Council Meeting Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> April 2016 NON AGENDA ITEM – Thank you Mayor Brown, elected Councillors , General Manager and Staff-

I would like to acknowledged that I have received a response from Mayor Brown dated 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016 from the Public Forum that I spoke at Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016 on the Rural Lands Strategy.

The response I have received to my questions to the Rural Lands Strategy "invitation only secret meeting" I have made the following observations —"Three complaints were received that the workshops did not cover the rural production issues" and the response I have received has only created further questions which I believe need to be address and answered.

NOW as I stated at the Council meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> March I believed 1 or 3 who left this meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> November influenced someone in authority to conduct this secret invitation only meeting — the facts are these 3 people that I mentioned left at the half way point after the vote was taken against these overlays NOW it must be asked given that they left this meeting before it's conclusion how could they possible know what transpired after they left and it has been confirmed by the Mayor's email that 3 complaints were received?

It is stated in this email "in accordance with current and past practice, when a community member requests a meeting with Council staff, Council staff agree to the request therefore I believe that the 3 complainant's should have been dealt with on an individual basis.

At this point in time it must be asked why were these complaints were not dealt with individually? and who "hand picked "the other farmers who attended this meeting" if others were to be invited the rest of the committee should have also been invited?

The question must be asked again why the majority of the Rural lands Committee were not invited to the "invitation only secret meeting"?

Given that the Consultant identified there were issues in relation the "lack of sufficient feedback from the producers" WHY did he not reconvene the Rural Lands Committee and discuss this issue with the committee as a "whole" as to what he required and seek ideas on HOW it was to be acquired?

ALSO it should be noted that this meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016 actually finished earlier than the advertised time of 7pm.

Elected Councillor's I believe this whole process of the "Rural Lands has been flawed" — why in June 2014 when the General Manager sat in the majority of the 5 group forum meeting and saw the discontent from the Rural Land Holder did she not call a meeting of the RURAL COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE" — rather than allowing a statement to be made that the previous consultant "Mr Danny Wiggins did not have the right temperament for this project" and the question needs to be asked why was the General Manager was absent from the last series of meetings?.

The facts are this Council should have reconvened a meeting of all those who were in attendance at the meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016 – rather than allowing a "them and us" situation occur by those 3 complainants who obviously were just not happy that a vote on these overlays occurred

with the majority voting against these overlays. I firmly believe that these 3 complainants" staged this secret invitation only meeting" for their own AGENDA.

At the meeting when the Rural Lands was adopted on the 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2016 there was an amendment put forward to the proposal words to the effect "That the Council amend the Rural Lands Strategy so as to recommend that the Native Vegetation Overlays not be included either in the Local Environment Plan or Development Control Plan" - the Councillor sitting directly to my right (who is MIA and not in attendance at this meeting) asked a direct question at the meeting as to what the Rural Lands Committee had voted on in relation to the draft? the amendment was lost —

NOW at the following meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> March when item No. NOM16/004 Marine Gateway was put forward it was stated that there had not been a committee meeting since November 2014 some 15 months ago and the committee had not met or voted on this Marine Gateway at Batemans Bay to conduct a feasibility study and the Chairman had actually put this proposal forward on his own that \$50,000.00 of rate payers money be allocated to fund this project, the same councillor (who is not here today) did not ask the most important question as to how the Committee of this project voted and yet this Councillor voted for this proposal without question – NOW where is the consistency?

My view is that some motions placed before this council are being voted on based on what Councillor actually puts the motion forward and the support is being given to that motions based on who that Councillor is, rather than what is in the best interest of this shire as a whole – there is NO consistency, NO equality, NO fairness – and what is being rumoured in this community is being described as back door deals.

Trish Hellier

**Batemans Bay**