

The Future of Local Government Review

Submission to the Local Government Board

Derwent Valley Council – 1 August 2023

Summary

The Derwent Valley Council submits that there is no compelling reason for the Derwent Valley Municipality to be amalgamated with another council area. Derwent Valley Council supports two parts of the “hybrid” model shown in the Stage 2 Interim Report Summary. Its preferred approach would:

Provide flexibility to apply for different approaches to designing new councils that serve urban and rural communities respectively:

This may mean, for example, scaling up our urban councils while preserving some smaller rural LGAs. In short, our future structure needs to be able to accommodate the (often very different) needs and circumstances of urban and rural communities – one size cannot fit all.

See the mandating of some service sharing but only for a relatively narrow range of services or functions.

This would not preclude further voluntary collaboration and service sharing between councils in areas of mutual interest or benefit. In fact, the Board also wants to explore how it can reduce barriers to allow more effective voluntary shared service arrangements. However, many potential mandated service sharing options would be contingent on new LGA boundaries and councils.

Accordingly, the Derwent Valley Council’s submission to the Board is to:

Retain its existing boundaries as was the case in the 1993 local government reform.

Recommend and support the establishment of a new entity for the service delivery of waste management for the 12 southern Tasmanian councils.

Work more closely with the Southern Central Sub-Region councils to increase organizational capacity and quality of service delivery.

Establishment of a Regional Waste Management Entity for Southern Tasmania

This is one of the three main governance models for shared services as outlined in the Information Pack – Supporting Paper, Shared Services Models.

Function-Specific joint authorities

This model involves the creation of an entity or entities focused on the delivery of a specific “customer facing” service offering to participating councils. This model would most likely apply at either a regional or catchment-wide scale. An example of this type of model would be a regional waste management entity, such as Dulverton Waste.

This regional authority would:

- Provide economies of scale from the larger operation
- Remove onerous reporting and management functions from member council
- Provide the ability to embrace new technologies and initiatives
- Provide consistency and equal service provision across the region
- Improve educational programs
- Allow partnerships with government such as Parks and Wildlife waste management
- Provide common and consistent pricing across the region
- Provide best practice waste management to residents of small councils

An example of such a regional authority is those in metropolitan Perth, Western Australia.

Perth WA Metropolitan Waste Management Authorities

With a population of 2.1 million the area is serviced by five waste management authorities. They are regional councils with boards comprising councillors from the member councils.

Mindarie Regional Council

- Town of Cambridge
- City of Joondalup
- City of Perth
- City of Stirling
- Town of Victoria Park
- City of Vincent
- City of Wanneroo

Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council

- Town of Bassendean
- City of Bayswater
- Shire of Mundaring
- City of Swan

Rivers Regional Council

- City of Armadale
- City of Gosnells
- City of Mandura
- Shire of Murray
- Shire of Serpentine
- City of South Perth

Western Metropolitan Regional Council

- Town of Claremont
- Town of Cottesloe
- Town of Mosman Park
- Shire of Peppermint Grove
- City of Subiaco

Southern Metropolitan Regional Council

- Town of East Fremantle
- City of Fremantle
- City of Melville

Comments - Reform Scenarios Affecting the Derwent Valley LGA

CENTRAL AND MIDLANDS COMMUNITY CATCHMENT – STRUCTURAL REFORM SCENARIOS

Scenario 1

Establishing two separate councils to the north and south. The southern council would comprise Brighton, Southern Midlands and Derwent Valley LGAs and a portion of the Central Highlands including Hamilton, Ouse and Wayatinah.

Comment:

This would diminish the local representation and identity of residents with such a large geographical LGA.

Scenario 2

Establishing a single Central and Midlands Council comprising Derwent Valley, Brighton, Southern Midlands, Central Highlands and parts of Northern Midlands and Meander Valley minus Carrick, Hadspen, Perth, Longford and Evandale.

Comment:

This council is far too large for communities of interest; for example, Granton and Old Beach have little in common with Deloraine.

Scenario 3

Establishing three councils – a northern council encompassing the Meander Valley and Northern Midlands, a southern council encompassing Brighton and the Southern Midlands, and a western council encompassing the Derwent Valley and Central Highlands.

Comment:

The western council of Central Highlands and Derwent Valley is also too large for local representation and common identity.

Scenario 4

Establishing three councils: a northern council capturing the Meander Valley, Northern Midlands and the northern Central Plateau region; a south-western council incorporating the Derwent Valley and south-west of the Central Highlands; and a south-eastern council reaching into Central Highlands.

Comment:

While not preferred, of the four scenarios this option provides the best alignment of communities of interest.

WESTERN SHORE COMMUNITY CATCHMENT – STRUCTURAL REFORM SCENARIOS

Scenario 1

Establishing a single council combining Glenorchy and Hobart LGAs and including Tarooma and Granton.

Comment:

While Granton residents might utilize services in the Glenorchy LGA they are more aligned with the Derwent Valley than Hobart and Tarooma.

Derwent Valley Council would lose annual revenue of approximately \$400,000 under this scenario.

Scenario 2

Establishing a single council merging Glenorchy and Hobart and including Granton and the urban footprint of Kingston, Blackmans Bay and Taroona.

Comment:

Similar with scenario 1, the residents of Granton are more aligned to the Derwent Valley than Kinston and Blackmans Bay

Derwent Valley Council would lose annual revenue of approximately \$400,000 under this scenario.

Scenario 3

Establishing a single council consisting of Glenorchy, Hobart, Brighton LGAs including urban Kingston and New Norfolk.

Comment:

Residents of New Norfolk have no common interests with urban Glenorchy, Hobart and Kingston.

The fate of the remainder of the Derwent Valley LGA has not been addressed.