

Minutes – Mount Peter Master Planning Taskforce Meeting



Date	18 TH November 2008	Start Time	3:30pm	Finish Time	5:15pm	Location – Cairns Regional Council, Committee Room.
Meeting Purpose	Taskforce Meeting					
Attendees	Mr Trevor Gordon (Chair), Cr Nancy Lanskey, Cr Paul Gregory, Noel Briggs, Tracie McPherson, Peter Tabulo, Peter Boyd, Bruce Gardiner, Steve Tyter, Dan Staley (DIP), Alison Stevens (DIP) Rachel Reese (QT), Helius Visser (MRQ), Vanessa Maruna (Pre), Ray Stokes (Sat), Adam Gowlett (Sat), Blue Williams (Mou), Kristy Gilvear (Con), Andrew Lyndon (H&S), Ben McDonnell (Con), Denis Crema (Den), Brian Haratsis (Mac), Sandra Burke, Adrian Sains (MPG), Brent O'Neill (MPG), Kerry Nisbett(MPG)					
Apologies	Mayor Schier, John Hawkes, Natalie Ormsby (QT), Roy Lavis (CEC), Scott Christiansen (CEC), Alan Savina (Preg)					
Observers	Gavin Allwood (B&M), Theo Kranbias (Den), Ben Coman (Mac)					

Actions and Agreements

Item	What	Who	When	Completed
1	Welcome & Introductions 1. Trevor Gordon welcomed all.	ALL	To note	
2	Chairmans Motion The Chair proposed that the Taskforce resolve ; A. Motion #1 to the Taskforce as follows be withdrawn; <i>“1. The Terms Of Reference be altered to the following: “7. Responsibilities of the Taskforce The Master Planning Taskforce is responsible for : • Ensuring that the Project is delivered on time & on budget. • Ensuring that co ordination is occurring between the various Groups. • Ensuring that members are being kept in formed about the project. The Taskforce, itself, does not produce any direct outputs (apart from Agenda/Minutes). It is a forum to review and to monitor progress. The Taskforce does not direct consultants engaged by Council”.”</i> B. Chairman’s open letter to Taskforce (Attachment 1) be accepted by the Taskforce as a reasonable and correct interpretation of the Taskforce Terms of Reference. <i>Items A & B were moved by Ray Stokes, seconded by Denis Crema.</i>	ALL	To Note	

	<p>C. That Motion 2a be modified and accepted by the Taskforce as follows ; Requests by Members (and agreed to by Taskforce) for the Consultants to undertake additional workshops / consultation or studies may give rise to additional costs if beyond the scope of work of the Cairns Regional Council / Cardno contract. Costs may be on-charged by the Cairns Regional Council to MOU Signatories (severally or jointly depending upon the nature of the requests and required meetings).</p> <p>D. That Motion 2b and 2c be deleted as follows : <i>“2b That Council has responded appropriately to the request by the Denor Group for details on project Briefs & Study Methodology and as such the Taskforce will not consider any further discussion on this topic”.</i> <i>“2c Developer Members confirm their commitment to the Project, to signing the MOU & to paying in accordance with the MOU and to abide by the request from the Chair that all correspondence be directed through the Chair in the first instance”.</i></p> <p>E.. That Motion 2D be accepted by the Taskforce as follows: That while the Taskforce deliberations are not of a confidential nature, the Taskforce would consider a serious breach of a code of conduct to have occurred if any Member was to provide to the media information/documentation that had not been approved from release by the Chair or the Mayor</p>			
2	<p>Previous Minutes (22nd Oct 2008 - #1536955v15) All other matters in minutes were correct, (<i>moved – Peter Tabulo /seconded – Denis Crema</i>)</p>	ALL	To Note	-
3	<p>Actions for Review from previous Meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representation to Federal members on Bruce Highway upgrade & follow up with Main Roads – <i>letter sent from CRC to State Member</i> 2. Revised MOU to be circulated and signed by all parties – <i>All except Denor signed. Will sign 18/11/08</i> 3. Information session with Gary White on Ripley Experience 4. Preliminary State Agency (v3) position paper issued to Taskforce. Comments due back to DIP by 01/10/08 . 5. Document Register to be issued to FSS 6. Catholic Diocese presentation at future Taskforce meeting- date to be fixed (not at Jan 09 meeting) 7. Meet with MPG to discuss Economic modelling 8. Question relating to flooding/development & response back to BH 9. Question relating to application of 5 m contour to flood model & response back to AG 10. Council review & response to Taskforce on document titled “Developer member report” 	<p>Cr G/ PB Dev Memb’s. DS ALL MPG PB BH SB SB PT/PB/SB</p>	<p>Dec 08 18/11/08 21/01/09 27/10/08 06/10/08 TBA 14/11/08 29/10/08 29/1/0/08 13/11/08</p>	<p>In progress In progress In progress Complete Complete In progress Complete Complete Complete Complete</p>
4	<p>Landowner & Community Ref Group (L&CRG) Update – Cr Lanskey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Workshop #1 conducted by MPG held on 15th October 2008. • Landowner & Community Reference Group to meet 18/11/08 • Community Workshop #2 scheduled for 27th November 2008. Proposed discussion on densities, population & framework options 	ALL	To Note	

5	State Agency Update <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State Agency review of draft Assumptions, Principles & Standards document completed 2. Gary White (DIP) scheduled to present at Taskforce meeting 21/01/09 3. DIP to review requirements of various agencies set out in the State Agency Position paper and report back to Taskforce on the review at /or before the Ebd” 	ALL ALL DIP	To Note To Note 09/02/09	
6	Project Update <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Project Update <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Progress - progressing well as per Program and Milestones b. Budget <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - YTD actual expenditure is \$79k below YTD budget - YTD actual revenue is \$358k below YTD budget – due to outstanding invoice payments and is significant issue. Denor and Satterley advise payment of outstanding invoices will be done immediately (asap) c. Risks – no change to risk status d. Communications – update on stakeholder & community engagement activities 	ALL Denor/Satter	To Note 24/11/08	
7	Master Planning Team Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presentation on project activities leading up to end of Dec 08 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 MPMPG to amend Assumptions paper to incorporate issues / changes as discussed at Assumptions workshop 1.2 MPMPG to circulate amended Assumptions Paper, Technical Papers and Workshop Outcomes Report by mid Dec 08” 2. Overview of actions arising from Assumptions, Principles & Standards w’shop of 17/11/08 	ALL MPMPG MPMPG ALL	To Note Mid Dec 08 Mid Dec 08 To Note	
8	Developer Member report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Denor (BH) commented that the workshop on 17/11 was well handled 2. CEC/ Moule (KG) commented that the workshop on 17/11 was well handled 3. Satterley (RS) commended that he was happy that the process was moving forward and working towards an outcome 4. Pregno (VM) nothing further to add 5. HS Vision (AL) happy with progress to date. Commended that 50k population was going to influence urban form 	ALL	To Note	
9	General Business <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Council response to "Developer Member Report" (signatories being Satterley & Denor) provided to Taskforce. No further discussion required 	ALL	To Note	
10	Meeting closed - Next Meeting Date – 16 December 2008and then 21 January 2009 December meeting to be an information session regarding technical papers.			

Attachment 1 - Chairman's open letter to Taskforce

Dear Task Force Members,

The purpose of this open letter is to bring to your attention my views on the progress of the taskforce, to raise some concerns that I have and to suggest a means of overcoming the concerns.

I ask that you accept that this letter is not a legal document. The sole purpose of the letter and the motion that is proposed is to make our meetings more productive and inclusive of all members.

Firstly, the progress of the Taskforce.

I am very positive about the achievements of the Taskforce. The Taskforce is a large group of skilled people drawn together to create a Plan for the Mt Peter Area – a Plan which will influence the lives of generations of people. Achievements would include the establishment of processes, the development of a broad vision, production of tender documents, the appointment of a planner and the commencement of the development of the Plan

What are my concerns?

I am sure that we know the difference between good and bad meetings. Good meetings have a clear purpose, all participants feel involved, there can be disagreements and debates, but resolutions are achieved, there are clear outcomes etc etc.

It is my opinion that meeting of October 22 was not a good meeting.

What do I see as the problem?

I believe that item 7 of the Terms of Reference of the Taskforce is being interpreted in a number of ways. Item 7 states that the Taskforce is responsible for 'planning and direction' and these words are being interpreted in different ways. We have discussed these differences of interpretation on a number of occasions but I believe that the differences have not been resolved. These differences make the operation of the meetings very difficult.

How can the problem be addressed?

My views on the roles of the members of the Taskforce, and the roles of the appointed planners (Cardno) are as follows.

The **independent chair** has responsibility for running a 'good' meeting' – I have already identified a number of elements of what I would consider to be a 'good' meeting and clearly I have concerns about recent meetings

The Councillors are, in my opinion, ultimately responsible for the Plan. They are the elected representatives and the community holds them responsible for the quality of the Plan.

The Council Officers. The Council Officers are responsible to the elected Council for ensuring that a quality Plan is produced.

Cardno (Cardno is used as an example of a consultant – the comments about Cardno would refer to all Consultants engaged by the Council): Cardno is responsible to the Council for the development of the Plan. They have a contractual agreement with the Council, are responsible to the Council and are bound by the legal requirements of the contract. Whilst they are expected to attend Taskforce Meetings, provide reports and listen carefully to advice and concerns, they have no direct responsibility to the Taskforce and are not obliged to report to or accept advice from members of the Taskforce.

Developer Members : Developer members fund the development of the Plan on the understanding that their funding will be returned in infrastructure provision to the same value. The Developers are members of the Taskforce and as such receive progress reports and are able to offer advice on the development of the Master Plan, and participate in workshops as organised by Cardno as part of their process of consultation. Developer members may provide additional advice and data to Cardno but Cardno has no reporting relationship to the Developer members and no obligation to accept the advice or data from the Developer members.

Directors and Members of State Agencies: The role of this group is to attend Taskforce meetings and to provide advice and data to Cardno both at the Taskforce meetings and at other times as required. Cardno has no reporting relationship to the State Agencies.

I am proposing that Item 7 of the Terms of Reference be adjusted to reflect the roles that I have described.

My Motion (which is included in the Agenda for the meeting) is as follows:

“7. Responsibilities of the Taskforce

The Master Planning Taskforce is responsible for :

- Ensuring that the Project is delivered on time & on budget.*
- Ensuring that co ordination is occurring between the various Groups.*
- Ensuring that members are being kept in formed about the project.*

The Taskforce, itself, does not produce any direct outputs (apart from Agenda/Minutes). It is a forum to review and to monitor progress. The Taskforce does not direct consultants engaged by Council”.

C:\TEMP\LIVE-#1536955-v16-CSC_-_MINUTES_of_Taskforce_Meetings.DOC