

COUNCIL MEETING

**Minutes of the Corporation of the City of Unley
Council Meeting
Held on Monday 24 October 2011 at 7.00pm
In the Civic Centre
181 Unley Road Unley**

PRESENT

His Worship the Mayor Mr L Clyne (Presiding Member)
Councillors M Hudson J Koumi
 M Saies (arr 7.02pm)
 J Boisvert D Palmer
 A Lapidge P Hughes
 D Tipper R Schnell
 R Salaman

OFFICERS PRESENT

A/Chief Executive Officer, Ms C Umapathysivam
General Manager City Services, Ms M Bonnici
A/General Manager City Development, Ms C Luya
A/General Manager Corporate Services, Ms V Minenko
Finance Manager, Ms N Tinning
A/Manager Governance, Ms D Horton
Manager Transport & Traffic, Mr C Mountain
Manager Community Development, Ms D Richardson
Manager Assets, Mr M Clarke
Executive Assistant to CEO & Mayor, Ms C Gowland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Presiding Member opened the meeting with the Aboriginal Acknowledgement.

PRAYER

Members stood in silence in memory of those who had made the Supreme Sacrifice in the service of their country, at sea, on land and in the air.

WELCOME

The Presiding Member welcomed Members of Council, Senior Staff, members of the gallery and the media to the October 2011 meeting of the Unley City Council.

APOLOGIES

Councillor M Hewitson
Councillor R Sangster

ITEM 266

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

MOVED Councillor Boisvert
SECONDED Councillor Palmer

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday 26 September 2011, as printed and circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 267

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES FOR SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 26 AUGUST 2011

MOVED Councillor Boisvert
SECONDED Councillor Palmer

That the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on Friday 26 August 2011, as printed and circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PETITIONS

None

PRESENTATION

Councillor Betty Gill, President of the Australian Local Government Women's Association (ALGWA) made a presentation to the Council of the Silver Gender Equity Award.

DEPUTATIONS

None

ITEM 268 **MINUTES OF AUDIT COMMITTEE**

MOVED Councillor Hughes
SECONDED Councillor Palmer

That:

1. The minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on Tuesday 27 September 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Item 36, be adopted.

CARRIED

ITEM 269 **MINUTES OF CITY OF UNLEY ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE**

MOVED Councillor Tipper
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

That:

1. The minutes of the City of Unley Road Safety Committee held on Wednesday 12 October 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 46 – 49 inclusive, be adopted.
3. The following Item be reserved:

Item 45 – King William Road – Proposed 40Km/h Speed Limit –
Reserved by Councillor M Saies.

CARRIED

ITEM 45

KING WILLIAM ROAD – PROPOSED 40KM/H SPEED LIMITED

MOVED Councillor Tipper
SECONDED Councillor Boisvert

That:

1. The report be received.
2. Community consultation be undertaken in November 2011 to introduce 40km/h speed limit on King William Road.
3. A formal submission be made to Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) to introduce 40km/h speed limit on King William Road and Northgate Street (between King William Road and Victoria Avenue)
4. A report be submitted to Council at its meeting in December 2011 on the outcomes of the community consultation and the submission to DTEI.

Extension of Debating Time

MOVED Councillor Koumi
SECONDED Councillor Lapidge

That Councillors Saies be given an extension to debating time.

Carried

CARRIED

ITEM 270
MINUTES OF CITY STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MOVED Councillor Schnell
SECONDED Councillor Lapidge

That:

1. The minutes of the City Strategy and Policy Committee meeting held on Monday 17 October 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 73 – 79 inclusive, be adopted.
3. The following item be considered by Council at its next ordinary meeting on 24 October 2011:

Item 72, Residential Parking Permits and Exemptions (tied vote)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 271
MINUTES OF UNLEY BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MOVED Councillor Salaman
SECONDED Councillor Schnell

That:

1. The minutes of the Unley Business and Economic Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday 18 October 2011, be received.
2. The recommendations listed under Items 25 – 28 inclusive, be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 272
MAYOR'S REPORT

MOVED Councillor Salaman
SECONDED Councillor Hughes

That:

1. The report be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 273
REPORTS OF MEMBERS

Items of particular interest, concern or urgency

Councillor Saies – Mayor's report for this month – dates incorrect.
Councillor Schnell – Meeting at Swimming Centre on Saturday with Councillors and staff from Gawler Council to look at our Swimming Centre. Not interested in the Starplex option.
Fern Avenue Community Garden – excellent outcome as a result of the grant.
Councillor Salaman – Ride to Work Day – Staff, Mayor handing out bags to cyclists. Email of appreciation received.

Centennial Park Cemetery Authority

Councillor Lapidge – Board met in September. Statistics for August not particularly strong. Annual report circulated with Agenda for Board to consider.
Remembrance Day service coming up.
Document re roles and responsibilities of Board Members is being updated.
Reminder to all Elected Members that the Minutes and Agendas supplied to Councillors are confidential.

Development Matters

Nil.

The Presiding Member advised that Items 274, 275 and 276 should be deferred to the end of the meeting. This was supported with a two thirds majority.

ITEMS 274, 275, 276
ADJOURNED ITEM 70 – PROPOSED SALE OF 39 AND 41 OXFORD TERRACE UNLEY

See Pages 21 – 25 of these Minutes.

ITEM 277

ITEM 72 – NO RESOLUTION FROM COMMITTEE – RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMITS AND EXEMPTIONS

MOVED Councillor Koumi
SECONDED Councillor Boisvert

That:

1. The report be received
2. The proposal to issue Residential Parking Permits and Exemptions for a period of two years and that the fee for both permits and exemptions be \$50 per application, together with the tradespersons temporary permit scheme be endorsed for community consultation.
3. The proposal to limit the maximum number of residential parking permits to two, less the number of off street parking spaces available on the property be endorsed for community consultation.
4. The proposal whereby properties with two or more off street parking spaces will not be eligible for any residential parking exemptions also be endorsed for community consultation.
5. A report on the outcome of the community consultation be brought to the December 2011 meeting of Council.

LOST

MOVED Councillor Schnell,
SECONDED Councillor Hudson

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The proposal to issue residential parking permits and exemptions for a period of two years and fee, together with the tradesperson's temporary permit scheme be endorsed for community consultation.
3. A report on the outcome of the community consultation be brought to the December 2011 meeting of Council.

CARRIED

Councillors Saies and Palmer left the meeting at 7.59pm returning at 8.00pm during discussion on the above Item.

ITEM 278

RIDGE PARK MANAGED AQUIFER RECHARGE (MAR) – COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

MOVED Councillor Lapidge
SECONDED Councillor Hughes

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the Managed Aquifer Recharge Scheme – Ridge Park (Attachment 1 to Item 278/11) be endorsed and public consultation be undertaken from 6 February 2012 to 2 March 2012.
3. The Consultation Concepts contained in the Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the Managed Aquifer Recharge Scheme – Ridge Park, be made available for the Bronwhill Keswick Creek Stormwater Management Plan consultation process.
4. Councillors Lapidge and Hughes be appointed as members of the Ridge Park MAR Reference Group until the conclusion of the project.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Councillor Boisvert left the meeting at 8.29pm returning at 8.31pm during discussion on the above Item.

ITEM 279

PROCUREMENT OF TENANT – UNIT 2, 71-73 KING WILLIAM ROAD UNLEY

MOVED Councillor Boisvert
SECONDED Councillor Saies

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The lease of the property located at Unit 2, 71-73 King William Road Unley, be approved based on the terms and conditions listed in the Lease Summary (Attachment 1 to Item 279/11).

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 280
ANNUAL REPORT 10:11

MOVED Councillor Lapidge
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The City of Unley Annual Report 2010:11 (Attachment 1 to Item 280/11) be endorsed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 281
GENERAL PURPOSE FINANCIAL REPORTS

MOVED Councillor Lapidge
SECONDED Councillor Hughes

That:

1. The report be received.
2. The General Purpose Financial Reports of the Council for the financial year ended 30 June 2011 (Attachment 1 to report 28/11) be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 282
FIRST QUARTER BUDGET REVIEW 2011-12

MOVED Councillor Tipper
SECONDED Councillor Hughes

That:

1. The report, including Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to report 282/11, be received.
2. The actual to budget comparison for the end of year position 2010-11 be noted.
3. Carry forward projects from 2010-11, totalling a net amount of \$2 878 000 be noted.
4. Budget variations of \$374 000 for the first quarter 2011-12 Budget Review be noted.

5. The revised budget Financial Statements including the revised Budget Operating Surplus before Capital Revenue of \$886 000 and revised increase of \$7 074 000 to the Net Financial Liabilities be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 283

END OF MONTH FINANCIAL REPORT

MOVED Councillor Hughes
SECONDED Councillor Palmer

That:

1. The report be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 284

RATE ASSESSMENT REGISTER OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

MOVED Councillor Schnell
SECONDED Councillor Salaman

That:

1. The report be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 285

COUNCIL ACTION RECORDS

MOVED Councillor Koumi
SECONDED Councillor Schnell

That:

1. The report be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 286

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR SALAMAN RE KING WILLIAM ROAD

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Salaman in September and the answers are now provided.

After only a year many of the repaired spots in the King William Road block paving have failed again. While the majority of the brick paving is in good condition for its age, the remaining life of the road surface is being jeopardised by these localised failures. This is only too obvious after heavy rain when sand has come to the surface where the bricks have moved, and in many places settled. I understand that a report will be presented to Council soon, but in the meantime I wish to place the following questions on notice for the September Council meeting.

Questions

1. Was the recent repair work overseen by a consultant, and if so what certificates of compliance with the repair specification were issued?

Answer:

The consultant's role was to observe a sample of the work carried out on the first night and provide their observations to Council. The Asset Manager was responsible for the overseeing of the work.

There is no record on file that a final certificate was issued to the contractor. Follow up with the previous Asset Manager will occur.

2. Who takes responsibility for the early failure of the repairs? The Consultant who prepared the specification, the Contractor or the Council?

Answer:

The defect liability period for the work was for 12 months and the work was completed in May 2010. After the defect liability period it is Council's responsibility.

3. Did the specification for the recent repair work spell out remedial work to the base and subbase layers?

Answer:

The specification included a scope of works methodology and technical specifications including treatment to be undertaken to the subbase layers.

4. Was the condition of the subgrade, especially the moisture content recorded?

Answer:

A Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) test was undertaken as part of the work and the results were recorded.

The (DCP) provides information in regards to penetrability, compaction and moisture levels.

5. Because of problems with the very poor subgrade, much of King William Road paving is underlain with a layer of leanmix concrete to provide a stable foundation for the pavers. Most of the failed areas of paving appear to coincide with reinstated service trenches, often apparently associated with repairs of water leaks. As a matter of course, is the concrete layer reinstated when any trenches opened up in the paving are made good?

Answer:

Some failures have occurred in areas where reinstatements have occurred. It is unclear if the failures are a result of the quality of the reinstatement.

Since 2009 Council has put in place a procedure to oversee any reinstatement work when notified by a Utility Company.

The majority of areas that show signs of failure relate to unravelling (Unravelling is the loss of bond where pavers become loose and move independently from one and other). The majority of unravelling is occurring adjacent to repair work that has been undertaken as part of maintenance and as part of trench reinstatement work.

6. If not, why not?

Answer:

As per above, Council has put in place a procedure to oversee reinstatement work.

7. During an earlier attempt to remediate the paving, a trial using expanding foam was made. While the trial was unsuccessful and discontinued, it was noted that the subgrade was saturated to a depth of at least a meter at the test site just north of Arthur Street. Since this was undertaken in summer during a drought, has the cause of the moisture been investigated and attended to?

Answer:

No documented evidence has been located to confirm that such an investigation of the area in question has been undertaken. Follow up with the previous Asset Manager will occur.

8. I understand that SA Water plots the locations of water leaks and uses this database to make informed decisions on when to replace their infrastructure. Can the areas that have failed be cross referenced against the SA Water records to confirm or otherwise that the two are related?

Answer:

A request has been submitted to SA Water to seek access to the database. Once received then a cross reference may be able to occur to identify if any of their work is linked to any failures.

9. If "yes" can SA Water be asked to contribute to the cost of (the second) repairs?

Answer:

If it can be confirmed and proven any failures are a result of SA Water reinstatement work, Council could seek a contribution from SA Water for the cost of repair works.

10. I understand that only one consultant has been involved in the recommending a maintenance regime for King William Road. In view of the recent failures of the repaired work, has consideration been given to getting a second professional opinion on how to do the work properly?

Answer:

The engineering consultancy company used to inspect and provide recommendations on the maintenance treatment has been involved in the project from its conception. There are a number of benefits in using this company in regard to knowledge and technical expertise in the management of a very unique road treatment. Therefore, taking into consideration the level of expertise and quality of the advice provided a second opinion has not been considered.

Note: A report will be presented to Members at the November City Strategy and Policy Committee providing additional information on the management of and the anticipated life of the pavement of King William Road.

ITEM 287

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR HUDSON RE OUTDOOR DINING AREAS

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Hudson and the answers are provided:

As a consequence of information provided by Administration on the response from the hospitality world to Council's initiative to encourage smokeless outdoor eating areas, I ask the following questions:

1. How many (if any) Unley eateries have embraced the ideas of reduced permit fees for smoke-free tables in their outdoor eating areas?

Answer

At this stage, none of the existing outdoor dining licencees have elected to change the status of their current approved areas to non smoking.

2. Should the concept eventually receive support, what is the feasibility of informing would-be diners, through our website, regular "Courier" column and hard-copy leaflets, about the availability of such zones?

Answer

Brief information was provided in the Unley Life Column following the decision of Council to endorse the discounted rate for non smoking outdoor dining areas.

Further information will be provided on the City of Unley's website, together with hard copy information about encouraging non smoking dining areas through the provision of discounted rates.

ITEM 288

QUESTION ON NOTICE FROM COUNCILLOR HUDSON RE GLEN OSMOND CREEK LINEAR PARK

The following Questions on Notice have been received from Councillor Hudson and the answers are provided:

Questions

1. On whose authority were major alterations to the Glen Osmond Creek Linear Park undertaken, ie
 - Removal of six wooden walkway/bridges
 - Removal of the swale into the Leicester Street playground
 - Replacement of the original composite footpath/walkway concept with tarmac
 - Change from the original meandering design with the final straight profile
 - Postponement of various ancillary items, such as works of art?

Answer

- **Removal of six wooden walkway/bridges**

The Final Design Concept endorsed by Council in July 2010 included 4 wooden walkway/bridges.

The Concept Design envisaged a culvert system similar to that in Windsor street (i.e. 600mm – 1m below ground level). It was identified prior to construction that the culverts were required to be at or above the 'local' ground level and therefore impossible to run the swale over the culverts and under the bridges.

Therefore the bridges were not required and not able to be achieved.

The decision was made by project staff following consultation with our technical engineering consultants.

- **Removal of the swale into the Leicester Street playground**

The Final Design Concept endorsed by Council in July 2010 did not include the swale into Leicester Street playground. The swale was aimed at achieving stormwater harvesting outcomes, which technical advice indicated would subsequently be unable to be achieved.

The following is from the July 2010 (Report Item 335/10):

Reuse of stormwater.	<i>The volumes of water that flows down this drain and the limited open space make it impossible to do water harvesting of any real scale. However some localised water reuse will be contemplated within design for plant watering. Larger storm water harvesting projects are currently being considered in other locations along the creek system.</i>
----------------------	---

- **Replacement of the original composite footpath/walkway concept with tarmac**

The Final Design Concept endorsed by Council in July 2010 identified that the paths would be bitumen.

The path is in accordance with the Australian Standards and Codes of Practice for shared pedestrian and bike facilities. It achieves the standard 3 metre wide shared path in line.

- **Change from the original meandering design with the final straight profile**

The Administration made this change to the project as reported in August 2011 (Question on Notice, Q 14, Item 223/11)

The shared path is not straight, but it does meander less than was indicated on the early consultation sketches. The "meandering" of the path was reduced during the final design and construction phases of the project as a result of receiving advice that showed a very high potential risk of premature cracking of the path at each location where the path steps off of the culvert.

Staff did consider alternate solutions but each achievable option came at significant cost variation potentially.

Additionally, where the path meanders into the "garden area" it left a section of exposed culvert that becomes a dead spot where planting cannot occur.....

- **Postponement of various ancillary items, such as works of art?**

The Administration delayed implementation of the public artwork awaiting the outcome of final costs of contamination and grant funding from SA Open Space Grant Program.

The preparation of a suitable 'project brief' and the need to allow potential artists to fully visualise the completed available area(s) have also contributed to delays in finalising the artworks and the 'node' (composite footpath) designs.

The artworks will be implemented over the next twelve months with agreement having been reached with Open Space and Federal Government Grant programs for this to occur.

This will also allow for any public and elected member consultation on design/s.

2. What budget savings were achieved as the result of the above?

Answer

A project saving of \$53,510.60 was identified as a result of the scope changes that resulted in the realignment of the swale and removal of bridges.

3. What steps will be taken to ensure that cyclists using the Glen Osmond Creek Linear Park will be prevented from continuing their journey down Windsor Street linear park, which would be to the detriment and danger of pedestrians?

Answer

A potential conflict has been identified and project and traffic staff are working together to review the situation and determine if any further action is required.

The project contingency will cover any changes that need to be made.

4. Under whose authority were Elected Members denied the opportunity to access the 22 communications of dissent from local residents regarding the treatment of Culvert Street?

Answer

Elected Members were not denied the opportunity to access the communications.

The 22 emails were received between 18 August and 22 August expressing objection, concern and displeasure about the design of Culvert Street as a partial one way street, increased traffic movements as a consequence of that design and disruption that has occurred as a consequence of the construction in Culvert Street.

The emails were not distributed to Elected Members. Rather the General Manager City Services attended the Council meeting of 22 August and at this meeting asked leave of the Mayor to address the Council. In the verbal address to the Council it was highlighted that 22 objections had been received during the preceding days and the nature of the concerns raised. It was also noted that 2 emails of support had been received.

5. Why?

Answer

Not applicable.

6. Who was responsible and why did more than six months elapse (without action) in negotiations with the Maud Street owner of land on the southern side of Culvert Street for the paving of the access to a number of Maud Street properties?

Answer

Staff changes during the project resulted in this matter being overlooked for a period.

Discussions have been ongoing since early August 2011 with the property owner and a Report to Council will feature during the November round of meetings.

7. Under whose authority, and for what reason, has the popular “tunnel” in the Leicester Street playground been removed?

Answer

The decision for the removal of the tunnel was made the Administration for several reasons:

- Removal was required in order to undertake contamination remediation works ie to put down the geo-textile fabric.
- The concrete tunnel was demolished in order to remove it, as it was embedded into the ground.
- In addition following discussion with our environmental consultants and Councils' parks and gardens staff the 'tunnel' was identified as an area for dumping of used syringes and other rubbish, creating safety concerns for young users.

8. Has consideration been given to the replacement of this popular feature?

Answer

No consideration has been given to replacing the concrete tunnel at this stage, as there is already a number of pieces of playground equipment in the park including a tunnel that forms part of the train.

However if a piece of appropriate playground equipment (ie compliant with playground safety standards) was to be installed then costings and equipment options can be for presented for consideration.

9. If not, why not?

Answer

Refer comments provided at Q7

10. Similar questions to 7, 8 and 9 above in relation to the roundabout and bench near the Leicester Street frontage.

Answer

Roundabout

The decision for the removal of the roundabout was made the Administration for several reasons:

- The 'roundabout' was removed as it does not meet current playground safety standards.
- This item was scheduled in our program to be removed at anytime that work was being done in the park.
- Under the playground safety standards if a piece of playground equipment which is not complying with the current standards is removed then we are unable to replace it and remain compliant with the standards.

However if a piece of appropriate playground equipment (ie compliant with playground safety standards) was to be installed then costings and equipment options can be for presented for consideration.

A hopscotch stencil will be painted on the paving area to compensation for this item.

Bench

The benches that were removed will be replaced.

ITEM 289
CORRESPONDENCE

The correspondence from:

1. The Local Government Association regarding 50:50 Vision – Gender Equity Program;
2. Hon Warren Truss MP and Tony Zappia MP, re Roads to Recovery Program;
3. Hon Tom Kenyon MP re South Australia's Road Safety Strategy 2020 – Towards Zero Together and the Road Safety Action Plan 2011 and 2012.

be noted.

MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

ITEM 290
UNRESOLVED ITEMS

Meeting Date	Item	Status
Council 27/10/08	Item 363 (copy attached) Notice of Motion from Councillor Hewitson re Sturt Football Club.	The question remain laid on the table.
Council 22/3/10	Item 622 (UBED Item 46) (copy attached) Adjourned Debate – Item 46 – Unley Business and Economic Development Committee – Glen Osmond Road Separate Rate Negotiation.	The Item lay on the table.

ITEM 274

**CONFIDENTIALITY MOTION FOR ADJOURNED ITEM 70 – PROPOSED
SALE OF 39 AND 41 OXFORD TERRACE UNLEY**

MOVED Councillor Salaman
SECONDED Councillor Tipper

That:

1. Pursuant to Section 90(2) and (3)(b) of the Local Government Act 1999 the Council orders the public be excluded, with the exception of the following:

Ms C Umapathysivam, Acting Chief Executive Officer
Ms C Luya, Acting General Manager City Development
Ms M Bonnici, General Manager City Services
Ms V Minenko, Acting General Manager Corporate Services
Ms D Richardson, Manager Community Development
Ms D Horton, Acting Manager Governance
Ms C Gowland, Executive Assistant to CEO and Mayor

on the basis that it will receive and consider the report on the proposed sale of 39 and 41 Oxford Terrace, and that the Council is satisfied that the meeting should be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed in relation to this matter because:

(b) information the disclosure of which –

- (i) could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the council is conducting, or proposing to conduct, business, or to prejudice the commercial position of the council, and
- (ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The doors to the Council Chambers were closed at 8.55pm.

Councillor Saies left the meeting at 8.55pm returning at 8.56pm.

CONFIDENTIAL

ITEM 275

ADJOURNED ITEM 70 – PROPOSED SALE OF 39 AND 41 OXFORD
TERRACE UNLEY

ITEM 276

**CONFIDENTIALITY MOTION TO REMAIN IN CONFIDENCE – ITEM 275 –
ADJOURNED ITEM 70 – PROPOSED SALE OF 39 AND 41 OXFORD
TERRACE UNLEY**

MOVED Councillor Salaman
SECONDED Councillor Boisvert

That:

1. The report be received.
2. Pursuant to Section 91(7) and (9) of the Local Government Act:
 - 2.1 The
 - ☒ Report
 - ☒ Attachments
 - ☒ Minutesremain confidential on the basis that the information supplied could confer a commercial advantage on a third party, and
 - 2.2 the report, minutes and attachments will be kept confidential until the item is revoked by the Chief Executive Officer.
 - 2.3 A copy of the Report, Minutes and Attachments be provided to the Audit Committee for information.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The doors to the Council Chambers were opened at 9.45pm.

CLOSURE

The Presiding Member closed the meeting at 9.54pm.

.....
PRESIDING MEMBER

.....