

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

20th September 2011 to 25th 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.

163

Hello.

We have read the proposals and consider that we are better off with A Single Southern Tasmanian Regional Council.

1 Bureaucracy

1 set of standards

Significant savings in infrastructure, fleet, workforce, running costs

A considerable savings to all of us.

Thankyou

Lindisfarne.

164

I prefer option 2, as I believe we are far too inefficient with so many Councils.

We are such a small population in this State the money saved by the community would be far better used for community development and the like.

165

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm currently a resident living close to the Moonah CBD and the Glenorchy/Hobart council boundary. I'd more likely support Option 1 or a combination of Options 3-4 which I will explain below. I do not support option 2 due to reading about mergers in Queensland and how such mergers lead to councillors behaving in a manner of self interest instead of in the interest of the residents of the area.

I currently think that the perception that our councils cover too small a population size is incorrect. All Tasmanian city councils were in the top 40% of councils ranked by population in 2009. While only the Bass Strait islands are in the bottom 20%. There are 12 councils with less than 1,000 people per councillor with 4 councils having greater than 2500 people per councillor.

While I've thought about possible mergers of all councils I think I can only comment on the council merge that directly affects me which is the merger of Brighton, Glenorchy, and Hobart with parts of Clarence and Kingborough. Using the census location of 2006 and the population percentage of the Kingston-Blackmans Bay urban centre and the Richmond area they used I estimated figures of the size of Greater Hobart to be about 179,116 people in 2009. This is a big population based on Australian council standards with it being in the top 20 councils ranked by population size in 2009.

It would be almost 3 times the size of Tasmania's largest current council which was Launceston.

I heard a figure floating about the people per councillor being around 10,000 which would mean 18 councillors perhaps 30 councillors would be a better number for the area that has currently 55 councillors it gives a better chance for people outside of the business arena to be on council and I'd prefer to have a ward system to prevent councillors coming from the one area as to properly solve problems you need to listen to a range of ideas. Under the 18 councillor system that could mean 3 spots come up in 3 wards and for a 30 councillor system that could mean 5 spots come up in 3 wards. This assumes that the current system of half the council, Deputy Mayor and Mayor seek to be re-elected every 2 years remains.

Yours Faithfully

166

Dear Panel,

Please find attached my review of your proposals, plus one of my own.

I think you failed to follow your own guidelines well enough.

Hope it makes sense to you.

Thanks,

Re: SOUTHERN TASMANIAN COUNCILS.

<i>Part A. Historical</i>	p1
<i>Part B. Panel Proposals</i>	p2
<i>Part C. Prop.5 - An Alternative</i>	p4
<i>Part D. Summary</i>	p7

Part A. History:

In times past, Tasmania had 48 separate Councils, but with the coming of motor transport and the telephone into the every day lives of the people, it made sense to combine these into far fewer entities. These were worked out along the lines of geographical divides, transport routes, areas of common interest, and local product.

For some time now there has been a general recognition that the Councils in southern Tasmania could be “doing it better” with regard to cost, provision of services, standards of services and ability to respond to emerging situations.

The internet, use of complex and specialized machinery and the rising cost of wages have all meant that some Councils were increasingly sharing resources and knowledge, while still trying to provide twenty first century services with 20th. century facilities.

Present Day Action:

The STCA called on an independent panel to review the current situation of twelve separate councils to find an alternative structure that would reflect improvements in the deficient areas listed above, among others.

The Panel identified two factors that guided their thinking:

“Hobart and its surrounding areas must play a crucial role in this transition”

and

“In so far as possible, decision making about local affairs should remain in the hands of local people”.

Part B. Panel Proposals:

The Panel came up with four proposals: (and in my opinion, missed a better option)

1. Status quo with shared services.
2. A single Southern Tasmania Regional Council
3. A Greater Hobart, with some amalgamation of others and status quo for the rest.
4. Separate Eastern and Western Shores for Hobart, plus regional amalgamations.

The following is a brief examination of each of the four proposals.

Proposal 1: Status quo. and shared services.

There would be some economies in sharing resources. Some areas of operation and decision making would be centralized.

However, there is a real possibility of tension between the Local Councils and the Central Authority (a la Water Authorities). Also, the areas of responsibility left with the Local Councils would be very few. Too few to ensure that in time of urgent need a Council would have the personnel, equipment and the financial resources to deal with any emergency.

Also, local communities would lose control on managing their affairs in several areas. While the present Tasmanian Councils are far smaller than their mainland counterparts, it is geography that separates the communities. They often have different needs, different transport routes, different weather patterns, different lifestyles and different local industries.

Proposal 2: Single Regional.

As for Proposal 1, but even more so.

The isolation of a problem from those that deal with it would be reflected in all areas. Districts would lose their ability to be self reliant and people would not be personally known to those making the decisions. Nor would there be any guarantee that some-one in a Council office would have any personal knowledge of an area or problem being raised by a rate-payer. They would be more likely to brush the problem into the "too hard basket".

Tasmania's geography means that traveling times are far in excess of that experienced in other States. There would still be a need to maintain many local Service Centres and Works Depots, otherwise the cost of transport for all concerned would begin to outweigh the benefits.

While the advent of the internet has helped many in the general community become electronically linked to the outside world, there are many locations in rural Tasmania that will remain isolated for some time. Also, there are many Tasmanians who much prefer to not become part of the Web, instead wishing to deal with matters in a face-to-face manner. Plus, there are those people who do not have the understanding of things technical and for whom a personal visit to a Council Office is the only way to pay their rates etc, in cash.

Proposal 3. Greater Hobart.

The new "Greater Hobart Council" would benefit greatly by having more resources, a larger rate base, more bargaining power. But all this would be at the expense of those rural localities surrounding it.

Its size would be commensurate with regional and capital city Councils on the mainland, but as a percentage of the State population, it would be in excess.

The Greater Hobart Council would comprise nearly all of the present Greater Hobart Metropolitan Area, and would be focused on providing services for light and medium manufacturing industry, service industries and the accompanying population living in medium to heavy density areas.

It would know very little of the needs of the other Councils, when it comes to rural allotments, intensive aquaculture, forestry, rural roads, tourism and isolated communities.

It would not have the in-house knowledge to assist with resources when asked to help on bigger projects in the outer areas

It would do nothing to help the rural Councils in southern Tasmania to better cope with the demands being placed upon them to "get with the times" and "use the economies of scale" in order to lower costs.

Proposal 4. Separate Eastern and Western Shores.

This proposal goes a long way to sorting the problems out, but then creates others for the outer municipalities. The outer Councils would be going it alone, as the nearest other Council with which to share plant and personnel would often be some distance away.

The present Kingborough would be split, adversely and to the great displeasure of those living in Taroona. While there are some Taroona residents who would like to join Hobart, they are the ones who do not venture south to Kingston and enjoy its facilities. They would also be the ones who do not put anything back into the community. They are in the minority.

Some existing inter-area links would be broken, both for the Councils and their residents.

A Fault In The Panel Membership.

The Panel has not taken into account the identities of the various areas. Two members of the Panel were from interstate and it would appear that they had no personal knowledge of what makes Tasmanians tick and what they identify with.

People live in the various communities because of the surrounds, the various lifestyles they afford and the work available in the nearby areas.

To a large extent, in this proposal, each of the Councils would become “specialist” in looking after specific lifestyles and industry types. They would be calling for different facets of development, different housing types, different transport facilities and have different rate bases to call on. One would not know what the other was talking about.

A Regional Body, possibly the STCA would be pulled in different directions for different reasons. The State and Federal Governments would not receive a united approach.

Some Councils would be large in area with a small rate base, while others would cover a small area but have a larger rate base.

Part C. An Alternative:

I have used these factors:

- #1. To better reflect the various and existing lifestyle and identity groupings, and at the same time have the Council boundaries encompass the areas in which their ratepayers work, live, socialize and recreate,
- #2. As far as is possible, to enable all Councils to have a mixture of business, residential, industrial, agricultural and residential areas,
- #3. To use geographic boundaries and attributes, tourism facilities and from these the necessary transport requirements,

so that each Council is on the same wavelength when it comes to talking with its neighbours, that the sharing of resources and specialized plant is more possible, that the Region is talking with a united voice, at the same time getting the economies of scale and increased expertise and capability when working on a larger scale.

Proposal 5: Five Councils:

- a. All of Huon and Kingborough;
- b. All of Hobart, Glenorchy, Derwent Valley;
- c. Central Highlands and Lower Midlands and including Oatlands;
- d. Clarence and Brighton;
- e. Tasman, Spring Bay and all of Sorell.

a. Kingborough/Huon.

This is a natural selection in many ways.

They already share some Council staff, have a joint tourism body, have the same interests in aquaculture, land based food production in all forms, have the same or similar lifestyles, similar housing density variations and service industries. They both have retail and business hubs, forestry, and art/craft operations.

The recreational and sporting scenes are similar and the respective bodies work well together.

The school district is already based on a joint basis.

They both have tourism attractions and National Parks.

There are transport routes that link from one area to the other.

The intervening line of hills has its own fire problems.

Many residents shop/holiday/work in one area and live in the other.

They are already using a joint identity in many ways.

The residents of Tarooma, while often working in Hobart, would certainly not like to be part of that Municipality (as suggested in Proposal 4). They identify as true residents of Kingborough, mostly shopping there and a lot have holiday properties on Bruny Island. There is a lot of bad feeling towards the HCC, following an attempt some years ago by Hobart to pump its sewerage to Tarooma for treatment.

But Kingborough and Huon Councils are isolated from the rest of the State by a range of mountains and hills, that limit access routes to just a few roads.

b. Hobart, Glenorchy, Derwent Valley.

This combination would have retail, business and commerce areas, low, medium and high density residential, light and medium industrial, rural, and forestry areas.

There would also be tourism attractions and recreational areas.

The larger rates base would help to provide funding for the extended rural area of the Derwent Valley.

The addition of the Valley would give Hobart a knowledge of rural and forest matters.

Residents of the various communities in the proposed Council area often work in a different community to that in which they live and recreate, but still in the proposed area.

The natural boundaries are the above mentioned hills and mountains to the south, and the edge of the Central Plateau to the west and north, combined with the Derwent River as it passes Hobart on the east.

c. Central Highlands/Lower Midlands.

This proposal is a combination of water catchment, storage, power generation, forestry, tourism, recreational angling and sheep grazing areas in the Highlands, with farming, commuter residential and tourism in the Midlands. Oatlands is a country town that can provide some service facilities, retail, business services and accommodation.

The areas are to some extent inter-dependant.

d. Clarence/Brighton.

With the Derwent River to the west, the Coal River to the east, Frederick Henry Bay to the South and the northern end meeting up with the Lower Midlands, it is natural to combine the two existing Municipalities.

The new identity would have business, retail and commerce areas, plus medium and low density housing, some rural areas, tourism attractions, recreational areas and similar weather patterns.

While a lot of residents of the two areas work in neither, this will change in times to come with the further development of the transport hub and light industrial areas at Brighton.

A lot of sporting organizations in the area are already embracing a wider community than they did in past.

e. Tasman/SpringBay.

This whole area is a coastal one. It has rural properties of various types. Forestry, fishing, tourism, accommodation and some light industry are to be found.

Sorell has retail, business operators and a service industry to match its fast growing residential component. Sorell is the gateway to the East Coast.

A lot of those who recreate on the Tasman Peninsular are residents of Sorell and its environs. Many of those living on the Tasman Peninsular are reliant on Sorell for medical, retail, financial and associated services. For those living at Triabunna, the need is nearly as great.

Sorell is already the heart of the area.

Part D. Summary:

The Proposals as put forward by the Panel are rejected. The Panel has not followed their guidelines well enough. I have modified these and added a third, to better translate into a more workable proposal. That, listed as Proposal 5, in Part C of my submission, above, is put forward in good faith.

By having five new Council areas, all with a retail/business hub, all with a rural area, all with tourism operations, all with medium and low density housing, all with semi-isolated communities, all with rural roads to maintain, plus other common factors, it is hoped that they each will be in a situation to help their neighbour/ guide them through times of emergency, share under-used resources and at the same time be able to be better managers of their own affairs and do it all at less cost to their ratepayers.

Tasmania has a unique geography which will dictate the size of a Council area, due to travel times. The residents also have different needs as a result of the above and need to be catered for locally, instead of a Council Officer traveling for 90 minutes or two hours each way.

The Kingborough area is remote from the Derwent Valley, and equally remote from Sorell. While some of their residents needs are similar, the there are several differences too.

The rate payers and the community in general should be able to feel connected with their Council without being isolated from it because of a geographical barrier or isolated access route. Residents would like to know that their Councillors and Council Staff have some personal knowledge of the respective areas because they travel through it, and not because they looked it up on the internet.

There will still be a need for local Service Centres and works depots/gangs, but there will not be a need to duplicate the many areas of administration that occur now.

However, there will be a need to re-introduce a system of having an elected Council representative from each locale (Ward) in the Council area. Otherwise it could be that a community will lose its voice. While the Council areas are moving in size to those of the mainland, there are many areas with special needs and qualities that deserve their own representative.

Author:

Taroona, Tas. 7053

19/09/2011.

167

Support Option 4

168

Hello I would like to let you know I strongly support Option 1 (Status Quo- Shared Services)

Regards

Council amalgamations have been proven ineffective in other states, particularly Queensland. The recent 'water and sewerage reforms' in Tasmania have also been a disaster and this has been well documented in the media.

No organisation can provide services as efficiently and cost effectively as the current well run Council's in Tasmania.

Amalgamating the already efficient larger Council's will lead to increased beurocracy, less service and higher rates for ratepayers who are already struggling to pay increased water and sewerage charges and ever increasing power bills.

Not to mention the longer queues at Centrelink, which will be created with the addition of sacked Council staff (already low paid compared to other Government and Industry sectors) and add to the State's ever growing list of unemployed people. An important role of Government in Tasmania, which never gets a mention, is the fact that Tasmania does not have the industry and commerce that larger States have, which provide employment for much of the Australian population. Government provides this much needed employment gap to the Tasmanian population.

Therefore my preferred option is to retain the 'Status Quo'. In addition, perhaps the Local Government Board of the State Government should be given more power to have input into providing efficiency into the running of the 'basket-case' Council's such as Sorrel and Glenorchy. It is not good policy to punish the ratepayers who have invested in already efficient and sustainable Council's. A far better option, and one that was not offered, would be to scrap State Government altogether and give the Health, Education and Police Departments to Federal Government and share the other State Government responsibilities amongst Local Government. Then, and only then, there may be a case for creating larger Council's.

Leave the Council's alone.

West Hobart 7000

170

I strongly support Option 2 - A single Southern council. Tasmania is very over-governed. Separate councils encourage frittering of resources through competition when an overall approach would give far better outcomes for less money (Consider the Bellerive oval that has no adequate car parking facilities as an example of a badly conceived development carried out because of competition between Clarence & Hobart). It is not correct to cite differences between city and rural areas as being a reason not to amalgamate - some mainland councils with very diverse needs and types of development and land use are successful - for example Shire of Yarra Ranges (VIC).

My second preference is for Option 3 - for similar reasons.

Lindisfarne 7015

171

Option 1- Status Quo



Master Plumbers' Association of Tasmania

The Independent Expert Panel
Structural Options Project
Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA)
GPO Box 503
HOBART 7001

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the review of local government structure in Southern Tasmania. The Master Plumbers Association of Tasmania (MPA) believes that any review should be a review for Tasmania because Tasmania will be a better place when we leave behind the North v. South mentality that suffocates our existence. If STCA could find a way to achieve that it would be great for Tasmania.

The Property Council, commissioned the *AEC Group Report into the Significance of the Property Industry to the Tasmanian Economy*. The report identified the property industry as the largest private sector industry in the state; 45,420 Tasmanians or 23.9 per cent of the State's total workforce are employed across the sectors that make up the Tasmanian property industry.

The plumbing industry is part of the property industry in Tasmania and deals with plumbing requirements that vary between 29 councils with 281 aldermen administering permits, fees, planning and an inspection regime that varies from one council to another with varying levels of service offered by the different councils to the plumbing industry and our clients (rate payers).

The cost of local government is an ever increasing burden on the industry and consumers. There is a compelling need to reform the duplication and consolidate the number of councils and the modus operandi of councils.

The MPA is supportive of the submission of the Property Industry Council to the STCA independent expert panel. MPA remains ready willing and able to assist in further deliberations that will, inter alia:-

- Maximize the financial sustainability of the southern Tasmania local government sector to support continued provision of services to its communities over the long term by promoting more effective service delivery and increasing collaboration within the sector; and
- Recommend viable, sustainable models for future local government reform in Southern Tasmania.

Thanks again for the opportunity

Yours faithfully

The Master Plumbers' Association of Tasmania

Adrian Cowie
Executive Officer

173

Panel Members

My background is of ten years in the xxxxxxx Medical Service in (then) xxxxxx , and xxxxxxx from 1950-60., ending up as Senior Health Officer in the xxxxxxx Ministry of Health controlling a staff of some thousands controlling the major endemic diseases and, when necessary, dealing with epidemic disease outbreaks. for a population of over 40 million.

I served in the Tasmanian Health Department from 1960-83, xxxxxxx.

It has long appeared to me that Tasmania has far too many Local Authorities, that it is over governed, and in need of remodelling to promote greater efficiency in provision of services, better representation so that there is more consultation between Councils and their electors in a "from the bottom upwards fashion" rather than as so often appears today from above downwards. In that respect I consider the wider use of precinct groups along the lines of those in Glenorchy desirable.

Of the models suggested my preference is for a 'Greater Hobart'. Greater Hobart would comprise somewhere about 200,000 souls which would still be a small administrative entity for a capital city both in terms of population and area.

Historically it seems that State Governments preferred to keep Hobart divided so that it could not become too powerful a challenge to the State Government. This, to me, gave rise to much parochialism and subsequent costs of management of the component parts. Indeed I recall an occasion when the President of the upper house (also Head of the Port Authority) confronting Hobart's Chief Health Inspector in Davey Street just outside the Customs House building with the advice that on the port side of the street he had no authority. In those days port health problems were dealt with by the State Division of Public Health. it was a ludicrous situation.

So far as I am aware there have relatively few responses to the proposals. If that is so the STCA should consider employing a reliable research agency to get as wide a public response as possible when putting recommendations to the State Government for its preferred change. One should avoid the old university argument that the "time is not right". As a professorial cynic observed over one hundred years ago "time is like the medlar fruit. It has a trick of going rotten before it is right.'

I would be happy to discuss these comments further at the panel's convenience.

174

Dear Panel,

I thank you for the opportunity to respond and comment on the proposals that have been put forward by yourselves. My own opinion is that providing the public, including myself, with too many options will lead to discontent when a final decision I made, having allowed a fractured response. It would have been preferable to have, choice between the status quo and the option that the panel believes would deliver the greatest benefit. I understand that your terms of reference may have precluded this, however for myself, I believe this would have a provided a more solid and united position from which to move forward, or remain the same.

In terms of the options presented, I do believe that something should be done to rationalize the number of councils in Southern Tasmania. Therefore option one is not considered appropriate. Option 2 of one single council will, I believe, lead to too much animosity between town and country. Therefore not considered appropriate.

Of the remaining two options, 3 presents the most favorable outcomes, of cost saving, better advocacy and shared services. My initial belief was that this could be achieved through less councils. However Option 4, which does have less councils and going by the narrative, would provide less upside for the amount of change required. I would therefore like to support option 3 of the options presented.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment and may this project move forward into action on the ground.

Best Regards
Cambridge TAS 7170

175

The CEO
Independent Panel
STCA
GPO Box 503
Hobart 7001

Dear Sir/Madam

25 September 2011

Re Review of Local Government- Southern Tasmania.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on this matter. I've been involved in Local Government for the past 30 years, from 1981-1994 as a Councillor on the xxxx Council and since 1989 as a surveyor in private practice operation from a home office at xxxxx.

My father was a Councillor on the xxxxx Council in the 1960s and my brother was on the xxxxxx Council for a number of years and was Deputy Mayor for a time.

I've had extensive experience with Local Government with Planning applications, engineering, subdivision and development including houses and multiple dwellings. The layout of the present xxxxxxx site development is of my making. Since 1992 I've been advocating and designing subdivision with multiple unit development potential on smaller lot sizes and now note Local Government has recently advocated this path albeit 20 years later.

In the recent past there has been no effective planning strategy for the southern part of Tasmania. No planned growth areas and all Councils competing for both residential and industrial development to the detriment of neighbouring Councils. Very little land set aside for future residential and no planning of services to provide for same. Minor short term local issues predominate and serious provision for the future seems to be beyond the province of the present administrations.

Take Brighton for example, Brighton is now surrounded by Rural Residential developments that preclude expansion of the present Residential areas. To the north there is Jordan Downs & Glen Lea areas and to the south of William Street predominantly Rural Residential again. There is no provision for sewerage to be install along the Jordan River from Pontville to service the area west of Brighton and there is probably little point now its Glen Lea subdivided into half & 1 ha lots.

There seems to be little accurate research of population growths for the southern area. Take Brighton again for example.- the Brighton Structure Plan authored by AURECON and dated 3 June 2009 page 26-27 estimated the Brighton population (on the high growth scenario) as 16,484 by 2026. The 2011 figure is 14,716. That figure has already been exceeded as your published population is already 15,807. Treasury have predicted the population to be 22,156 (p27) by 2026.

These widely different figures make planning for the future difficult and Local Governments clearly do not have the resources to make meaningful decisions on future growth patterns and services.

The failure to have an overall strategic plan for the growth of the greater Hobart area is detrimental to the region. We can no longer tolerate the ad hoc growth that has occurred in the past and both Local Government and the State Government are to blame for the lack of strategy and for not identifying the growth areas required and for setting those areas aside.

Take the transport hub for example. The State spent \$170 million on this – there are no transport operators on site and no trains, no infrastructure for transport operators, no trucks, no reduction in the B Double traffic to Evans Street, and no announcement as to when it will be operational. All we have is an impasse on who will operate the facility!! So much for planning!!

Dealing with so many different Local Governments is a nightmare for private consultants, so many different rule interpretations for the same legislation. Take planning applications for example, in Glenorchy the legislation is interpreted as requiring an applicant (not being the owner) to sign a statutory declaration to the effect that the owner has been notified of the application. Most other Council have the declaration on the bottom of the application form and this is sufficient to comply with the legislative requirement. The New Norfolk Planning Scheme (Derwent Valley) has a clause in the planning scheme that requires the owner to sign regardless of the declaration to be notified.

And that's just for the application!!!!

Where to from Here?

There needs to be significant reform of the structure of Local Government and this reform needs to be implemented over a period of time, sufficient to allow the various stakeholders to adjust/implement the reforms. The last thing we need is another rushed implementation as occurred with the water reforms which has resulted in a complete lack of confidence by the public especially in Southern Tasmania, highlighted by the announcement of two major structure reforms this month!

All change needs to be carefully implemented.

My preference for Local Government in Southern Tasmania would be for one city Council comprising all of Hobart and Glenorchy with the urban parts of Clarence, Kingborough and Brighton with sufficient buffer outside that urban area to cater for at least 50 years growth. The remaining outer areas could then be service by three "Rural" Councils based on Huonville, New Norfolk and Sorell. These are solid regional centres with major banking and other services and would make ideal bases for regional councils (as they are at present). In regard to the one city Council concept the notion that the Derwent River is natural boundary for Local Government is farcical. There are many great cities around the world that have a river running through them. Imagine Brisbane with different Councils on either side of the Brisbane River. Who would run the ferries?? The notion that Clarence is different is little more than a fairytale. Who would give a second thought to Glenorchy saying the New Town Rivulet is a natural local Government boundary- but it has been so for decades! Clarence, Brighton & Kingborough need to be part of the city as they are all major residential expansion areas that exist because of Hobart. Once it is accepted that the City includes these expanded areas we can then accept that industry and business can exist outside the central Hobart area.

Take Canberra for example – the city is based on a central area with satellite centres some kilometres away. These satellite centres are the focus of centralised transport (buses) with excellent interconnecting roads. The roads are utilised in both directions at peak hours because there are major office complexes in these satellite areas as well as services, unlike Hobart where the traffic is tidal during peak hours and underutilised in the other direction. There needs to be much more development away from the City centre and a diversified city Council would allow this to happen.

As for the regional Councils the model I have proposed would allow a future merge of all the councils into one, while retaining representation within the regional areas for the time being. The one Council concept would be very difficult if not impossible to "sell" in the short to medium term, but would be more appropriate in 20-40 years time.

I have not studied in detail the makeup of the three regional Councils, but obviously with the Huonville Regional Council the area would include Bruny Island and the southerly parts of Kingborough as well as the present Huon Council area.

The New Norfolk Regional Council would include the present Derwent Valley , Central Highlands and Southern Midlands.
The Sorell Regional Council would include Sorell, Tasman & Glamorgan Spring Bay .

Now assuming about 5000 of the Kingborough residents are now in the Huon region the resultant numbers for each of the Councils would be approximately :-

Hobart	170,000
Huon	20,000
Sorell	20,000
New Norfolk	18,500.

This would put Hobart at about the same level as achieved by the Victorian reforms about 10 years ago (180,000) and the regional councils with very closely equal numbers and presumably viability.

There are about 2000 additional summer residents in the present Central Highlands area.

Richmond could be included in Sorell without too much effect on the overall numbers.

In the implementation of Local Government reforms I think there would be strong resistance from State Government for a “one Council for Southern Tasmania” . The State would then look to Local Government to provide transport and other services and be fearful of the strength of a “one Council model”. There would certainly be a fear fact resistance for the north of the State with such a large Local Government for Southern Tasmania.

In all of this there needs to be a “stand back” decision making process where the best outcomes are achieved without the local constraints of territorial influences. I’m not advocating a Kennett approach, but a cooperative change that would not see any redundancies for a couple of years and councillors staying in place for two years before new elections were held. There would be a need for “surplus” staff in the implementation of the changes for some time.

I would see room for an interim committee for implementation of change and not follow the Southern Water model of “do it our way” with unacceptable consequences!

I’m sorry I have spent so little time on this submission but Sunday afternoon is the only time I can allocate in my schedule. I am available for further discussion if required.

Yours sincerely

176

I think one large council is the best choice.

In the days of horse and cart it made sense to have local councils but today communications are instant and a person can travel by car from Hobart to any area in Southern Tasmania in a few hours.

Forty years ago a small council was run by two people but today the same council has an office full of people, I don't know what they do. It seems we are over governed.

regards

Moonah 7009

177

U3A Kingborough Inc.
P.O. Box 479
Kingston TAS 7051

26th September 2011

Joint CEOs
Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority
GPO Box 503
Hobart TAS 7001

Dear Sirs,

Subject Reforms to Local Government

Our organisation has dealings with Kingborough Council. It like we presume the other Councils in Southern Tasmania operates with approx 10 or more Councillors who are paid small amounts of money for their services. The Councillors work part time for Council and could not survive without other sources of income.

We have close relations with our council and they are very accessible to us and to the community.

Our concern with the paper “A review of structural reform options” is that while comments are made about the potential efficiencies and savings possibilities of amalgamation, there are no detailed financial analyses of the amalgamated and residual municipalities. We are worried that by excising Kingston and leaving the residual area of the Kingborough Municipality to be combined with Huon there could be an inadequate population and rate base to pay for the necessary social and environmental services expected of the Council.

It seems clear from the information that the accessibility of Councillors to the population living in the areas outside Metropolitan Hobart would be substantially reduced in comparison with the present situation.

It is unquestionable that regional level issues ought to be dealt with at a regional level and that southern Tasmania has suffered in past years in this respect. However, we support the regional land use study done and would support the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority being given decision-making authority by State Government over defined regional issues.

Excising regional planning and decision-making from Local Government would leave it with management of Local Government issues and Municipalities could be encouraged to amalgamate voluntarily but not compulsorily.

Yours sincerely,

A/President