

Towards improved local government in southern Tasmania - Community Feedback on Options

27th August to 2nd September 2011

Please note

- This document contains the emails that have been sent to the Independent Panel.
- The emails have been edited to delete the names or other text that may identify the individual that has sent the email.
- All edits, other than the deletion of names, are marked by “xxxxxxx”.
- All emails have been formatted into a common font.

1

Hi,

Thanks for the opportunity to have a say in this project. Many of us think this should have happened years ago. The amount of money saved from Mayors and councillors salaries alone should bring a reduction to rates. Then there are vehicle & infrastructure savings as well.

Just make sure something happens, in Tasmania we seem to have so many studies done with no resulting changes. (ie wharf/city proposals) Money spent on these projects are significant & for us to move ahead confidently, we desperately need changes.

We support the Separate Eastern & Western Shores for Hobart & Regional Amalgamations.

PLEASE make it happen!

2

Hi there.

My name is Mitchell and I am 24. I live in Clarence but work in Hobart. From the options provided I support the greater Hobart model. I believe I live in Hobart but get no say on the governance or operation of the city because I live on the other side of the bridge. In my opinion I believe Hobart extends from Blackmans Bay to New Norfolk and even to Sorell.

The option I would like to see if provided is a greater Hobart model combined with the regional amalgamation model. To have 12 councils supporting just 250 000 people is laughable and expensive. On another note if this model were to ever come to fruition I believe we should then have the ability to grow state government to 35 members. But that would also mean adjusting the local government models for the rest of the state.

Thanks for your time.

3

Dear Panel,

I support Option 2. Of course only a few others will do this because, since statehood the population has grown accustomed to small, parochial, "localised" thinking and attitudes! Old habits die hard etc...

Why don't we go even further, by suggesting we have just ONE local government body in Tasmania, with regional offices? We already have "regional" offices, for organizations like Centrelink and Medicare, so why not council? The population of Tasmania is about the same as the Gold Coast, which has one council and one mayor. There are geographical differences, but nothing that couldn't be solved with Skype, video-conferencing and regional offices!

Regards, and good luck with Option 2!

4

Dear Panel

I support a single Southern Council because:

1. Tasmania is over governed.
2. A single council will result in substantial efficiencies in costs with benefits to rate payers.
3. Improved coordination between the councils - cycling facilities are one example.

Best regards

5

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the four models.

As background, I am a planner with xxxxxxxxxxxx . I'm particularly involved in management planning for xxxxxxxxxxxx.

Having read your two background papers, there are clear advantages for asset management in amalgamation. Forward maintenance schedules can bring savings and getting the capital expenditure to depreciation ratio up to the benchmark are both desirable outcomes.

However the risk in amalgamation is a loss of a sense of place, and not taking the bulk of community with you in the transition.

Despite the Eastern shore - Western shore weather jokes, there really is not much difference between the two shores for the urbanised areas, and the greater clout and economies of scale of a Greater Hobart council I think would be worth any initial birth pains.

The more rural councils are more closely tied to the land and cover large areas, it makes sense to keep them separate but with access to economies of scale through some sharing arrangement with Greater Hobart and perhaps some further amalgamations as their communities see fit.

The key to taking communities with you in the transition will be active engagement with local areas and allowing them to have their say in issues that affect them through their own structures.

As an example, I live in Taroona, an urbanised 'mini village' half way between Kingborough and Hobart. For a small area with 1350 households, there is a clear sense of community, an active Taroona Community Association and many groups such as the Taroona Neighbourhood garden.

This community has active engagement on a range of issues (in particular environment and sustainability) with Kingborough, but could also readily fit in with Hobart City council. In fact, having Taroona as part of the Greater Hobart council could assist in finalising the Hobart to Kingston bike path, would potentially offer the Hobart city council's solar and water rebates to Taroona residents and generally assist in progressing the urbanised part of the Kingborough municipality - one of the fastest growing areas in Tasmania.

So in summary, of the four models, Greater Hobart makes the most sense, but the sense of place issues need to be dealt with in the transition and this may require new ways of engaging with local communities.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Cheers

6

Hi Panel,

Thanks for the opportunity to have input to the discussion on how our Local Government is developed to provide a more cost efficient representation & inturn outcome delivery.

My view has always been, that given Local Government is not covered under our Australian Constitutional, therefore we should begin a broader exploration to advance CHANGE.

The change that I will always advance, is we in Australia, have one too many levels of government & given that position we Australians should consider change to our constitution.

Referendums in Australia dont enjoy a great success, but todays environment has embraced many changes, but Government has not. Todays IT systems allow conversation, business management & decision enactment without re-work, which in todays current format takes place through having 3 tiersof government.

Proposed is to only have 2 tiers of government, that being Federal & Local, hence our need to restructure our Local Government make up.

* State Governments to be abolished, the savings here would be huge !.

?? Tasmanian make up would consist of 3 Regional Local Councils (Press Map todays Mercury N/P , is excellent) Southern District - North East District - North West District, this regional positioning would alien with current service providers, eg Water ? possible Waste in the immediate future.

Representation would, within the new Local Governments to be made up from ONE member from each current Council Municipality, thus giving a more focused spread within it first make up. Change of course, our only constant, would develop over time to gain the preferred mix, given that we would not have State Governments.

Working models of 2 Tier Governments are one within Australia (Camberra) , New Zealand & possible more around the world, that I am unaware of, our position is to now, find how best to make the CHANGE, change is necessary & this may well be the start.

I enjoy the opportunity to contribute, lets hope many more also take this valuable time frame to express their views.

Regards: xxxxxxxxxxx (Tasmania ' Simply the Best ')

7

I would strongly support a single southern regional council. My second choice would be a greater Hobart council. The less bureaucracy the better

Regards
xxxxxxxxxx
Sandy Bay

8

Dear Panel,

Thank you for inviting feedback from the wider community. My views are:

1. We should have single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council. In terms of greater efficiency, cost-saving, resource-sharing and the like, it is without doubt the best option.
2. To overcome the regional isolation concerns, we should have localized offices where a council representative is available during normal hours to listen to local concerns. Obvious places are Huonville, Swansea/Orford, Nubeena, New Norfolk/Ouse, Richnond/Sorell, etc. In double locations, the officer could perhaps do 2 days in one and 2 days in the other, using the fifth day to report back at headquarters. Such an office in each location could be part of the local library or other community service centre.
3. However, we also need, in order for such a council to work effectively, a business advisory council that continually attends to overseeing efficiency, accountability, direction and ensures that definitions are adhered to and all processes are subservient to the latter.
4. "Definitions" are terribly lacking in most public institutions. For example, do we actually have a clear definition for "health" against which every hospital, clinic, treatment plan, building, etc, is held up against? We do not! (Which is one major reason why the health system is in such a terrible mess.) In the same way, a large regional council would need clear definitions for

every department, with a subset for each regional area. AND an independent body (such as the business advisory council) empowered to keep an eye on things and see that the definitions are always considered before every decision is made!

5. This business advisory council should also be required to submit a (say) half-yearly report for public consumption.
6. Each regional area within the Greater Council should be invited to have a committee of locals, on a voluntary basis but with expenses paid, to put together local visions, report on local issues, represent local views, etc, on a (say) monthly basis. This would strengthen the "local" feeling, make sure that smaller issues are not overlooked, and it would incidentally be a great training ground for those aspiring to serve politically, and a great opening also for younger people to train in public issues. Such opportunities would make people feel that they could in fact have a say, and take a real interest.

Regards,

9

A single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council is the only option that should be adopted by a State Government that is concerned with improving the efficiency of the State, rather than with preserving the fiefdoms of multiple local councils. The adoption of this course may then eventually lead to the situation where the whole State is administered by **ONE LOCAL COUNCIL**.

10

Dear Panel,

The Future Options Paper, spelling out a range of possibilities for reform of the outdated 12-Council setup, is a credit to you all. I have been arguing for many years that it is clearly ludicrous to divide the largest urban area in the state into three administrative blocs; a single Greater Hobart Council is by far the most logical arrangement. To maintain the fiction that the Eastern Shore is somehow a distinct community is plainly silly, and Kingborough, Brighton and Sorell councils have seen enough growth in recent times to be clearly an integral part of the fabric of urban Hobart.

To this end, I would say that Option 3 would get my vote, with one minor modification. The outer areas - Derwent Valley, Southern Midlands, Huon Valley, East Coast, etc. - would be better arranged as proposed in Option 4. A large urban council for Greater Hobart, surrounded by three geographically extensive Rural Councils is, I think, the best arrangement of all. Especially if the voting structure of

LGAT is re-arranged to provide proper democracy that reflects such a structure. (And, although I'm sure the other levels of government would much rather deal with a single Gorilla, I reckon they would settle for four Orangutans over the present 12 Monkeys...)

Best of luck with convincing the Southern Councils that they should vote themselves out of existence - I know a lot of Councillors who can see the light, but I fear there are many more who are more than a little parochial!

Yours Sincerely,

11

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this. I would propose option 4 , Separate Eastern & Western shores for Hobart & Regional Amalgamation. I believe that the geographic divide is best suited & it reduces the number of councils

Regards

12

At this stage of the debate, I favour a single southern Tasmanian council. I believe the advantages of the cost savings and the increase in power are too good to ignore. The furthest outlying areas only represent very small populations and I think it would be to their benefit to be part of a larger council. BUT only if they have real representation on the council.

13

Hi

Read the report and my vote is Option 3. Sounds like a great plan!

Cheers

14

Dear STC Independent Panel

I support the formation of a single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council (Option 2).

I believe this would be a good option for local government in southern Tasmania as it would provide a very strong voice for the south, and through streamlining & rationalisation, could & should if managed properly produce efficiencies in service delivery.

I also believe it would allow the sub regions to maintain their identity within a greater southern region. It may certainly have advantages in marketing, branding & tourism promotion & development.

Although yes, the 'seat of power' would obviously be Hobart, presumably there would exist sub-regional or community offices throughout the southern area eg in Sorell, Huonville, New Norfolk, Oatlands etc so that a greater Council would remain in touch with its constituents. Certainly one would not want to see only one Council office in the Hobart Town Hall - some decentralisation would be necessary.

As a resident of Southern Midlands the issue of regional identity is a significant one, as is also the issue of service delivery.

For the former reason Option 4 is my least favoured option as the Southern Midlands Municipality would in effect be cut in half & as someone who has been involved in raising the profile & branding of the 'Southern Midlands' this option would destroy all the work done over the past few years in establishing the new identity of the place 'Southern Midlands', formed officially in the early 1990's.

However one would like to see an opening up, greater transparency & accountability of Councils particularly in regard to the enormous power & influence of one position within the administration of Councils ie the General Manager - in reality the GM, has almost absolute power & runs the Council, not the other way around & this can be unhealthy & undemocratic in practice, a concern felt by many I believe.

A disadvantage of a larger Council is that it can be cumbersome & not responsive to local needs & issues

A smaller Council can 'go it alone' if necessary & this has occurred within the Southern Midlands with regard to the development of its

Heritage assets eg Callington Mill, Oatlands Gaol & Oatlands Supreme Court etc, which until recently were liabilities, neglected & allowed to run down - it was only by dint of the vision of local people in this small community driving the idea forward that these sites should be redeveloped & turned into assets, & finally convincing politicians that this was worth doing, that made it happen despite opposition & nay saying from elsewhere...the danger with a larger Council is that this sort of initiative may not see the light of day unless there were mechanisms put in place to facilitate & enable such community development.

Perhaps that is one of the exciting possibilities with a larger Council that new processes could be put in place...some thinking & doing outside the box please!

It would be nice to see an end to the nepotism that exists in small councils ...but that is a hard one.

I think Option 3 Greater Hobart would very much leave the smaller country based Councils as poor relations with a very small voice at the table, so I don't think this option would equally benefit all areas & communities.

My second choice after Option 2, is Option 1 the Shared Services model - this maintains the individual identities of communities but allows for efficiencies to be found in the service sharing arrangements. Perhaps this could be a transitional step ie this could be the next step in reform, a 'hasten slowly' option, to be followed further down the track by another, to be determined, option?

Just a few thoughts

regards

15

Dear Panel on Local Government.

Could we please have option 2 - One large southern council. The advantages of maintaining separate local councils of small populations of people in options 3 and 4 does not make sense. And option one is just unnecessary - you would probably end up with a greater administrative burden than you currently have. Provide smaller sub council facilities in the derwent valley, huon etc.. using existing facilities. Smaller councils will not have the ability to provide the types of services that can be developed through having one large council - and make sure that facilities are provided to all. Services in some of these small councils are currently appalling - so surely it wouldn't get any worse?

Option 2 has many advantages - One massive council has many advantages. Imagine - one set of rules for dog management, one set of rules for playgrounds..one web manger - with a team of people delivering services. imagine the quality of services an amalgamated council could provide for aged care services - the improved pool of staff that could be used for people with different needs.

I live within Glenorchy City council area (Moonah). I look forward to living in a southern Tasmanian council area.

Kind Regards

16

Dear Panel,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for the considered options you have put before southern Tasmanian ratepayers. The four options that are described in the Mercury on 27 August are only briefly described in terms of the potential costs and benefits, and I assume there is a considerable amount of other information that you have considered that is not evident in what has been published.

Nevertheless, I believe there is sufficient information in which to make comment.

I am opposed to the Status Quo. Tasmania is well and truly overgoverned and the size of local government, and the number of them, is simply unjustifiable and unsustainable. Most believe that the current structure is imposing unnecessary costs on ratepayers and for arguably average service levels at best. It is good to see that there are attempts to quantify this so we can have an informed debate. I cannot see the Status quo, even if a move to more shared services were to be successful, providing the necessary increase in efficiency and productivity that we need the local government sector to return.

I strongly endorse a single Southern Council (and more broadly, just 3 regional councils for Tasmania, though I acknowledge that this is outside your terms of reference to consider). It is bizarre that the Hobart City Council can purport to be a major capital city council and share the same stage as other capital city councils - Brisbane Council is significantly larger than the whole of Tasmania. At the very least, a greater Hobart Council would be appropriate (the people of Launceston have long taken this logical route). There is no reason for Glenorchy, Hobart, Kingborough and Clarence to be seperate (and argueably Sorrell), as the urban circumstances facing each of these localities is pretty much the same. Why we need a dozen or so councillors for each, plus their respective administrations and service provision staff, is far beyond justification.

One Southern Council would also assist in improving the quality of representatives, as it reduces the power of small minority voices to have a disproportionately large say through backing a particular candidate, who does not need to gain many votes to get elected. We need representatives that are elected, and supported, by a broad cross section of the community, rather than councils being a ground for vested interests to pursue their own agendas at the expense of broader community interests.

One Southern Council would presumably require some form of intra regional subsidisation to ensure equity for those who are truly in regional areas (eg those currently living in the very small, non urban councils, such as Tasman). But it would be hoped that they would enjoy better services than they do now by being part of a much larger resourced entity. If they were to remain outside of a Greater Hobart council as stand alone councils, I assume they would receive explicit subsidisation through continuation of the State Grants Commission process to distribute Commonwealth Financial Assistance and road grants to councils on an equalisation basis.

I am not in favour of five regional councils that artificially split the urban area of Hobart. I would, however, think that if a greater Hobart council were formed, there may still be opportunities for the current small regional councils to enter into some mergers, either with each other or with greater Hobart (and hybrid option if you like in between your Greater Hobart option and your one Southern Council option).

I urge you to consider the public feedback but weigh it against what all the evidence tells you, and be courageous in your recommendations to the Southern Councils. Whether the Southern Councils have the courage to look beyond their own self interests and do what is right by ratepayers, remains to be tested.

Regards,

17

To whom it may concern,

After seeing your advertisement in today's Mercury I thought I would put my humble two cents worth in.

Why look at a whole southern Tasmania council when the population of the city of Toowoomba in Queensland has a population similar to the population to the whole state of Tasmania. A whole Tasmania council would end problems that have dogged Tasmania for years like parochialism and pork barreling in different areas from state governments to secure votes.

Call me a dreamer but I long for a future where all politicians are working for the people not party policy, bloody bureaucrats and the best interests of stakeholders like unions and other extremists.

I may be only a dreamer

18

Hi,

We think a single council would work best because;

- * Even a saving of half the projected amount would be a huge benefit. Used to pay back debt and deliver better services
- * Two council members elected from each of the current areas, like the Senate, would ensure fair outcomes for all citizens.
- * Each councillor could be given a particular responsibility such as water, sewerage, disability, events etc And a deputy for each area also.
- * Cost saving would mean council positions could become professional, with the appropriate pay for the added workload. A full time job.
- * If it became the seventh largest council in Australia, we would have a louder voice and better bargaining power in Canberra.
- * Current duplication of jobs, accounts, reception etc would make a more efficient system. Instead of making people redundant they could be put into areas that really benefit ratepayers. But as people resign they would not be replaced unless they had a specialised. So no job losses but a better system.

Thankyou for the chance to comment.

It's a great idea and we feel that Tasmania really needs to make decisions for the future and growth.

19

Introduction

It is encouraging to see that the STCA has formed a body to consider options for alternative structure of local government boundaries in the southern part of the State. Given the size of Tasmania, where we have the proliferation of councils to govern local affairs, significant restructuring not only in the southern area but in other parts of the state is long overdue. The arguments outlined in the brief provided to the independent panel are logical and common sense.

Problem

I suspect that one of the overriding problems to emerge from any recommendations is being able to achieve a full consensus from local government authorities which are the subject of the scope of the review, given their history of self interest and incapacity to cope with change.

The only method of achieving an appropriate outcome is to seek state government legislation to ensure that any proposal for amalgamation is enacted upon and a strict timetable be laid down. The legislation can be supported with the results of the "feedback" exercise which I believe will have overwhelming support for a dramatic change in local government boundaries.

Given this initiative by the STCA it can also form the foundation for further amalgamations in other parts of the state where there should be no more than a total 3 local government administrative bodies.

The options

Of only the four options presented by the independent panel the separation of eastern & western shore of Hobart plus regional amalgamations are favored. This proposal would reduce twelve councils to five. The second favored option is to form a single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council.

An alternative option

However, I believe there is a better proposal that warrants consideration given demographics and separation by natural geological features. By the formation of only two bodies in the southern part of the state, where some pooling of resources can still occur, we will see greater competition for investment and lifestyle opportunities flourish which can only be healthy for the economic future of the state. One single body however may see a predominance and imbalance of interest and activities in a particular confined region at the expense of other parts of the greater area.

My proposal is as follows:

- (1) Merge Clarence, Sorell, Tasman, Brighton plus more southern urban parts of Glamorgan and Southern Midlands.
- (2) Merge Hobart and Glenochy, Kingborough and Huon plus more urban parts of Derwent Valley.

With some creative boundary changes the whole of Central Highlands and remaining parts (i.e. the northern extremities) of Derwent Valley, Galmorgan, Southern Midlands would be absorbed within other existing local government councils to a more "Central Tasmanian Authority".

For consideration.

xxxxx

xxxxxxx

Tranmere 7018

20

In reply to the recent advertising, I would like to put forward the following:

I certainly support the idea of pooling resources, the economies of scale argument. There is, however, a counter argument that suggests this would simply produce a larger, lumbering bureaucracy. If there is to be a streamlining of services and procedures, it would be greatly underpinned by a thorough examination of current practices across all affected councils and consideration given to adopting and expanding those that offer the best outcomes.

This would produce a lot of entrenched resentment and resistance to change, as can be found in most reforms. However, my experiences with the Kingborough Council has led me to believe there is much that can be done to improve services, give better outcomes and this change need not be expensive. The simple example of how much annual funding Kingborough Council has decided will be diverted to road improvements and which roads will be improved is a glaring example.

If there is to be a time of some disruption and change, let it be well advertised, transparent and the outcomes well understood.

Of the four models offered, I would give my greatest support to the Greater Hobart.

If I could influence any outcomes, I would like to see the elected councillors paid more in order to have a more professional group responsible for the direction and decisions of the council.

With thanks,

xxxxx

xxxxxxx

Margate.

21

The main objective in this exercise should be, not to save administrative costs, but to ensure better land use, transport and resource planning across southern Tasmania. We have a very small population, so efficiency in land use planning and delivery of services is important.

Option 1 should be rejected as it would provide no significant benefits. Shared services models have not been shown to work well in most contexts - and there is no reason to believe that the model would deliver any benefits in this context.

Option 2 (a single Council) has some merit in that it would provide opportunities for better decisions to be made around land use planning and delivery of services at both local government level and State & C'wealth government level where a larger council with more resources could provide a more cogent and effective voice in lobbying in relation to matters of concern to residents and business. The difficulty at present is that each Council, concerned to increase it's income base by increasing the number of rate payers, makes land use and planning decisions that make sense locally but no sense at all in the bigger scheme of things. The classic example is where Councils in outlying areas (where land is cheap) approve residential development applications which increase the number of residents in that municipality. The difficulty is that once the residential areas are established, the developer walks away with a cash profit, the council receives more in rates but the State Government is left to

- manage the increased traffic congestions demands between the residential development and the city where employment and services are located
- subsidise and facilitate public transport services to these areas, thus increasing the overall cost of public transport
- provide schools, police, ambulance, fire, health etc etc services on a scale that is incredibly uneconomical given the population of Southern Tasmania.

Infrastructure costs of providing power, water, telephone, and sewerage services are also increased, and these costs are passed on across the wider community.

If option 2 were adopted, there would be greater capacity for the council to work with State and Commonwealth government to make better decisions about land use planning - to encourage higher density housing closer to services and actively discourage increased residential development in locations distant from services. There would also be opportunities to support business and industry development in a coordinated way within the municipality. Developing rural communities (not far flung rural dormitory suburbs) could also be facilitated through the better planning that would be possible if we had just one council rather than multiple councils competing with one another.

There may also be administrative cost savings but this isn't a major consideration.

Option 3 and 4 have some benefits but don't allow for coordinated planning across the region. The difficulty of any model that creates 'rural' Municipalities and 'urban' Municipalities is that the rate payer base is lower in the rural areas and so the urban areas subsidise services in rural areas without any control over the developments that are permitted there. Furthermore, the rural municipalities are forced to try to increase their income base by any means possible, and without regard to externalities and cost transfers that imposes costs on others. Subsidising service provision in particular areas is fine, but the decision to do so has to be part of broader planning considerations, not a post-hoc reaction to unplanned development.

If we are to be serious about creating sustainable communities, I think that one council is the way to go as it's only through this sort of mechanism that sensible planning, resource management and service delivery decisions are going to be made.

xxxxxxxxxxx
South Hobart

22

I saw your ad in the Mercury. Please - bring some sense to the situation. All these Southern Councils serving only 250,000 people. It is ludicrous. And please can you lead by example the rest of Tasmania?

We moved to Tasmania 11 years ago from Boroondara shire in Melbourne. When we moved, there were 853,000 people in Boroondara. Everything worked. The planning system worked, the garbage was collected. All by a single Council. We are now in Glamorgan Spring Bay, and the situation is terrible. We are paying very considerably more in rates, yet all we get is our garbage collected and a single street light (and the latter is probably provided by State Government). We are convinced that if we must have

Local Government in a State as small as Tasmania (and why it is necessary given the size of State Government is not clear) then surely a maximum of three Councils (North South and North-West) is more than sufficient. The cost saving would be massive.

We respectfully suggest that any change to Local Government should include the removal from all Councils of planning power. Set up a single Planning Authority and a single Planning Scheme. Offices in North and South, and provide officers with mobile phones and cars. We might then get some uniformity, and with that comes certainty, in the planning system, and that in turn would take pressure from the Tribunal and Commission and save poor hapless residents from the horrendous costs associated with the current system. If applicants can with some measure of certainty predict the outcome of a planning application, that must go to making the place a better option than it presently is for development.

The same goes for the Water Corporations - it makes no sense to have more than one – and although well outside your terms of reference the power corporations should be a single entity also.

Tasmania is clearly in deep financial trouble. Yet there are 29 Councils, 31 planning schemes, three water corporations, and it just goes on and on. We have discussed this with locals in this municipality and save for Councillors and Council employees, no-one has a good word for the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council. Surprisingly, a lot of locals (and by that I mean people who live and work in rural Tasmania) have suggested that either all Local Government should go, or that there should be a few Councils, and get rid of the State Government (500,000 or so people and there's a Department of Health, of Education, and so on) and join Victoria. We have discussed this with colleagues in the Hobart area, and all speak of the waste generated of the multiplicity of Councils.

I wish you well in your task, and sincerely hope that the vested interests (there seem to be more politicians per square inch in Tas than anywhere else in Australia when Councillors are added to the mix) don't prevent you from strong recommendations which will effectively reduce costs, improve services to all ratepayers, and bring about real change.

Regards,
xxxxx
xxxxxx
Buckland

23

Support for a Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council

This is my preferred model. We have to reduce the number of councils in Tasmania. We need to get better efficiencies and streamline and simplify processes for planning approvals and service delivery. The benefits of a single council far outweigh any perceived negatives such as people living a distance away from their council headquarters.

All around Australia, there are councils who operate for populations far greater than what is proposed here. The cost savings from reducing the bureaucracy that is duplicated by having 12 councils representing such a small number of ratepayers will be significant. Then resources can be put into the services that ratepayers require, and those services can be spread throughout the region and delivered on a needs basis.

Currently most councils do not operate efficiently because politics and the personal interests of alderman often over-rides what is in the best interests of the municipality as recommended by the paid officers of council.

We need to make sure One Single Council for the region, and one that is operated as a business providing services to that region. Those services need to be delivered according to a strategic plan and a business plan, and with clear and transparent processes for decision making, devoid of the politicking that goes on currently between councils.

24

Dear panel.

Half way through a working life (building development) having to deal with local councils I'm just about worn out with their incompetence. I'm for one council in the south. I might then start to think about building my investments again.

25

Of the four options you have presented, we are both in favour of the Greater Hobart proposal.

This would bring together the urban areas which have common interests and needs thereby unifying the capital area as one entity while allowing the rural regions which have different needs the flexibility to serve the uniqueness of their communities accordingly. At present Clarence, Brighton, and Kingborough have both urban and rural areas with these councils being required to fill the diverse needs of both.

This option, for the reasons above and for the anticipated reduction in duplication should improve economies of scale and efficiencies, therefore greatly reducing costs.

We would only support change, however, if it leads to savings and consequently to a reduction in local government rates - otherwise there is no point in making a change.

xxxxxxxxxx
Bellerive

26

I have for many years thought that we are very over represented in the area of local Government to the detriment of rate payers.

Duplication is evident across all areas of operation. Administration, equipment and services as well as councilors.

Having councils with only 2000 rate payers cannot be cost effective, I note we have two in that category with a further five with ten thousand or less, this represents over 50% of the total Southern Councils.

The parochialism apparent within councils is highly evident and has been a barrier to what after all should be in the best interest of rate payers.

There has been in the past due to the small pool to draw from and apathy, seen people elected to local government with little if any experience in the commercial world these people without the ability to interpret financial statements are placed in control of many millions of dollars and rely and are influenced by their general managers.

A merger of the twelve Southern Councils into a single entity would be cost effective in all areas of operation and would attract people with the skill necessary to oversee a business of this size, it would exercise a strong political voice, attract the best in administrators and equipment and hopefully reflect good value for the rate payers dollar.

27

I like Option 4.

I am currently a resident in the Huon Valley Municipality.

Of all the options presented, Option 4 is the most appealing to me and makes quite a bit of sense. The Huon has a very extensive area to administer already but would cope well with the addition of the regional areas of Kingborough.

However, was the option of amalgamating the current Kingborough and Huon Municipalities ever considered?

My second preference would be the resource sharing model.

Thank you

28

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the review of southern Tasmanian local governments. I commend your work.

I am of the view that one council should cover the Greater Hobart area. In my opinion any differences between the various areas are more than offset by their similarities and a single governing body makes the most sense. Of your four options only 2 and 3 fulfil this criterion. I am unclear why you did not include a fifth option; where there is a Greater Hobart council and the other councils are also amalgamated into three, similar to option 4.

My preference between options 2 and 3 is option 2 - a single council for the whole region. A Greater Hobart council would be much bigger than any other council in the region and their needs may well swamp the smaller councils in a competitive situation; however, within a Southern Region council it would be possible to mandate for, and ensure, even handed treatment of the various districts to minimise, or eliminate, any disempowerment. I do not think that the possibility, that the North and North-West councils may also choose to amalgamate into regional councils and thus threaten the state government, is a problem - I see it as an exciting prospect for the future governance of Tasmania. I agree that the possibility, that such a large body may become dysfunctional, is an issue; but that could be prevented with care and regular surveillance.

I am happy to be contacted if my participation in this process can be helpful.

Yours sincerely,

29

Dear Panel Members

Thank you for the hard work you have done on this very important issue. For a long time I have considered that we over-governed in Tasmania and that we are in desperate need of reform to bring us to a more efficient situation. For that reason I strongly support your Option 2 (A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council).

However I despair that the vested interests in this state will sadly mean that we cannot meet the optimal outcome. If that is the case my fall back option is your Option 3 (Greater Hobart).

Good luck with your endeavours. I hope you can pull it off.

xxxxx

xxxxxxx

Mt Stuart 7000

30

to whom it may concern

I prefer the 5th option

the separate eastern & western shores for hobart & regional amalgamations

the reason

rural council with rural council

city with city

as a resident of New norfolk I would like to see my town as part of a more rural municipality

if amalgamated with another rural area the DV would get reasonable representation on the new council

as against being joined with a city like glenorchy and the DV would get almost no representation.

the DV needs a council which will advocate and support business development in the DV and central h,lands.

my only recommendation would be that the rural part of brighton

ie that part of brighton above the causeway (dromedry) be also included in the suggested "central lakes" council

rgds

xxxxxxx

New norfolk

31

In response to the invitation published in Saturday's Mercury, I would like to express my support for the option entitled, "a Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council".

I am an American by birth, and lived in Melbourne for more than twenty years before moving to Tasmania in 1997 to take up an appointment xxxxxxxxxx. For my first 10 years, I lived at Lower Snug in the Kingborough Council. I now live in Battery Point (Hobart City Council). My experience of living in these two distinctly different council areas has confirmed my more general sense that Tasmania is seriously over-governed in ways which impede its ability to make the most of its opportunities. The present configuration of councils might have made sense at an earlier period of communication — but not now.

Regards,

32

Option 4 is the preferred option of those presented. The current inefficiencies are unacceptable. Incredible that an area such as Tasman with a population of 2300 has a council when the Gold Coast has a population of 500 000.

However, another option is that all the "urban" councils form one council including Clarence with Hobart, Glenorchy and then 3-4 "regional" Councils.

This would provide the opportunity to market Hobart as one city.

33

Having worked within the State over the past eleven years the past six as xxxxxxxxxx I have experienced the complexities of local Government first hand.

The lack of articulated cultural policy in many Council areas means that many communities miss out on the opportunity to build on their creative capital through events like Ten Days on the Island. Servicing and working with so many local Government areas in an equitable way presents an enormous challenge for State wide organisations.

One council for the South with coordinated services would present I think incredible opportunities to make the most of what we have and plan for a better future in the arts.

Regards

34

I would like to congratulate the panel on their work and the clearly set out options. My preferred option is Greater Hobart. I think that economies of scale are important. I think that this plan makes a sensible division between urban and rural. If I had to make an alternate choice it would be a single Southern Regional Council. I am tentative about the size but I could see sense in Tasmania eventually having three major councils for each of the regions i.e. South, North and Northwest. I have spoken to a relative, who doesn't have email and asked if I could reply for her too. She prefers the single Southern council for the reason I have suggested. I think our present system needs urgent improvement so the status quo is out and I think a parochial Western, Eastern shore on the grounds that they are different is just plain silly and does not advanced reform far enough.

xxxxx

xxxxx

Taroona 7053

35

Brief summary

The following is a response to the invitation in the Mercury of 27 August 2011 to comment on four proposals to alter the structure of local government in southern Tasmania.

In order from most preferred to least preferred, my preferences are:

- A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council
- Greater Hobart
- Separate Eastern and Western Shores
- Status Quo with shared resources
- Status Quo

In a little more detail

Evidently, I am a minority of 35% preferring the Single Council option. Nevertheless, I expect that this option will solve most of our problems most efficiently, and that liabilities will be rare and relatively unimportant. The complaint that some regions might be two hours from the centre seems contrived. Even if this is a problem, it is a problem with redeeming consequences: if the travel time is a nuisance for our councillors, they will be highly motivated to fix it, and they can do that easily by building better transport networks. All of the alternative options maintain many councils and this maintains the opportunity for isolation and parochialism, and the temptation to leave problems in some other council's "too hard basket".

I could accept the Greater Hobart option as a compromise. However, I expect that this would solve fewer problems and be less efficient. It seems a bit weird to spend more money to solve the problem less well, but I guess this is a quirk of democracy.

The Separate Eastern and Western Shores option is a high risk strategy. If we could be certain to elect only wise councillors, it might work moderately well, but if we elect councillors of about the calibre we have been electing historically, I expect yet more of the parochialism of which Tasmania already has way too much.

I think that the Status Quo with Shared Services will be of negative benefit. Theoretically, it might save a little money, but it doesn't solve the real problem. We might save the cost of some concrete and asphalt, but we'll need inter council committees as well as intra council committees, and this is certain to increase the cost of paperwork and other bureaucratic inefficiencies. When a council is busily wasting money on a folly nobody wants, it is unimportant that by sharing resources, we might waste 41 million dollars instead of 43 million dollars. We need to change what our councils do, not just the cost of doing it.

Obviously, I'm not the least teensy weensy bit happy with the current Status Quo. We have way more cooks than anyone needs to thoroughly spoil the broth.

Further discussion

I think that the role of councils generally has changed greatly since the 19th century when the concept of “council” seemed important. In earlier times, travel and communication between regional communities was slow and cumbersome. It was natural for each community to be highly self sufficient. Our ancestors expected their local council to do little, and they expected to pay little for it. They were also highly tolerant of relatively poor standards: earth closets were commonplace; potable water was scarce and precious, rubbish dumps were rubbish dumps, not resource recovery centres. In modern times, we set much higher standards, but still expect to pay little. We expect our councils to do jobs way too big and way too expensive for small councils to do. And we grizzle way too much when they tell us how much our expectations cost.

In past times, we valued regional differences. We regarded the differences between the rules, regulations and standards in adjacent communities as “part of the charm”, giving each community its distinctive “look and feel”. In modern times, although some of us value this a little, we value it only a little, and mostly prefer that once we know the rules that apply where we are, we won’t need to learn a whole volume of different rules just because we move 30 kilometres or 300 kilometres.

I think it is important to be reasonable. It is more than a little hypocritical that we will happily pay three or four dollars per litre for water when we buy it from an extraordinarily wealthy multinational business obviously making a whopping great profit, but fume with outrage when our impoverished council or water authority wants us to pay a few cents per litre to discourage us from flinging huge quantities of potable water over our lawns and ornamental plants.

Similar reasoning applies to many of the other jobs councils once did. Roads, transport, water, sewerage, rubbish removal, and many other chores have all become too expensive to expect small councils to be able to do them well.

In addition to the “small councils are too small to do the job properly” problem, people living near Hobart face four other problems:

- 1: they have little say in decisions the Hobart City Council (HCC) makes;
- 2: nevertheless decisions the HCC makes have a huge effect on their lives;
- 3: they make no contribution to the budget of the HCC;
- 4: nevertheless they place huge demands on the services the HCC needs to provide.

About the only simple way to address these problems is to amalgamate at least the councils from Franklin to Bagdad and from New Norfolk to Sorell.

36

Dear Sirs,

I have long held the view that Australia as a whole is overgoverned, however if we must wear a three-tier government let us at least shed or combine a few local councils if only to consolidate our finances.

My first choice would be for the third model - "Greater Hobart" because, as a longtime resident of Clarence I have seen it grow to encompass a vast area of rural land; when I believe that places such as South Arm, Richmond and Midway Point/Seven Mile Beach and so forth would be better served by the Sorell Council. Hobart (City) with its relatively small population should encompass the whole area (as shown) from Kingston north to Brighton and the Clarence urban area east to Rokeby to give it its city status and hopefully more cost effective. Perhaps this could even give the port of Hobart deservedly more significance on the national scale.

Ultimately I would hope that the second model - "A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council" (provided that the remaining councils follow this example) could be considered to consolidate them even further, but that may only become a pipe dream.

Yours very sincerely, xxxxxx
xxxxxxx Bellerive, Tasmania. 7018

37

To the Independent Panel

Reference Mercury article Saturday, August 17, 2011

My belief is that rural areas should run themselves as they are capable of running an efficient low cost model, that city and suburban councils are incapable of doing.

In addition councils should have 'a single seat for each ward' so that voters can contact with confidence their local alderman. It should not be structured to facilitate political parties whatever their objectives.

The responsibilities of Councils should be reviewed, as appears too much time and money is wasted on 'social issues' rather than providing and enhancing services.

Therefore -

Status Quo with shared services – definitely NO.

A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council – definitely NO.

The Greater Hobart option – definitely NOT if still leaves 9 councils.

Separate Eastern & Western Shores for Hobart with Regional Amalgamations – with total 5 councils sounds attractive, with –

Western Shore as described – YES

Eastern Shore as described – YES

D'Entrecasteaux from merger of Huon Valley + rural part of Kingborough including Bruny Is – YES

Derwent Valley and Central Highlands could be merged. (Note coloured map is incorrectly drawn / coloured as indicates Derwent Valley as part of the Huon.

Southern Midlands and Glamorgan Spring Bay + Tasman could merge.

Alternatively Eastern Shore excluding Sorell which merges with Tasman as sixth council. Existing roads indicate Tasman should join Sorell.

Yours sincerely

xxxxxxx

xxxxxxx Hobart, Australia 7001

38

Hello,

I have reviewed the options. I note there is not an option where “no change” is made. The “do nothing” should always be an option, even if it just to discount it.

Notwithstanding this, I consider that the option of existing councils with shared services (OPTION 1) will not achieve the outcomes you are pursuing. Obviously there will be some efficiencies in some areas if this were to be put in place. However I believe that the opposite is true in most circumstances.

For example if there were separate authorities for, say, developments, waste, roads etc. Each of those authorities would then need their own management systems and support systems in place to operate. Examples of these support services include: fleet maintenance, financial services, HR services, IT services, use of existing depots, contract services, design services, asset management services etc. This is the opposite of what you are trying to achieve. Southern Water is an excellent example why you should not recommend Option 1.

Out of the options provided, OPTION 3 makes the most sense. This option will allow for significant efficiencies to be realised, whilst allowing to keep the identity of the rural Councils and Greater Hobart.

Regards

39

Option 3 is the most appealing to me, however I wonder if consideration could be given to an amalgamation of Tasman with the Sorell/ Richmond area.

40

Dear Panel Members,

It is with interest that I read your proposed four options to improve the benefits to residents of Southern Councils.

In my view, the first two options – status quo with shared services and a single Regional Council would not provide the best outcome. The former because it is little more than a band aid solution – and a very thin strip at that. The latter is too unwieldy in that the area is

large, diverse and would require the Council to be divided into “wards”, akin to “mini councils”, in order for it to be workable. This in turn will lead to a fairly large number of councillors, local council centres and perhaps duplication of administration – hardly a cost saving move. Also, local decisions will probably need to go up the line to “Central Office” – hardly a streamlined service.

The option of a separate Eastern Shore and Western Shore councils (plus Regional Amalgamation councils) has merit in that it gives legal approval to the perceived view that they are different communities. But are they? The River Derwent certainly divides the Hobart into two parts but that doesn't necessarily mean that each part houses a significantly different type of inhabitants. This may have been the case before 1975 (the collapse of the Bridge), but since then the Eastern Shore has vied, very successfully, with Hobart to become a just as important business, professional and recreational centre. There is also merit and cost savings in only have 5 councils.

The option of a Greater Hobart City Council, with all that title entails, would certainly give it more standing and put us on a more equal footing with other mainland capital cities. However, as outlined, it would consist of 8 councils, some of which will be the same as before with two having a population below 2400 e.g. Central Highlands (pop.2324) and Tasman (pop. 2374). This is not a desirable outcome.

I propose a variation of the Greater Hobart with 3 councils. The first council would comprise Hobart, Glenorchy, Brighton, Clarence and Kingborough. The second council would comprise Richmond, Sorrel, Tasman, Southern Midlands, Glamorgan Spring Bay. The third council would comprise Derwent Valley Huon Valley, the Channel and Bruny Island. I may have missed some small areas- the map was not clear e.g. Richmond is included in the descriptions but of course is not an existing council. Other places such as Margate and Howden may be slotted together with Kingston, whereas Snug, Kettering, Woodbridge may be slotted more easily with Huon Valley.

You will notice that what is missing from my proposal are the words “urban” and “rural” – which have been used in the options in regard to, for example, Kingborough.

These terms are not defined and it is not clear where the boundaries of “rural” and “urban” parts of Kingborough are drawn or will be drawn. It is difficult to move away from the perception that “rural” Kingborough is somehow inferior to “urban” Kingborough. We live on a small farm xxxxxxx. Our farm is classified as primary producing land. It takes me less than xxx minutes to drive to the nearest shopping centre in Kingston. Our address is Kingston and we regard ourselves as residents of Kingston – not rural, not urban - just Kingston.

One final point is the issue of services versus economy. A careful management of pooled resources to provide essential service to residents should result in economy of costs. However, the plethora of councils and councillors we are lumbered with do not provide this. It is time – for change.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of putting forward my views.

xxxx
xxxxxxx,
Kingston 7050

41

Hi

My vote goes to the Greater Hobart option. I reached that decision mainly by elimination.

Status Quo gives us no reduction in councils but yet an additional organisational layer.

A single STRC is just too big and too ambitious at this stage. Many outlying areas might feel their voice would be lost in the wilderness, so to speak.

Separate East and West shores plus regional amalgamations - I think the wider metropolitan Hobart area needs to be more unified under one council, hence my choice of....

Greater Hobart . The summing up in "the Mercury" newspaper lists all the advantages and I can't think of any others. However I would prefer to see the Greater Hobart Council take on a wider area than proposed - perhaps Richmond and Sorell and/or Huon Valley and the Channel and Bruny Islands.

Regards

42

Dear Panel

The most obvious thing to do is to create a Greater Hobart Council. One has to look no further than the City of Brisbane for an example. It appears clean, streamlined, modern and efficient with excellent facilities, including a superior public transport system (particularly the "goCard" system).

I live on the Eastern Shore and I have no problem in joining with the other major city councils. I think Clarence City Council does an excellent job and would be keen to see local voices retained from each council on the new, larger one. However, I think it would be a mistake to continue to foster an 'Eastern' and 'Western' divide, or 'Northern' and 'Southern' for that matter. We should be working together from all points of the city compass. Apart from significant cost savings and streamlining of services, it would tackle social divisions we could do without.

I am not so familiar with the regional councils, but the proposals under the Greater Hobart option seem at first glance to be a good compromise.

Yours faithfully

43

Hi,

My vote supports the STRC concept as long as the expected economies of scale are achieved. Had we had this in place statewide (3 regional councils only) some time ago I believe that we would have no need for the ridiculously beauracratc 3 water corporations as we have now. The 3 large regional councils would have had the rate base to fix any water infastructure problems.

regards

44

Thank you!! for the opportunity for the citizens to speak out and voice their opinions.

After studying the choices, I feel that the Status Quo option is merely adding one more layer to government...something we have entirely too much of already. Tasmania would have to have more 'governors' in local, state and federal positions per capita than nearly anywhere in the world. The idea of cutting back on duplication of effort, planning, wages, etc, etc., is such a good one, but not the Status Quo option.

My choice is the Greater Hobart model, making the capital city council of a size to be reckoned with and equal with other capital city councils around Australia. I do feel that an amalgamation of some of the smaller councils on the East Coast would have benefits too.

Again, thank you for giving us a voice.

xxxxx

xxxxxx

West Hobart 7000

45

thank you for a clear and informative advertisement. I live in the Glamorgan Spring Bay Municipality and I believe that if we are going to change we should go to one Southern Tasmanian Council. Our population is too small for anything else.

46

29 August 2011

Independent Panel
Options for Structural Reform
Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority
independentpanel@netspace.net.au

Dear Sir/Madam,

Feedback on the Independent Panel's Options for Structural Reform Paper for the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority

I am a resident of Clarence, and after reviewing the Towards improved local government in southern Tasmania - A review of structural reform options document, I submit the following comments:

Option 1

This would seem to compound the problem in Tasmania of over-governance. Must we install yet another layer of government with a new organisation "sitting between State and local government"? This does not seem to offer any improvement or address the core issue: too much duplication.

Option 2

This option also does not appeal as it is too close to the jurisdiction or 'level' of State Government. Further, metropolitan concerns differ greatly from rural areas, in terms of what they expect and require from local government. Having one council to address these different agendas does not emerge as a desirable solution. Finally, one suspects that if this option were implemented, a number of additional, more localised bodies would need to be established to respond to the concerns of local communities (indeed, the Report suggests this model: "there would need to be delegated authority to localised community committees"), which would perhaps defeat the purpose of abolishing the large number of existing bodies, and would end up with much the same scenario as outlined in Option 1 (the flaws of which I have already described).

Option 3

While this option has more appeal than Options 1 and 2, the following issues should be noted.

Firstly, it is stated in the Report that a Greater Hobart City Council would have a population consistent with regional and capital cities in the rest of Australia. That may be, however it should be remembered that due to the larger size of such cities (capital cities in particular), they often (or usually) have more than one council representing the greater metropolitan area. The council representing the inner urban area usually assumes the moniker of the city as well as the responsibility for advocating for the city as a whole. While these inner-city councils may be comparable in size to a Greater Hobart council in terms of population, there are two significant differences: Hobart has a very low population density, and therefore the geographic area that a Greater Hobart council would be responsible for would be much greater than that of other 'city' councils.

Other capital city councils are usually not burdened with having to respond to the wider needs of the greater metropolitan area of their city, as due to the large size of the city, a number of councils operate in the wider urban area. A Greater Hobart council would have this burden however, and would therefore need to address both 'city-wide' issues, as well as 'intra-city' issues.

Secondly, leaving the rural councils "as they are at present" goes against the Report's own findings that there is strong public support for significant reform, as well as the results of the Community Survey which found that 47% of rural respondents agreed that their local council should consider amalgamating with one or more of its neighbours (with 34% against). To have eight rural councils represent 95,000 people does little to improve the current situation.

Option 4

This option emerges as the most functional, as it addresses the issue of too much duplication by drastically reducing the number of councils, and also retains enough regional (rural) representation so as to not be too far removed from local communities. Furthermore, an expanded Hobart Council would significantly improve its gravitas (more than doubling in population), while having a degree of separation within the Greater Hobart area (Western and Eastern) retains scope for addressing the immediate concerns of local urban communities.

That this option "does not seem to respond to the needs of the Hobart metropolitan area as outlined earlier in [the] report" may be avoided if the moniker of "Hobart City Council" is retained for the CBD and surrounds (the western suburbs) so that, like other states, Tasmania continues to have a council that lobbies on behalf of the capital city. Joint ventures between both Hobart councils could add further weight in terms of advocacy when required. Such a bilateral relationship should not be too onerous, especially in comparison to the current scenario. Representatives of both councils may even perhaps sit on a Greater Hobart board to facilitate such ventures. Other disadvantages that the Report lists are also questionable. The Panel's concern regarding the distances to the centre of governance seems misplaced, as the need for physical proximity to local government centres is reducing due to the development of communications technologies. In any case, the distances do not seem comparable to many mainland rural council areas where the distances are significantly longer and the population is far more dispersed and remote.

Why "the joining of councils on the eastern shore will effectively achieve very little" is not explained in the Report, and if this is the case, why is it limited to the eastern shore, and what's the point of it all if not to amalgamate at least some of the councils? And the statement that "a smaller number of councils could accentuate divisions between them" seems to be a dubious argument against structural reform when the "case for change" is so compelling, and that the overwhelming response in the Community Survey was for fewer councils. Furthermore, it is difficult to see how Option 4 has "the smallest cost savings and efficiencies of the four models", when: it has far fewer governing bodies than Option 1 (which appears to add to the bureaucracy rather than reduce it); it would not require localised community committees in addition to local government as in Option 2; and it has a little over half the number of councils as Option 3.

The Panel's obvious preference is for Option 3, however having a council that represents the whole of Hobart for advocacy purposes is not the be-and-end-all of an effective, efficient and responsive local government structure.

Thank you sincerely for the opportunity to comment, and I look forward to monitoring the outcome of the Review.

Yours faithfully

xxxx
xxxxxxx
BELLERIVE TAS 7018

47

Dear council option people

I'm emailing in response to the four amalgamation options that I saw in Saturday Mercury (27 August). The nomenclature for the different options is pretty horrendous so I'll refer to the positions on the printed page. Seems to me the four options do cover the bases, but miss the best bet: Greater Hobart from the lower left panel, plus from the lower right panel SouthEast coast, D'entrecasteaux (calling it Channel would be easier to spell), and Central. These four areas are fairly well delineated, and each one seems to have internally consistent interests.

One good reason for amalgamating Kingston/Hobart/Glenorchy/Brighton/Eastern Shore, would be to avoid pointless "competition" between urbanesque microcouncils. Witness the daft, hideous, windswept, and thank god largely deserted airport mall development--- but I could name others. Same goes for housing development/transport/general planning sense. "Greater Hobart" is not "in competition" with the three non-metro councils on the lower right--- but there **is** considerable potential competition within "Greater Hobart" and potentially within each of the 3 non-metro councils. Competition in planning is **not** a good thing!

Also, I note that "... only 35% preferred [a single STRC]". Actually, with 4 options on the table and consequently a mean preference of 25%, 35% is excellent... The real question might be what the non-metro residents thought about this option, since I'd guess they're likely to feel, and quite likely be, overlooked under a single council where over 80% of the residents are metropolitan. As above: my 1st choice is for a hybrid bottom left/bottom right, but my 2nd choice would be for a single council (top right), rather than either the current bottom left or bottom right.

Thanks for your efforts!

xxxx
xxxxxx
South Hobart
Tas 7004

48

To the Independent Panel

Option 2.

A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council is the the option of my choice.

+ possiblity for increase efficiency, less bureaucracy which saves costs, decision making process could be managed to the advantage of citizens.

Ratepayers have one place to go to.

Overall planning could be done better, enhanced consulation with citizens, participation in the decision making process should include normal citizens as a right and also to familiarize citizens with constraints, laws, regulations which have to be considered, which would lead to a better understanding to issues by citizens and by the coucil – results could be very possitive for everyone.

- I see problems, as for any change. Mainly the loss of influence now held, by councils and individuals. – Lack of courage to try new things, unfamiliar ways of thinking, loss of status by individuals. Bref – the usual hindrance of progress.

- Task- to promote Option 2, will need education. Let me know if I can help.

Please check if my comments appear on the website. This was not my intention, if you can, please remove.

Thank you.

49

I vote for the single Southern Tasmanian regional council. It has to save costs by not duplicating services and make things run more efficiently. I am assuming that the mayor will be paid more and this should hopefully persuade more people from other sections of the community to run. I am looking for a council made up of intelligent people who are interested in the concerns of the community as a whole, not retired people with scatty ideas, who have nothing better to do and business men who are only interested in getting their photos on the front page of the newspaper to advertise their business!!

There also needs to be a time limit on how long you can be on the council. Regular fresh faces and ideas have to be good. The council manager (finance) position should be advertised internationally and interstate. No jobs for the boys please!

50

Mooted Local Government Changes

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on possible changes to local government arrangements as raised by the report from the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) (Mercury, 27 August 2011). It raises the possibility of change, change that has been needed for a long time. Change is the only constant in life and we live in a time of great change. Continuing change will be the norm. The need for change will increase as the current call for improved Australian productivity accelerates. Tasmania cannot quarantine itself from global and national imperatives.

The mooted changes will be strongly opposed by many with vested interests and natural human conservatism will also play a part. I beg the Authority to stand firm on the need for change.

The current survey

I favour very strongly the option entitled 'A single southern Tasmanian Regional Council'.

It is the first modern step in a process that eventually should cover other council regions.

I think there is little opposition to the view that Tasmania is grossly over-governed with 29 local councils in addition to two levels of state government for a population of about half a million, in what is, in Australian terms (not European), a relatively small area. I don't know how many elected members there are in the state but it is clear that there are too many and that the current situation provides the opportunity for families to develop dynasties and for small groups with common interests to flourish.

The scope for inefficiency in the current situation is too obvious. The amount of duplicated bureaucracy and equipment inventories is wasteful. And there are too many boundary issues, and local rules and regulations that cause confusion to anyone who wants to achieve anything. The cost of administering elections might even be a consideration.

The statement in the Mercury suggests that area of the proposed larger regional council is vast. It is not! Compare it with a large number of mainland council regions and it is small.

The statement also says that only 35% in a recent survey favoured this option. What survey? Equivalent figures for the other options are not quoted and should have been. The 35% figure should not have been quoted as it suggests that the committee does not favour this option and also that it is trying to pre-empt the results of this survey. If each option was to receive equal support in a survey, that would be 25%, so this option appears to receive more support than the 'average' scenario would indicate.

Longer term change

I see the current discussion as one to grow over time with the chance to consolidate even further the amount of governing we endure.

As a longer-term view (30-50 years timescale? Ideally less.), I would like to see the system evolve to a state system with only 4-5 councils, reducing red tape, duplication and vested interests even further. In an even longer term, a merger of councils and the lower house of state parliament is possible, leaving the upper house to be a genuine independent house of review.

It is impossible to predict the future of Tasmania but if current trends are anything to go by, population growth will remain lower than the mainland, incidentally providing the opportunity to preserve our lifestyle and avoid the disasters of developments in other states. Mainland Australia will remain the important market for agricultural, mining and manufacturing products, and transport increasingly will be

from the north. These are natural consequences of our geography and geological history. In the 100-200 year timescale, I envisage that the north will be of expanding relative importance and that a higher proportion of any growth will be there.

This scenario suggests that the importance of the southeast will shrink with time. The south will remain the centre of government and administration, but much of any growth will be in the north and may include migration from south to north.

xxxxxx

Mt Nelson 7007

51

My concern is the way Southern Water has been so successful , Not, how will this not happen with council mergers. Where some councils may now be efficient they merge with councils who are not doing so well. Which rate payers bear the cost of this, even with supposed savings.

Regards

52

I am a ratepayer of City of Launceston, City of Hobart and City of Clarence. I am a resident of Richmond area on an intensive agriculture zoned property (once part of Richmond Municipality).

I support amalgamation but do not think urban lifestyles should have a say over the treatment of prime agricultural land. Even Hobby Farms need treatment that is different to that required urban controls (eg. The keeping of animals, poultry etc).

Option 4 is the best of the options presented but I feel there needs to be a tighter delineation between the urban and rural interface. Eg. Eastern Shore should only include the urban part of Bridgewater and Brighton and from say Pontville (East of River Jordan / Midlands highway) the rural parts of Brighton should be joined to Richmond / Sorell rural Council. The urban part of Eastern Shore should run down the East Derwent Highway area and through the urban part of Clarence. I feel the rural and urban areas should be treated

separately, notwithstanding that the Clarence / Richmond boundary used to be at Belbins Rivulet (Dulcot), from about 1km from Cambridge on the Richmond Cambridge Road the “Coal Valley area” commences. The extent of the “mains water” serviced blocks defines this point.). The Meehan Range can separate the two Councils and Risdonvale remains within “Eastern Shore” but eastern side of Grass Tree Hill becomes part of Richmond. Midway Point remains with Sorell despite its urban feel. Seven Mile Beach to Opossum Bay completes the Eastern Shore City / Shire. All of Back Tea Tree Road agricultural area should become part of the east coast council. I think this should pick up everything from more or less the Midlands Highway to the East Coast and as far as Southern Midlands now extends (Tunbridge?) and Glamorgan Spring Bay (Freyrcinet).

Greater Hobart or Western Shore is from Granton to Margate on the East of Mt Wellington. I do not think Clarence / Brighton should be part of Greater Hobart as the river is a natural divide and we have seen before it can become a very distinct barrier (eg 5 Jan 1975!!)

D’Entrecasteaux should be centred at Huonville.

Derwent Valley / Lakes should be based around New Norfolk and pick up Kempton and everything else on the West of the Midlands Highway (without splitting towns like Bagdad), so the boundary could be drawn generally along the Midland Highway but not exactly (maybe again a valley ridge line).

Most of Southern Midlands should join with Richmond / Sorell / Tasman / G -SB as there is not much point of having a Tasman Council or Southern Midlands or Glamorgan / Spring Bay with big areas and few people.

Urban Centres: Hobart / Clarence

Regional Centres (suggested): New Norfolk / Huonville / Sorell All close.

Easy for Regional leaders to meet and still some chance of further shared services.

Option 1: Status Quo with shared services.

There is insufficient change and in my opinion there is a risk of extra costs for the administering body without real savings. I do not support this option.

Option 2: Complete amalgamation – a single southern regional council.

This has all the hallmarks of another Southern Water debacle. Whilst on a population basis it seems a good idea the needs of Battery Point, Chigwell, Sorell and Levendale are so vastly different that focus on the smaller centres away from the urban area is a problem. The election of members to council with a rural voice is my greatest concern. I do not support this option.

Option 3: Greater Hobart

This sucks all the population out leaving some very poor cousins. I do not support this option.

Good Luck!

53

Hello,

Regarding the STCA independent panel reviewing the proposed changes to local councils in Southern Tasmania.

After reading the four options I think that "Greater Hobart" may be the best because it could improve efficiency, reduce duplication and save money. Any option that can save money (thus hopefully passing those savings onto rate payers) is a better option than one which does not.

I also liked the "'Separate Eastern & Western Shores....' because it reduces the number of councils from 12 to 5, until I read that it could result in "significant upheaval for limited cost savings"

"A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council" may well be too big as stated in the review. Are ratepayers in Geevston and Dover faced with similar problems as ratepayers in West Hobart? Are ratepayers living in Nubeena faced with the same problems as citizens in New Norfolk? If the answer is 'Yes!' then perhaps one large STRC is the way to go. I assume the main problem here is rural vs urban. Communities in rural areas face different difficulties than urban and sub-urban communities.

The option "Status Quo with Shared Services" effectively creates another organisation with all the costs that go with that... As there are few examples of this model operating successfully I think that answers its own question.

Just my humble opinion generated mainly by the hope that bureaucratic efficiency can be improved and waste lessened, whilst costs for the citizens of these councils can remain reasonable: as the cost of living is becoming a huge burden for people to maintain.

Regards,
xxxxxx
(an urban-dweller)

54

Dear Committee

Whilst the second option outlined in your discussion paper entitled “structural options to improve local government in southern Tasmania” would appear at first glance to be the most economical model I take note of your concerns and in particular it becoming a cumbersome behemoth although being a threat to the State Government might be seen as a good move.

That being said option three, obviously your preferred model, appears a sensible compromise as the number of bureaucrats and attendant minions required would one assumes, drop considerably from the present number. whatever that may be.

It would help lay people such as myself if you inserted financial estimates into the Options shown indicating the present councils total management costs together with their number of councillors and their attendant costs under Option 1.

Produce an estimate of what the likely costs would be for the alternate Options in like manner so that we are able to compare apples with apples. One recognises the need to factor in the administrative costs for local ward offices.

Whilst not in your terms of reference, a pity, it would be nice to see a larger council wield a greater clout in the State arena and to that end ensuring that the current four water boards be reduced to one, would be a sensible place to start. They are, after all supposed to be the beneficiaries of any dividends, or so we are led to believe.

Sincerely
xxxxxxxxx
Taroona

Dear Panel,

I have examined the four options put forward by the Panel and am unable to support any - but offer the following for your consideration before the final recommendation is submitted to STCA.

It is my belief that any option submitted for recommendation needs to not only ensure each of the new Councils are financially sustainable but also to ensure the values (and voices) of the existing rural local communities are not destroyed in the process. Having said that I also believe there needs to be consideration of the current human resource expertise available in the urban fringe Councils – and which could be utilised across larger Council amalgamated areas to assist satisfactory and sustainable development.

At almost 50 years of age, I believe I can say this with some authority having been raised on a farm in a rural environment, to have then spent my adult working life in the city as a professional in the civil engineering field whilst also commuting from the rural area of my birth until my 30's.

To this end, I would like to offer an alternative option to the four proposed – one which draws upon the advantages of your Option 3 but also addresses more positively the needs, values and voices of the rural communities.

GREATER HOBART AND RURAL MERGERS

This model would involve creating four Council areas in total - centred around a Greater Hobart City Council comprising the current areas of Hobart, urban Glenorchy, urban Brighton, urban Clarence and that part of Kingborough generally north of Brown's Rivulet – producing a City of around 160,000 people.

The remainder of Kingborough and Huon Valley to then be amalgamated to provide a new Council of about 40,000 centred around the existing admin and retail centre at Kingston – with a satellite centre at Huonville.

Amalgamation of Sorell, Tasman and Spring Bay/Glamorgan (including Richmond area) for about 25,000 centred around the imminently new admin and existing retail centre at Sorell – with satellite centres at Nubeena and Triabunna.

Ditto for Derwent Valley, Southern Midlands, Central Highlands, rural Brighton and Collinsvale of about 25,000 centred around the existing admin and retail centre at New Norfolk – with satellite centres at Bothwell and Oatlands.

As these new fringe Councils can expect to be relatively sustainable and thus capable of offering highly competitive salaries within the region, this option would likely lead to the three new fringe Councils being able to successfully draw additional full-time professional expertise to those areas – leading to ongoing, advanced and cost-effective development across the entire region.

Governance would also require consideration – but I have not advanced any suggestion in this area.

I thank you for your attention – and I may be contacted on xxxxxxxxxx if considered necessary.

PS Seeing as there is a sealed and well maintained coastal route connecting Bicheno to St Helens, perhaps for shorter access to an admin centre Glamorgan could be re-split from Spring Bay (at say the hills north of Cranbrook) and amalgamated with Break O'Day? This split may be acceptable to residents in those areas.

Regards

xxxxx
xxxxxxx
MIDWAY POINT 7171

56

Good morning

My name is xxxxxxxxx and I would like have an input on the number of Councils in Southern Tasmania, I would like to address them as they have been printed in The Mercury on the 27th of August 2011.

1. Status Quo with shared services. Should the councils remain as they are and you have a “joint body” to oversee various activities and procurements, you will be creating another bureaucracy on top of the existing twelve councils, thus having another CEO or general manager plus all the support staff and offices etc. Savings would be minimal and would create a pecking order within the Councils as Hobart Council would say we should come first as we are the biggest etc.

2. A single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council. This would only work if you got rid of the State Government (now there's an idea) as a single Council it would be just too big to manage with the quality of the current administrators. This would also be very difficult to implement as it would be too much of a change for most Tasmanians to deal with.
3. Greater Hobart. This appeals to me more than the others but the cost savings would not be sufficient to warrant any change. It would also create a "poor relation" type attitude amongst the other Councils as they would feel left out of loop on decision making and funding.
4. Separate Eastern and Western Shores for Hobart and Regional Amalgamation. This idea is very good but should be reduced to four Councils not five, There will be less duplication, less competition for funding, the councils will have an equal say of what goes on and as always the less people at the top, the more efficient the organization. Politics should be left out of the local Council and if a person at the top has an active affiliation to a political party ie an Alderman being a State Politician, they should step down or not be elected.

These are my thoughts for your consideration and I trust this exercise of "community consultation" is not like most of the Local, State and Federal Government consultations in the past where the decision has already been agreed upon before the community gets to have a say.

Once you people have decided on how many Councils there will be, will there be an opportunity for the community to have a final say on the matter.

I look forward to your decision as the sooner this reduction in Councils is finalized my rates hopefully will be reduced.

Regards

xxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxx
Claremont 7011

57

After moving here from the mainland I was quite shocked with the high number of councils you have here, I would hate to imagine how much rate payers money is wasted, particularly on wages. Obviously the set up we currently have is not working as in 2004 my rates

were around \$600 due to living in a rural area, no waste collection, no water and no post. This year my rates came in at \$1129. How could it be allowed to double in such a short period of time? Nothing has changed, we don't get any benefits that we didn't before. Please vote for Option 2 before I have to take a loan out to pay my rates.

Regards

Refer to previous email, my municipality is Derwent Valley, the council that wasted thousands on putting big planter boxes in the middle of the roads, and then took them out as they were a hazard. Please amalgamate the idiots into Hobart

58

Just to be a nuisance, I would favour the Greater Hobart option but with the rural areas divided up as in the Separate Eastern & Western Shores version. I feel it would be a mistake to split the two shores as we do not want to end up with the nonsensical Hobart/Launceston bickering. Certainly 12 councils are too many.

I will be interested to see the final decision.

Regards, xxxxxxxx, Taroona.

59

The Independent Panel,

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the options presented for review of the Southern Tasmanian councils.

It would appear that the primary purpose of each of the options and the focus of much of the community is to find savings by one means or another. However, cost savings, while important, are not the only reason to consider reconfiguring our councils.

Significant issues already exist in the greater Hobart area due to competitive planning agendas across the southern councils. These issues will only get worse with time. Further, the fractured nature of our council structure prevents southern Tasmania from being able to achieve recognition of our regional significance as this area deserves.

I believe we need to consider a range of goals:

- planning synchronicity, preventing further urban sprawl and strain on infrastructure as well as being able to target and direct particular types of development more successfully;
- a regional voice capable of being heard in Canberra;
- ongoing viability of councils; and
- cost savings to benefit all ratepayers.

The only way to achieve all of these outcomes is by a single council or Option 2.

Any options which would create small marginal councils reliant on the Commonwealth or State Government for support (option 1, option 3) should not be entertained as this only defers tackling the difficult issue of viability. For small councils to accept such an outcome is high risk. A general move to a single council now gives the smaller councils the opportunity to negotiate their way in on terms which will deliver greatest benefit to their ratepayers. Delaying tackling the issue of viability means they are likely to be folded into a larger council involuntarily under terms of a financial rescue at some point in the future with little scope to influence the way in which that should happen.

Regards

xxxxxxx
resident of Kingborough

60

I would like to see separate Eastern & Western Shores for Hobart and Regional Amalgamations
Regards, xxxxxxxx, Moonah

61

I believe Council mergers must happen only if the bureaucracy is made to shrink. You only need to look at the debacle that is Southern Water. The Government tried to sell a line that it would be more efficient to bundle sewer and water services together for 'efficiently'.

What needs to be remembered in all of this is Councils are there to work at a closer level with their rate payers than that of the State Government. If we were to change to one southern Council we may as well go the whole hog and abolish councils entirely giving the impression that real efficiencies have been made.

My idea is different again to any of those that have been proposed, the basics are;

- Huon Valley and Kingborough merge
- Hobart and Glenorchy merge
- Brighton and Southern Midlands merge
- Tasman and Sorrell merge
- Clarence and GSB merge
- Central Highland and Derwent Valley merge

The merged Councils have a strong affinity and likeness with each other currently and would lessen the uneasiness of ratepayers and staff about changes.

Councils should be merged state wide not just the south.

With some of the money saved a body is set up to manage funding. All rates would be pooled into the new body and distributed to the new Councils dependant on population and value of assets owned. There would still be money left in the kitty for any bigger capital or renewal works for which each new council would need to apply for a grant in such a way that is the case with Federal funds such as those for Black Spot, Roads to Recovery and Community Water grants.

From what I am lead to believe Councils seem to have different ways of assessing and depreciating assets. For this method to work all councils would need to use a like to like system to stop artificial inflation of asset worth.

You could probably put arguments and figures against my ideas as to why it wouldn't work, but to me it just makes sense.

Thanks for your time.

Regards,

62

I have had discussion with both my co- work and people who live in my area. I was elected to write on behalf of the 27 people I spoke with.

We agree that A SINGLE SOUTHERN TASMANIAN COUNCIL should exist. We researched other states; countries and looked at size and population. Tasmania had by far has the most councils. It is therefore very over staffed. (London was the best example, one council) high wage cost and duplication. Variable rules, rates and charges. Is this day and age of technology and high staff cost it is ridiculous to have so many councils that do the same task for a relatively small area and population.

63

I would choose option 3 – Greater Hobart

Because:-

The population base is consistent with the rest of Australia

More effective use of resources due to less duplication

Reduced costs

It would be good to increase the size of the police force especially in the Kingborough area which is chronically understaffed – with the costs saved.

In my experience, our local council has shown itself incapable of dealing with neighbourhood crime, bullying and law breaking. Talks and letters from council staff are generally ineffective and rarely followed up. A specialist suburban 24 hour police team would be much more effective.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

xxxxxxx

Blackmans Bay

64

Hello,

Regarding the STCA independent panel reviewing the proposed changes to local councils in Southern Tasmania.

After reading the four options I think that "Greater Hobart" may be the best because it could improve efficiency, reduce duplication and save money. Any option that can save money (thus hopefully passing those savings onto rate payers) is a better option than one which does not.

I also liked the "'Separate Eastern & Western Shores....' because it reduces the number of councils from 12 to 5, until I read that it could result in "significant upheaval for limited cost savings"

"A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council" may well be too big as stated in the review. Are ratepayers in Geevston and Dover faced with similar problems as ratepayers in West Hobart? Are ratepayers living in Nubeena faced with the same problems as citizens in New Norfolk? If the answer is 'Yes!' then perhaps one large STRC is the way to go. I assume the main problem here is rural vs urban. Communities in rural areas face different difficulties than urban and sub-urban communities.

The option "Status Quo with Shared Services" effectively creates another organisation with all the costs that go with that... As there are few examples of this model operating successfully I think that answers its own question.

Regards,
xxxxxxxxxx
(an urban-dwelling rate payer)

65

Dear Sir/Madam
ADVERTISEMENT in THE MERCURY SATURDAY 27 AUGUST 2011

We write in response to the above invitation.

We have a number of concerns and comments.

It is obvious that the boundaries of local government areas were drawn up at a time when communication options were very constrained – the fastest travel was by horse and that itself was very slow. All messages were carried by a person, sometimes horse assisted.

Nearly 200 years later, that has all changed. The principal selection criterion for boundaries for administration should be environmental. That means that a logical way to define the management of Southern Tasmania should be by the catchment of the Derwent River. Any decision made by someone in, for instance Ouse, on the handling of rubbish, sewage, stormwater has an impact on the rest of the residents who live downstream of Ouse.

Equally, a decision by the present Hobart City Council on works on Mt Wellington can have an impact on residents of the Eastern Shore, who in many cases have a better view of the mountain than HCC residents.

A similar argument can apply to the area around Launceston, as there is one major river there. The North-west Coast is a bit trickier, as there are several parallel rivers. But those areas are outside your brief.

We would thus be in favour of A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council.

We do not believe that being 2 hours travelling time from the head office of the council is a problem. Telephone, facsimile and email travel fast enough that any urgent message can be delivered almost instantaneously.

There may be a delay in getting the relevant repair gang to the problem, but that exercise in logistics has already been addressed, and presumably solved, by Southern Water, Aurora Energy, Telstra, Optus among others.

There are at least 12 council works depots at present, probably more. While there should be some rationalising of these, it is obvious that a depot at New Norfolk or at Huonville should be maintained for some time, particularly as the existing workforce has a detailed knowledge of the quirks and idiosyncrasies of the existing infrastructure.

Existing buildings can be re-assigned to become Centres of Expertise. For instance, all town planning might be consolidated at the Clarence Council Chambers, all heritage and environmental staff at Hobart City Council, all of another area of activity at Glenorchy.

Each council building should be retained, in the short run, to allow residents to pay their rates, lodge repair requests and so on, although there is no reason why most or all of these functions cannot be handled by Service Tasmania. Buildings no longer required could be made available for true community use, perhaps as a Men's Shed, or as meeting rooms for community groups. Perhaps some services such as the Baby Health Centre at Lindisfarne could be moved to more modern premises.

The one issue we have not resolved for ourselves is electing a council. Many councils have 12 councillors/aldermen and a new council for a larger area should not need very many more. The trick will be to ensure that there is equable representation from all regions. That has been achieved at the state government level with the careful drawing of the electoral boundaries, and ought not to be beyond the new council.

One model could be to guarantee one member from each of the present 12 councils, with perhaps another 5 or 7 elected by the entire electorate, with this entire structure to be reviewed after 7 or 10 years.

Yours faithfully

66

We have examined your options for Local Government reorganisation .. The Greater Hobart appears to be a good one but with further amalgamations of rural areas, seen in the last option, would seem a good addition.

Yours truly,
xxxxx
xxxxxxx 7000

67

Good Afternoon

I propose Option 2 – the creation of a single Southern Council.

I am firmly of the opinion that Tasmania is over represented by government officials based on its population size. Reduction in the number of councils would not change this, but may be a step in the right direction.

The main reasons I support the creation of a single Council are as follows:

1. The current system has massive duplication of services in areas that are not far apart geographically. Significant cost savings and economies of scale would be achieved by the amalgamation of all southern Councils and rationalisation of services.
2. Councils are no longer responsible for water and sewerage services, which were a large function before the Water corporations were created. Accordingly large scale change is required to the current system of Councils to keep them efficient.
3. We already see some sharing of services – some Councils are too small to offer all services and outsource these functions to other Councils. A single Council would further streamline this.
4. There are different systems and ways of handling common procedures across Councils at the moment. We need a single set of rules applied to all ratepayers in Southern Tasmania.
5. Councils themselves are not independent enough to view these reforms and comment objectively; each is wanting to protect “its own patch”. Therefore change has to be mandated on them to serve all ratepayers and drive savings.
6. By having separate Councils, I do not believe we are serving Southern Tasmania’s interest effectively. The creation of one Council will allow submissions for funding to organisations such as Infrastructure Australia to be co-ordinated and therefore achieve a better success rate. At the moment, the “push-pull” that we see is counterproductive and is an impost to investment.
7. We need to look at best practices across the Country. There are areas that are far bigger geographically than Southern Tasmania and with more ratepayers that are served by a single Council. Tasmania needs to catch up and not be a step behind all the time.

Thanks for your consideration.

xxxx
xxxxx
West Hobart 7000

68

I live in Battery Point and I am responding to your request for feedback on the four options presented in the options paper.

I favour a combination of options 3 and 4 with a Greater Hobart City Council from option 3 plus the three regional councils from option 4. I do not see a reason to divide Hobart into western and eastern shores as we all share many of the facilities and can easily work on one shore and live in the other. Option 3 has too many very small councils and they would benefit from the amalgamations implied in option 4. If it is decided to have separate councils for west and eastern shore then option 4 has things about right.

Regards,

69

I support Option 2 – amalgamation of all southern councils into one Greater Hobart Council.

Whilst this will create a very large Council, with the right balance of representation, it should be possible to ensure the needs of all residence are met.

By comparison, we have a State Government with a similar number of elected members, responsible for the needs of the entire state. Parochialism aside, there is little debate or concern that the needs of all Tasmanians is represented.

With one southern council, and hopefully similar mergers in the north and north-west of the State, we should expect to see fairness and equity delivered to all communities, with consistent policies and procedures.

Tasmania cannot afford the waste that results from pandering to the parochialism that has plagued this State for far too long.

xxxx
xxxxxxx
Kingston 7050

70

I would choose to have a single Southern Tasmania regional council. Half of the council would be elected at one time with the other half two years later. If the term is four years then elections would be held both in year 2 and year 4.

Reasons: Population is not that large to support the number of administrative staff, council cars, council staff, transport workers etc.

Teams could be put together to target specific targets esp with road works and instead of having a few council workers here and there scattered all over southern Tasmania a larger team could get in and out having done the job in less time. People would see progress faster and think things were actually happening.

If needed there could be portfolio areas for specific areas in specific regions to deal with a single issue throughout the council region or within a specific council area where the issue may be relevant only to that spot.

There is far too much waste in administering more than one or two regional council areas and the duplication costs too much money. The more money saved the more projects that could be completed and the happier people would be.

As well voting on issues would have a bigger base of ideas, thoughts and personalities and with swinging election shifts new voices could be coming and going and we would not get the stagnation of the same people making the same decision.

I would also like to see mandatory voting in council elections.

That's my 2 cents. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to forward my ideas.

Regards,

xxxx

xxxxxxx

South Hobart, TAS 7004

71

Upon reflection of the 4 options you pose we are more in favour of the Greater Hobart option as it would appear to have a stronger voice. We think that the eastern and western shores need to co-operate more and this model may promote that. How the power is divided will be important for this to work

Regards

72

You have been sent 3 pictures.

PICT0001.JPG

PICT0002.JPG

PICT0003.JPG

The attached pictures are of the following,

1. The commencement of the footpath from the junction of Carlton Beach and Carlton River Road. This badly constructed and unsafe footway ends prior to the residential part of Carlton. From then on pedestrians have to walk on a busy road.
2. The commencement of the footpath along Carlton Beach Road to Park Beach. Unsafe and in a bad state of repair.
3. This is Regunna Street in Carlton.

The Sorell Council should be disbanded and the area taken over by a single council controlling and maintaining areas East of the Derwent River.

- (1) The average rates for the Dodges Ferry, Carlton area are in excess of \$900.
- (2) 70% of the streets are unsealed causing pollution to tank water and property.
- (3) 80% of the area does not have stormwater drainage. This also causes property damage.
- (4) xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx .
- (5) Health and safety issues are not on the councils agenda.

I would hope that the independent panel have someone carry an independent inspection of the Dodges Ferry , Carlton area.

xxxxxx
Carlton

73

My preference would be for a single southern council. We as Australians are over governed. There is no reason to have all these council to cover the population the size of Tasmania. xxxxxxx South Arm.7022