



**MINUTES**  
Open Portion  
Monday, 27 April 2026  
At 4.00pm  
Council Chamber, Town Hall



---

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

---

### PRESENT, APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

1.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY .....	4
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	4
3.	TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS.....	5
4.	COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRPERSON .....	5
5.	NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL WORKSHOPS.....	6
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	7
7.	DEPUTATION .....	8
8.	CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS .....	9
9.	INDICATIONS CONFLICTS OF INTEREST .....	9
10.	PETITIONS.....	10

### OFFICER REPORTS

11.	Shared Micromobility Program - Next Steps.....	11
12.	Taste of Summer City Partnership Proposal 2026-27 - 2028-29.....	11
13.	City Hall Activation .....	13
14.	Dorney House: Update of Status and Future Options .....	15
15.	Governance of Motions - Notices of Motions Audit .....	17
16.	2026-27 Fees and Charges.....	18
17.	City of Hobart Complaints Management Policy.....	20
18.	Cat Management in Tasmania - Discussion Paper.....	21
19.	TasWater Gas Road Lease Amendment.....	22
20.	Private Underground Electrical Connections in Road Reserves .....	24
21.	Consultation: Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026 .....	25
22.	Consultation: LUPAA - Preventing delays in development assessment timeframes .....	26

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**23. Code of Conduct Determination Report - Councillor Anna Reynolds V Councillor Louise Elliot ..... 27**

**MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

**24. Pedestrian Infrastructure Audit and Maintenance Program..... 28**

**25. Cost Increase Process ..... 32**

**26. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE ..... 37**

    26.1 South Hobart Football Club Lease..... 37

    26.2 Selling Merchandise..... 37

    26.3 Unsolicited Bids Policy..... 37

    26.4 Timeframe for processing a licence ..... 38

    26.5 Tracking Food Licences Time..... 38

**27. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE..... 39**

    27.1 Question on Notice - Scramble Crossings Financials..... 39

    27.2 Question on Notice - Collins Street (Tactical Trial/'Transforming') Financials ..... 39

    27.3 Question on Notice - Crowther Financials ..... 39

**28. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE ..... 40**

**29. CLOSED PORTION OF THE MEETING..... 45**

**PRESENT:**

Acting Lord Mayor Councillor Dr Z E Sherlock, Alderman M Zucco, Councillor W F Harvey, Councillor M S C Dutta, Councillor J L Kelly, Councillor L M Elliot, Alderman L A Bloomfield, Councillor R J Posselt, Councillor B Lohberger, Councillor W N S Coats and Councillor G H Kitsos.

**APOLOGIES:**

Lord Mayor Councillor A M Reynolds.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Nil.

Councillor Posselt arrived at the meeting at 4.03pm, and was not present for items 1 to 5.

Councillor Posselt left the meeting at 4.48pm, returning at 4.49pm.

Councillor Posselt left the meeting at 5.04pm, returning at 5.06pm.

Councillor Kelly declared an interest in item 13 (clause 5) and left the meeting at 5.26pm, returning at 5.27pm.

Councillor Dutta left the meeting at 6.39pm, returning at 6.42pm.

Councillor Elliot left the meeting at 7.32pm, returning at 7.34pm.

**1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

---

The Chairperson opened the meeting and provided an acknowledgement of country.

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

HARVEY  
LOHBERGER

The Chairperson reports that she has perused the minutes of the meeting of the Open Portion of the Council meeting held on [Monday, 30 March 2026](#), finds them to be a true record and recommends that they be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

The minutes were signed.

**3. TRANSFER OF AGENDA ITEMS**

---

Are there any items, which the meeting believes, should be transferred from this agenda to the closed agenda or from the closed agenda to the open agenda, in accordance with the procedures allowed under Section 17 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*?

No items were transferred.

**4. COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRPERSON**

---

No communication was received.

## **5. NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL WORKSHOPS**

---

In accordance with the requirements of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025, the Chief Executive Officer reports that the following workshops have been conducted since the last ordinary meeting of the Council.

Date: 13 April 2026

Purpose: Crowther Reinterpreted (Stage Four) Update | City Hall Activation | City of Hobart Charitable Trust | Cat Management in Tasmania – Discussion Paper

Attendance:

Lord Mayor Councillor A M Reynolds, Deputy Lord Mayor Councillor Dr Z E Sherlock, Alderman M Zucco, Councillor's W F Harvey, M S C Dutta, J L Kelly, L M Elliot, Alderman L A Bloomfield, Councillor's R J Posselt, B Lohberger, and G H Kitsos

Apologies:

Nil.

Leave of Absence:

Nil.

Date: 20 April 2026

Purpose: Waste Management Strategy Implementation Plan – Progress Update (April 2026) | Consultation: LUPAA – Preventing delays in development assessment timeframes | Consultation: Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026 | Memorandum of Understanding – Macquarie Point Precinct Order

Attendance:

Acting Lord Mayor Councillor Dr Z E Sherlock, Alderman M Zucco, Councillor's W F Harvey, M S C Dutta, J L Kelly, L M Elliot, Alderman L A Bloomfield, Councillor's R J Posselt, and B Lohberger

Apologies:

Councillor G H Kitsos

Leave of Absence:

Lord Mayor Councillor A M Reynolds

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

---

### **6.1 Public Questions**

#### **6.1.1 Assessment of Wildlife - Lower Wellesley Park**

---

Tracey Withers put the following question and was provided with a response by the Chief Executive Officer.

**QUESTION:**

The question relates to Council's plan to build a fenced off leash dog area in Lower Wellesley Park.

In their consideration and planning of this project, did council do a formal assessment of the type and number of wildlife that resides in and utilises Lower Wellesley Park?

If yes, is it possible to see a copy of the findings and if no, why not?"

**RESPONSE:**

The City has not undertaken a recent formal survey specifically to quantify the type and number of wildlife in Lower Wellesley Park. Instead, Council's understanding of wildlife presence and habitat use is informed by existing data sources, primarily the Tasmanian Natural Values Atlas (NVA).

This database contains a comprehensive range of species records collected over time by the City, state agencies, researchers and community contributors, and provides a reliable picture of wildlife known to occur in the area.

Records from any previous surveys undertaken in or near the park are captured within the NVA, and this information is publicly accessible. A new, site specific wildlife survey was not undertaken as part of this project because existing data provides a sufficient and appropriate basis to inform planning and decision making for this well-used urban reserve.

#### **6.1.2 YouthARC, Air BNB and E-bikes**

---

Chris Merridew put forward the following:

- Value of YouthArc (City Hall Activation item 13 on the agenda);
- Air BNB issues currently in the press (Fees and Charges, item 16 on the agenda); and
- E-bikes having no public liability insurance (Shared Micromobility Program - item 11 on the agenda).

As those items are on the agenda, the Acting Lord Mayor accepted Mr Merridew's questions as statements.

## **6.2 Responses to Public Questions Taken On Notice**

LOHBERGER  
BLOOMFIELD

That the responses to Public Questions taken on notice, marked as item 6.2.1 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be received and noted .

MOTION CARRIED

### **VOTING RECORD**

#### AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

#### NOES

### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the following response to public questions taken on notice, marked as item 6.2.1 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 be received and noted:

6.2.1 Proposed Dog Fence at Lower Wellesley Park

## **7. DEPUTATION** **File Ref: F26/23527**

---

POSSELT  
LOHBERGER

That the deputation provided by Amanda Sinclair and Lucy Musik on the proposed dog facilities at Lower Wellesley Park, be received and noted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the deputation provided by Amanda Sinclair and Lucy Musik, on the proposed dog facilities at Lower Wellesley Park, be received and noted.

**8. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS**

---

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council resolve to deal with any supplementary items not appearing on the agenda, as reported by the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with the provisions of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*.

No supplementary items were received.

**9. INDICATIONS CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

---

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

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

The following interest was indicated:

1. Councillor Elliot - item 23

## 10. PETITIONS

---

### 10.1 Tabling of a Petition - Keep Green Spaces in South Hobart Shared for all Community Members

---

POSSELT  
BLOOMFIELD

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 10.1 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

#### VOTING RECORD

##### AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

##### NOES

#### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The petition titled 'Keep Green Spaces in South Hobart Shared for all Community Members', and marked as Attachment A to item 10.1 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be received and noted.
2. No further action be taken on this petition.
3. The lead petitioners be advised of the information contained within the report marked as item 10.1 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026.

**OFFICER REPORTS**

**11. Shared Micromobility Program - Next Steps**  
**File Ref: F26/22090**

---

KITSOS  
POSSELT

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 11 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	Zucco
Harvey	Kelly
Dutta	Elliot
Bloomfield	
Posselt	
Lohberger	
Coats	
Kitsos	

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. Council endorse officers commencing an open market public tender for a new Shared Micromobility Program provider under permit.
2. This Shared Mobility Program be exclusively for e-bikes commencing on 1 October 2026.

**12. Taste of Summer City Partnership Proposal 2026-27 - 2028-29**  
**File Ref: F26/22022; 16/119**

---

BLOOMFIELD  
HARVEY

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 12 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The Council endorse a three-year City Partnership with Taste of Summer for the Taste of Summer Festivals 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 with the funding commitment of:
  - (i) \$75,000 cash (excluding GST) per annum, indexed to the Hobart CPI (March), comprising sponsorship and support for the City of Hobart - Hobart Respects All Community Day and any other ancillary benefits as negotiated for inclusion in the City Partnership Agreement.
  - (ii) In-kind support through full and partial fee waivers for equipment hire, venue hire, civic banners, road closures and associated parking spaces, and provision of plants and associated watering, to an upper limit of \$414,000 (2026-27), \$428,490 (2027-28) and \$443,487 (2028-29) for the respective Festivals (excluding GST).
2. The Council delegate the authority to the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and enter into a City Partnership agreement on the Council's behalf, and finalise any licence requirements, including the details of the sponsorship benefits and incidental additional requests for in-kind support sought by Taste of Summer Pty Ltd for Tasmania's Taste of Summer Festival 2026-27, 2027-28 and 2028-29.
3. The total value of the sponsorship be recorded in the 'Grants, Assistance and Benefits Provided' section of the City of Hobart's 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 Annual Reports.

Councillor Kelly declared an interest in Item 13 and determined that it was not so material as to require him to leave the room for the debate. Councillor Kelly left the room for the vote in respect of Clause 5 of the officer recommendation.

**13. City Hall Activation**  
**File Ref: F26/23396**

---

HARVEY  
BLOOMFIELD

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 13 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

The Chairperson, in agreement with Elected Member present, proceeded to put the recommendation in the following parts:

**Part 1**

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.

PART 1 - MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	Zucco
Harvey	Elliot
Dutta	
Kelly	
Bloomfield	
Posselt	
Lohberger	
Coats	
Kitsos	

Councillor Elliot abstained from voting on the motion.

*In accordance with section 32(3) of the Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025, to abstain from voting at a meeting is to vote in the negative and has been recorded accordingly.*

**Part 2**

Clause 5.

PART 2 - MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The Council identify the region centred around City Hall, Theatre Royal/Hedberg, Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG), Federation Concert Hall, and potentially, Council Centre, Town Hall, Civic Square/Mawsons Place as a future cultural precinct.
2. The Council agree to work with the State Government as well as the Directors and Board of the Theatre Royal, The University of Tasmania, Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG), Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra (and Hotel Grand Chancellor) to develop a cultural precinct proposal and business case, (potentially) including Council Centre, Town Hall, Civic Square/Mawson's Place's role within the precinct, and which would identify and prioritise future initiatives and projects to deliver maximum benefits to the community.
3. The Council develop and undertake an Expressions of Interest process to identify an anchor tenant or tenants to assume the role of custodian, facilitator and manager of City Hall (excludes tenancy of YouthARC) with a broad aim of achieving increased use and activation of City Hall together with reduced financial reliance on the Council for the operation of the Hall.
4. The Council work with the anchor tenant/s to identify and implement short, medium and long-term upgrades to City Hall to enable it to meet operational and user needs.
5. The Council develop a concept plan for the redevelopment of Market Place as a civic square for City Hall, which would also cater for adjoining businesses and be designed to mitigate the impact of future flood events. This plan would also need to incorporate Dunn Place to enable the channelling of flood water directly out to the Cove.

6. The Council notes that YouthARC is currently accommodated within City Hall and will remain in place for the foreseeable future. Council may consider proposals that include the longer-term relocation of YouthARC where this enables an exemplary use of City Hall and deliver materially improved activation and sustainability outcomes. However, any relocation would likely take a number of years, require substantial financial investment as well as a suitable alternative facility.

#### **14. Dorney House: Update of Status and Future Options** **File Ref: F26/22992**

---

ELLIOT  
DUTTA

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 14 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

#### VOTING RECORD

#### AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

#### NOES

#### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The Council agree to the following actions:
  - (i) An Expression of Interest (EOI) process be initiated for the future management and use of Dorney House;
  - (ii) The EOI documentation clearly outline that proposals must:
    - (a) Respect the heritage significance of Dorney House and Fort Nelson, including visual impact;
    - (b) Be compatible with the environmental, access, and hazard constraints of the site;

- (c) Demonstrate financial viability; and
  - (d) Include a robust operational plan addressing risk, safety, access, transport, and environmental impact.
- (iii) The Council allocate \$50,000 in the 2026-27 budget to prepare the design and investigation work required to upgrade the access road to Dorney House, noting that construction works are currently estimated at \$550,000 and will require a future funding decision.
- (iv) A further report be brought back to the Council outlining:
- (a) The outcomes of the EOI process;
  - (b) The preferred proponent (if any); and
  - (c) The recommended next steps to activate the site.
2. The Council note:
- (i) Should the EOI process not identify a viable tourism-based option, the Council consider pursuing the subdivision of the land or residential rental of Dorney House as an interim use, recognising that:
    - (a) Residential use is permissible as a discretionary heritage-triggered application;
    - (b) Such use would improve site security and support ongoing conservation; and
    - (c) Revenue generated would offset ongoing holding costs.

**15. Governance of Motions - Notices of Motions Audit**  
**File Ref: F26/22327**

---

POSSELT  
LOHBERGER

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 15 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	
Zucco	
Harvey	
Dutta	
Kelly	
Elliot	
Bloomfield	
Posselt	
Lohberger	
Coats	
Kitsos	

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The information in this report be received and it be noted that future progress reports for reporting on the progress of implementing Notices of Motions, will occur via the Elected Member Bulletin.
2. The Council note the completion of Notices of Motions listed in Attachment A to item 15 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026.

**16. 2026-27 Fees and Charges**  
**File Ref: F26/21871**

---

LOHBERGER  
KITSOS

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 16 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

**AMENDMENT**

POSSELT  
HARVEY

That the fees for planning application for change of use for visitor accommodation is as follows:

- (a) Permitted applications - \$250
- (b) Discretionary applications - \$5,000

**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

KELLY  
ELLIOT

That the matter be deferred to a workshop for further consideration.

PROCEDURAL MOTION LOST

**VOTING RECORD**

AYES	NOES
Zucco	Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock
Kelly	Harvey
Elliot	Dutta
Bloomfield	Posselt
Coats	Lohberger
	Kitsos

AMENDMENT CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	Zucco
Harvey	Kelly
Dutta	Elliot
Posselt	Bloomfield
Lohberger	Coats
Kitsos	

SUBSTANTIVE MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	Zucco
Harvey	Kelly
Dutta	Elliot
Posselt	Bloomfield
Lohberger	Coats
Kitsos	

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the Schedule of Fees and Charges, marked as Attachment A of item 16 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted for 2026-27, along with the following amended increases in 'change of use for change of use for visitor accommodation':

- (a) Permitted applications be increased to \$250; and
- (b) Discretionary applications be increased to \$5,000.

The meeting adjourned for a meal break at 6.44pm and reconvened at 7.09pm

**17. City of Hobart Complaints Management Policy**  
**File Ref: F26/10994; 16/119**

---

HARVEY  
POSSELT

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 17 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The report titled City of Hobart Complaints Management Policy be received and noted.
2. The Council adopt the updated City of Hobart Complaints Management Policy marked as Attachment B to item 17 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026.
3. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to make any administrative changes required to finalise the City of Hobart Complaints Management Policy and arrange for it to be made available from the City's website.

**18. Cat Management in Tasmania - Discussion Paper**  
**File Ref: F26/22287; 16/119**

---

HARVEY  
KITSOS

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 18 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION LOST

VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	Zucco
Harvey	Kelly
Dutta	Elliot
Posselt	Bloomfield
Kitsos	Lohberger
	Coats

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

The motion was lost.

**19. TasWater Gas Road Lease Amendment**  
**File Ref: F26/22364**

---

LOHBERGER  
BLOOMFIELD

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 19 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The Council resolve to amend the lease dated 15 November 2024 to TasWater for land at Cornelian Bay Point to allow for the importation of an additional 15,000 cubic metres of fill material, being 6,500 cubic metres of Level 2 – Low Level Contaminated Soil and 8,500 cubic metres of Clean Fill Type 1, on the following conditions:
  - (a) TasWater provide certification that the identified contamination levels in the Level 2 – Low Level Contaminated Soil are appropriate for recreational areas;
  - (b) Excavated material is separated and tested prior to being placed within the Gas Road lease area (or any other land owned by the City).
  - (c) The liability and responsibility for the imported fill material does not pass to the City until the lease ends or is otherwise terminated and TasWater has provided the City with confirmation that the spoil does not contain any additional contamination beyond the previously identified elevated metal concentrations contained in the attached report.

- (d) TasWater obtain EPA approval for the proposed works and provide the City with a copy of the EPA approval document.
  - (e) Subject to EPA approval, the imported Level 2 – Low Level Contaminated Soil is reused in accordance with the Endorsed Spoil Reuse methodology, and that all records required to be kept in accordance with the methodology are provided to the City on request.
  - (f) Additional to the Endorsed Spoil Reuse methodology and subject to EPA approval, the imported Level 2 – Low Level Contaminated Soil is capped using geotextile and at least 300 mm of topsoil or Clean Fill Type 1.
2. The Council resolve by absolute majority to agree to amend the lease dated 15 November 2024 to TasWater for land at Cornelian Bay Point by:
- (i) replacing the lease area as shown in Attachment A of item 19 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 to with the lease area shown in Attachment C item 19 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026.
  - (ii) Increasing the rent payable by \$39,500 (+GST) pa from the date the amendment described in paragraph 2 (i) becomes operative.
3. The Council resolve by absolute majority agree to amend the lease dated 15 November 2024 to TasWater for land at Cornelian Bay Point by amending the current lease to expire on 15 November 2026.
4. The Council resolve to delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officers to finalise the terms of the deed of amendment.

**20. Private Underground Electrical Connections in Road Reserves**  
**File Ref: F26/14247**

---

BLOOMFIELD  
KITSOS

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 20 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. The Council issue necessary approvals to residents or their agents to allow for excavation within road reservations to facilitate the installation of private underground electrical connections within private property, subject to the conditions and requirements detailed in the report.
2. The Council note that the conditions of approval for PUECs include installation, documentation, safety, and notification requirements designed to mitigate risk to workers, utilities, and the public.
3. The City update its public-facing information, including the relevant section of the City of Hobart website, to reflect the Council's adopted position.
4. City Officers communicate the adopted policy position to TasNetworks and relevant stakeholders.

**21. Consultation: Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026**  
**File Ref: F26/22816**

---

KITSOS  
BLOOMFIELD

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 21 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That

1. Council endorse the submission to the Tasmanian Government in response to the draft submission to the Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026, as set out in Attachment A of item 21 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026.
2. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to finalise the submission and to lodge it with the State Planning Office.

**22. Consultation: LUPAA - Preventing delays in development assessment timeframes**  
**File Ref: F26/22818; 24/47**

---

HARVEY  
BLOOMFIELD

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 22 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Kitsos

NOES

Coats

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That:

1. Council endorse the submission to the Tasmanian Government in response to the position paper entitled 'Preventing delays in development assessment timeframes', marked as Attachment B to item 22 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 to this report.
2. The Chief Executive Officer be authorised to finalise the submission and to lodge it with the State Planning Office.

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Councillor Elliot declared an interest in item 23 and left the meeting.

**23. Code of Conduct Determination Report - Councillor Anna Reynolds V  
Councillor Louise Elliot  
File Ref: F26/18598**

---

LOHBERGER  
COATS

That the recommendation contained within the officer report, marked as item 23 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026, be adopted.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the Council receive and note the Code of Conduct Determination Report in respect to a complaint lodged by Councillor Anna Reynolds against Councillor Louise Elliot, shown as Attachment A to item 23 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026.

**MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH REGULATION 19(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
(MEETING PROCEDURES) REGULATIONS 2025**

**24. Pedestrian Infrastructure Audit and Maintenance Program**  
**FILE REF: F26/21561**

---

Alderman Zucco

**Motion**

“That the Council:

1. Undertake a Comprehensive Audit  
Conduct, as a matter of priority, a city-wide audit of all footpaths and pedestrian crossings, identifying and documenting defects, hazards, and non-compliant infrastructure.  
The audit is to include a risk-based assessment, with hazards categorised and ranked, and the findings to be publicly reported to ensure transparency and accountability to ratepayers.
2. Establish a Funded, Time-Bound Maintenance Program  
Develop and implement a formal, fully funded, and time-bound footpath and pedestrian infrastructure maintenance and renewal program.  
This program is to include clearly defined service levels, inspection schedules, and performance measures, with regular reporting to Council on progress and outcomes.  
The program should incorporate the use of technology and data-driven systems to proactively identify and address defects before they result in injury or claims.
3. Prioritise High-Risk Areas  
Ensure that the maintenance and renewal program prioritises high-risk locations, including but not limited to:
  - Areas with high pedestrian volumes
  - Steep or uneven gradients
  - Locations impacted by tree root intrusion
  - Ageing or deteriorating concrete infrastructure
  - Areas frequently used by older residents and persons with mobility challenges
4. Strengthen Community Reporting and Response  
Establish or enhance a simple, accessible, and responsive community reporting mechanism for footpath hazards.  
Council is to commit to defined response and rectification timeframes for community-reported issues, with tracking and feedback provided to residents.

5. Recognise Pedestrian Infrastructure as a Core Service  
Acknowledge the maintenance and upgrade of footpaths and pedestrian infrastructure as a core Council service, requiring appropriate and sustained funding, strategic planning, and a clear commitment to timely and proactive action.”

**Rationale:**

“Unsafe pedestrian infrastructure presents a significant and unacceptable risk to residents and visitors, particularly older persons and those with limited mobility. Injuries arising from preventable hazards place a human, social, and financial burden on the community.

It is imperative that Council acts with urgency and seriousness to ensure that no person suffers injury simply by walking within the city. Proactive investment, transparent reporting, and genuine accountability are essential to delivering a safe and accessible public realm.”

**Administration Response to Notice of Motion**

**Discussion**

The City manages footpaths, pedestrian crossings and related infrastructure as part of its broader road asset portfolio, using established, risk-based asset management and maintenance practices.

The City has adopted an operational document titled the *Road Services Management Plan* (RSMP). Adopted in 2021 and reviewed in 2023, the RSMP sets out technical levels of service, inspection regimes and maintenance intervention thresholds and maintenance response times based on risk and road hierarchy. The RSMP was developed in consultation with the City’s insurer and benchmarked against comparable councils in Tasmania and Victoria, ensuring that the City’s approach reflects contemporary practice and provides an appropriate level of risk mitigation.

The City employs an experienced, full-time Road Inspection Officer who undertakes proactive inspections of all road and footpath infrastructure at the frequency provided in the RSMP. Defects that meet the RSMP road maintenance intervention levels that are identified during inspections are recorded in the City’s Asset Management Information System and work orders are created. This ensures consistency and defensibility in maintenance decision-making.

In addition, this financial year an external provider has been engaged to collect imagery and utilise AI defect detection technology to provide a condition survey of the footpath network, this data will be utilised to inform the City’s forward program for footpath renewals under the Capital program.

The City also funds an internal road maintenance team responsible for repairing identified defects. Maintenance response times are monitored against the criteria defined in the RSMP, providing oversight of service performance.

Performance data is reviewed monthly. Where performance trends have indicated a decline, this has been escalated appropriately. For example in the previous year the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) was briefed on the capability of available resources to address road maintenance demands. In response, the organisation allocated additional resources to the Road Maintenance team to address an identified shortfall.

Members of the community are able to report road and footpath defects through a range of channels, including online reporting tools and customer service contact points. All reports are centrally managed by the Road Services team and assessed using the criteria provided in the RSMP. Responses are provided in accordance with the City's Customer Service Charter and performance against the Charter is monitored weekly

In addition to the RSMP and inspection regime the City Transport Group has previously and is currently undertaking more specific audit, assessment and project creation and prioritisation work in relation to pedestrian infrastructure in Hobart.

For example, in 2019 officers undertook a complete audit of the (then) more than 120 laneways in the Hobart LGA and detailed a compliance upgrade and signage program to address risk issues, which has now been substantially completed.

The Hobart Walking Plan, an action of the endorsed City of Hobart Transport Strategy, is currently finalising a compliance audit for pedestrian crossing points in the core 50 blocks of the Hobart CBD and four key arterial walking corridors (Elizabeth Street, Hobart Rivulet/Collins Street, Sandy Bay Road and the City to Gardens Way corridor.) This audit is based on the methodology contained in a report (*Walkability of the Elizabeth Street/New Town Road Corridor*) presented to the City Infrastructure Committee at its meeting of 27 October 2021.

Therefore, having regard to the current procedures, resources and inspection/audit regimes in place, Officers do not support the progression of the Notice of Motion, as the existing arrangements are considered appropriate and effective.

## Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

### Capital City Strategic Plan

Pillar: 7 – Built Environment

Outcome: 7.3 - Infrastructure and Services Support a High Quality of Life

Strategy: 7.3.3 - Our infrastructure and services are planned, managed and maintained so they provide long-term benefits to Hobart communities.

### Legislation and Policy

Legislation: Not applicable

Policy: Not applicable

Financial Implications

1. Not applicable

ZUCCO  
KELLY

That the motion be adopted.

**PROCEDURAL MOTION**

HARVEY  
ELLIOT

That the matter be deferred to a workshop for further consideration.

PROCEDURAL MOTION CARRIED

**VOTING RECORD**

AYES

NOES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the matter be deferred to a workshop for further consideration.

**25. Cost Increase Process**  
**FILE REF: F26/23364**

---

Councillor Elliot

**Motion**

“That the Council require cost increases related to projects and capital works approved by the Council (that represent more than a 10 per cent increase) to be presented to Council as a standalone agenda item for approval.”

**Rationale:**

“Significant variations in costs have occurred across multiple projects. Financial considerations are often a key factor in decisions for elected members. Major changes in costs have the potential to change Council decisions. Given the considerable variance in the costs, it is appropriate that these return to Council for approval as a standalone officer report.”

**Administration Response to Notice of Motion**

Council’s capital works are best managed through the existing adopted budget and delegated authority framework rather than a rigid percentage-trigger for re-approval. In practice, a *prescriptive 10% threshold* would be difficult to apply and counterproductive for several governance and operational reasons:

- **Established Practice:** Like most councils, the City of Hobart manages its capital program via the approved annual budget and delegated financial authorities. Each year, the Council approves a Capital Works Budget (part of the Annual Plan) and sets out the expected projects. Delivery of this program is overseen internally – for example, through the Capital Projects Committee (CPC) – under a tiered delegation system. This means officers can approve routine cost variations within defined limits, escalating only substantial changes for higher approval. This framework (articulated in the CPC Terms of Reference) provides robust governance with flexibility, ensuring Council maintains strategic oversight without needing to individually sign off every budget fluctuation.
- **Governance:** Capital budget variations are reported to the Council in the quarterly finance reports, so while there may be transfers to and from the contingency to manage work, they are all ultimately reported to provide transparency.
- **Practicality and Proportionality:** A fixed 10% threshold does not consider scale or context. For a small project (say \$50,000), a 10% variance is just \$5,000 – a minor change that can be absorbed in program management.

Requiring a standalone Council report for such a small dollar increase would be disproportionate. Conversely, for a very large project, a 10% overrun might be millions of dollars, but any significant multi-million-dollar issue would in practice be reported and addressed anyway through existing processes (e.g. via budget review reports or specific briefings) based on its materiality. Relying on informed officer judgment and existing financial thresholds is more sensible than a one-size-fits-all rule. It ensures attention is focused on changes that materially affect the City's finances or service delivery, rather than triggering procedural hoops for mundane variances.

- ***Efficient Delivery and Timeliness:*** To successfully deliver the annual capital works program, the City needs agility to manage variations as they arise in real time. In practice, budget variations of 10% or more are relatively common, especially in construction projects – they can result from unforeseen site conditions, weather impacts, supply chain price shifts, or opportunities to achieve scope improvements. Many of these occur during time-critical phases (for example, during construction or procurement). Halting a project to seek a separate Council approval mid-stream would likely delay works, incur contractor standby claims or remobilisation costs, and possibly cause the project to miss critical delivery windows (e.g. weather seasons or grant funding deadlines). In short, a rigid requirement to pause projects for approval would reduce the City's ability to deliver projects on time and on budget overall.
- ***Financial Management Impacts:*** Introducing a restrictive 10% re-approval rule could ironically increase overall costs to the Council. If Officers must avoid exceeding a strict threshold at all costs, they are likely to build larger contingencies into initial project budgets to cover any potential scenario. This means budgets would be less accurate reflections of actual expected costs – effectively tying up funds unnecessarily “just in case”. With finite capital funding, excessive contingencies translate to fewer projects delivered for the community each year. By contrast, our current approach lets us allocate reasonable contingencies and adjust across the program as needed, delivering the maximum scope of works for the available budget. Furthermore, the City conducts regular budget reviews and has controls to ensure the overall capital program remains within the adopted funding envelope – individual project fluctuations are managed in that context.
- ***Market and Contractor Considerations:*** The local construction market values certainty and smooth project delivery. Requiring frequent Council re-approvals would send a negative signal to contractors: every project could face a stoppage or additional approval process if costs shift moderately. Contractors might respond by avoiding bids or adding risk premiums to prices to account for potential interruptions and extended timeframes. Over time this would reduce competition and drive-up costs for Council projects. Our current delegated approach allows us to make prompt decisions (for example, approving a tender that comes in slightly above estimate, or adjusting scope with a contractor on

the go), which in turn builds confidence in Council as a client that can manage projects efficiently. Maintaining this agility helps attract good contractors and competitive pricing, whereas a rigid policy would likely have the opposite effect.

- **Risk Management and Outcomes:** Delivering infrastructure inherently involves risk and change. The City's project governance framework is designed to manage risks proactively – through project risk registers, Executive oversight (via CPC and the Executive Leadership Team), and exception reporting when things go off track. Imposing a simplistic 10% threshold does not improve risk management; rather, it may impede risk mitigation. Officers might be hesitant to adapt or optimise a project (even if it leads to a better outcome or long-term saving) because any adjustment could trigger the extra approval step. Additionally, in urgent situations (e.g. discovering an asset failure or safety issue that requires immediate budget increase), a hard rule would delay responsive action, increasing exposure to risk. A more flexible system, guided by professional judgment and existing controls, ensures that issues are dealt with at the appropriate level and escalated when truly necessary. This way, Council's attention is reserved for significant matters (where their decision is critical), and routine risks are managed administratively in line with Council-approved policies.

In summary, officers recommend against adopting the motion. The proposed prescriptive approach would likely reduce the effectiveness of capital program delivery, increase costs, and slow down projects, without any commensurate benefit to governance. The City already has strong financial management practices, where the Council approves the annual budget and receives updates, and any major deviations can be brought to the Council through the budget review or dedicated reports as warranted. A blanket 10% trigger is an overly blunt tool that does not reflect best practice in project governance or the practical realities of managing capital works. A more proportionate, program-level oversight approach – supported by clear delegations and robust reporting – is the accepted norm in local government and remains the City's preferred method to ensure accountability while getting on with the work.

## Strategic, Legislative and Policy Implications

### Capital City Strategic Plan

Pillar:	8 – Governance and Civic Involvement
Outcome:	8.2 – Hobart is a city that delivers public value and excellence by being a financially responsible, high performing and accountable organisation that is responsive to the needs of the community.
Strategy:	8.2.1 – Monitor and maintain financial sustainability into the future through responsible management of annual budgets, assets and long-term financial planning.

Legislation and Policy

Legislation: Nil

Policy: Nil

Financial Implications

1. Nil

ELLIOT

ZUCCO

That the motion be adopted.

ZUCCO

COATS

That Councillor Elliot be granted an additional three minutes to address the meeting.

MOTION CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

AYES

NOES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

DUTTA

BLOOMFIELD

That the motion be now put.

PROCEDURAL MOTION LOST

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Dutta  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Kitsos

NOES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Coats

MOTION LOST

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Zucco  
Kelly  
Elliot

NOES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

The motion was lost.

## **26. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

---

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

HARVEY  
LOHBERGER

That the information contained in the following responses to questions without notice marked as items 26.1 to 26.5 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 be received and noted.

MOTION CARRIED

### VOTING RECORD

#### AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

#### NOES

### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the information contained in the following responses to questions without notice marked as items 26.1 to 26.5 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 be received and noted:

#### **26.1 South Hobart Football Club Lease**

---

Memorandum of the Director Strategic and Regulatory Services of  
10 April 2026

#### **26.2 Selling Merchandise**

---

Memorandum of the Director Strategic and Regulatory Services of  
15 April 2026

#### **26.3 Unsolicited Bids Policy**

---

Memorandum of the Acting Director Corporate Services of  
15 April 2026

**26.4 Timeframe for processing a licence**

---

Memorandum of the Director Community and Economic  
Development of 20 April 2026

**26.5 Tracking Food Licences Time**

---

Memorandum of the Director Community and Economic  
Development of 15 April 2026

## **27. RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

---

Regulation 35 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*.  
File Ref: 13-1-10

HARVEY  
POSSELT

That the information contained in the following responses to questions on notice marked as items 27.1 to 27.3 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 be received and noted.

MOTION CARRIED

### VOTING RECORD

AYES	NOES
Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock	
Zucco	
Harvey	
Dutta	
Kelly	
Elliot	
Bloomfield	
Posselt	
Lohberger	
Coats	
Kitsos	

### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION:**

That the information contained in the following responses to questions on notice marked as items 27.1 to 27.3 of the Open Council Agenda of 27 April 2026 be received and noted:

#### **27.1 Question on Notice - Scramble Crossings Financials**

---

Memorandum of the Director Strategic and Regulatory Services of  
22 April 2026

#### **27.2 Question on Notice - Collins Street (Tactical Trial/'Transforming') Financials**

---

Memorandum of the Director Strategic and Regulatory Services of  
22 April 2026

#### **27.3 Question on Notice - Crowther Financials**

---

Memorandum of the Director Community and Economic  
Development of 22 April 2026

## **28. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

---

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

### **28.1 Councillor Kelly - Rapid Bus Network**

---

Question: Is there any knowledge of the greater Hobart Rapid Bus Strategic Business Case proposal to charge a levy of \$1500 as an annual charge on parking spaces in the Hobart CBD. Is there any discussion on where we are at the moment as this is the first time I have heard about it?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that it is included in the State Government's business case as part of the early work they've completed. The State Government advised that it is not a proposal they are seeking to progress. They further confirmed, at the briefing last week, that it is not a proposal they will be moving forward on or intend to implement.

### **28.2 Councillor Kelly - E-mail Signatures**

---

Question: There are a range of flags displayed on the footer of e-mail templates that I use (e.g. Australian flag, Tasmanian flag and the Aboriginal flag). Is it permissible for elected members just to choose the flags they would like to include on the footer of their correspondence?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that from an organisation point of view it is our preference to have consistent footers and e-mail templates for all staff including elected members. At the moment e-mail footers and templates are consistent for employees. In the past, elected members haven't wanted to have consistent signatures and footers. The Chief Executive Officer advised that he would be happy to revisit a consistent e-mail approach for elected members.

### **28.3 Councillor Dutta - Capital Works Delegations**

---

Question: The issues raised by Councillor Elliot regarding capital works projects tonight are major issues. Is it possible to have a workshop on that or be provided with clarification, as I don't have the clarity I require?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that he is happy to provide clarification on this through a workshop.

### **28.4 Councillor Posselt - Collins Street Total Costs**

---

Question: Were the numbers provided to Councillor Elliot (Question on Notice) on the total cost of Collins Street re-modernisation project inclusive of the Scrambles crossing upgrade at Murray Street and Collins Streets and were they separate from projects endorsed by the Council?

Response: The Director of Strategic and Regulatory Services advised that there are two Questions on Notice one to do with Collins Street and one to do with scrambles. The costs were separated. The scrambles on Collins Street were included in the scrambles answer but not in the Collins Street answer.

### **28.5 Councillor Kitsos - Wellesley Fence Implications on Budget**

---

Question: Is the Council inclined to endorse fully funding stage 2 of the Wellesley Park development in the 2026-2027 financial year and what implications will that have on the Capital Works Budget and the roll out of other projects?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that the capital works program is well advanced and further consideration is required on this project. The question was taken on notice.

### **28.6 Councillor Elliot - Parking Over Driveway Enforcement**

---

Question: What is the current status in relation to officers issuing enforcement notices for parking over driveways? Are officers enforcing that road rule at the moment and if so which areas?

Response: The Director Community and Economic Development advised that officers are taking a proactive position in CBD. But in the suburbs enforcement is being undertaken on a complaints basis.

### **28.7 Councillor Elliot - CBD Definition**

---

Question: In relation to enforcement of parking over driveways - what are we treating as the CBD? Does that include Salamanca and the waterfront?

Response: The Director Community and Economic Development confirmed that Salamanca and waterfront is included in the CBD area.

### **28.8 Councillor Elliot - Enforcement Rules Driveway**

---

Question: Is the Chief Executive Officer considering flexibility around enforcement of rules in relation to people parking over driveways - in light of feedback from small businesses?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that he hasn't received any feedback directly from small businesses and encouraged any businesses (having concerns in relation to people parking over driveways), to raise those issues so the City is aware of them.

### **28.9 Alderman Bloomfield - Snap - Send - Solve**

---

Question: Can Elected Members be provided with information on how many snap-send-solves have been reported, completed and are not complete?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that Snap-Send-Solve is a product that has been in use for a number of years so it is not something new. It is used by many councils including Hobart, but it's not the only way people engage with City. The information can be provided. The Chief Executive Officer took the question on notice.

### **28.10 Councillor Posselt - Consultation on Wellesley Park**

---

Question: The depute at the start of the meeting requested that we conduct significant depth of consultation rather than breadth of consultation around the lower Wellesley Park for dogs. Can we consider doing this before the project starts?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer took the question on notice, but advised that a round of engagement has been undertaken. However, the outcome of that engagement hasn't been finalised. Once the results of the first round of engagement is known, Council can request further engagement.

### **28.11 Councillor Posselt - Wellesley Park Engagement**

---

Question: Is it possible for the Wellesley Park engagement report be provided to a workshop for Elected Members to consider if further engagement is required?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer advised that a given the high level of community interest in the proposal, that it would make sense to bring it back to Council before implementation.

### **28.12 Acting Lord Mayor Councillor Sherlock - Code of Conduct Questions**

---

- Question: For this term of Council, can you please provide us:
- with a run down of how many applications of a Code of Conduct have been submitted by each elected member?
  - a break down of how much of rate payers' money has been spent on Codes of Conduct for each elected member?
  - how much rate payers' money has been spent in total on codes of conduct?

And for the last term, how much of rate payers' money was spent on codes of conduct in total?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer took those questions on notice.

### **28.13 Alderman Zucco - Codes of Conduct Reported by Public**

---

Question: Can you please provide details on - how many codes of conducts have come from members of the public against elected members in this term of Council? And also from the previous term of Council?

Response: The Chief Executive Officer took those questions on notice.

## 29. CLOSED PORTION OF THE MEETING

---

LOHBERGER  
COATS

That the Council resolve by absolute 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 Council meeting
- Information of a personal and confidential nature
- Personal hardship
- Information relating to commercial arrangements
- Proposals for the Council in interest of land

The following items were discussed:-

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Item No. 1  | Minutes of the last meeting of the Closed Portion of the Council Meeting      |
| Item No. 2  | Communication from the Chairperson  |
| Item No. 3  | Leave of Absence  |
| Item No. 4  | Consideration of supplementary Items to the agenda                            |
| Item No. 5  | Indications of Conflicts of Interest  |
| Item No. 6  | Proposed Closure and Sale of Part of Evans Street, Hobart<br>LG(MP)R 17(2)(g) |
| Item No. 7  | Cross Street Safety Issues<br>LG(MP)R 17(2)(g)                                |
| Item No. 8  | Proposed Sale of Land - Pottery Road<br>LG(MP)R 17(2)(g)                      |
| Item No. 9  | Sale of Land for Unpaid Rates<br>LG(MP)R 17(2)(g), (h)(i) and (l)             |
| Item No. 10 | Current Legal Proceedings<br>LG(MP)R 17(2)(k)                                 |
| Item No. 11 | Questions without Notice  |

MOTION CARRIED  
BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

VOTING RECORD

AYES

Acting Lord Mayor Sherlock  
Zucco  
Harvey  
Dutta  
Kelly  
Elliot  
Bloomfield  
Posselt  
Lohberger  
Coats  
Kitsos

NOES

The Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 6.44pm for a meal break.

The meeting was reconvened at 7.09pm.

Item 17 was then taken.

There being no further business the Open portion of the meeting closed at 8.44pm.

TAKEN AS READ AND SIGNED AS  
A CORRECT RECORD THIS  
25<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MAY 2026.

---

**CHAIRPERSON**