 Mount Nelson Local Area Mobility Plan**  
**File Ref: F26/2326**

---

Report of the Transport and Traffic Engineer, Manager City Transport and Director Strategic and Regulatory Services of 4 February 2026 and attachments.

**REPORT TITLE:** MOUNT NELSON LOCAL AREA MOBILITY PLAN

**REPORT PROVIDED BY:** Transport and Traffic Engineer  
Manager City Transport  
Director Strategic and Regulatory Services

## 1. Report Summary and Key Issue

- 1.1. This report outlines the development process for the LAMP, including the engagement approach, findings, and a summary of projects.
- 1.2. The LAMP project aims to enhance community active travel by identifying key walking and cycling routes to destinations like schools, shops, parks, and bus stops.
- 1.3. The report seeks to boost walking and cycling participation through direct interventions that promote well-being and facilitate these transport modes.
- 1.4. Creating a safe and comfortable environment is crucial to making walking and cycling viable options.
- 1.5. The report proposes projects, policies, and initiatives, including a speed limit reduction in Mount Nelson.
- 1.6. The main objectives are:
  - To enhance pedestrian and rider safety by minimising traffic risks and improving connectivity to essential facilities.
  - To promote active transportation and fostering social interaction through a pedestrian-friendly environment.
  - To contribute to a sustainable transportation system by reducing carbon emissions from private vehicles.

## 2. Workshop Purpose

- 2.1 *This report presents the Mount Nelson Local Area Mobility Plan and seeks Council feedback to guide the project's continuation and future endorsement.*

### 3. Discussion and Background

- 3.1. One of the key strategic priorities for the City Transport group is to develop Local Area Mobility Plan (LAMP) for the local neighbourhood areas in the City.
- 3.2. This Local Area Mobility Plan aligns with the previously endorsed Local Area Mobility Plans Battery Point and Northern Suburbs (2023) and West Hobart (2025).
- 3.3. This report presents the final draft, incorporating feedback from the community engagement process held in January.
- 3.4. It is important to highlight that Local Area Transport Plans vary in methodology and outcome, as each part of Hobart can face unique challenges and specific requirements.
- 3.5. This plan was developed through extensive stakeholder collaboration and data analysis, to identify local travel patterns, key routes, and existing barriers to walking and cycling.
- 3.6. The engagement process has happened in two stages:
  - 3.6.1. In *Stage 1* (August–September 2025), the community provided feedback via an interactive map, focusing on ways to improve local safety, connectivity, and liveability. A workshop was held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of September with a presence of 15 people.
  - 3.6.2. In *Stage 2* (December 2025 – January 2026), the community provided feedback on the draft plan and responded a survey on Your Say website. A workshop was held on the 13<sup>th</sup> of January with a presence of 15 people.
- 3.7. The consultancy firm WSP was engaged to prepare the LAMP in collaboration with the City of Hobart.
- 3.8. The Mount Nelson Local Area Mobility Plan identified three key opportunities to enhance the area as a more pedestrian and ride friendly neighbourhood:
  - 3.8.1. A connected walking network
  - 3.8.2. Safer vehicle speeds
  - 3.8.3. Improved transport choices
- 3.9. The plan's actions were designed to address known barriers and leverage key opportunities.
- 3.10. The targeted actions to improve streetscapes throughout the area, were classified into the following categories:

- 3.10.1. Safer intersections and crossings
- 3.10.2. New or upgraded footpaths
- 3.10.3. Traffic calming
- 3.10.4. Track and trail links
- 3.11. Survey results indicate 61% general support for the LAMP, with a significant majority pointing out Mount Nelson Road (near the Signal Station) and the Mount Nelson Bends as their highest priorities.
- 3.12. Survey results indicate 79% of respondents selected new or upgraded footpaths as the top priority.
- 3.13. New or upgraded footpaths are proposed for four locations to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort while reducing vehicle speeds.
- 3.14. A key finding of this study was the strong community support for a dedicated space for walking and riding along Nelson Road from the Oval to the Signal Station.
- 3.15. During the first engagement stage, 49% of entries identified locations where crossing or moving along the street felt unsafe. Vehicle speeds and roadkill were recurrent themes during the first stage.
- 3.16. Interventions to discourage speeding are aligned with Action A.13 of the Hobart Transport Strategy, which aims to 'Trial an area-wide speed limit reduction to inform a Speed Limit Reduction Policy' and A.20 'Continue to enhance vulnerable road user safety through improved infrastructure'.
- 3.17. Following the West Hobart 40km/h trial, this plan proposes reducing speed limits across Mount Nelson, excluding Olinda Grove, to meet community demand for safer traffic speeds.
- 3.18. The installation of new crossings and new pedestrian islands combined with the lower speed trial, aims to improve pedestrian safety and accessibility while moderating traffic speeds. The aim is to create an environment where drivers will naturally adjust their behaviour, rather than responding to signage and speed enforcement.
- 3.19. The expansion of the track and trail network will provide safe, off-road routes that encourage walking and riding, particularly for young people seeking independent travel options.
- 3.20. By improving connections to existing bushland tracks, this plan will transform recreational paths into viable transport routes, diverting short journeys from main roads.

#### **4. Legal, Risk and Legislative Considerations**

- 4.1. The primary risks associated with the West Hobart LAMP is related to implementation. The Council may face reputational damage if the projects outlined in the plan do not progress.
- 4.2. City Transport will apply for suitable grant programs to implement the priority projects and will commence project planning upon endorsement.
- 4.3. Additional risk assessments are required before tactical infrastructure installation.
- 4.4. Certain project elements, like the 40km/h wide-area speed limit alteration, necessitate Transport Commission direction.

#### **5. Strategic Planning and Policy Considerations**

- 5.1. The Council, in its capacity as a road manager, considers the strategic planning and delivery of enhanced pedestrian, bicycle, and public transport infrastructure to be a fundamental responsibility and a core component of its operational mandate.
- 5.2. This plan aligns with the objectives of existing Tasmanian Government plans and strategies, in particular:
  - 5.2.1. Tasmanian Walking and Cycling for Active Transport Strategy (2010).
  - 5.2.2. Towards Zero - Tasmanian Road Safety Strategy 2017-2026 (2017).
  - 5.2.3. 30-Year Greater Hobart Plan (2022).
  - 5.2.4. Speed Management Strategy – Consultation Paper (2024).
  - 5.2.5. Hobart Transport Strategy 2024.

#### **6. Financial Viability**

- 6.1. Financial Considerations:
  - 6.1.1. The LAMP does not have an initial implementation budget for this financial year, 2025-2026. However, planning and design budget will be sought in future years to develop and deliver the primary identified projects.

6.2. City Economy Strategy:

- 6.2.1. This proposal aligns to the following strategic priorities listed in the City of Hobart City Economy Strategy 2023 – 2028:
  - 6.2.1.1. Plan for our collective social, economic and environmental prosperity
  - 6.2.1.2. Position Hobart as an enviable place to visit, live and do business
  - 6.2.1.3. Promote and leverage Hobart's uniqueness and celebrate the Hobart Difference

6.3. Consultants

- 6.3.1. The project has engaged WSP Australia through a competitive tender to undertake the strategic planning in conjunction with City Transport.
- 6.3.2. It is anticipated that additional expertise from other engineering and quantity surveying consultancies will be required in later stages to deliver the proposed projects and interventions.

**7. Climate and Sustainability Considerations**

- 7.1. This plan is fundamentally designed to promote active transportation—specifically walking and cycling—to reduce community reliance on private motor vehicles, thereby directly mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and contributing to a positive environmental impact.

**8. Community and Business Engagement and Collaboration**

- 8.1. The Mount Nelson LAMP is the outcome of collaboration between the City Transport Group and other Council departments who contributed ideas and feedback throughout the development of the project.
- 8.2. The Mount Nelson Community Association was an integral part of the engagement with residents, businesses and stakeholders.
- 8.3. This plan has been developed through two stages of community and stakeholder engagement. Further details are contained in the Background and Discussion.

*As signatory to this report, I certify that, pursuant to Section 55(1) of the Local Government Act 1993, I hold no interest, as referred to in Section 49 of the Local Government Act 1993, in matters contained in this report.*



Thiago Borges  
**TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC  
ENGINEER**



Daniel Verdouw  
**MANAGER CITY TRANSPORT**



Karen Abey  
**DIRECTOR STRATEGIC AND  
REGULATORY SERVICES**

Date: 4 February 2026  
File Reference: F26/2326

Attachment A: Mount Nelson Local Area Mobility Plan V7-R (Supporting information) 

## 8. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

---

Regulations 33 and 34 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*.  
File Ref: 13-1-10

33. (2) *A question asked at a meeting is to, as far as is practicable -*

- (a) *be concise; and*
- (b) *be clear; and*
- (c) *not be a statement; and*
- (d) *have minimal pre-amble*

34. *Questions without notice by a Councillor*

- (1) *A councillor at a meeting may ask a question without notice -*
- (a) *of the chairperson; or*
- (b) *through the chairperson, of -*
  - (i) *another councillor; or*
  - (ii) *the Chief Executive Officer.*
- (2) *In asking a question without notice at a meeting, a councillor must not -*
- (a) *offer an argument or opinion; or*
- (b) *draw any inferences or make any imputations -*  
*except so far as may be necessary to explain the question.*
- (3) *The chairperson of a meeting must not permit any debate of a question without notice or its answer.*
- (4) *The chairperson, councillor or Chief Executive Officer who is asked a question without notice at a meeting may decline to answer the question.*
- (5) *The chairperson of a meeting may require a councillor to put a question without notice in writing.*

## **9. CLOSED PORTION OF THE MEETING**

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve by majority that the meeting be closed to the public pursuant to regulation 17(1) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025* because the items included on the closed agenda contain the following matters:

- Minutes of a Closed Committee Meeting
- Confidential Information
- Closed Questions Without Notice

The following items are listed for discussion:-

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Item No. 1   | Minutes of the last meeting of the Closed Portion of the Committee Meeting |
| Item No. 2   | Consideration of supplementary items to the agenda                         |
| Item No. 3   | Indications of conflicts of interest                                       |
| Item No. 4   | Items For Workshopping   |
| Item No. 4.1 | Dark Mofo 2026-2028 City Partnership Proposal<br>LG(MP)R 17(2)(h)(ii)      |
| Item No. 5   | Questions Without Notice   |