Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 1 -	
Moved: ***Michael Foster*** ***Seconded:*** ***Professor Pamela Sharpe***	That: 1. This public meeting calls upon the University of Tasmania to suspend all action in relation to its proposed relocation from its Sandy Bay campus until the proposal has been subject to a public inquiry as to its merits.
Officer Response - That the Council request UTAS respond to this part of the resolution, as the City cannot compel or require UTAS to do anything in relation to the University's own decision-making processes or outcomes. The Lord Mayor has written to UTAS on 21 March 2022 following the Notice of Motion passed on 15 March 2022 asking that UTAS carry out considered consultation and engagement around the city move.	
	2. This public meeting calls upon the Premier of Tasmania, Jeremy Rockliff, to initiate an urgent public inquiry into the merits of the proposal by the University of Tasmania to relocate from its Sandy Bay campus.
Officer Response - That Council resolve it is unable to give effect to this resolution. It is a matter for the Premier to determine whether to initiate a public inquiry to review the merits of the proposed relocation. The movers of the motion can instead advance their request for an inquiry through their State or Federal Members of Parliament.	
	3. This public meeting calls upon the councillors of the City of Hobart to cease cooperation with the University of Tasmania in relation to its proposed relocation from Sandy Bay except in relation to statutory obligations.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Officer Response - That Council resolve it is unable to give effect to this resolution. The City cannot cease 'cooperation' with a stakeholder and public authority in the municipal area with the exception of any 'statutory obligations'. A public meeting decision cannot bind any Elected Member engagement with a public institution, nor any stakeholder.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 2 -		
Moved:	***Judy Tierney***	That:
Seconded:	***Maureen Robinson***	An open and transparent inquiry be held to fully explain to the people of Hobart why there has been such the lack of public consultation and provision of information to allow informed debate on the University of Tasmania's and the Hobart City Council's support for the proposed move of the current Hobart university campus to the city.

Officer Response -

That Council resolve it has no jurisdiction to effect this resolution.

The City itself has no jurisdiction to run any such inquiry. The movers of the motion can instead advance their request for an inquiry through their State or Federal Members of Parliament.

The report on the Notice of Motion passed on 15 March 2022 to be tabled alongside this report, will reflect that for more than 14 years, consecutive Councils have discussed and made strategic city-shaping decisions based on the University's presence in the city. Elected Members of this Council have also been on Council tours of univer-cities around the world and returned to encourage the Council to create stronger ties with UTAS and support for their increased presence in the city. This Council, and previous Councils have consistently made decisions that commit to advancing teaching, learning, research and innovation in the heart of Hobart. These have been named up as economic, social and cultural priorities for the future of the City.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 3 -	
Moved: ***Joseph Bugden*** ***Seconded:*** ***John Hamilton***	That: Any proposed development of the University of Tasmania site at Sandy Bay be rejected on the basis of broad and relevant community concerns and that, further, the site be retained and used for public education, as was the basis on which the site was provided by the Government of Tasmania on behalf of the people of Tasmania.
Officer Response - That Council resolve it cannot allow such a resolution to subvert its statutory obligations. A public meeting cannot fetter the statutory planning requirements of a Council.	

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 4 -		
Moved:	***Louise Bloomfield - Chairman Confederation of Greater Hobart Business Ltd***	That: The Hobart City Council reconsider its responsibilities to small business owners and ensuring that the parking supply is maintained at healthy levels so they can continue to trade.
Seconded:	***Paul Daniels***	

Officer Response -

Council seeks to balance the integrated transport, parking and access needs for all users of the city. Council recognises that some small business owners wish to see parking supply maintained as the city grows, and, parking will continue to be a key aspect of Council's future precinct planning including the Central Hobart Precinct Plan and the future North Hobart Precinct Plan.

Council is keen to ensure that any provision of car parking by UTas within the CBD is built on sound evidence-based analysis of this need and impact.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 5 -	
Moved: ***Paul Daniels***	That:
Seconded: ***Louise Bloomfield***	Elected members list the relationships they have with UTAS, and those of their 'close associates' with the latter being as defined in the *Local Government Act.*

Officer Response -

That elected members continue to ensure any interests are declared in relation to UTAS in accordance with their statutory obligations.

Elected members have obligations around the declaration of interests in Part 5 of the *Local Government Act 1993* ("the Act"). Section 48(2) of the Act requires an elected member to declare any interest that the elected member has in a matter before any discussion on that matter commences. In accordance with the requirement in section 54 of the Act, the CEO maintains a register of interests of elected members where the elected member has notified the CEO of that interest.

It remains a matter for each elected member to determine whether they have an interest in a matter and fulfil their obligations to declare it.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 6 -		
Moved:	***Louise Elliot***	That:
Seconded:	***Denis McLoughlin***	1. The Council advise the public what, if any, studies have been undertaken directly or initiated by the Hobart City Council solely or in partnership with UTAS about UTAS relocation and make these studies available in full to the public within fourteen business days of this meeting.
Officer Response - A 2018 UTAS report "Potential socio-economic impacts report" will be tabled in the Notice of Motion (NoM) report scheduled for the Council meeting on 30 May. A study on underutilised CBD sites carried out through the Speculate Research Experience program is available here: https://www.hobartcity.com.au/files/assets/public/projects/speculate/speculate-underutilised-20190902-hn-print-h.pdf All existing reports are available here: https://www.hobartcity.com.au/Projects/Speculate-Research-Experience-projects Any additional material available that relates to this motion will be addressed through the Council report on the NoM from 15 March 2022 to be presented to Council on 30 May 2022.		
		2. The Council make available to the public the meeting agendas, papers and minutes from the Hobart City Council and UTAS Governance Council meetings for the past eight years within fourteen business days of this meeting.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Officer Response -

Council resolve that the response to this resolution cannot be provided due to a current Right to Information Request.

The material proposed for release by this resolution is not currently publically available and is currently the subject of an application for assessed disclosure pursuant to section 13 of the *Right to Information Act 2009*. It is therefore not appropriate that it be released prior to that application being assessed.

3. The Council write to the Premier asking that he support the undertaking of a comprehensive, independent, and public review of UTAS relocation at the State Government level.

Officer Response -

That Council resolve it is unable to give effect to this resolution.

It is a matter for the Premier to determine whether to initiate a public inquiry to review the merits of the proposed relocation. The movers of the motion can instead advance their request for an inquiry through their State or Federal Members of Parliament.

4. The Council formally request in writing to UTAS that:

   a. UTAS withdraw or pause the applications they have submitted to the Hobart City Council and submit no further applications until a response from the State Government regarding a public review is received or until Local Government elections are held and finalised and a new Council appointed in around October this year (whichever is later) and;

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Officer Response -

That Council resolve it is unable to give effect to this resolution.

Council cannot deny its statutory function as a planning authority – there is a significant risk to giving effect to this motion in terms of interrupting the capacity of council to perform its statutory duties. Further the effect of this motion is contingent on the State Government deciding to request a public review.

b. UTAS cease and rewind relocation activities that have already made into the city in recent years, with some reasonable exceptions, given the strong and widespread community support against their move and indicate that the Council is making this request on behalf of these community the Council represents.

Officer Response -

That Council resolve it is unable to give effect to this resolution.

Council cannot respond to this part of the resolution, as the City cannot compel or require UTAS to do anything in relation to the University's own decision-making processes or outcomes. It is entirely a matter for UTAS as to whether it wishes to rewind its activities such as the Menzies Research Institute, the Hedberg, the Conservatorium of Music, the Hunter Street Art School and the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Sciences – all of which are current operations in the City.

5. The Council develop a policy that governs Council's relationships with other parties when the other party is seeking (directly or indirectly) to influence the strategic direction and vision of our City and that the draft policy be made available for public consultation within 14 calendar days of this meeting.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Officer Response -

Council note the existing policies that govern relationships with stakeholders.

The Council does not have a specific policy as noted in the motion, however it does have a range of documents which suggest that the development of a policy is not necessary.

The Intergovernmental Relations and Advocacy Framework, an internal document endorsed by Council in 2021, provides a framework for Council to undertake advocacy, intergovernmental and stakeholder relations in a post COVID-19 environment.

Additionally, the City's vision – *Hobart: A community vision for our island capital* sets out the City's ten-year Strategic Plan which is used as the basis for all activities and decisions. This will also be enhanced upon the finalisation of the Central Hobart Precincts Plan currently under development to guide the future of the City.

It is therefore considered that the development of a further policy is not necessary.

Attachment A: Save UTAS Campus Public Meeting: Response to Motions

Motion 7 -		
Moved:	***Marcos Gogolin***	That:
Seconded:	***Nigel Legge***	It be acknowledged that back in 2012/3 the Tasmanian TAFE Department of Creative Industries South, along with its staff and its 300 enrolled students, were invited by UTas to move to the UTas Centre for the Arts at Hunter St. This move came with many promises (e.g. advanced fabrication lab; multimedia lab; workshops for wood design; for jewellery; for ceramics; car parking etc.) especially towards engaging with younger students via articulation programs for VET towards a UTas bachelor degree. As students were co-enrolled by TAFE and UTas it allowed double dipping on government funding. Articulation was never consolidated towards students' qualifications thus the initial promise became only beneficial to UTas and TAFE managements' budget at the time. UTas made promises which became an opportunity grab, jobs for mates with TAFE and the VET sector becoming a casualty, this must not be allowed to occur elsewhere.
Officer Response -		
That Council take no action in relation to this resolution, as Council has no authority to take any action associated with this motion.		