

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Submissions LGBoard](#)  
**Subject:** Kentish and Latrobe Councils  
**Date:** Wednesday, 2 August 2023 9:22:22 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Having read the Catchment Information Pack and online resources I am at a loss to understand the benefit to any resident of Kentish from integrating further with Latrobe (or new amalgamation with any other Council).

At the recent Sheffield Town Hall Information evening it was learned, in respect of a full amalgamation of Kentish and Latrobe, that:

1. There would be no cost savings gained
2. Rates for each Council are likely to rise, certainly for Kentish
3. Representation of the communities by councilors would reduce dramatically. Kentish, half the size of Latrobe, would likely end up with an inequitable representation of 3 councilors and unlikely to ever elect a Mayor or Deputy Mayor from within its current foot print. This is despite a land area approximately double to triple that of Latrobe.
4. Combining any number of councils would result in participating councils inheriting the financial positions, debt, contingent liabilities and decision makers residents in each council area seek to prevent.
5. Retention of both council offices, whilst committed to, is substantially inconsistent with amalgamations nationally given this is an area of signification savings
6. Amalgamation, or combining, or merger, however labelled, will not be compelled by State Government.
7. Proposals include an expansion of social services that will cost ratepayers further

Points 1-4 above are sufficient to let the opportunity to fully amalgamate pass. Tax/Ratepayers are not in the business of giving any tier of government more money to restructure their office without material reform that reduces outgoings for residents in the near and long term. Residents are not the Government's ATM.

The Catchment Information Pack appears to place an emphasis on aligning Council boundaries to achieve a foot print that increases the proportion of people both living and working within the proposed Council area. This is a meaningless statistic, except to the extent that such a consolidation reduces representation and thus, connectedness, of those residents dramatically, perhaps by 90%. A resident will feel no more connected to their place of residence or work merely by a re-drawing of a council boundary. I doubt any resident in the nation gives any tier of government a second thought when it comes to connectedness. It is certainly no point of justification for spending millions of tax/ratepayers dollars embarking on a amalgamation exercise that council areas on the mainland, 5 years after having done so, are now seeking to unwind. Those amalgamations didn't save money, deliver better services or representation, more often they achieved the opposite. Residents within those areas are seething. About the only conclusion I can draw from the connectedness claim is that it points towards the Premier's desire to create 15 minute cities within Tasmania, [REDACTED]. If connectedness is the key metric to be pursued, then more grass roots representation with teeth is required, not less. Somehow this is not what I think the State Government has in mind.

Absent in the Catchment Information Packs and website material is any other measure of meaningful Local Government Reform. There are no substantive or material changes in the way Local Government are proposed to be reformed other than by combining/amalgamating councils, that aren't already being done (or could be done) by Councils across the State.

I cannot support government's proposal to amalgamate any Council that does not result in a net saving to affected ratepayers, permanently maintain or improve the level and quality of representation, regardless of any other claimed benefit.

Kind regards,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.