



COOLOOLA SHIRE COUNCIL

AGENDA

of the

GENERAL MEETING

CHAIRMAN: Cr M Venardos OAM (Mayor)

**Held in the Boardroom
Old Bank Building,
Cnr Nash & Channon Streets,
Gympie Qld 4570**

**On Tuesday 22nd January 2008
at 9.00 am**



Cooloola Shire Council

GENERAL AGENDA

*Mayor MJ Venardos OAM (Chairman),
Crs. CR Chapman OAM, FG Nissen AM, NR Ellis, LJ
Friske, R. Owen, SS Jocumsen, DR Neilson, IT
Petersen, WJ McIntyre, WW Sachs, J Watt and M.
Prior*

APPOINTMENTS etc.

10.00am **Mr Col Gear, retired Council employee, will join Councillors for morning tea and a presentation for 34 years service to Council.**

CONTENTS:

SECTION 1: OPEN WITH PRAYER.....	4
SECTION 2: APOLOGIES.....	4
SECTION 3: CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING	4
SECTION 4: PETITIONS.....	4
SECTION 5: ADOPTION OF WORKS & SERVICES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	4
SECTION 6: REPORT BY WORKS & SERVICES COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN (CR L FRISKE)	4
SECTION 7: ADOPTION OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	5
SECTION 8: REPORT BY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN (CR D.R NEILSON).....	5
SECTION 9: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT MATTERS (M. HARTLEY)	5
9/1 ELECTION SIGNAGE.....	5
SECTION 10: CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT MATTERS (MJ VENARDOS OAM, C MANSON, B. HAYES)	13
10/1 COOLOOLA SHIRE COUNCIL OPERATIONAL PLAN 2007/2008 REVIEW AS AT 31 DECEMBER	14
10/2 DRAFT REVISED MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR COUNCILLORS	14
SECTION 11: MEETING DATES	16
SECTION 12: FOR YOUR INFORMATION	16

SECTION 13: LATE ITEMS 17

SECTION 14: GENERAL BUSINESS..... 17

SECTION 15: IN COMMITTEE MATTERS 17

SECTION 1: OPEN WITH PRAYER

ONE MINUTES SILENCE TO BE OBSERVED FOR DECEASED
COOLOOLA SHIRE RESIDENTS

SECTION 2: APOLOGIES

**SECTION 3: CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF
PREVIOUS GENERAL MEETING**

(MOTION: That the Minutes of the General Meeting held on 15 January
2008 be taken as read and confirmed.)

SECTION 4: PETITIONS

**SECTION 5: ADOPTION OF WORKS & SERVICES
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

(MOTION: That the Recommendations of the Works and Services
Committee Meeting held on 15 January 2008 as presented, be received.)

(MOTION: That the Recommendations of the Works and Services
Committee Meeting held on 15 January 2008 (as amended), be adopted.)

**SECTION 6: REPORT BY WORKS & SERVICES
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN (Cr L Friske)**

**SECTION 7: ADOPTION OF PLANNING &
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS**

(MOTION: That the Recommendations of the Planning & Development Committee Meeting held on 15 January 2008 as presented, be received.)

(MOTION: That the Recommendations of the Planning & Development Committee Meeting held on 15 January 2008 (as amended), be adopted.)

**SECTION 8: REPORT BY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN (Cr D.R Neilson)**

**SECTION 9: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT MATTERS (M. Hartley)**

9/1 Election Signage

Re: Election Signage
From: Division 2 Councillor – Cr Ron Owen
File: 311/13 Doc ID 868337
Date: 15 January 2008

To supply further information regarding Election Signage, Political Signage and the Freedom of Speech, per Constitutional Protection.

- 1. There are political signs through out the road reserves of the Cooloola Shire some remaining from the last Federal Election, re Kate Malloy and other candidates.*
- 2. At Federal Election and State Elections candidates such as Warren Truss had political signs on private property, Bill Boards and road reserves.*

3. *No applications to Cooloola Shire Council were made by any candidates or any other people before erecting political signs. Signs were erected prior to 28 days of the election.*
4. *Many political signs are in situ through out the shire, some have been in place for many years,ie. Referring Local Government 'Greg has a Hairy Nose', Tin Can Bay Rd.
Signs referring to Peter and Mary and the Dam.*
5. *Complaints have been received concerning the above signs.*
6. *Quite correctly Cooloola Shire Council has taken no action to harass or hinder the above mentioned political signs or the owners of the signs or the owners of the land that they are situation on. CSC has not even removed the political/election signs from the property that it is responsible for the public road way.*
7. *If citizens want to put up signs on there own property saying, Ban Floried, Ban Nuclear Power, Vote for Guy Fawkes they have the constitutional right to do so it is a Freedom of Speech and their democratic freedom to petition others to their cause of that petition.*
8. *The reason for the election sign report before Council is that, last week the acting CEO phoned me and asked me to remove a sign, with 'Vote Ron Owen for Mayor'. The sign was moved to another location. I informed the Acting CEO that there was a political/election sign on private property outside 24 McMahan Rd, and if he thought has the power to prosecute or take down this sign to please come straight away, or to notify me when he or any member of his staff was attending so that I could have camera's and reporters present to record the violation of the land holders Constitutional rights. He told me that he was not coming as he had not received a complaint. I informed him that I was making an official complaint, and he asked him that as he had an official complaint when he was coming. He told me that he would not accept of official complaint.*
9. *The COOLOOLA SHIRE COUNCIL Subordinate Local Law No. 11.1 (Election Advertisement) 2005 states,
2 Object
(1) The object of this subordinate local law is to supplement Local Law No. 11 (Control of Advertisements)
(Subordinate means subordinate to Local Law No 11 (Sign Codes))
(a) Local Law No 11 is the Actual Local Law which is gazetted in the Government Gazette and has followed a tightly held process. Unfortunately, Local Law No 11 (Control of Advertising) has been gazetted under the Local Government Act 1993, Notice (No 3) 1996 published in the Gazette on 20th December 1996 but there seem no record of the gazettal of Local Law No 11 (Sign Codes). This might be legitimised if Local Law No 11 refers to the (Sign Codes). This might be legitimised if Local Law No 11 refers to the (Sign Code) but it does not it only refers to a Council Document called "Policy".*

- (b) *This Local Law is null and void and staff have been attempting to correct this process for several years besides subordinate Electoral Signs 11.1 being a supplement to the Local Law no 11 which is still undergoing this process to legitimise, is null and void.*
- (c) *At the front of this superordinate Local Law No 11.1 Electoral Signs there is no information as to when this was processed through the Governor-in- Council. No date as to when it was gazetted in the Government Gazette to fore fill this process and has no commencement date so on that basis again is null and void.*
- (d) *The subordinate Local Law No 11.1 Electoral Signs document refers in its sections such as definitions of the Act. Yet does not inform us of which Act, the Electoral Act or the Local Government Act, or the Act of Interpretation Act it refers to so can draw no power, interpretation or intention from “the Act”.*
- (e) *The subordinate Local Law No 11.1 Electoral Signs document refers in its section to other Local Laws yet does not state which ones they are just S12(3) or S11(3). We may presume that they are the Local Law No 11, but if they are they have no power of legitimacy as this Local Law has not been proclaimed in the Government Gazette and has not been processed into law correctly. So again produces a null and void status for this document.*
- (f) *Cooloola Shire Council Subordinate Local Law No. 11 (Signs Code) which states. To be read with: Local Law No. 11 (Control of Advertisements) which is a null and void document due to the reasons above, also states that “Divisional Councillor are permitted to erect one (1) election sign” which as the rights of Council divisions have been removed by the majority of this Council then this document again is null and void as it does not apply to a Candidate or a Division.*
- (g) *Cooloola Shire Council Subordinate Local Law No. 11 (Signs Code) which states, To be read with: Local Law No. 11 (Control of Advertisements)*

1.0 PREAMBLE

CITATION

This is Subordinate Local Law No. 11 (Signs Code)

AUTHORITY

This Subordinate Local Law has been adopted (for the purposes of advertising) as Subordinate Local Law pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 12 of the Local Government Act.

10. The Local Government Act controls the Local Governments powers to make Local Laws

Chapter 12 Local laws and subordinate local laws

Part 1 Preliminary

Division 1 Object and application

848 Object

- (1) *A local government’s jurisdiction to make laws is stated in chapter 1, part 1, division 3.*
- (2) *This chapter provides a common law-making process for all laws made by local governments.*

(3) It also provides for subordinate local laws to assist the detailed implementation of a local law's objects.

It also makes provisions for redundant laws and places expiry dates which is defined in 899A Definitions for pt 5 In this part – expiry date means –

(a) for the first review date – 31 December 2010; or

(b) for a subsequent review date – 31 December in the year that is 2 years after the review date.

First review date means 1 January 2008.

But specifically makes the provisions that remove the jurisdiction of Councils Local Law making powers in two specific area's

854A No jurisdiction to make local laws and subordinate local laws about distributing how-to-vote cards

(1) A local government has no jurisdiction to make a local law or subordinate local law prohibiting or regulating the distribution of how-to-vote cards for an election under this Act or the Electoral Act 1992.

854A No jurisdiction to make local laws and subordinate local laws prohibiting placement of election signs or posters

(1) A local government has no jurisdiction to make a local law or subordinate local law prohibiting, in its area, the placement of election signs or poster for an election under this Act, the City of Brisbane Act 1924, the Electoral Act 1992 or the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918 (Cwlth).

(2) A local law or subordinate local law, to the extent it is contrary to subsection (1), is of no effect.

(3) In this section –

Election signs or posters means signs or posters that are able, or are intended-

(a) to influence a person about voting at an election; or

(b) to affect the result of an election.

11. The reasons for both of these are very obvious as if they were not included Councillors could propose, debate and vote in heir own cause, they would have a "Personal Material Interest' in the outcome. For example they could ban their political opponents How to Vote Cards or ban their political opponent political signs. A councillors may have an interest in a newspaper and want all candidates to compete in that forum where he had free advantage. Thos are some of the reasons why the Local Government Act has taken the jurisdiction away from councils to legislate in this area. Section 854AA makes Cooloola Shire Councils electoral Sign 11.1 null and void.

12. Please Note.244 Exclusion from meeting of councillor with material personal interest

(1) A councillor who has a material personal interest in an issue to be considered at a meeting of the local government, or any of its committees-

(a) must disclose the interest to the meeting; and

(b) must not be present at or take part in the meeting while the issue is being considered or voted on.

(2) A councillor who is barred from a meeting under subsection

(1) must not be in the chamber where the meeting is being conducted, including any area set apart for the public.

All Councillors have a material personal interest and should not discuss or take part in any motion where we have no jurisdiction and have a material personal interest.

13. Other reasons why the Local Government Act 1993 has removed this jurisdiction and not given power to Local Governments to legislate in these areas is the Constitutional protection provisions under the Commonwealth Crimes Act 1912 and the Queensland Criminal Code of 1899. The Constitutional protections are enforced by this legislation and would impact on staff either removing signs from private property of writing to property owners hindering or obstructing them in carrying out a Constitutional right to place political signs or messages on their property.

14. See below. CRIMES ACT 1914 – SECT 28 Interfering with Political Liberty

Any person who, by violence or by threats or intimidation of any kind, hinders or interferes with the free exercise or performance, by any other person, of any political right or duty, shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Imprisonment for 3 years.

And

CRIMINAL CODE ACT 1899 – SCHEDULE 1 THE CRIMINAL CODE.

78 Interfering with political liberty

(1) Any person who by violence, or by threats or intimidation of any kind, hinders or interferes with the free exercise of any political right by another person, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment for 2 years.

(2) If the offender is a public officer, and commits the offence in abuse of the offender's authority as such officer, the offender is liable to imprisonment for 3 years.

15. No provision has been placed in the Cooloola Shire Council's Electoral Signs Local Laws to protect staff from prosecution of any sort civil or criminal. If Council wished it could make resolutions to amend the subordinate Local Law to protect the employee from civil prosecution by funding the employee's defence in court and paying any fines. Cooloola Shire Council has no legal mechanism at its disposal to protect its employees from a Criminal prosecution under the Crimes Act or the Criminal Code and it would not be able to collectively serve the imprisonment for 3 years. Cooloola Shire Council Staff should not be placed in this jeopardy.

16. As the Legislative hierarchy in Australia commenced with the Commonwealth Constitution, to Commonwealth Legislation, to State Legislation, to Local Laws to Subordinate Legislation, Cooloola Shire Legislation can never hope to have precedence over the State Law, Cooloola Shire Council has a duty to protect its staff from prosecution.

17. Motile vs Cambooya Shire Council and Anor [2004] QSC 50

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — Powers, functions and duties of councils generally— Powers over advertising signs and hoardings — Extent of power — Whether council had power to remove election signs exhibited on land under its control. Justice Fryberg

In my judgment, insofar as it applies to roads, s 17(1)(c) of Local Law No 8 is not rendered ineffective by s 854AA of the Local Government Act.

Justice Fryberg refused to look at the prohibition in a general, due to time consideration and the impending election of 2004 to look at s 854AA as it was an application for a declaration, and all the signs had been placed on public roads under the control of the Council.

Justice Fryberg found that the Council had a common law right as do the property owners of erecting or removing signs on property under their control.

*18. Freedom of Speech and Political Rights are defined in many diverse documents, such as Australian Journal of Human Rights by Jeremy Webber**

“There are many ways in which rights might plausibly be implied. The ones that have attained the most currency, however, are founded on constitutional provisions that establish democratic structures of government. The argument is that democratic institutions cannot operate without free political debate. Some protection of freedom of speech must therefore be implied.

As mentioned above, this mechanism involves the determination that certain rights are implicit in the Constitution. Commonly, the rights are founded upon constitutional terms that establish democratic institutions (from which rights to political free speech are derived) or establish the courts (from which norms to protect judicial independence are derived). This is certainly the case in Australia, where the High Court has recognised a right of free political expression, working off the provisions establishing representative government in the Australian Constitution (notably ss 7 and 24, which state that members of the Senate and House of Representatives are to be ‘directly chosen by the people’). In the first of these cases, Brennan J (as he then was) summarised the essential argument (Nationwide News at 48—49):

‘... where a representative democracy is constitutionally entrenched, it carries with it those legal incidents which are essential to the effective maintenance of that form of government. Once it is recognised that a representative democracy is constitutionally prescribed, the freedom of discussion which is essential to sustain it is as firmly entrenched in the Constitution as the system of government which the Constitution expressly ordains.’

This right was used to strike down laws that prohibited criticism of members of the Industrial Relations Commission and that limited television advertising in elections (Nationwide News Pty Ltd v Wills; Australian Capital Television Pty Ltd v Commonwealth). It also prompted the High Court to revise the law of defamation insofar as it applies to criticism of public officials (Theophanous v Herald & Weekly; Lange v Australia Broadcasting Corporation).

Other rights too might be implied from the Constitution. In McGinty v Western Australia, the Court considered whether the Western Australian Constitution required rough equality in the determination of electoral boundaries (so that each person's vote would be of approximately equal value). The Court refused to find such a requirement. The High Court has declined to hold that a general right of equality can be derived from the Federal Constitution (Leeth v Commonwealth; Kruger v Commonwealth). But other principles with strong

rights implications have been implied. In both Australia and Canada, the courts have developed constitutional guarantees of the independence of the judiciary, from which additional limitations have been derived: in Canada, judicial review of the jurisdiction of administrative tribunals has been constitutionalised on this basis; in Australia, the principle of the separation of powers has been used to strike down a law designed to keep a named offender in preventative detention beyond the end of his original sentence.”

**Webber J ‘beyond regret: Mabo’s implications for Australian constitutionalism’ in Division, PPATTON and W Sanders (eds) Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000 pp 60-88.*

19. In High Court decisions such as Theophanous v Herald and Weekly Times Limited [1994] HCA 46; (1994) 182 CLR 104; (1994) 124 ALR 1 (1994) Aust Torts Reports 81-297 (12 October 1994, the High Court acknowledges the Constitution rights of the people to free political expression. In Theophanous many other earlier cases such as the Australian Capital Television case are quoted. There are no shortage of examples but please read the quotes from this case below as samples:-

“In the context of those dramatic changes since 1901, there is manifest wisdom in Inglis Clark’s instruction that, in its application to contemporary conditions and exigencies, the Constitution must be treated as “a living force” and not as “a declaration of the will and intentions of men long since dead”. In following that instruction in the present case, the Court must take full account of contemporary social and political circumstances and perceptions in determining whether an unqualified application of State defamation laws to political communication and discussion is consistent with the constitutional implication of freedom.”

“The full answer to it is, however, that it is now well settled that, in the application of constitutional guarantees or immunities, one must look to substance rather than form. When that is done, it is apparent that potential civil liability in damages and costs is likely to represent a much more effective curtailment of the freedom of political communication and discussion than the possibility of conviction of most of the many criminal offences which are punishable by a pecuniary penalty (179) See, e.g., City of Chicago v. Tribune Co. (1923) 139 NE 86.”

“To a significant extent, the law of defamation in our various State jurisdictions represents the adjustment, by the State Parliament or by the common law, of the competing demands of freedom of speech on the one hand and protection of individual reputation on the other. The adjustment cannot, however, override the operation or effect of the Constitution’s implication of freedom of political communication and discussion to which, as has been seen, State laws and legislative powers are subjected. Nor can the approach be adopted by this Court that the common law’s or a State Parliament’s adjustment of the competing claims of free speech and private reputation should be simply accepted as dispensing with a full and proper consideration of the question whether the curtailment of political communication and discussion effected by a State’s defamation laws is consistent with the constitutional implication. For one thing, that approach would represent an abnegation of the Court’s constitutional function and duty. For another, the

common law's or a State Parliament's adjustment of the competing claims of general free speech on the one hand and the need to protect reputation on the other will inevitably have been made without regard to the Constitution's specific implication of the freedom of one particular category of communication and speech."

"As Duff CJ and Davis J commented in Re Alberta Legislation ((189) (1938) SCR 100 at 133; (1938) 2 DLR 81 at 107.):

"The statute contemplates a Parliament working under the Influence of public opinion and public discussion. There Can be no controversy that such institutions derive their efficacy from the free public discussion of affairs, from criticism and answer and counter-criticism, from attack upon policy and administration and defence and counter-attack; from the freest and fullest analysis and examination from every point of view of political proposals. This is signally true in respect of the discharge by Ministers of the Crown of their responsibility to Parliament, by members of Parliament of their duty to the electors, and by the electors themselves of their responsibilities in the election of their representatives.'

"Clearly, the freedom of the citizen to examine, discuss and criticise the suitability for office of the elected members of the Parliament (or candidates for such election((192) See e.g., Monitor Patriot Co. v. Roy (1971) 401 US 265 at 271; Harte-Hanics Communications v. Connaughton (1989)491 US 657 at 686-687; Coleman v. MacLennan (1908)98 P 281 at 286.)) and the manner in which they discharge their functions and duties as such lies at the very heart of the freedom which the implication protects. Such examination, discussion and criticism would be all but pointless if the ordinary citizen were effectively precluded from making any statements or comments which cause injury to the reputation of a particular member or candidate.

Be that as it may, the answer to this third line of argument seems to me to be that a risk that some may be deterred from seeking public office is a comparatively small price to pay for the freedom of the citizen to engage fully in the political communications and discussions which are an incident of representative government without fear of crushing financial consequences." "32. At the end of the day, it appears to me to be plain that the serious curtailment of the freedom of political communication and discussion which is involved in an unqualified application of State defamation laws to render the citizen liable in damages for the making of statements about the official conduct or suitability of a member of the Parliament or other holder of high public office in the service of the Commonwealth (such as a member of this Court) cannot be justified in the public interest in the narrow sense explained above. It follows that the unqualified application of those laws to impose such liability is inconsistent with the implication and precluded by the Constitution."

"Australian Capital Television Pty. Ltd. v. The Commonwealth (1992) 177 CLR at 19 1-195.). Sections 7 and 24, and the other provisions of the Constitution, do not guarantee free speech but provide for representative government. The only necessary or obvious implication, if indeed it be a mailer of implication at all, is that there must be freedom of communication to the

*extent that it is a requirement of representative government. The Legislative powers of the Commonwealth under s. 51 of the Constitution are subject to the Constitution and hence subject to ss.7 and 24. No doubt ss.7 and 24 not only inhibit Commonwealth legislative power but also prevail over any inconsistent State law. **If a State legislature were to enact legislation which interfered with the requirements of s.7 or s.24, the legislation would be invalid either for simple inconsistency with the Constitution, or as an interference with Commonwealth governmental authority**(2 10) See *Melbourne Corporation v. The Commonwealth* [1947] HCA 26; (1947) 74 CLR 31 at 81.) or as beyond the power of the State legislature to legislate for the peace, order and good government of the State - perhaps for all three reasons. It is unnecessary to pursue that aspect of the matter further.”*

“8. The first step is to say that the Constitution contains a guarantee of freedom of communication which is the equivalent of the First Amendment guarantee of freedom of speech. It is not, of course, express like the First Amendment guarantee, but is said to be implied by the requirement of representative government which is contained in the Australian Constitution.”

*“The defendants are correct in contending that in *Australian Capital Television* a majority of this Court held that the institution of representative government is an inherent part of the Constitution, that freedom to discuss the government of the Commonwealth is an indispensable condition of representative government and that the freedom of discussion extends to all levels of government in Australia.”*

20. The residents of Cooloola Shire know they have a right to place an election sign on their own property. Bullying and intimidation are illegal in law and have only prevailed in the past due to a partnership between a Newspaper and a Mayor. The introduction of free integrity into this coming election will finish the fear tactics for the future.

Recommendation: (Director of Planning & Development – M. Hartley and Acting Director of Corporate Services – B. Hayes)

That due to time constraints, a late report will be provided.

<p>SECTION 10: CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT MATTERS (MJ Venardos OAM, C Manson, B. Hayes)</p>

10/1	Cooloola Shire Council Operational Plan 2007/2008 Review as at 31 December
------	--

Re: Cooloola Shire Council Operational Plan 2007/2008 Review as at 31 December
From: Acting Chief Executive Officer, C. Manson
File:
Date: 16 January 2008

Report: (Acting Chief Executive Officer – C. Manson)

Cooloola Shire Council Operational Plan 2007/2008 as at 31 December is due for review, and was delivered to Councillors with last week's agenda.

Recommendation: (Acting Chief Executive Officer – C. Manson)

That the Cooloola Shire Council Operational Plan 2007/2008 Review as at 31 December 2007 be received.

10/2	Draft Revised Model Code of Conduct for Councillors
------	---

Re: Draft Revised Model Code of Conduct for Councillors
From: Acting Chief Executive Officer, C. Manson
File:
Date: 16 January 2008

“The Department of Local Government, Sport and Recreation has revised the Model Code of Conduct for councillors. The revised Model Code of Conduct has been simplified in order to provide greater clarity for councillors about their ethical and behavioural obligations.

Gazettal of the revised Model Code of Conduct will occur before the local government elections in March this year. It is intended that the new Model Code of Conduct will apply to newly amalgamated councils. New councils will therefore not be required to decide which of the former council's Code of Conduct will apply. More information on the revised Model Code of Conduct is provided below.

Please find a draft version of the revised Model Code of Conduct attached. The Department is inviting comments on the draft Model Code of Conduct. If you have any comments on the draft Model Code of Conduct please email them to Victoria.Turns@dlgpsr.qld.gov.au by 5pm Thursday 24 January 2008.

Local governments are required by the Local Government Act 1993 to adopt a Code of Conduct, and may choose to adopt the Model Code of Conduct. If a local government has not adopted a Code of Conduct within 6 months of each

quadrennial election (s.250C), then the Model Code of Conduct applies to councillors of the local government.

It is intended that following implementation of local government reforms and elections in March 2008, the Model Code of Conduct will apply to all new local governments until the local government makes a new Code of Conduct. If the local government does not make a Code of Conduct, the Model Code of Conduct will continue to apply. For those local governments who have not amalgamated, the code of conduct that have previously adopted will continue to apply.

Local governments may choose to adopt their own Code of Conduct, provided it is consistent with the requirements of the Act (s.250F). A local government Code of Conduct must include the statutory obligations for councillors and information about whether a penalty applies, a statement of what constitutes a “repeat breach” and information about making a complaint. The Model Code of Conduct contains these minimum requirements. In addition, a local government Code of Conduct may include additional ethical and behavioural obligations for councillors that are consistent with the ethics principles in the Act. Those ethics principles are included in the Model Code of Conduct.

The Model Code of Conduct provides general information only. It is important that councillors be familiar with the relevant provisions of the Act.

WHO THE CODE OF CONDUCT APPLIES TO

The Code of Conduct applies to councillors, including the mayor, in performing their duties of office (s.250E). Councillors must comply with the obligations in the Code of Conduct. Once elected or appointed a councillor must sign a declaration of office which includes the councillor’s agreement to comply with the Code of Conduct (s.242(4B)).”

Report: (Acting Chief Executive Officer – C. Manson)

The Draft Revised Model Code of Conduct for Councillors has recently been received from The Department of Local Government, Sport and Recreation asking for comments on the Draft to be made by Thursday 24 January 2008.

Recommendation: (Acting Chief Executive Officer – C. Manson)

That Councillors provide any further comments to the Acting Director of Corporate Services to be included in a combined submission.

SECTION 11: MEETING DATES

The meeting dates for the month of February 2008 have been set as follows:

TUESDAY, 5th February 2008	GENERAL 9AM WORKS & SERVICES COMMITTEE TO COMMENCE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING
TUESDAY, 12th February 2008	GENERAL 9AM PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TO COMMENCE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING
TUESDAY, 19th February 2008	GENERAL 9 AM ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE TO COMMENCE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING SHIRE GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TO COMMENCE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING.
TUESDAY, 26th February 2008	GENERAL 9AM PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TO COMMENCE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING

SECTION 12: FOR YOUR INFORMATION

- Copy of report on the recent information days for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the proposed Traveston Crossing Dam.

Recommendation: (Acting Chief Executive Officer – C. Manson)

That the information be received.

SECTION 13: LATE ITEMS

SECTION 14: GENERAL BUSINESS

SECTION 15: IN COMMITTEE MATTERS